

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 17, 1970

Opening prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions. Reading and Receiving Petitions.

MR. CLERK: The petition of Everett Williams praying for the passing of an Act for the Relief of Everett Williams.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, on opening day when the Attorney-General brought in the report from the Special Committee on Law Revision, I was tempted to speak although I later on decided not to, and I also wanted a chance to look at the report itself that was being tabled at the time. Having perused the report and also having taken a look at the new statutes that are being turned out now, I feel that this is a very great improvement over what we have had in the past and no doubt this will be of great benefit to all the members of this Chamber.

When we think of the amount of work that's gone into this revision, we know that Mr. Gerald Rutherford, Q. C. started this work in 1963; now it's seven years later and we have the finished product before us. I think these gentlemen deserve a hearty vote of gratitude for the work that they have been doing, not only Mr. Rutherford but people such as Rae Tallin, our Legislative Counsel, Mr. Evans, the Queen's Printer, and probably I should also mention a former member of that department, Mr. Higenbottam, who is now in British Columbia.

Not only do we have this finished product before us now but these people are now engaged in revising the Regulations as well, and I wonder if there is any member in this House, except probably a few of our learned friends, that have a complete set of Regulations of this province in their possession. I doubt it. I haven't, and I'm sure most of the other members haven't got them and --(Interjection)-- You have? No, I'm sure you haven't. This is why I feel this is very important because this is information that we as members do not have, and this will be a large step forward for us here in Manitoba. So I want to give commendation to these people and also to the committee that has participated in this work.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion. Introduction of Bills.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood) introduced Bill No. 4, an Act to Amend The Chartered Accountants Act.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to our guests in the gallery. We have with us today in my gallery the members of the Killarney Rovers, and with them they have His Worship Mayor Dave Gibson of the Town of Killarney and Reeve Sam Tripp of Turtle Mountain municipality. Both the municipality and the town, and the group known as the Killarney Rovers, are in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney. On behalf of the members of the Legislative Assembly we welcome you this afternoon.

Also with us we have 14 students of Grade 11 standing of the Neepawa Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Haas. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. And 60 students of Grade 9 standing of the Nordale School. These students are under the direction of Messrs. Benton and Mahaychuk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Vital. And 30 students of an upgrading class of the Red River Community College and these students are under the direction of Messrs. McLeod and MacKay. And 50 students of Grade 11 standing of the Kelvin High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Long and Mrs. Davidow. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here today.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Finance. Will interim financial statements be available as of December 31, 1969 to give us more current information on the financial picture?

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the practice in the past; I'll look into that.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary question, then. Did the government end up with a surplus as of March 31, 1969, and if so, how much?

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm now doing just what the honourable member could do: he could look at the balance sheet which I find before me and no doubt get the same answer I will get when I find it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity of pointing out that there is also a little green man up in the Reporters' Gallery and he has been celebrating also.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I'm not Irish but unfortunately my Irish is up today, and I address a question to the First Minister and indeed the Minister of Government Services. It's been brought to my attention that car licence number 25E78, which I understand is from the Premier's office, is well covered with NDP propaganda for Mr. Rowland in the Selkirk by-election, and I direct my question to the government that as you know - I had thought about bringing this up as a personal grievance for reasons perhaps known to some members opposite - that Vera Enns, the most capable woman that's running in that constituency, is quite capable of taking on all fair competition, but my question to the First Minister and indeed to the Minister of Government Services is: how many government vehicles, how many government employees are involved in the campaign, or actively participating in the campaign against Mrs. Vera Enns - yes, Enns, that's spelled E-n-n-s - is involved in that campaign, which I would think that all womanhood of Manitoba would regard as highly unfair in the sense of this kind of a competition? I put it to you somewhat facetiously, in view of the day that we're celebrating today - St. Patrick's Day - but it is not a facetious question, Mr. Speaker; it's a very serious question. It's alien to our system to have the government participating with this kind of activity.

HON. E. SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I'm really not sure if the Honourable Member for Lakeside is serious in putting his question because -- I took him seriously for the first few seconds and then I got the distinct impression that he was merely taking advantage of an opportunity to put in a plug for a candidate of some relationship to him. The answer to the question, if it is a question in fact, is that I am not aware of any car bearing that number licence plate that is being used in that particular by-election campaign, but I shall check and in the event that it is a car that is attached to the government service, I can assure you it will be stopped forthwith. But at this point in time I must say that I'm completely unaware of any automobile belonging to the Crown being used.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, would that I could plug my candidate in that Selkirk constituency as obviously members opposite are. I was informed, I repeat for the Minister, the licence number 25E78, and I'm told that it is a car belonging to the secretary of the Premier or attached to the Premier's office, and I might also ask the question: since when do Premiers' secretaries drive government cars?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Government Services)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I think it would be proper for me as Minister of Government Services to reply to my honourable friend, and I want to assure him first of all that there will be many hundreds of cars during the by-election in Selkirk plying backwards and forwards throughout the constituency endorsing the candidacy of the former executive of the First Minister, Douglas Rowland, and I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend will agree with me, despite the relationship that he has with one of the candidates Rowland will be successful. But apart from that, Mr. Speaker, may I assure my honourable friend that I will check into the matter, and offhand I would say that there is no government vehicle being used for political purposes in the Province of Manitoba with this administration.

MR. ENNS: May I use up my supplementary question then for the direction of the Minister, I was referring to a particular car, well identified with the Province of Manitoba emblem on the window as a sticker of a government car, parked in that car, and checked with the Director of

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)... the Public Garage, Mr. Del Begio, as to its ownership.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I say to my honourable friend, during the election that preceded the defeat, thank goodness, of the former administration, there were many cars that had government stickers on them plying backwards and forwards throughout the constituencies in Manitoba, and possibly that contributed to the defeat of my honourable friends opposite.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister should name those cars or he shouldn't make the statement.

MR. PAULLEY: I am fully aware of it as is my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): I think Phil Reimer is also a pretty good guy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I intend to change the subject. I don't want to be political here. I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. According to press reports the gold mine at Bissett is to be brought back into production. Is this going to be under a private undertaking and how soon is this supposed to come about, and has the mine been surveyed? What is the potential?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I should take that question as notice because quite frankly, to this point in time, I'm unaware of any activity at the San Antonio Mine site other than certain salvage operations, but I'll take it as notice and see if there have been developments in recent weeks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to reopen a subject with the First Minister that I haven't had a chance to ask him about for four months now, and that is the situation regarding the Centre Point development, or projected Centre Point development, in downtown Winnipeg. Can the First Minister report the status of that subject to the House?

MR. SCHREYER: I think I can tell the honourable gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as the province is concerned we are willing to proceed with the province's requested in-put into that Centre Point development project. There are certain conditions or requirements which would have to be met or upon which the province would have to be assured, but all in all, Mr. Speaker, I believe it can be said at this point in time that the development of the Centre Point project awaits a favourable decision from the private entrepreneurial groups involved. Insofar as the province is concerned, we are ready.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the First Minister tell the House whether any of the original private investors, or private developers, have re-examined their position and decided to withdraw?

MR. SCHREYER: No, there's been no such definitive indication, Mr. Speaker. However, it would be correct to say that they still have the matter under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Honourable the Minister of Cultural Affairs. It relates to the activities of the Manitoba Centennial Corporation. Could he tell us when he proposes to table the annual report of the Centennial Corporation for the period ending March 31, 1969?

HON. PHILIP PETURSSON (Minister of Cultural Affairs)(Wellington): Mr. Speaker, it would be in due course, some time subsequent to that date.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to either the Premier or the Minister of Finance. According to today's report in The Tribune, the Churchill Forest Industries' loan is now revealed as standing at the figure of \$90 million. Most of us were under the impression that the loan limit was somewhere in the \$40-\$45 million range, and according to this newspaper report it is now up to \$90 million so my question, Mr. Speaker, is: are there any more unrevealed details in the agreement that call for more public monies to be put into the pot for CFI?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the honourable member's question is slightly misleading in the sense that the amount indicated does not relate to Churchill Forest Industries alone but rather relates to the aggregate loan extended to all of the companies involved in The Pas forest complex. There are four companies and that amount which the

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.).... honourable member mentioned is the aggregate amount to be lent over a period of time to the four companies.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, may I re-phrase my question, Mr. Speaker? Are the four companies going to receive any more than the \$90 million figure as per the original agreement?

MR. SCHREYER: Well Mr. Speaker, I don't want to rule out the possibility that this may happen but the likelihood is very remote, and in any case the amount, the contractual obligation to lend is limited to that amount.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce since he was the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources before. It's in connection with the Pembina Dam. I was wondering if they have done anything new this summer, because our cannery at Morden has closed down and we feel that these things are somewhat related.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): With all due respect, Sir, I think that it will be more proper for the current Minister of Mines and Resources to answer this question.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Inkster): Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to inform the honourable member that the departmental program relating to dams and other works will be discussed during the estimates of the department.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, if I may I'd like to have a supplementary question. On the news report last night it was stated that the United States was in favour of this but Canada was dragging its feet, and I was wondering has the province of Manitoba done anything towards advancing this with the Federal Government since last year?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my previous answer stands.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services. Could he tell us whether as yet a reply has been sent to the Day Nursery Centres regarding a request for capital funds for a new Day Centre?

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no - not to all of them.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member a supplementary question?

MRS. TRUEMAN: A supplementary question. There is only one Day Nursery Centres Board and this was the one about which I was enquiring. If they haven't received a letter, when could they expect it?

MR. TOUPIN: As soon as possible, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Minister of Youth and Education. Has the Department of Education arrived at a decision with respect to the final Boundaries Commission's report on school boundaries in the Interlake?

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education)(Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, legislation will be introduced later in the session making it possible for the government to take action on the boundaries in the Interlake.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister at this time inform me and the residents of St. Laurent as to whether or not the high school will be remaining within that community?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman well knows, the Department of Education does not dictate where a high school shall be built. This is a decision of the school board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the First Minister. Have John and Yoko Lennon replied to the Manitoba Government's invitation to be in Winnipeg this summer?

MR. SCHREYER: No they haven't, Mr. Speaker, but in case my honourable friend is anxious I can arrange for them to meet with him, and perhaps they can work out an entertainment card for both of them to perform together.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and I promise not to express opinions. I ask the Minister of Agriculture if it is his intention to give a report to the House on his trip to Rome during the agricultural crisis in the province of Manitoba.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, at some point during the session, if my honourable friend wishes to indulge I could deal at some length on that subject matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Youth and Education. Are we to expect changes in amounts granted to school divisions or the structures of the grants from what they are now, in the coming few weeks?

MR. MILLER: That information will be known when the estimates are tabled.

MR. GIRARD: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister is aware that this could substantially affect divisional budgets and they are waiting for this.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the school boards should be waiting for the estimates of this House.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Chairman, a supplementary question. Is the Minister aware that for the divisional budget it matters whether there is a transferability from one area to another as to how they can use their grants?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I repeat, this will all be revealed during the estimates.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): I would like to direct my question to the Honourable First Minister. At the last session of this House he informed us he would be expecting a report of the Boundaries Commission on the Metropolitan study by the 15th of February. Has the government now received that report?

MR. SCHREYER: No we haven't, Mr. Speaker.

MATTERS OF URGENCY AND GRIEVANCES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent public importance and I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur, that the House do now adjourn for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance brought about by the recent announcement of the Minister of Youth and Education fixing the 1970 Foundation levy at 9.9 mills on residential and farm property and 33.9 mills on other property, with no apparent compensating adjustments in the Foundation program system and thereby shifting a greater burden on the property taxpayer who in 1970 faces increases of up to 10 mills on top of large increases in property assessments and in the face of declining property values in rural Manitoba combined with the critical economic situation, the unfortunate net result being that the government in my opinion will take more money from property taxpayers in 1970 than in any former year, and leave the municipalities, schoolboards and taxpayers in a most unfair position.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to thank the honourable member for bringing this matter to my attention in accordance with the provisions of our rules. Upon perusing the motion I find that it deals with the matter of assessment and taxation. May I refer the honourable members to page 6 of the Speech from the Throne delivered by His Honour on the opening of this Session of the Legislature, and which is reported in Hansard on page 5, 4th paragraph as follows: "The whole question of municipal assessment is of concern to the government, and the Legislature will be asked to cause the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs to make a complete study of the subject. In the meantime, legislation will be introduced dealing with specific problems pertaining to municipal assessment and taxation."

May I direct the attention of the honourable members to our Rule 26, subsection (6) subsection (b), which reads in part as follows: "The right to move the adjournment of the House for the purposes in sub-rule (1) is subject to the following restrictions: (d) The motion shall not anticipate a matter that has previously been appointed for consideration by the House."

I feel the honourable member's motion is anticipatory and it appears that there would be opportunity to debate this matter on other occasions. Therefore I must rule the motion of the Honourable Member for Riel to discuss a matter of urgent public importance out of order.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Attorney-General.

TABLING OF RETURNS

HON. AL MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to table a number of returns required pursuant to Acts of the Legislature. In doing so, I

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.)... want to tender apologies to the saints for the colour of these ribbons, particularly the people from Killarney. It seems that the offices are well stocked with blue ribbon and we're certainly not going to discard it - we're very frugal; we'll use it up first.

There is a copy of a return under the Controverted Elections Act for the year 1969, a nil return from the Court of Queen's Bench and the Court of Appeal. A copy of a nil return under The Trade Practices Enquiry Act for the calendar year 1969. A report of the Comptroller-General, statement of assets and liabilities, profit and loss account for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1969 re the Liquor Control Commission. A report covering the operation and enforcement of liquor laws in Manitoba for the calendar year 1969. Embodied in this report at page 21 is a statement of general administrative and prosecution expenses for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1969. A copy of the general report of the Liquor Commission is tabled as well, and a copy of a letter attached which was sent out accompanying a copy of this return, which was sent to each member of the House, wherein it was indicated at the next session the report would be tabled.

Also tabled is a copy of the report of the Chief Inspector of the Liquor Control Commission, and the proceedings of the first annual meeting of the Conference of Commissioners of Uniformity of Legislation in Canada 1969.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (cont'd.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Is his department or the government considering developing any summer camps similar to the ones operated by YMCA and various church organizations? If the answer is yes, can he tell me how many?

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism and Recreation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I don't think the answer is going to be yes. I would say the answer would possibly be no.

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

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if the minister can give the House a progress report of the Pleasant Valley Dam project, where it stands today.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I consider again this to be appropriate to deal with the dam program during the estimates of the department.

MR. GIRARD: I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Is your department, Sir, carrying on an investigation into the circumstances of the unfortunate industrial accident at Sprague with a view of preventing any recurrences?

MR. PAULLEY: May I, Mr. Speaker, inform my honourable friend that this department investigates every fatality in industry. My answer to him is yes, and if we find that there was negligence, either by employee or employer, it will be revealed after the coroner's inquest.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: I direct a further question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, Mr. Speaker. Did I understand the Minister to say that we would not expect to get any answers from this side of the House until the estimates of Mines and Natural Resources insofar as water conservation is concerned?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend's question merely indicates the low level of his understanding. I said that I would not -- (Interjections) -- Mr. Speaker, I indicated that I would deal with the progress and the dam questions which were put by the Honourable Member for Pembina and the Honourable Member for Morris. Mr. Speaker, when the honourable members are prepared to sit and listen and wait for an answer I will give it to them.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege I think that I should answer the remark from my honourable friend. I think his answer to the member who just asked the question on the Pleasant Valley Dam, the answer he got is an indication of the low level of the understanding of the department he represents. Probably we should bring some of his staff in here and find out what's going on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On the same topic, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Resources. When can I expect a reply to a Return of an Order accepted at the previous session on the same subject of the Pembina Valley Dam?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question as notice. I am not immediately aware of the Order for Return.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Private Members' Resolutions.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that all sides of the House are in agreement that Private Members' Resolutions will not be proceeded with today, and I would therefore ask the Speaker to proceed to the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for The Pas for an Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to His Speech at the Opening of the Session; the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition in amendment thereto. The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin my remarks by congratulating you on holding the Chair of this House once again, and might I assure you on behalf of the members of my party that we will do our best to co-operate with you in the smooth running of the affairs of this House.

To the mover of the Speech, the Member for The Pas, may I say that your contribution was well taken and I, too, hope that the government will pay more heed to the problems of the northern peoples of this province. As a member of the Northern Task Force, I was part of the group that visited nearly 40 communities and spent some days during the months of December, November and January in the north, and we heard from literally hundreds of northern residents. It is our hope also in this party that these pleas and requests will be taken seriously and that the great potential of the north will come into its true place in Manitoba.

To the seconder, the Member for Point Douglas, I say also that your comments were in tune with the times and valid when you mention the high cost of drugs to our elder citizens and in some cases the abuse of drugs by some of our younger people. To the Premier and his ministers who have had eight months in office, I trust that they have fully acquainted themselves with the instruments of power at their disposal and will use this power for the good of all of our people.

We listened with interest to the Leader of the Official Opposition yesterday when he stressed his concerns over certain lack of content in the Speech from the Throne. I am inclined to agree with him when he expressed some of his anxiety. I, as one of the Manitoba elected representatives, consider myself very fortunate to have happened to have been on the scene in this our Centennial year in Manitoba. Before young countries such as Canada can take their place in the front ranks of the respected nations of the world, a certain degree of maturity must be achieved. Usually the maturity comes from experience gained in dealing with problems both inside the country and externally.

We, as Manitobans, are playing our part in Canada's destiny and as we look back on the first hundred years of Manitoba's existence as a province, we have much to be proud of. From the early days of the fur trade when the traders of Scotland and France arrived, down through the years when successive waves of immigration brought people here from the British Isles, Eastern Europe, Western Europe, our province has been building spiritually, culturally and materially. To those who have passed from the scene and have not had the opportunity to look back on 100 years of progress, may we pause to think of them now. To those people who are serving on the 180-odd committees across the province to make a successful Centennial year in their respective communities, I say thank you and I hope that your enthusiasm will keep up for the remainder of the year.

We also look forward with pride and pleasure to the visit of Her Gracious Majesty and the Royal Family. We in Manitoba may consider ourselves fortunate that we are able to receive this gracious family in so many communities in our province.

Despite what I have said, Mr. Speaker, concerning our pride in the achievements of our forerunners here in Manitoba, much remains to be done and that is why we are here for this Second Session of the Twenty-ninth Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I have listed a number of points I wish to make and they are not necessarily in the order of their importance, so because one places ahead of the other it does not mean that it has precedence in priorities in my mind at this time.

The first matter that I would like to discuss that was mentioned in the Throne Speech is the matter of automobile insurance. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I was concerned when I

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.)... first knew the makeup of the Commission appointed by this government to enquire into all aspects of this problem. While I had nothing of a personal nature against the gentlemen who make up the Commission, I was concerned when, as the hearings developed, that all of the members seemed to be openly and unabashedly in favour of a government-operated plan. It did not appear that any of the gentlemen were unbiased or open-minded in their questioning of the witnesses who came before them.

However, I understand from the Premier's remarks on the television on Sunday, that a Crown Corporation may be set up to compete with private companies, with no compulsion attached to joining the government plan. My only comment at this time is, I hope the government plan will not be subsidized either directly or indirectly by the taxpayers of the province. Also, if the government plan does not offer a substantial saving to car insurance purchasers, then I can hardly see the advantage of setting up a duplication of service in the province, with more red tape and an increase in the number of civil servants. Of course, Mr. Speaker, if we were to look at some New Democratic Party election material from the last election, we would note the words that it is their intention to produce a plan, "at a much lower cost."

Mr. Speaker, I'd now like to turn to agriculture. While the recently announced plan of the Federal Government to assist farmers in the present crisis is acceptable, and very helpful as far as it goes, in paying \$6.00 an acre for summerfallow and \$10.00 an acre for the two-year plan of switching from grain to forage crops, the provincial administrations of the west should press the Federal Government to implement a long-range plan for agriculture as it affects the grain-growing industry.

Also the Provincial Government should intensify its efforts to give leadership to the farm community in the field of diversification of crops, farm management and scientific advice through the University.

Finally, in the one area where the province is solely responsible, namely property tax, a plan should be worked out to relieve the farmers of some of the high land taxation. We know of many cases where the earning power of the land cannot support the tax. In other words, there is no relation between the two.

In the matter of agricultural marketing I believe that extensive research is required in Canada into all aspects of marketing farm produce, including promotion in foreign countries, transportation of perishable products over long distances, and the educational programs in developing countries to promote the use of feed grains for feeding livestock.

In this regard the domestic market for feed grain also must be developed. In southern Ontario, for example, last year farmers imported 28 million bushels of American corn for feed while western farmers were left sitting on millions of bushels of feed grain.

Finally, farmers need accurate information regarding the amounts and kinds of farm produce that the domestic and world markets might be expected to absorb, so that they can better plan their production programs in advance. This is particularly true in Manitoba where better and more reliable market information is required. Present attempts by the Provincial Government to forecast prices of farm products, livestock numbers and crop acreages, are not adequate as yet. The importance of market information should be recognized by the Manitoba Government and consideration should be given to the formation of a new agricultural marketing branch with a Director responsible to the Deputy Minister of Agriculture.

Concerning livestock, I feel that too many farmers lack a suitable alternative to elevator sales in order to market their wheat, oats and barley. Livestock, particularly beef cattle and hogs, offer the only suitable alternative as markets for grain in years like the present when burdensome world grain surpluses loom as a continuing thing. The present provincial government must recognize that Manitoba is marketing its beef and its hogs on a North American market and that a tripling of livestock numbers in this province in an orderly manner would not hurt prices. In addition, it would be of great benefit to many Manitoba packing plants which are threatened with extinction through lack of business.

Greater resources are needed by the animal industry branch to operate more effectively in three fields: first, export development; second, management information and extension; and thirdly, exploration of goals for the livestock industry and how to achieve them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a word about the taxation as it affects the farmer. The tax on real property on some farm land in Manitoba is now as high as \$4.00 an acre. This is an impossible burden for farmers in years of low grain quotas and depressed prices. The crux of the problem is that farm land is being taxed very heavily in many areas for schools and

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . hospitals, particularly schools. **These** are services for people, not service related to property, and should be recognized as such. I would think that farmers are concerned with the fact that neither the Manitoba Government nor the Minister of Agriculture has ever announced the objectives of the Manitoba Department of Agriculture in the context of today's changes. Without objectives, governments flounder and do not effectively serve their people. Objectives are extremely important now because two full farm programs are needed: one program for commercial agriculture and the other a social program of credit, training and assistance for disadvantaged farmers. The two programs should be kept separate and distinct, and this is not the case in Manitoba.

I'd like to mention a word or two on the matter of expropriation. I'm glad to see that the Throne Speech makes reference to improving the expropriation laws of the province. In the matter of expropriation, particularly in the Department of Highways, there is much to be desired. Particularly reprehensible is the policy of asking the holder of property to be expropriated if an offer is satisfactory, then changing the offer. Another serious failing is delaying payment for expropriated land, sometimes for years causing undue hardship to people who cannot afford it unless they go to the heavy expense of going to court.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to say a word on the economic development of our province. If there's one burning question facing the industrial and business leaders of Manitoba, it surely must be: "Where do we stand with the NDP government?" When statements are made by government members to the effect that this government is considering going into the car insurance business, life insurance, mutual funds, offices, stores, drug manufacturing, then the Department of Industry and Commerce is going to have an insurmountable task in trying to convince industry to expand or enter Manitoba. Yes, the Honourable Member for Morris said "still" and I agree with him. This has been seriously discussed too, I understand.

So, Mr. Speaker, who is going to pay the taxes to support the bills that you folks are considering to bring in?

MR. GREEN: Which one?

MR. JOHNSTON: Where are the taxes going to come from? They can't come from the home owner. We've taxed on the Income Tax about as far as we can go. Surely you must know that if we are going to introduce any social improvements then the money has to come from the industrial growth of the province.

With respect to the changes contemplated in the role of the Manitoba Development Fund to the concept of a Crown corporation, two points should be made: one, that the Fund should primarily be made available to Manitobans first and other Canadians second. I have been told by businessmen who have applied for MDF loans and have been turned down, that there seems to be a preoccupation within that organization to make multi-million dollar loans to foreign corporations.

The second point is that no special consideration should be granted to prospective borrowers that are contrary to our national interests, such as the decimating of our forests and the ruining of the wildlife cover. Members of the Northern Task Force up north a few months ago were shocked to see logging operations going right up to the edge of scenic roads, and that land will be barren for many years to come. Surely when we make bargains with companies, government should write into the bargain, into the agreement, all the laws that apply to every other citizen in the province should apply to anyone else coming in.

I could mention one shocking example of discrimination, and I'm going to use a company name here, and it's the unfair situation in which the Prendiville Saw Mills have been placed in northern Manitoba. This firm, which has flourished and expanded for 20 years in the north, is gradually being squeezed out of operation in northern Manitoba. At one time this firm employed 250 people, paid good wages, paid the going rate of stumpage and royalties to the province, and paid taxes. Now it's fighting for its existence against Churchill Forest Industries and the province is now denying them long-term cutting permits so that they can stay in business. The proprietors of this firm four or five years ago had a flourishing business that was saleable at a very good price. Today it couldn't be given away. Should this be allowed to happen? Mr. Speaker, I submit it's not too late to correct this situation. Surely the government with their bargaining powers can correct injustices such as this.

In the matter of the operation of the Department of Industry and Commerce, I would say that the main work of the department should be the identification of industrial opportunities through feasibility studies, but even more important is the selection of specific studies which

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.).... suit the particular economics of Manitoba. There should be better promotion of these opportunities, first to Manitobans, and then to outsiders who may invest new capital in the province. The government agencies now active in development must review their functions and develop better co-ordination of effort to improve results. And closer continuing liaison with the business community of Manitoba must be developed and a greater emphasis on commercial development is desirable. And so in this context, Mr. Speaker, I think the Manitoba Development Fund should be used.

In industrialization, Mr. Speaker - and this is where Manitoba's salvation lies; agriculture is having its difficulties in these years - new industries are needed in all parts of the province. They are needed to provide jobs for people, not only in the cities but in the rural areas as well. The Manitoba Development Fund should be used as an instrument for regional development to assist job producing industries to locate in rural and northern and urban areas. Rather than dividing available funds into two or three major loans per year, it would be preferable to make a multitude of smaller loans to small and medium-size businesses started in many more communities where job opportunities are lacking.

In addition, Manitoba must find a way to overcome the most serious obstacle to industrial development in this province - the freight rate problem. We can produce virtually anything in Manitoba that can be produced in other parts of Canada but, because of our distance to the market in which our goods must be sold, our goods often are not competitive. By pressing for participation in the development of a federally-sponsored national freight rate policy designed to equalize the opportunities for industries in all regions of Canada, we will have taken a significant stride forward to help in the development of Manitoba.

In the matter of new industries, Mr. Speaker, we know that we require them; we know that we have to move in this direction if we are to raise our standard of living, if we are to stop the drain of trained people from Manitoba. We also need these people in industries to broaden our tax base so we can continue providing necessary services.

Tax reform and industrialization should be matters of top priority with any government in this province. Without question there are two basic and most important issues facing us now. We must make a complete review of all taxes in Manitoba. From this we must draw up a more equitable tax structure for this province. We will not be able to complete our tax reform program until we do generate new economic activity and we must begin the process of overhaul now. Some changes should be made immediately and others will have to be introduced just as quickly as our economic expansion permits. The most crushing tax of all for most people is the property tax which has skyrocketed in all parts of Manitoba in recent years. Too much of the load now is on property, both in rural and urban areas. This is due mainly to the high cost of education as well as health and welfare in some areas. But these are not property services and the burden of their cost should be transferred from the property tax to the broader provincial tax base.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to propose an amendment to the amendment based on the failure of this government to keep a promise accepted in good faith by the people of Manitoba. I would like to refer to the promise, Mr. Speaker. It's in the election material of the New Democrats in the last election and I quote: "Taxation" - there is a picture of a young couple looking at a house under construction and I quote the wording - "Young people like these are being crushed under an unjust taxation system. Ed. Schreyer and the New Democrats believe that property taxes should only be used for services to property; services to people should be covered by general provincial revenues based on fairer methods of taxation."

Now perhaps the gentlemen who are in power now will say it can't be done; we thought it could be at the time but now it can't be. I would like to refer to the Throne Speech given by Mr. Thatcher in Saskatchewan where he is trying to do something about these problems. He is keeping his promise. "An unspecified boost in the annual \$50 grant to home owners and a measure of relief for local taxpayers' is part of one paragraph. Another paragraph - "The province, concerned at the steadily climbing property taxes, also proposed to assume a larger proportion of overall costs of education in an attempt to ease the burden on the local taxpayer."

Mr. Speaker, our friends opposite have had eight months in which to come to grips with this problem and they even had the audacity to mention in the Throne Speech -- in the 4th paragraph they say this: "My ministers believe at this time in our history we need to abandon old ideas, dogmas and traditions that have outlived their relevance and usefulness."

And then in the very next paragraph - in my opinion this is a contradiction - towards the

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . end of the paragraph, "Although my Ministers recognize that there remain inequities in the present revenue collection system, they have decided that present conditions must be reviewed before new measures are implemented regarding further tax reform." Well, Mr. Speaker, that's a poor excuse for keeping an election promise.

So with those few words, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that the amendment be further amended by adding at the end thereof the following words: And specifically has failed to relieve the municipal and school tax burden from those in particular need such as the old age pensioners; and further, that in spite of all the previous statements and assurances of the present government members prior to their election, they have failed to provide a plan and a program for the economic development of Manitoba and the provision of jobs for our people.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

. continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I can help the member of the opposition -- the Leader of the Opposition rather and the Leader of the Liberal Party, in giving some suggestions as to how we can relieve the taxation problems in Manitoba.

But first of all I would like to congratulate you on your return, and I was rather surprised that the Speech from the Throne didn't include a suggestion that there would be a permanent Speaker established very shortly. It seems that all members of the political parties in Manitoba, when they are on the opposition side, think this is a great idea, but when they get over to the responsible side of the House they seem to forget that it is a position that should be really made as soon as possible because I do feel that as the Speakers gain experience they can certainly help guide us through our troubled times, and while I believe you had your novice year last year, I would say that you would be a person that I would certainly support if the government so decided, not because I will agree with you all the time but most of the time possibly.

I think that in this centennial year we have been trying to find ways and means for the people of Manitoba generally to participate in celebrations, and yet we haven't set anything really as a goal for ourselves as MLA's, and as members of this House I think we should maybe show a little more concern about our province in doing something about it. I did gather that, in being a member of the Northern Task Force, in finding that some of the others did become closer to the problems of Northern Manitoba, and I would suggest to you that perhaps the government could consider some type of a program in which it would allow say urban members of this House to visit some of the rural areas, some of the northern areas; the people in the north visit some of the rural areas and the urban areas; and of course the rural people visit urban and northern areas. If we could conduct a tour something along that basis, then possibly we could get a little closer to what the problems are. We always seem to strive to indicate to the people that we are getting to the grass roots of the problems, but unfortunately too often it does point out to us generally as politicians that we really are not getting to the grass roots of the problems of this province and possibly it is because we are too parochial. I leave it for your consideration and maybe we can do our own thing as well as asking others to do it in this province.

Going on to the Leader of the Opposition's contribution, I found it certainly a large improvement over that of the last session and I think he hit upon many of the problems that people generally are concerned about, and I would hope that it is an indication of how we are going to discuss the real problems of Manitoba during this session.

For one minute I would like to go back to the First Minister -- unfortunately he is not here -- but I have found that quite frankly people have gained confidence in what he is doing and what he is saying, except that there are members of his party that seem to be laying traps for him, and while he has been able to sidestep them up to now, I just wonder how long he is going to continue to be able to do this -- (interjection) -- I have only got 40 minutes.

We discussed for a couple of minutes yesterday just before the Orders of the Day the question of the Federal Government's \$200 million to depressed areas in Canada, and it is worthy to note that our dear friends in Ottawa decided that the depressed areas by and large, according to the Winnipeg Free Press, were mostly on the eastern part of Canada, and when they got into the western part of Canada they found one in Manitoba, they found three in Saskatchewan, one in Alberta and none in B. C. Mr. Speaker, when they decided on Manitoba they found one at The Pas and the Honourable James Richardson decided that this would take care of the many problems of the Indian-Metis people and I guess according to him this was going to look after everything in the north because last year -- last year they introduced the same problem for depressed areas such as Montreal and Toronto and Winnipeg and Regina, and all those large depressed areas of Canada were looked after last year. Maybe next year the north will gain a little recognition.

But I just don't understand it. Maybe I'm not in tune with the thinking of the rest of Manitoba, but why pick The Pas? It's on its way; it's starting to grow. If they have problems it was because the problems grew out of the industry that was established in The Pas and the fact that it was not properly planned in the first place. They do not mean to say at this time that we should take away monies that have been offered The Pas, but I do seriously say at this time that certainly something should have been done about Churchill, because at the time

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . that they announced this policy they had already known that they were going to withdraw the major industry that was left in Churchill. Mr. Trudeau, when he stopped off to gas up a couple of weeks ago at Churchill, he said, "Well, things will happen in the spring perhaps," and I guess hope springs eternal in Churchill. But the Minister yesterday, the First Minister, indicated maybe something would happen: Mr. Trudeau has indicated something would happen. But why all the secrecy? If something is going to happen in Churchill that's worthwhile, then why not let the people know about it? I don't think they know whether they are coming or going.

A MEMBER: - Who? The people or Trudeau?

MR. BEARD: I didn't refer to Churchill either. Mr. Speaker, when I first got up I said that probably I would be able to help the members of the opposition parties in coming to some conclusions as to what could be done about the financial problems of Manitoba, and I believe in this case I will be referring to many of the things that took place during the public meetings of the Northern Task Force so I am not revealing anything that certainly hasn't been talked about in the papers in the past, and particularly in the last two or three days. But I would like to say that in reviewing the information gathered by the Northern Task Force, it has confirmed in my mind the desperate need for government to take the extra step of creating a senior Department of Northern Affairs. Certainly the challenge that has been presented to the Task Force underlines the necessity for changes in both policy and legislation.

I believe the second challenge is the need to firmly establish the reason for developing a new northern Manitoba, not only in the minds of the legislators but also the citizens of this province. Certainly it is my contention that past governments and Manitobans have not given enough serious thought to either the cost involved or the revenue. The returns would be enjoyed by Manitobans in general. The money spent in the north is not a cost or an expense but rather an investment. The resources of the northern part of our province can establish the future for the Indian-Metis people and the future generations of many other Canadians. Money invested today will develop an area capable of accommodating many millions of people if the resources are properly managed.

Certainly the primary concern to all must be the assurance that each resource will be developed to its ultimate potential. The planning and co-ordination will require the guidance of a strong minister with enthusiasm, energy and ability, and for one, I am presently prepared to support the Commissioner of Northern Affairs if the First Minister is ready to take that step of not only creating a senior Department of Northern Affairs but seeing to it that it has the teeth and the money to do the job that the Northern Task Force is going to refer to it. When the Department was first proposed by the last government under the directorship of Mr. Bob Smellie, I was very enthused, as I was led to believe that it would grow in importance. Unfortunately, this never came about, it was shifted from one area to another. It remained a branch of government with little or no working capital. On the other hand, it was used as a protective tool to shield government from the responsibilities of any orderly development of our north.

The real sour note today is the irresponsible attitude that both civil servants and the politicians have taken to use the built-in shortcomings of northern affairs to try and strengthen their own philosophy. I am firmly convinced that these people have taken it upon themselves to destroy the image of northern affairs and the good work that it has accomplished. Certainly now is the time to erase that jealousy and rivalry of civil servants and develop the spirit of co-operation and responsible policies and programs. Quite frankly, I find that most people fear that there will be built-in costs through duplication of service. There is also the fear that the people throughout the rest of the province will be reluctant to accept or face up to the present needs and the future needs of the north. It certainly is my personal feeling that Manitobans require the resources of the north to meet the present and the future demands of Manitoba budgets.

The first priority of this government will be the task of educating Manitobans in respect to establishing overall priority for the development of our natural resources and the use of our local Manitobans so that they may become involved from the very beginning. The Indian-Metis people have asked to be allowed to participate in northern Manitoba's future. Governments should feel duty bound to see to it that these associations are carried through to their very end, and certainly in most respects because we are talking about over 25,000 people of Indian-Metis origin in the north.

(MR. BEARD cont'd)

While I have no intention of downgrading the importance of our agricultural resource, I must point out the danger of continuing our present policy of bordering on the mistake of over-emphasizing one resource at the expense of so many others. The agricultural industry in Manitoba can no longer be expected to carry on the demand of the provincial budget. As we look northward we must not lose sight of the fact that in many respects it actually includes the major part of the central portion of the province. Much of this area, through underdevelopment, has become pockets of desolate areas of poverty. This disgrace must be charged to both senior governments. They have allowed these areas to fall at least 50 years behind today's modern-day standards through the lack of providing government services offered to other communities. There is a growing feeling that many of the northern communities would have been far better off if the provincial boundaries had remained those of the postage stamp era. Once again the situation we face today is one in which both governments must stand prepared to invest in bringing these areas the modern-day amenities that they have been denied for so many years. For these many reasons I return once again to the need of government to accept the responsibility of establishing a strong senior government of northern affairs to co-ordinate orderly development and gather the civil servants responsible for the north under one authority.

Generally speaking, the needs of the north are different. The approach must be different. Since the individual services are so interdependent, they must work together and understand the day to day thinking that must take place. While I have no intention to single out priorities, I do feel that we must develop a better means of communication and transportation if we are to design any effective foundation. An effective Northern Affairs Department must be prepared to change some of its approaches. Their planning must come through local consultation with northern Metis and Treaty communities which must be involved in the intricate part of the first phases of development. These people are saying over and over again they want to break away from their dependence upon welfare programs. They want to become recognized as responsible citizens and confided in as policies are made in Winnipeg and Ottawa. In fact they really are only asking for the same rights that our forefathers had when they developed southern programs and southern communities and made the mistake in creating those programs and policies.

I believe that a Northern Affairs Department must have the complete confidence and co-operation of other departments. There must be a closer relationship at the civil service level so that one group does not run ahead advocating projects outside the capacity of government to adequately finance. The department must establish a feeling of confidence of the northern people and their local governments. The department must see to it that all civil servants take note of all problems when they visit isolated communities rather than telling people that they cannot deal with the matters outside of their immediate jurisdiction. The department must co-ordinate future resource developments to assure the northern people of job security in keeping with their type of life. Certainly industry, unions and government must face up to the need to change the rules of the game if they are to take advantage of the Indian-Metis northern Manitoba labour pool.

The job of developing the north is not the job of a part-time minister. The orderly management of three-quarters of this province should prove to be a rewarding investment--as good a rewarding investment as this province has ever made. We have discussed a program that will cost a good deal of money. It is hard to guess just how much. Certainly we must make a start, and I suggest that a pool of money be created by diverting the money that is usually spent by each department in the north. This approach may help to eliminate unnecessary duplication, and through selective programming make the best use of each dollar.

I am firmly convinced that more revenue is developed in the north than is re-invested at both levels of government. The seemingly never-ending magnitude of northern Manitoba's resources grow each year as new minerals are discovered. I believe that industry and both levels of senior governments will stand prepared to invest in modern services--should be rather, just as they are expected to share in the return. Sound planning and co-operation should not develop too much of a tax load for Manitobans. While past governments have always taken the attitude that modern services cannot be extended to include the north, I am sure that the investment in over-all planning for Manitoba would have created revenue rather than cost money. Certainly the time has come to discard the old postage stamp type of

(MR. BEARD cont'd) . . . thinking and create a modern Manitoba in which people will be satisfied to come and stay. I believe this type of programming is far superior to creating an impossible tax load as an inheritance for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, it is hardly necessary to advise you of course that I would not wish to conclude without discussing Churchill to some extent. In fact I can report that the weather has been much kinder this year than government. It is apparent that the government, just as all past Manitoba governments, is convinced that the problems of Churchill are the responsibility of the Federal Government. Even at 40 below it is far better than the treatment they have got from the government. Since this is the apparent thinking of all Manitoba political parties, then I feel that the present time requires that we do have some action. I believe that an elected negotiating team from Churchill, along with the provincial and federal authorities, should settle down to some serious negotiation respecting the Port of Churchill joining the Northwest Territories. While it may be a little too late to help many of the people at Churchill it will at least insure the future of Churchill for many others. I suggest this approach not because I wish to kick Churchill out of the Province of Manitoba, I do so because I can find no real support from Manitobans in respect to the development of Port Churchill. On the other hand, I understand that when the Prime Minister was asked if he would comment on Churchill's request to join the Northwest Territories, his first remark was "Great". The Commissioner of the Northwest Territories was in attendance and he said Churchill would become a welcome addition to the Territories. So now that Churchill has found someone to really love them, I can't see how we can hold them back from progress.

The people of Churchill appear to accept this change as a welcome alternative to their present state of affairs. After all, when you are at the bottom there is only one way to go and that's up. Absolutely no community that I know of has had so many setbacks and disappointments as Churchill. In speaking to Mayor Trager of The Pas yesterday, he suggested that Manitoba may be better off to close up Churchill and move the people to The Pas. Generally speaking, this is what all people say - what would happen to Manitoba if Churchill disappeared?

I believe that if Churchill should be allowed to join the Northwest Territories it would improve conditions at Churchill and we could anticipate greater use of the C.N.R., which will create more jobs for the railroad in Manitoba. The expansion of Churchill would establish more traffic for Transair which would improve northern service and hopefully drop prices. Greater use of Churchill facilities would bring about a review of railroad freight and passenger rates and service, while also securing some hope from my MLA that he would build a road to this new resource center soon. I recognize that I have no real authority to go further in this representation than to ask the government of Manitoba to hold a vote in Churchill to see if the people are really interested in changing the boundaries. Certainly no secret meetings should take place between governments without the inclusion of a Churchill representative.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the Speech from the Throne, not because I support the controversial philosophy of many of the government members but because I feel the First Minister has indicated his intention to humanize government to a greater degree. I am also encouraged by the indication that the government stands prepared to commit themselves to help the people of Northern Manitoba in their request for self-government and a better life.

If I may, I would like to touch on minimum wage, Mr. Speaker. Since the Speech from the Throne commented on the minimum wage, I would like to record a few of my thoughts. If I read the papers properly, they indicate that the government are considering a raise to approximately \$1.50. I find no quarrel with this figure. If anything, it is still below the poverty level. Certainly it is below any negotiated wage that I know of in the province to date. Most would agree that some form of compensation has to be legislated to look after those who work for less.

However, I do want to caution the senior government that while most business people will be able to adjust their prices to meet this additional expense, it does do little to assist in fighting inflation. When one government raises wages while the other cuts back on income tax exemptions and considers tax reform, I say the cost-price squeeze is on for many operators in this province. As wages rise the operator has to cull out the less productive people and this creates more problems for government. Now is the time for government to call in the operators of the type that pay minimum wages and try to establish a formula which will encourage these businesses to offer employment to those who are not capable of holding their own in the labour market. We must produce programs of assistance that will encourage these

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) workers to do as much as possible to support themselves by co-operating with industry.

I am encouraged by the Speech from the Throne in that it assures us that the north will begin its long road to modern living conditions and lower the cost of living. I also support it in spite of the fact that my MLA took Churchill off the map. Little does he know how much effort it took to get it there in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, may I close with again appealing to the First Minister to seriously consider an independent Department of Northern Affairs at the next session, and I again state that I would like to see the Honourable Member for Inkster get an opportunity to head this new senior department. I don't agree with him all the time but I feel he has the energy, the ability, and he's stubborn enough to see to it that we will get our share. And I would like to point out too, Mr. Speaker, that you haven't had to warn me that I have used up my 40 minutes. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that debate be adjourned.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I understand that although the Member for Rhineland may take the adjournment, that any other member who wishes to speak may do so.

MR. FROESE: I personally have no objection but . . .

MR. TURNBULL: If I may then, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, it gave me a great deal of pleasure when I heard and read in the Speech from the Throne that our most gracious Queen, Queen Elizabeth II would be visiting us in our Centennial year and that she would be accompanied by the Duke of Edinburgh, the Prince of Wales and Princess Anne. I am sure that all members of the Assembly and all the people of Manitoba will enjoy that visit and that you, Mr. Speaker, in your capacity as Speaker of this Assembly, will have the opportunity of meeting the Queen.

It was with some disappointment yesterday that I listened to the speech of the Leader of the Official Opposition, who is not in his place now. I was wondering what arguments he would bring to bear on the Throne Speech and when he concluded I thought that perhaps I wouldn't have very much to refute today, but fortunately we have had the Member from Portage la Prairie who has brought up a few issues that I may address myself to.

There is one matter that the Member from Portage raised, relating to the change in property taxes so that the property owner would have to pay less in taxes, particularly for school costs. I am sure that the Member from Portage and other members would be familiar with the desire of his party and of this government to bring about in government a more open government, and in reference to that open government would agree with our desire to call the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs so that both the members of the House and the public could participate in formulating recommendations to this House and to the government for a shift in taxes from property to other sources of taxes if the committee, after its deliberations, concluded that those recommendations would be satisfactory.

There is as well, I think, a need to comment on the Member from Portage, his reference to auto insurance. There were some questions raised in the last session here about the possibility of subsidization of Crown corporations, and I think that his concern is certainly a concern that strikes all members of the House. It would not be wise for any Crown corporation to be subsidized by the government, and I would like to assure him that I am at one with him on that particular issue.

A MEMBER: How about private industry.

MR. TURNBULL: Private industry, well I feel shouldn't be subsidized quite to the extent that the previous administration was willing to subsidize it. I would hope that any form of auto insurance, regardless of the structure which is introduced to carry out the government plan if there is to be one, would be more efficient and more effective, and that the motoring public would benefit from those efficiencies and more effective administration.

In the member's speech he also made some points relating to the necessity for the Department of Industry and Commerce and the government in general to study economic development, industrial development in the province, and through the use of feasibility studies identify areas in the economy, in the industrial sector, which would be suitable areas

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd.) . . . for government attention and development. Now I would think that in the Throne Speech this matter was dealt with quite explicitly when, to quote it, it was said that "a program for economic and industrial development would be focused primarily on those areas in the province's economy which provide the greatest reward in terms of effective growth, productivity and well-being for the citizens of Manitoba," so that I think that his concern in that matter, Mr. Speaker, is certainly one of our concerns and is already being undertaken.

With regard to his mention of the need for some rationalization of freight rates. I think that by the term "rationalization" I mean the same thing as he means when he mentions the national freight rate policy. I think that perhaps rather than raise that matter in this House before a government that is already actively concerned with some improvement in transportation rates for the west, that he take his case to Ottawa and appeal to the Federal Government made up of his own party members, so that they might give us a hearing which would bring about a more fair transportation structure for the western provinces and for western people. (You'll do that for us? Good.) -- (Interjection) -- The Member for Churchill is most anxious that you do this.

The Throne Speech, it seemed to me, brought about a statement by this government which was indicative of its desire to give attention to all areas of the society and economy in Manitoba. There was in the Speech mention made of the desire to put aside old ideas and to bring into practice modern techniques of management and administration. It is hoped, as the Throne Speech indicates, that by the use of the modern technique, by the use of improved management, by the use of better administration, the government will be able to reduce disparities throughout the province and equalize opportunities for all. Now as I heard the Throne Speech I did not think that this was rhetoric but a desire to give practical application to these ideas, which application I think is long overdue. I think it is time that we had a more modern, a more progressive approach to government administration, and to the implementation and indeed the formulation of policy. I think it is time that the government responded to the needs of the people. It is time that they responded to the needs of the retired and the old and the senior citizen. It is time that they responded to the needs of the wage earner, to the needs of the employee, and it is time that they responded to the Indians and the Metis in this province. And I think that we will see in this session and in the other sessions during which I hope this government is in operation, that we will develop programs that will be a response to the very self needs of the people that I have mentioned.

In this Throne Speech which we have before us, there is already for the wage earner suggestions of improvements in the minimum wage, which have already been referred to; suggestions for improvement in labour legislation. There is, too, suggestion in the Throne Speech that the government will be giving attention to the needs of Churchill, to the needs of the north, all the north - even that part of it which is in the Member for Dauphin's constituency. The need for giving attention to the northern people I think is one policy that the government clearly enunciates in the Throne Speech and clearly indicated its intention by appointing the Task Force for the north. There was in the past, it seemed, one or two MLAs who were concerned with the problems of the north. Now there is a government which is concerned and a government which, according to the Throne Speech, will bring action, not just words, to finding solutions for northern problems.

There is also too, for certain groups of retired people, mention in the Throne Speech of improvements in retirement benefits. The Civil Service Superannuation Fund and the Teachers Retirement Fund are to be revised to bring about improved benefits for those people, and hopefully there will be other improvements as well. For the people generally who in the past have had such great grievances against the administration and against the government, there is an ombudsman now established whose office will be operative by April of this year. And then, too, to save the people from becoming confused with the great number of statutes that exist in Manitoba, there will be Law Revisions Commission which will hopefully improve the statutes and make them more intelligible to the ordinary person.

The points that I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, I think are a rather concrete statement of the government's intent in relationship to certain matters, and I would feel that the points mentioned, the indications of policy that are contained there, are what made the speech for the Leader of the Official Opposition a difficult document.

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd)

The problem of education, which causes property taxes to rise, is also one which the government through the Throne Speech has given attention to. The program for education as outlined in the Throne Speech is another indication of how the government intends and hopes to reduce disparities and equalize opportunities. The province has been asked before, all provinces have been asked before by the Association of Universities and Colleges, to ensure that there would be no general increase in fees without assurance of a simultaneous increase in student aid. The question has always been one of whether the aid provided to the students would be repayable aid or non-repayable aid. Now it would seem - and I am sorry that the Minister of Education is not in his chair - it would seem that any non-repayable aid (that is, bursaries) would best be administered when they are very definitely related to academic performance on the part of the student, but more important than that, the bursaries need to be related to the student's ability to pay, and these two criteria, academic performance and ability to pay, have to be effectively implemented, and in the past it would seem that these criteria have not been effectively implemented and hopefully from now on, hopefully they will be.

The other form of aid, of course, could be repayable aid in the form of loans. In Sweden, which often seems to come into debate in the House these days, in Sweden repayable funds, repayable aid for students is set up in this way. The interest payment on the loan is postponed until the income of the graduate student reaches a particular level, at which point the student is required to start repaying the loan and the interest on it. Now that scheme strikes me as having considerable merit because there is no guarantee that any student who does undertake to accept a loan for university education will actually benefit from the loan and from the investment that he makes in his education, but regardless of the long term policy which I hope this government will be working out, the program proposals contained in the Throne Speech for the immediate future provide funds for a variety of schemes, a variety of programs. There is here, I note, financial aid to be provided for technical training assistance, for overcoming handicaps in basic literary skills and for overcoming the problems of orientation. There is, too, funds to be provided, financial aid to be provided to assist children with special learning problems. I think that the detail with which these programs are mentioned in the Throne Speech augers well for the government and for its concern with people, with its concern for improving the quality of life for everyone and not just the special few.

There is in the speech, Mr. Speaker, an area which is not given over great attention except by an indirect reference, and that area of course is the whole area of urban affairs and urban problems. There is, of course, the proposal to freeze municipal elections so that there should be, or could be, a restructuring of municipal government in the future. Now it would seem that this restructuring is long overdue. The urban problems that are becoming increasingly more pressing in the Metro area are of course housing and transportation, pollution, and there are others; but these three in particular seem to pose very basic problems difficult of solution for any level of government including that of the provincial government. There would seem to me to be great need for improving the structure of government so that pollution, for example, could be controlled. In the United States as you know, pollution is becoming a major problem. I think here in Manitoba it is always possible that the incipient problem of pollution will not be recognized soon enough and as a result we will have the kind of atmosphere and the kind of water that is no credit to government and is certainly of no benefit to the people.

I have noticed in the paper just recently that the director of urban studies at the University of Winnipeg has pointed out that the Winnipeg - and I assume he means the Greater Winnipeg area - has no record of collective community effort on major problems, and I would think that this lack of collective effort may reflect, may reflect the past lack of leadership, lack of decisiveness on the part of the government. There would seem, for the benefit of my rural friend over here, to be some desire amongst many people to bring about some restructuring of municipal government in the Metro area so that urban problems could be more effectively studied, and more effectively solved, and I would look to some restructuring as a result of the freeze on municipal elections which have been declared in the Throne Speech.

This brings me, Mr. Speaker, to the area of civil rights, and I note in the Throne Speech that a number of proposals have been made which hopefully will improve the opportunity of all to benefit from the civil rights which are supposed to be the inherent right of every

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd)...citizen of Manitoba. There is, I note, to be a code of administrative practices, a codification of those practices that already exist which hopefully will standardize appeal procedures before various Boards and Commissions. There is to be a Criminal Injury Compensation Act which would seem to be long overdue and there's to be consolidation of fair employment practices.

But above all, Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech indicates that there is to be a Bill of Rights, and I think that this Bill of Rights has to include the proposal that all those who wish to enter political life can do so. And I would think - and she is leaving the Assembly now, Mr. Speaker - I would think that the kinds of statements that have been made in this House by members who are now going to go to Court about the rights of particular groups in this society to participate in political life, should be written in to this Bill of Rights. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that up until very recently, except for a minority or a few people who could be elected to this Assembly, it has been up until now, Mr. Speaker, an Assembly made up of those individuals who because of their birth or because of the particular occupation they chose, were entitled to sit here. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the statements that have been made by the Member for Fort Rouge, which would attempt to limit the civil rights of certain groups of people, should be prevented in the future by writing into the Bill of Rights provision to enable everybody to participate regardless of their employment, regardless of their chosen occupation, regardless of their birth, regardless of their colour, their creed and their place of living. I think, Mr. Speaker, if we can have a Bill of Rights, if we can have a Bill of Rights which brings about not only the statement of the political rights that we are all supposed to enjoy, but also a Bill of Rights that brings about an implementation and a procedure by which all can actually enjoy their political rights which the members of the Opposition, some of them anyway, would deny, then I think we have achieved in this our Centennial year an advance in political democracy that is long overdue.

..... continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker. I'd like to begin, Sir, by congratulating you on your office as you begin your second session in this 29th Manitoba Legislature as our advocate, the advocate and defender of the rights of the individual member, and commend you on what I feel, Sir, was the just and impartial manner in which you conducted the affairs of this Assembly in the earlier session, and assure you that I look forward with confidence to the fair and equitable kind of treatment for which you are now known being afforded to all members in the session which is now under way.

I'd like to congratulate the Ministers of the administration as they embark on their second session and also to say a word of special welcome and congratulation to those who through recent portfolio changes have now begun to carry new responsibilities.

I'd also like to place on the record my congratulations to the promoters of the Festival du Voyageur in St. Boniface and all the local committees throughout the province who are working so enthusiastically on Centennial programs at this time.

And I would like to add my praise to that which has already been extended by other speakers in this Assembly, to the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, the Honourable Member for The Pas and the Honourable Member for Point Douglas, respectively. Their respective words rang with the sincere conviction about the needs of Manitobans, particularly those Manitobans who live in their constituencies, and we would like to tell them in our party, Sir, that we are with them in their desires and in their goals.

I'd like to say a word or two at this juncture too, Mr. Speaker, about some achievements that have been attained this winter by various sons and daughters of the constituency of Fort Garry, which constituency I have the honour to represent. In this vein, Sir, I would like in particular to cite in this Chamber the feats of the following young Fort Garry men and women, feats that bring distinction not only to Fort Garry but to all of Manitoba. In that category were the four members of the Brian Penston school boy curling rink, consisting of Brian Penston, Al McGarrol, Ray Rosset and Gary Arason, four young students of Vincent Massey Collegiate who won the Manitoba Schoolboy Curling Championships and then performed, without ultimate success but with great distinction, in the National Schoolboy Curling Championships in St. Jerome, Quebec, as Manitoba's representatives.

In that same category I would like to mention, Sir, Mike Barlow, Manitoba's junior athlete of the year, who won the Centennial Corporation award for athletic prowess and achievement, who is also a resident of Fort Garry. And the most recent achievement, the most recent achiever of laurels and distinction, Fort Garry's Elizabeth Lupton, who was the young school girl who won the Aikins Memorial Trophy at the Manitoba Music Festival. These are achievements and distinctions in which I suggest, Sir, all Manitobans can take pride in this our Centennial year, and of course those who live in my constituency, Fort Garry, take a special pride in such honours.

Sir, as I address myself to the Speech from the Throne and the business at hand, I find myself wondering why this particular session of the Assembly was so late in being called. Many of us were under the impression that the delay in the start of the session was due to the fact that the Ministers, and in particular the First Minister, were having extreme difficulty in wrestling with their responsibilities and the challenges ahead of them and that it was going to take time to work out the comprehensive program that was going to be laid before this Assembly and indeed the people of this province.

Well, that may be true, Sir, but I submit that up to this point, on the basis of the Throne Speech delivered by His Honour last Thursday, there would appear to be very little in the program to justify that delay, and we on this side of the House will have to wait further developments in terms of specific legislation to be introduced before we can make up our minds as to whether the session got under way at a timely date or indeed was postponed unfortunately beyond the most appropriate date for its beginning in this Centennial year, and in fact whether the delay is not really to serve a political advantage and enable the First Minister and his colleagues in the Ministry an opportunity to keep their options open in the event it appears advisable for them to seek a renewed mandate from the people of this province.

Now that's fair political game. I don't challenge their right to make such an assessment or base a decision in terms of the opening of the Legislature on factors of that kind; I merely raise the question as to whether this really was the reason for the delay in the start of the session or whether there is so much of a significant and meaningful and constructive nature

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) contemplated by this government that they couldn't get things ready in time to start earlier than they did. Now of course we're faced with what well may be a session stretching deep into Centennial activities in the summer. All of us of course are fully prepared to discharge whatever responsibilities and whatever pressures upon our personal schedules are necessary in fulfilling our roles as members of this Assembly, but I pose the question, Sir, as to whether or not it might have been advisable, possible, practical, and indeed preferable to get this session under way a month earlier than was the case.

-- (Interjection) -- Yes, I'll permit a question by the First Minister, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, does the Honourable Member for Fort Garry have any idea as to when the First Minister called the session in 1959, which session followed a short fall session just as was the case last fall? I'm referring to the regular session called in 1959 by a former Premier.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I recall it was called very late, it got under way very late in the spring, in fact it might have been almost described as early summer. But I don't share much responsibility, in fact I share none for the date on which that session was called and I would have raised the same objection then had I been in the caucus or the Chamber at that time.

Mr. Speaker, opposition is never an easy role to play, not at any rate if it is to be at all constructive and to contribute anything to the general affairs of the community, and as we enter this second session of the 29th Legislature of our province it's going to be more than ordinarily difficult for us on this side of the House to discharge our responsibilities as an Opposition effectively and well. On the basis of last Thursday's Speech from the Throne, Sir, which opened this session, there's really very little that we can oppose without falling into the trap of sounding petty and picayune. On those grounds I feel the government is to be commended for having produced a very shrewd political document, and I submit that the people of Manitoba will be selling the government short and underestimating its cleverness if they fail to recognize it as such.

One commentator in the local media described it last Thursday as "A brilliant social document". I think that commentator had stars in his eyes, Sir, when he reached for his thesaurus to find his words and I think he chose the wrong word. What it is, I submit, is not a brilliant social document but a brilliant political document. In one masterful stroke, running just 11 or 12 pages in length, the government of the day has glossed over the fuzziness of its direction, patched over its differences, trussed up its philosophical ruptures and hidden its mistakes. I'll repeat that, Mr. Speaker. Trussed up its philosophical ruptures and hidden its mistakes, and done a more than passing good surgical job of removing the sting from the body of the Opposition. It's done this, Sir, with a document that in my estimation pretty carefully avoids all reference to the critical bread and butter questions that currently have Manitobans worried and restive, and places all its emphasis on an area in which it is safely beyond attack, an area which is the political counterpart of motherhood, the area of human rights.

Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, in the context of life in Manitoba today and life in Canada today, in fact is that brilliant social thinking, as my friend the commentator described it, or is it rather brilliant political thinking, for which I give the government full marks. I for one take my hat off to the government for coming up with such a strategy, and I suggest that anyone who thinks this government is not capable of playing a pretty subtle and pragmatic game of politics had better think again. I suggest there have been few political postures adopted by any party, on any issue in Manitoba in recent times, to match this Throne Speech for cleverness. The only thing is, we won't be able to stand the next one. The only thing is, that in attempting to remove the sting or the stinger from the body of the Opposition, Sir, our friends on the government benches didn't achieve complete success. They did a masterful job to be sure, but they didn't quite get it all, and although they tried to sweep the problems of our province under the rug and take the high road of social idealism, they haven't quite succeeded in disarming us for there are some problems in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, current and imminent, which won't just go under the rug and Manitobans who are truly concerned about these problems, many of them economic, are not going to be diverted or smoke-screened or put down by theoretical essays from the pens of theoretical speech writers in a theoretical government.

So let us say that we congratulate the government on a neat piece of tactics and let us

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) concede that our role as an Opposition is made more than ordinarily difficult by a Throne Speech that would do justice to the Boy Scouts. There's nothing in it to attack. But let us speak up at the same time for all those Manitobans who are sincerely concerned about the economic health and the future of our province. Let us serve notice to this government that we do not regard the Throne Speech as a brilliant social document, merely as a smart piece of NDP politics, and we do not intend to let fear of press censure or public criticism interfere with our democratic responsibility to the people of this province to meet our challenge as a loyal Opposition and to oppose. If we can find nothing to oppose in what the Throne Speech did say. Sir, we certainly have an issue with the government in what it didn't say, and we certainly have an issue with the government in the way this province is being run. It may have been a good Throne Speech, but that doesn't guarantee that our province is going to be run right.

What are some of the problems that just won't go under the rug, Mr. Speaker? What are some of the problems that the Throne Speech conveniently avoided? Well my leader has already mentioned one of the primary ones: the whole problem of the load being carried by the municipal and school taxpayers across our province, and this of course is the substance of our party's non-confidence motion currently before the members of the Chamber; but there are other ones that come to mind.

The government makes much, as we have noted, of the field and the whole concept of human rights; and it seems, Sir, I think there'd be little argument at any rate, that one of the most crucial rights of all in our society is the right to a means of earning a decent livelihood, and a good many Manitobans are keenly worried today about this province's capacity to provide economic opportunity in the next few years for all its citizens. Together with its failure to offer any hope of assistance to municipalities and other local jurisdictions in meeting their rising costs of operation, this government has failed in the Throne Speech, its statement of intent to offer any economic or industrial or resource development programs of a concrete nature that will produce jobs and livelihood opportunities of any size or in any number. This is probably the biggest single omission in the entire Throne Speech, the whole subject of jobs and job opportunities; and, Mr. Speaker, the government may rest assured that to entrepreneurial Manitobans at least, the subject is mightily conspicuous by its absence.

There are other areas of our lives, Mr. Speaker, which cry out for intelligent action: the development of our natural energy potential being very near the top of that list, and it must have been with more than ordinary dismay that Manitobans read yesterday of the latest decision of Manitoba Hydro on the subject of sources of electrical energy. Here is the report, Sir, for the benefit of those who may have missed it: "Manitoba Hydro taking what sources say is a calculated risk, has decided against any rush program to build a thermal plant addition in Selkirk to meet electrical needs of the 1973-74 winter. Hydro said despite the rapidly growing demand for power there is no risk of a brownout." Well, I would ask, Sir, since when could Manitobans afford to play Russian roulette on anything so critical as a fundamental energy source? Since when could Manitobans afford to run the risk, in any degree, in any mathematical context, of such a brownout.

Some of the other areas which have caused concern across the Manitoba community in general have been touched upon by previous speakers in this debate, Sir, and it's not my intention to be repetitive of their message of their remarks. I would cite one or two areas that I would wish to bring especially to the attention of the Chamber, however, Sir, and one of them is in the area of the quality of life which seems to be a concept that enjoys much favour with the present government, as indeed it does with our party on this side of the House, and I would ask what might be contemplated in terms of sport and fitness programs that would contribute to the quality of life enjoyed by Manitobans. Sport and fitness programs at the level of young people at elementary and junior high school and high school levels, in the country, in the rural points in particular, not just in Metropolitan and urban areas. I would commend action in this field to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, to the First Minister and his colleagues and cite it as a need of great urgency among our people, young and old in Manitoba today.

There was mention of some effort will be brought to bear in the field of pollution, anti-pollution measures, but here again the community at large and particularly the members of our party are awaiting specific and definitive indication from the government as to what they intend to do beside pay lip service to the ideal of anti-pollution practices.

(MR. SHERMAN con t'd.)

There is a crying need for this government under the Attorney-General to devote some attention to measures to reduce crimes of violence. There is a need to protect the law-abiding Manitoban from the law-breaking Manitoban, and I think all of us are very familiar with the critical scale of mathematics where armed holdups and crimes of armed violence are concerned in the Metropolitan area of Greater Winnipeg today; both daily newspapers in Winnipeg having done comprehensive reports and statistical surveys on the subject in recent months. To quote just briefly, Sir, from a recent report in the Winnipeg Tribune on this subject, I would remind the House that Metro Winnipeg up to the time this report appeared, which was late January, had had 53 robberies and 13 violent deaths since October; that violent crime, according to this newspaper, was demonstrably on the upswing here in the Metropolitan Winnipeg area; and as the newspaper pointed out, the public has good reason for concern. The Tribune went on to say that Winnipeg was justifiably proud of its relatively low crime rate when compared to other large Canadian centres in recent years. Canadians generally were proud, too, that the robbery rate per 100,000 population stood at 28.5 in 1966 as against 78.3 in the United States. But all that is changing before our very eyes and I suggest that this is one of the most crucial areas to which the honourable member of the administration who has responsibility in the Attorney-Generalship, in the office of the Attorney-General, should address himself in the weeks and months ahead while we are in session in this Chamber.

A number of glowing newspaper reports in recent months, while the House has been in recess, Sir, have talked about the practice of the present administration to revolutionize government tactics and strategy and methods in operation in Manitoba and great tribute has been paid to this ethereal and ephemerical term "participatory government"; a number of commentators have extolled on the virtues of "participatory government" as practised by the current administration. Well, we on this side of the House remain, we on this side of the House remain hopeful, we remain hopeful and we remain in need of a demonstration, Sir, as to the effectiveness, and in fact the integrity of this kind of government. In our view, on the basis of the thrust and denial tactics that have been employed by every member of the administration, on the basis of the continual fire fighting job that the First Minister has had to do, and has done I might say, with great elan and style and dash, but nonetheless with desperation . . . -- (Interjection) -- in the last four months . . . we see this more as the case of government by trial and error . . . and name the error, Mr. Speaker.

There are sectors of our Community that are torn by doubt and anxiety and worry at the present time because of trial balloons that have been shot off, that have been fired off by members of the administration and subsequently shot down by other members or by the First Minister. They know what they do on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker, and the members of the various sectors of the economy in the community that have been affected by these statements know not where they stand.

MR. SCHREYER: I'm surprised at you coming from Ottawa and not knowing what trial balloons are.

MR. SHERMAN: We didn't have much chance to try them while I was down there.
-- (Interjection) -- Well, maybe third time lucky.

There are some of the areas, Mr. Speaker, of life and enterprise in our province which sits troubled and confused today, which sits with many questions unanswered and bothersome as a consequence of the administration's penchant for what I've described as government by thrust and denial. Our role on this side of this House is clear, Sir. It's to oppose this kind of government while admiring many of the same things that the government says it intends to do, but to oppose the kind of government that sows seeds of hesitation and worry throughout our society. We shall, of course, have to await the actual legislation from the government side of the House before we can fulfil our role properly. We can't, Sir, punch at shadows and at platitudes.

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I would think that under normal circumstances in getting up to speak you might use the time worn cliché, "Unaccustomed as I am to public speaking" - "I just happen to have my violin with me" but in this particular case I must say that I rise to make a few points on the sub-amendment to the Throne Speech motion.

Before making these few points, Mr. Speaker, might I wish you well in assuming again your role as Speaker of this House. I know it is a very challenging responsibility which

(MR. CRAIK con t'd.) you've assumed.

Might I also congratulate the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech motion, the Member for The Pas and the Member for Point Douglas. I listened with interest as they made their points and I found much of interest in them. I don't at this point though wish to comment on this. What I rise specifically to do is to speak on a matter which is of peculiar, particular concern to myself and to members of the Chamber and to the members of the Manitoba community who are going to pay property taxes. This, Mr. Speaker, happens to be the issue that is paramount in Manitoba today. I attempted to discuss it on an earlier occasion but was unsuccessful in making the grade at that point and I would like to make a few points at this time.

In the announcement which we heard yesterday in the Chamber, we had the Minister of Youth and Education on the 16th of March announcing a decision which was urgent because it required a decision by the 15th of March and as a result the announcement was absorbed by all of us and I'm sure digested. But in reflecting on it, the announcement which was to basically say that the government was lowering by one mill the levy to provide for the Manitoba Government Foundation Program has more implications than would meet the eye. In the statement and the follow-up questions the Minister also mentioned the important fact that the provision for doing this was partially through more money that was gained last year through the Foundation Program, and I think secondly by - although he didn't say it directly - it was due to the fact that the assessment had increased by \$100 million for 1970. Now essentially what this did, I think, Mr. Speaker, it should be laid fairly and squarely on the table, was cast the die for educational financial assistance for Manitoba for 1970; because in announcing the program which would set the mill rate, the Minister in effect said that there were going to be no changes in the foundation grant. This was not said in the Speech but it is axiomatic that when the Foundation levy is set the foundation grants are also set, and essentially it means that there are no changes in the foundation grants. Now this was not indicated in the Throne Speech either but it is the only equitable way that the Provincial Government can provide for education in the system. It's the only equitable way, the Foundation Program is the only equitable way that money can be provided to the "have-not" areas from the "have" areas; and what essentially the Minister said was that the government is reducing the amount of money it is going to take from the "have" areas to provide to the "have-not" areas.

He also made the, or provided through this announcement the information that in actual fact where he has said - and I perhaps should go back to some prophetic statements at an earlier date - he's also in effect said, we're reducing the mill rate but we're going to take more than that away from you because we're going to increase your assessment.

I would like to reflect briefly back for some sort of text, back to earlier Hansards, namely May 13, 1968, when the present Minister -- and I do this not to rehash old stew, or rethresh old straw, or whatever the saying may be, but simply to set the stage for remarks that I think are very valid at this time. At that time the present Minister made the statement saying, "As a first step" - and he's now at the point of making his first step - "as a first step, I would seriously suggest that this province has to recognize, and this government has to recognize, that it must assume the full cost of the Foundation Program". Now the Minister may throw up his hands and say, Well, this is ridiculous; it is going to cost so much money and how are the taxpayers going to pay for it. They are paying for it now but they are paying for it in a much unfairer way; they are paying for it now because the province has the power to simply send a letter to a municipality and say, you shall henceforth increase the municipal levy by X mills. We had it this year and there's no guarantee it won't happen next year."

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, is that not just what the Minister did yesterday? He said to the municipality, you are going to collect X - X being 9.9 mills on personal property, 33.9 mills on commercial property. But that isn't what the Minister has really done. His friends on the front bench have been busily working all year in sending their assessors throughout the province to raise the assessment in Manitoba on an average of 5-1/2 percent, and the Minister -- all for the great build-up so the Minister can get up and say, We are going to reduce the mill rate. They didn't announce that they were increasing assessments incidentally; I never saw any announcement in the paper. Over the period of a whole year they have increased the assessment by 5-1/2 percent.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the honourable member a question. Is the honourable member suggesting that any member - and he referred to the members of the front bench - instructed assessors of the Provincial Government to go out and increase

(MR. GREEN con t'd.) assessments. Is that your suggestion?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Municipal Affairs is not in charge of his department he should be relieved of the responsibility.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is dodging the question. He suggested that members of the front bench directed provincial assessors to go out and increase assessments across the province. Is that your charge?

MR. CRAIK: Now let's just say . . . when I say front bench I mean the treasury bench and that includes the second bench.

MR. GREEN: . . . that the Minister of Municipal Affairs sent an assessor out and told him to increase assessments?

MR. CRAIK: Well he certainly couldn't have told him not to.

MR. GREEN: Are you suggesting that he told him to increase assessments?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this is . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I want to know whether that is the charge that the honourable member is making; and if he is not then he should withdraw the statement.

MR. WEIR: It is not a point of privilege.

MR. GREEN: It is a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. -- (Interjections) -- Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that the honourable member has charged a member of the front bench, or members of the front bench, with directing our assessors, the provincial assessors to increase assessments; and if he's not saying that then let him withdraw it.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if the Cabinet of this government is not prepared to back up the decisions that are being carried out by their civil service, they don't deserve to be in office.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there is at this point obviously a legitimate point of privilege. It is quite one thing for a minister to charge that this administration is not backing up its civil servants. I don't know how that question comes to the floor at this time, because what was an issue was a statement made by my honourable friend a few minutes ago that the cabinet, the administration ordered the assessors to increase the assessment, and that you know is really a statement most unworthy of my honourable friend. He knows very well that there are no instructions given by the Crown to the civil servants who are the assessors that they should either increase or decrease assessment. We gave them no specific instructions of that kind, so why doesn't he be a man and withdraw that statement?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this just simply reaffirms what the previous speaker my honourable colleague from Fort Garry said that they know not what they do. If you don't know what your assessors are doing, it just reaffirms the fact . . .

MR. SCHREYER: I must insist that there is a point of privilege here, because it may well be that the assessors in the normal course of their work were increasing assessments in certain municipalities wherever they happened to be working, but that's not what my honourable friend said in the first instance. He said that we directed the assessors to increase the assessment, and on that statement you'll either withdraw it or else substantiate what you say. That's quite different than saying that the result of the assessors' work was that assessment was increased; we wouldn't argue with that contention. But you said, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member said that the government directed the assessors to increase assessments, and that is, if you want a blunt word - a lie.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable First Minister has given a satisfactory explanation of the position of the government.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): On a point of order. Probably the better question would be, are the same instructions going out to the assessors now as were going out under the previous administration?

MR. SCHREYER: That would be a much more accurate question.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Ste. Rose has a valid point that was well used during the August session. This is no longer the August session. This government has had time and has given every indication that it is responsible for its action, as any government should be, and I don't see that the statement which I made is any more than a difference of semantics. I will withdraw the statement providing they are prepared to say that through the Minister of Municipal Affairs they are responsible for the actions of their department.

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) Mr. Speaker, do I have the right to continue?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there is no problem in my view. The honourable member has said that he withdraws the statement that this government directed the assessors to come up with a certain finding. He said in return would this government admit that it has to assume responsibility for the actions of the assessment branch, and of course the answer is yes and we do.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think we are dealing in semantics but the moral of the story is that in 1970 the assessment in Manitoba on the average is up 5-1/2 percent. The announced reduction of the mill rate works out to between 1-1/2 percent and 2 percent. The net difference is that the government is going to be, through the Foundation Program levy, taking more money from the property taxpayer than it has ever taken in any year previously in the history of Manitoba.

MR. MILLER: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I can't sit here and let this continue.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, it's not a point of privilege at all.

MR. MILLER: It is, it's a point of privilege because the Member for Riel is making false statements to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member please state his point of privilege.

MR. MILLER: My point of privilege is that I am being misquoted with regard to the statement I made yesterday. The statement I made. . .

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, it is not a point of privilege.

MR. MILLER: Well I'm sorry, it's a misquotation and the misquotation should be corrected. Mr. Speaker, the statement I made yesterday was that there was a lowering of one mill on the Foundation levy. This came about through a surplus which the Public School Finance Board had, which we this government didn't think they should have.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): The member has made his point of privilege and now he is making a speech. He is entitled to make his point of privilege and he has done so and it's out of order.

MR. MILLER: I just hate to see the Member for Riel. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the Honourable Minister contain his remarks to explaining whatever inaccuracies he may have.

MR. MILLER: The point of privilege is this. I made the statement yesterday that the surplus which came about in the Finance Board operations is being given back to the rate-payers, because it was their money in the first place. That in addition to that, there was going to be a reduction of one mill; we eliminated a \$1 million deficit in one fell swoop which the former government incurred.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, might I enquire of you, Sir, whether that was a point of privilege? I would like to have a ruling on this so that the members on this side of the House will know how to conduct themselves during the balance of the session. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, might I reply to my honourable friend we've got a better chance of learning than what there is exists over there have.

A MEMBER: Would you explain that again please.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I would like your ruling. Was that in fact a point of privilege?

MR. SPEAKER: It was perhaps an explanatory comment that was necessary to make for the benefit of the continuation of debate; but whether it's a point of privilege. . . are reservations in my mind.

MR. JORGENSEN: May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if any members on the opposite side want to make any explanatory comments they have the opportunity to do that when they rise in their place to take part in the debate, not interrupting other people who are on their feet.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. May the Honourable Member for Riel continue please?

MR. CRAIK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to waste many more words. I will repeat what I said, and I will have to look at Hansard to find out what the Minister has claimed I said, that I made a false statement, before I come back on it, but I resent that fact - I come back to the fact that over the period since you have been in power you have raised Manitoba assessment by 5-1/2 percent and the one mill which you are making the headlines out of, that the headlines you are trying to make out of your reduction in your mill rate account for less

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) than 2 percent in terms of what you have done to the assessment, and the point that is more important and the major point that is hidden behind the announcement yesterday is that the grant system for 1970 is now cast. I ask you smiling fellows in the back bench who may be buoyed up by the spirit of participation as to whether in fact you have read into the announcement of your government, and particularly the announcement of yesterday, coupled with the fact that the school building program has been cut off earlier, in earlier weeks, as to whether or not you are not retrenching completely in terms of the contributions of this government to education?

In addition to that, what you have done effectively, and I think I am safe in saying that the mill rate increase which you're headed for in Winnipeg this year is for seven mills on the average, in the Metro area, seven mills effectively - the increase in assessment if you work it back is the equivalent of three mills in terms of real dollars, the new increase is 10 mills. And the Minister makes a grand announcement that he is reducing the foundation levy by one mill, and in addition to this has cast the grant system which calls on 30 percent of its funds on that foundation levy. This is what is implicit in the announcement he made yesterday, and I wish to heavens that the present government in their statements would quit gilding the lily so much and tell the people the truth. And education is only one of the fields that that's happening in. -- (Interjection) -- It's like the Minister of Health when I go out to see some of my senior citizens and the problems they have. They are reading all these announcements and they scratch their head and say, how come I'm on a means test for dental care now; how come I'm on a means test for drugs? Then you enquire into it and say, well there's only 1,000 people in Manitoba got put onto this test. But this is nothing compared to the other things, but we don't read this in the headlines; we find this out now when we go and talk to the people that are on the benefiting end. And the same thing is happening in education. They have got their PR department working overtime to crank out all this garbage - absolute unadulterated garbage, and you stop and ask yourself what kind of political fraud is being perpetrated on the people of Manitoba now. And that's exactly what is behind this announcement yesterday. Why didn't you say that there were going to be no changes in the grant structure because there are not going to be changes in the grant structure when you've cast the foundation mill rate. And that's absolutely true. There are not going to be major changes in 1970 because you have gone too far now. Your turning point was yesterday. -- (Interjection) -- No I'm not asking you questions. If I was you can answer it later.

Mr. Speaker, I can honestly say that I was looking to this government for some intellectual honesty. I can say, Mr. Speaker, that I now think that they are bankrupt in terms of that commodity. -- (Interjection) -- Well that's fine. You can read all the Tribune polls you like and smile along there Mr. Fort Rouge or Osborne or whatever it is, and you will feel very fine and that's good. All I am doing is standing up here and asking for some straight statements from a government that thinks it is a blessing that has been, you know, given to this province. -- (Interjection) --

I think that might be a very good idea. The second thing I wanted to mention, and I realize that this is also going to be washed out for this year. However, I might as well have it on record now. When the present Minister made the statement in the same great speech talking about the subterranean program of financing education in the Province of Manitoba he said, and it goes without saying that a Foundation Program is not a document that is simply tabled and then left to gather dust; a Foundation Program has to be enhanced and has to be revised every year - every year - just like this year - just like this year - there was a slight, very miniscule adjustment this year. Well, Mr. Speaker, those are prophetic words, "there was a slight very miniscule adjustment this year." Mr. Speaker, there wasn't even that this year. What there was was a statement that said to every taxpayer in Manitoba there is going to be an increase this year in taxation, we are going to cover 10 percent of it. You are going to pick up 90 percent of the increased cost of municipal government, and unless you can find some means of uncasting the decision that was cast yesterday, that statement remains true.

Mr. Speaker, this is the main point that I want to make. It's the most important point, it's the most important thing that is facing the people of Manitoba today. The agricultural community is much worse off than those of us that live in the city because their assessment has increased, increased in the face of the fact that the market value which has traditionally been the heavy factor in determining assessments, the market value has gone down maybe by 50 percent, we don't know exactly; you can only go by resale values. In the face of this, the

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) government has talked about massive programs to help the farmer, they have all during the course of this time been increasing his assessment so that he can pay for more and more of the school program which these fellows, the present government, said that they were going to take completely off the taxpayer; and I say again that in 1970 that despite the miniscule announcement made by the Minister that the property taxpayer for his local government and for his schools is going to pay more money, not to the local government only but also to the Provincial Government, to both governments, he's going to pay more money than he's ever paid before in the history of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, seconded by . . .

MR. FROESE: La Verendrye.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that the debate be adjourned. Oh, I'm sorry. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GREEN: Just before the honourable member continues, may we find out, because it may be some advantage to both sides in the efficiency of the House, if there are any other honourable members who are going to speak, because if not then we would be having a night session just to finish a speech. Now if there are speakers that's fine. I'm just asking whether there are any other honourable members who wish to speak today. If they do, then we'll go as usual. If not, then we would know whether we were going to meet tonight.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, through you to the House Leader, Sir, to my knowledge we have no other speakers who wish to take up their positions in the debate today or this evening, except for the Member for Birtle-Russell.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, in that case I would defer to the adjournment of the Member for Rhineland. -- (Interjection) -- You wouldn't allow me to talk from 8:00 o'clock till 10:00, I don't believe.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I had no intention that the honourable member shouldn't continue. If he wants to continue I think the House would be prepared to listen and even stay a few minutes longer rather than come back tonight at 8:00 o'clock. Or come back - just as the House chooses. But if the honourable member can finish in 20 minutes or so . . .

MR. SHERMAN: We'll go tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GREEN: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Wednesday.