

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Monday, May 11, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills, Standing Orders, Printing and Library.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Private Bills, Standing Orders, Printing and Library, beg leave to present the following as their First Report.

Your Committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Einarson as Chairman. Your Committee recommends that, for the remainder of this Session, the Quorum of this Committee shall consist of Seven (7) members.

Your Committee has considered Bills:

(No. 4) - An Act to amend The Chartered Accountants Act.

(No. 20) - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited.

(No. 33) - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the "Portage Industrial Exhibition Association".

(No. 45) - An Act to incorporate Seven Oaks General Hospital.

(No. 46) - An Act to incorporate Club de Golf St-Malo.

(No. 55) - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Investors Group.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee recommends that the Fees paid with respect to Bill (No. 45) - An Act to incorporate Seven Oaks General Hospital, be refunded, less the costs of printing.

Your Committee also recommends that the time for receiving Petitions for Private Bills be extended to the 1st day of June, 1970 and that the time for presenting Private Bills to the House be extended to the 8th day of June, 1970.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Charleswood, that the Report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wolseley, that the fees paid with respect to Bill No. 45, An Act to incorporate Seven Oaks General Hospital, be refunded, less cost of printing.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Wolseley, that the time for receiving petitions for Private Acts be extended to the 1st day of June, 1970 and that the time for presenting Private Bills to the House be extended to the 8th day of June, 1970.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to oppose it; I would just like to pose a question. Is the House going to be still in session at that time?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, the answer lies with the members of the Assembly.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I should like to introduce our guests in the gallery. We have with us today Reeve Potoski of the Rural Municipality of Dauphin. On behalf of the Members of the Legislative Assembly, we welcome you this afternoon.

We also have 39 Grades 7 to 10 students of the Thompson Junior High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Butler, Mr. Wimble, Mr. Broadfoot and Miss Martens.

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Transportation. And 29 Grades 7 and 8 students of the Sundown School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Drewniak. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Emerson. And 34 Grade 11 students of the Murdoch MacKay School. These students are under the direction of Miss Dymtryuk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister for Labour and Minister of Government Services. And 55 Grade 9 students of the Andrew Mynarski School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Dooley. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

On behalf of the Members of the Legislative Assembly, we welcome you here this afternoon.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for The Pas. The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation)(Thompson): Mr. Speaker, this is a motion I really shouldn't have to speak on. My views are well-known inside and outside this House as far as the north is concerned, but I feel in view of the performance put on by Las Vegas Lil last Friday in talking about the north -- (Interjection) -- the Member for River Heights -- speaking about the north with such great understanding and compassion, I felt it was incumbent upon me to say something lest the people up north may get the impression that the Member for River Heights is more concerned about them than I am.

In the course of his remarks he dealt at some length with the Mauro Report on Northern Transportation, which I think is part and parcel of the Northern Task Force. If you're going to do something for the north you're going to have to consider transportation, because I believe whether it's telephone or airplane or car or train, without that type of transportation all the development we may want for the north is going to be of no value. So he dealt at some length with the Mauro Report and he was concerned that we're not doing anything about it. The fact of the matter is the Mauro Report was presented to us shortly after we took office - we've been in office ten months only - and he's concerned that we're not doing anything. I had my department give me a list of all the commissions, various commissions like the TED Commission and the COMEF Report and the various Royal Commissions that were set up in the course of eleven years that the Conservatives were in office, and as you can see by this report here there's literally dozens of them, and I would say with one or two exceptions these reports are all on a shelf gathering dust, and yet he feels that we have to, this very minute, start taking action on his report.

Well, I'd like to say first, Mr. Speaker, that we are moving in that direction, and as a matter of fact after reading some of the reports - I just got finished reading the Mauro Report completely within the last few months - I was amazed to find, Mr. Speaker, that we were doing some things without knowing that that was the recommendation. In other words, because of the fact that we know what's going on in the north it wasn't necessary - and I hate to sound like I'm bragging - but it wasn't necessary for us to refer to a report. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that any government that wants to do something for the people, they don't have to hide behind a Royal Commission; they should have the courage and the foresight to bring in certain proposals and certain actions that will change a particular area. On reading the report and then looking at our programs, the various programs that the Ministers have, I find out that there's about ten of them that we were going ahead with in any event.

I'd just like to read from the Summary of the Mauro Report on Northern Transportation some of the summaries that he brought up, and those that aren't acted on, some of them are Federal Government; in other words, we can't go ahead on them in any event. Other ones were so obvious, Mr. Speaker, that I wonder why the previous administration didn't do something about it. On Page No. 1 under "Summary," they have this quote: "The Federal Government's regional air policy of October, 1966, should be extended to provide subsidy of a tertiary of local air carriers to maintain an adequate level of service." Now this has been around since 1966, Mr. Speaker. It didn't require an expensive Royal Commission like the Mauro Commission to come up with this gem, and if the government really was concerned about doing something they could have went to Ottawa and discussed this. As a matter of fact, the previous Minister of Industry and Commerce lectured me at some length last fall why we weren't meeting with our

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) . . . counterpart to implement some of these things. The fact of the matter is that this has been around, and had he cared at all - and I think in this case it wasn't a question of money, it was just a question was he interested in the north - he could have met with the Ottawa people and discussed it. And may I say that we have on several occasions, either myself or the First Minister or some other Ministers, have met with our Ottawa counterparts and are discussing these items.

"Air transport charges should be no higher per mile in the north than in southern Canada." Now as I recollect, Mr. Speaker, during the last session I took time out in this House to chastise TransAir and to raise holy hell about the high rates, transportation rates, that we were charged, and at that time I was told in no uncertain terms by the former Minister of Industry and Commerce, the Member for River Heights, that we were chasing free enterprise out of Manitoba; that he was shocked that a Minister of the Crown should get up in the House and complain against private enterprise. Yet this is what one of the recommendations is, and when we went along - and again this is a coincidence, this was our plan in any event but it's a recommendation - when we were trying to carry out the recommendations the other side of the House chose to criticize us, and I hope in the course of the next year that they make up their mind whether they want us to go ahead with the Mauro Report and the Northern Task Force, which may be in conflict with their own policy and their own ideology, but they'd make up their mind where they stand on these items because we're going to be moving on quite a few of them. Some of them are going to cost money.

Here's some other recommendations. Page 2 - "Operation and function of Manitoba's Air Service should be reviewed." Now this again has been under the jurisdiction of the previous government since 1932 I believe, when it was taken over from the Federal Government. The government has eight planes and they have never changed the policies since 1932 as I recollect. We're going to look at it. In fact we're looking at it and we're thinking of expanding into air ambulance. There may be other things - we could expand into fire-fighting, into aerial photography rather than contract it out to private planes who charge us quite high rates per hour.

Here's a few more recommendations that we are moving on, Mr. Speaker. "Grand Rapids road to Ponton." We've cut down the schedule on that by half. We expect that within twelve months we'll have an all-weather road built from Grand Rapids to Ponton. "Lynn Lake to Nelson House and Thompson Highway." We've received a great deal of criticism, not from the Conservative Party in this case but mostly from Liberals, prostrated Liberals in Lynn Lake about diverting the road to some other place. But this is one of the recommendations, and we're carrying it out and we've speeded up the schedule on construction.

The next recommendation: "Paving of road - Thompson Road." Last year, if you'll recall, we paved about 32 miles from The Pas in. This year we're going to pave about 25 miles from Paint Lake south which will bring us in to cover all the mines, service all the mines and also our resort area.

Another recommendation: "Reconstruction and paving of road between Lac Du Bonnet and Pointe Du Bois." Again we're moving in this direction. We have budgeted, I believe, \$400,000 for this year's program to work on that road, and that road - if anybody's been on it and I'm sure most of the opposition members have been - is a terrible road and has been for I guess since day one.

Another one of their recommendations: "A subsidy should be provided to offset the extra cost of moving passenger automobiles to and from Churchill by rail pending construction of highway." Now this one here is one that we're looking at. I've had discussions with the Vice Presidents of the CNR this winter about the feasibility of this.

Further on in the recommendations they talk about a cargo-rail plan which is used in Canada. I'm told by the CNR that it's impossible to use it in areas, isolated areas, or areas that don't have too many cars. In other words, to make it feasible for the CNR they have to have so many cars moving per day. They have special cars built for it and it was his opinion that you couldn't possibly utilize it there. However, there is another program we're working on - I don't know what the costs will be - they're going to give us the rates on it. If they could put two cars on a train, they could give us a special rate.

One area we did move in, which was half of a recommendation, is gas tax rebate to people who hunt and fish, or who use snowmobiles and fishing boats. I believe a bill went through here, a resolution or a bill in the last week, where we're going to rebate, I believe, gasoline tax to residents in isolated communities, particularly people who hunt and fish for a living.

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.)

Recommendation No. 14 - "Communities captive to rail should be given freight rates comparable to those applicable where highway competition exists." Now there's another area, Mr. Speaker, that was open to the previous administration for many years, and I suppose they didn't go ahead with this for the same reason that we probably won't, that it's too expensive. This applies to government regulation of marine carriers' rates and services on Lake Winnipeg. This is an area that's been around longer than trains; transportation on the lakes has been around for a couple of hundred years. I don't think we're going to move on that particular one.

Recommendation No. 21 - "Extension of shipping season by 23 days is economically feasible, through installation of tidal barrier and control of slush ice in harbour area, to permit six million bushels of grain to be shipped in addition." This is another area we're concerned with. We've talked about it, as has everybody else in Western Canada. It's something that's up to the Federal Government. They move the wheat, they sell the wheat and it's their facility. All we can do is whisper in their ear, and so far they haven't been responding.

"Transport policies within Manitoba should be coordinated through the new Provincial Department of Transportation." Contrary to what the former Minister of Industry and Commerce said, that our shifting about of responsibility is making a mockery of the department, that's a lot of nonsense. The fact of the matter is that the Department of Transportation is working on anything that moves in this province, and those things that we can't do anything about like -- (Interjection) -- Well I've thought about it often. The Commissioner of Railways was taken from me and given to the Minister of Labour, and as I said at that time, it's a symbolic post; it's meaningless; I can't and the other Minister can't do anything about it. As a matter of fact, I don't know why it was taken away from me.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Maybe you didn't sign your union card.

MR. BOROWSKI: "Planning of transportation facilities and services should focus on designated" - I'm sorry Russ, "designated or growth centres." One of the reasons I suppose the Mauro Commission recommended a highway go through Thompson is because if you're going to develop the north you're going to have roads, air-links and road-links, terminating or crossing at major communities like Thompson, for example. Had we taken the recommendation of certain people up in the north, including our Member for Churchill who I know agrees with me but politically can't say so, but had we taken his recommendation and run the highway straight south, it would have cost us \$5 million more and it would have ended up in the middle of nowhere at Ponton, where at the moment exists only one gas station.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): . . . on record that I shook my head.

MR. BOROWSKI: The Member for Churchill shakes his head in agreement.

"Indirect compensation to the individual resident of the north for the burden imposed by high transport costs through revision of income tax legislation and regulations." As the members of this House know, when it comes to income tax we have precious little to say about it except the provincial portion. We are however looking at another area which is within our jurisdiction - I've already bragged about it once and I'll do so again for the record - that as a result of negotiations with the Thiessen Bus Lines - or is it Manitoba Transit? - they've cut the bus fares by 10 percent. I am still negotiating with them and it's my hope that before the House adjourns that there may be some further movement in the lowering of bus fares, which means that if we can get the Bus Company to lower the fares I would think it's logical to assume that the transport companies, the two companies that haul express by truck there, I think it's logical to assume that we can, through friendly persuasion, convince them they should lower their rates in line with those by the bus companies. I think it's fair to say that if this happens that this would affect the freight rates for everybody in the north. Now there will be some items that will still be shipped by rail and that's another area that we're working on, but as far as our truck rates are concerned, I think if we can lower them - and it's my hope that we will - that this will affect costs of shipping goods to just about every isolated community in the north because I think most of them have to come to Thompson one way or another.

Now one other recommendation in the Mauro Report was that the government should consider the feasibility of using hovercraft. That's on Page 275. You all recall the statement I made previous to the House sitting here that we were looking into that possibility. We are looking into it, and again it's my hope that within the next 12 months that we will be able to make some arrangements with some enterprising free enterpriser from the south to go up and set up

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) a transportation system using the hovercraft which will I think eliminate the building of expensive roads or airports.

The last item - and I think, Mr. Speaker, this is a most important one - I'd like to read what the report has to say on it. This is Page 271. "It's tragic that a chronic high degree of unemployment exists among the native people of the region at the same time that there is a serious shortage of labour at Lynn Lake, Thompson, Gillam, Snow Lake and other centres of activity. It is a matter which must concern public and private authorities responsible for northern development and the economic well-being of the local people."

I think the House is quite well aware of the program that this government and its department has instituted insofar as hiring local Indian and Metis people. We've had discussions with Sherritt-Gordon and International Nickel this winter about the possibility and the practicality of hiring native people to work in their operations. There is no agreement at the moment, but I think it's fair to say that Sherritt-Gordon, which is probably one of the most progressive companies in Manitoba, is quite enthusiastic, and if there is some type of cost-sharing through retraining - federal retraining - could be reached, I think we can expect that a considerable number of Indian and Metis people that are presently on welfare will be employed in certain operations in mining. This does not mean that they will be put into jobs like actual mining itself which are very dangerous and which require a high degree of skill, but there are many jobs which don't require that type of training and it's our hope that we can work out an agreement with these companies to employ the local residents.

Now Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to take any more time of the House except to indicate that this government does not need reports, Royal Commissions or prodding from the opposition to get moving. We have certain beliefs, a certain philosophy, and if it's economically feasible we're going to carry them through. As I've indicated at the beginning of my remarks, we're moving in about eight programs at this very moment and it's my hope that before this year is out that we may be able to advance and tackle some of the other serious problems facing the north. Thank you.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to make a brief proposal which I've discussed with the Government House Leader and which has his concurrence, Sir. I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the name of Mr. Claydon be substituted for the name of Mr. Moug on the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs. (Agreed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Springfield) presented Bill No. 83, An Act to amend The Clean Environment Act.

MR. TOUPIN presented Bill No. 86, An Act to amend The Corrections Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

MR. CHERNIACK introduced Bill No. 74, An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet) introduced Bill No. 81, An Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act; and Bill No. 82, An Act to amend The Crop Insurance Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Youth and Education. Could the Minister now inform this House how many students have been placed in the student job placement program?

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education)(Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, this is an on-going program and it's going on from day to day and almost hour to hour, and to try to give a figure at this time would be completely unrealistic.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. LEONARD H. CLAYDON (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister and I wonder if I could get a direct answer. Is it the intention of the government to supply all members of the House with the supporting regulations covering Bill 56 at the time they're introduced by the Minister?

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, it would seem to me an altogether reasonable and fair procedure to provide just that amount of information on regulations as was done in the case of other legislation of this kind, the Hospital Act, the Medicare Act. We'll look at precedent in the case of the Canada Pension Plan Act in Ottawa and act accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Transportation. In view of the announcement last week that there was a study or inspection of the ancient Arlington Bridge, I wonder whether the Minister could indicate whether this was in the form of a regular inspection or whether there's been some further deterioration in that structure.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm not considered important enough in Ottawa to be taken into their confidence. I've read the remarks in the press and in Ottawa Hansard what the Honourable Mr. Jamieson said. He was speaking of some type of pilot project and before they start this project they are going to have an inspection of the bridge. Now what this pilot project is all about I'm not sure, but I do know that we are going on an inspection tour of the bridge on Thursday morning.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question. Is the provincial government carrying out negotiations to obtain some financial support from the federal authorities on this project?

MR. BOROWSKI: Indeed, we always carry on negotiations when it comes to getting money from the tightwads in Ottawa. As a matter of fact, we met this morning with the Vice President of the CNR and some CPR people, Metro people and two representatives from the Department of Transportation in Ottawa, and we had a two hour discussion this morning at the Metro Building. Nothing concrete has come out. It's something I think that's going to require a lot of debate and a lot of haggling and negotiation. Metro is determined to go ahead with it, and of course if Metro can help us get a few million dollars extra from Ottawa, we're certainly on their side.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Transportation. Would the Minister see to it that we get more maintenance on Provincial Road No. 243 and 521. The south had about an inch and a half of rain over the weekend. They've had very bad roads and very little maintenance on this, and teachers who are supposed to go to their schools are getting stuck. Would he see to it that more maintenance is given this particular road?

MR. BOROWSKI: I'll try and answer his speech, Mr. Speaker. I expected there would be problems of this type when we implemented the recommendations of the Roy Jorgenson and Associates. We expected that some people would complain because in some areas he recommended cuts in dragging for a year and in other ones he recommended an increase. I've had several complaints on it from various areas of the province and we have a difficult time at the moment because of the bad spring we've had. The roads were fairly dry and then the snow fell which threw our program out the window. Now we can't turn around and do all the dragging within one month and then be stuck for lack of funds for the areas all summer. We are doing everything possible we can to adjust the program, to bend it as much as possible, but there is a limit and I hope the member appreciates that.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, we know that not all roads are in like position, but this road is in a particular bad position, its shape, and I implore or appeal to the Minister that something is done in the very near future because it's getting an impossibility to travel.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I might ask a supplementary or related question to the same Minister on behalf of many students who are now in the gallery. I wonder if the Minister of Transportation would please give his consideration to the improvement of the Morden-Sprague Highway 201.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, we are giving consideration at all times to all roads in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Youth and Education. Could he indicate whether any new policy has been undertaken by his department or the Public Schools Finance Board regarding new school construction - and

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.). . . . I'm referring specifically to at least one school division who is not calling general contractor tenders for new school construction but instead is going to a management type of arrangement. If perhaps the Minister could undertake to look into this - unless he can rise now.

MR. MILLER: Well I can answer the question. The Metro-West School being planned in St. James-Assiniboia, the school division in concurrence with the Finance Board and myself agreed that we should adopt that approach.

MR. CRAIK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Have all school boards in the province been advised of this or is that their initiative that this is undertaken.

MR. MILLER: No, this is taken at their initiative, Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism and Recreation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to answer a few questions that were asked some time back, one or two referring back to the time when I was dealing with my estimates. One was an error that I made and I'd like to have it corrected just for the record. In regard to the question that was asked as to how much money was spent by our department in advertising and where this money was spent at, whether it was in Canada or the United States or whatever, at that time I quoted that \$60,000 was spent on our Canadian campaign and I should have said \$340,000 in Canada, but somehow I said 240 so I'd just like to correct that just to have the record straight.

Some of the other questions that I'd like to clear up at this time before we go any further. A question was asked by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye with respect to the fact that he noticed that \$15,000 less was being spent on tourist promotion this year as compared to last year. I would just like to say that it was considered during this our Centennial Year that a lot of promotion was taking place in the Province of Manitoba and we felt that perhaps that could be cut down somewhat, but it is our hope that next year we will increase that amount quite substantially.

Another question he had was with respect to the stay of our tourists in Manitoba. I think the question was: Are two-thirds of our tourists actually staying less than a day in our province? Well, this is quite correct, but I might say that this not only applies to the Province of Manitoba, it's pretty well general right across Canada. As a matter of fact, we in Manitoba are in a better position than most of Canada because statistics show that United States visitors, about 30 percent of the United States visitors anywhere in Canada stay for less than a day, whereas United States tourists that come to Manitoba, about 40 percent of those visitors stay for more than a day, so actually we have a pretty good record here in that respect. However, that does not mean that we are satisfied; we are going to continue to try and do better as we go along.

I believe this question was asked by the Member for Morris. He wanted to know what types of grants were paid and for what purpose. We have three different types of grants that are being paid. One is grants given to municipalities to assist them in development of their own recreational programs. The Recreation Commission must be established by a municipal by-law. Now last year there were something like 163 municipalities that received grants for this purpose. Other grants are made to municipalities who hire a full-time recreation director. We pay up to a maximum of \$2,000 and something like 22 municipalities qualified for this grant. Grants are also paid to provincial sports and recreation organizations to assist them in extending their programs to communities throughout the province. Now I'm not going to -- it will take some time to read off all these municipalities but I would be glad to get this information to any members who would like to have the names and the amounts that are paid out to the various municipalities. We have that available and I would be glad to furnish them with this information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Minister for his information and ask a supplementary arising out of the information he's given the House. Can he advise the House whether he has had any consultation since the presentation of his estimates with officials of Manisphere or others interested in promotion of a major winter carnival for the Metropolitan area?

MR. BURTNIAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, no, I have not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for giving us that information. I'm also wondering in connection with what he mentioned in regards to advertising, have there been many changes made as far as which companies formerly

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) received the advertising, have there been many changes made that other companies now receive that kind of advertising, receive the moneys for advertising?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I got the question correctly or not. Are you speaking of the advertising companies?

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, what I basically wish to know, have many changes been made as far as which companies are doing the advertising for the government from the former companies.

MR. BURTNIAK: In answer to that question, yes, there have been some changes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Could he advise the House whether he will be providing us with any further information regarding the shares now owned in the M.S. Lord Selkirk Company, information by way of operating statements, etc.?

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it is a customary procedure for the Manitoba Development Fund to make available to the public various pieces of financial information, financial statements, such as the honourable member has requested. I don't think that the public interest will necessarily be served nor will the interests of that particular company.

MR. CRAIK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does this mean that even when we exercise that portion of the MDF Act that we're still not going to be able to get information when we take equity position?

MR. EVANS: Well, the company itself has provided considerable information. It hasn't been the practice in the past, as the honourable member knows, to provide the type of information which he has requested, so at this time I am not proposing to table such information.

MR. CRAIK: A supplementary further, Mr. Speaker. I think we were advised in the case of Versatile that if we wanted this information it was available because it was a public offering. I believe that this is a private company and we do not have the same opportunity. Is that not true?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the ones put by the Honourable Member for Riel. I would like to ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce, are we as members not entitled to financial statements of any companies that we put an equity into? This would be my idea, that if we invest the moneys that we should have financial statements available to us.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member knows, the equity participation by the government is a relatively new departure from previous practice exercised by the Manitoba Development Fund and it is really a matter for policy decision, but I would like to point out that in this particular case we're talking about a very small amount of investment and that you should balance against this the effect on the operations of the company, because I think you'd be among the first to agree that you would not want to reveal information that would be detrimental to the operation of any particular company, including this one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the question posed by the Honourable Member for Riel and the Honourable Member for Rhineland, I can't conceive of there being any problem with respect to the kind of information asked about. At the end of the fiscal year, for any given company in question in which there is a shareholding by the Crown, the information usually given out to shareholders will be given out to the Crown, and through the Crown to members of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I inform the members of the House that a decision has been made on the interest rate payable on the Centennial Savings Bond issue, and work is now in progress to get the applications out as quickly as possible so that the issue will become available to the public as quickly as possible. I had indicated earlier that the rate would be determined as at the last possible moment, and it was determined at the amount that I guessed then would be the amount, namely 8 1/2 percent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, it would seem to me that the members of this House should give some recognition to the efforts of the 20,000 young people who participated yesterday in the March for Millions, walking a distance of some 35 miles in an effort to raise money for the people of underdeveloped nations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, may I say that we're happy to grant leave to the Member for Elmwood, on this side, to make the statement that he just finished making and we join him in his words of commendation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the other two members in expressing our appreciation to these young lads that walked and behaved in such terrific manner, and I think it's wonderful -- I meant the girls as well. I know there's a few members that belong now to the 35 mile club in this House. I wonder if anyone walked yesterday and I'd like to hear if there was. I know that my colleague from Portage was one of them and I believe there may be some others.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - BUDGET DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance and the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition in amendment thereto and the proposed motion of the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to continue my remarks that I started on Friday. On Friday I very gently reproved the Opposition about the tactics they were using, the tactics to smear the government. Not only have they indulged in smear tactics but these doctrinaire free enterprisers who occupy the benches of the Official Opposition seem to misunderstand the historic nature of the Canadian Conservative movement and it's this item that I would like to discuss briefly now - the nature, the historic nature of the Canadian Conservative movement.

I should like to quote first from George Grant's book, "Lament for a Nation". George Grant is one of the few Conservative philosophers in this country. They seem to be a rather rare commodity, Conservative philosophers, but Grant is one of these. -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, pardon me, I forgot the Member from Pembina. "Since 1960 Canada has developed into a northern extension of the continental economy. This was involved in the decisions made by C.D. Howe and his men. Our traditional role as an exporter of raw materials, particularly to Europe, with highly protected industry in central Canada, gradually lost its importance in relation to our role as a branch plant of American capitalism." -- (Interjection) -- Yes it does. Now I believe, along with Grant - and I'm an admirer of Grant's writing - I believe along with Grant that the British connection is essential for Canada to counterbalance the dynamic pull of the United States.

Again I'd like to quote from Grant. "The British connection has been a source of Canadian nationalism. The east-west pull of trade provided a counter thrust to the pull of continentalism. It was a tradition that stood in firm opposition to the Jeffersonian liberalism so dominant in the U.S. Green and Diefenbaker were of this tradition." (He's talking about Howard Green of course, not our Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.) "Such Canadians could not give their loyalty to the great republic to the south. This did not imply anti-Americanism, simply a lack of Americanism, and in this Diefenbaker was true to the tradition of the Conservative Party of Sir John A. Macdonald, the man who developed a national policy which was opposed to the continentalist policy of the Liberal Party of the late nineteenth century." I am an admirer of Macdonald. This may sound odd coming from a member on these benches, but I'm an admirer of Macdonald and I'm also an admirer of John Diefenbaker.

Macdonald developed a national policy consisting of three components - a transcontinental railway, a high tariff policy and a policy of western settlement. Now the Crown, the Crown was the central drive between all of these three components of the national policy, so Macdonald was a man who used the instrumentality of the Crown, which honourable members opposite seem to view with such great horror. Macdonald used the Crown and he used it for the purpose of creating the Canadian nation and we must give him due credit for that.

Now one of the basic problems with MacKenzie-King, one of his basic failures was the fact that he lacked a balancing policy vis-a-vis the United States, and one of the primary motives for Macdonald's national policy was to prevent the absorption of the developing Canadian nation by the much more powerful neighbour to the south. MacKenzie-King lacked this balancing policy. He continually guarded against imaginary threats to Canadian sovereignty from the British Crown and he did this at a time when the British Crown was no threat to Canadian

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd.). . . . sovereignty, in fact the threat to Canadian sovereignty during MacKenzie-King's time was increasingly from the United States.

Now because of the British constitutional monarchy form of government which Canada inherited, this country has been able to form a society in many ways distinct and different from the United States. And I would like to quote George Grant once again. "Loyalists and later immigrants' desire to build a society with a greater sense of order and restraint than freedom-loving republicanism would allow. It is no better to find than a kind of suspicion that we in Canada could be less lawless and have a greater sense of propriety than the U.S. Inner stodginess has made us a society of greater simplicity, formality, and perhaps even innocence than the people to the south. The conservatism of the early leaders of British North America was essentially the social doctrine that public order and tradition in contrast to freedom and experiment were central to the good life. The British Crown was a symbol of the continuing loyalty to the state. Until recently, Canadians have been much more willing than Americans to use government control over economic life to protect the public good against private freedom." Let me read that once again - this is George Grant speaking. "Until recently, Canadians have been much more willing than Americans to use government control over economic life to protect the public good against private freedom." Ontario Hydro, the CNR and the CBC were all established by Conservative Governments. Too often Conservatives forget this.

Now one other great advantage we have derived from the British form of government is that it has led to development in Canada of a relatively strong democratic socialist movement. This phenomenon is not found in the United States but it is found in Canada, and I would think that one of the main reasons for this is the British heritage or the later British heritage which we have. According to George Grant again, "This movement could have prevented the integration, economically and culturally, of Canada into the United States." Now Grant felt - and still feels - that only a socialist movement, a strong socialist movement could have saved Canada from being absorbed by the United States.

I would now like to read from an article published in the Free Press, Saturday, March 21st, 1970. The headline here is: "Nationalization Historian's Cure. Canada may have to nationalize her leading industries to survive as a nation, Historian Donald Creighton said Thursday." Creighton is of course the greatest historian that Canada has today. He is the great biographer of Sir John A. Macdonald and I must say that I admire Donald Creighton as much as I admire Sir John A. Macdonald. "Creighton has come to an interesting conclusion. He told a news conference that Canada's independence has been eroded to the point that it may only be restored by nationalization." This is a Conservative speaking. This sounds terrible doesn't it, a Conservative saying this. "Enlarging on the book's description about creeping continentalism" - not creeping socialism - "creeping continentalism" - which the Member from Fort Garry should listen to -- for Fort Garry pardon me -- "creeping continentalism being helped by Canadians to a final triumph. Professor Creighton says he respects calls by Melville Watkins of the New Democratic Party for independence through socialism." So Mr. Watkins now has a new waffle member. "His remedy, nationalization, may be the only one that will work, he said, suggesting that no other ways have ever been tried to escape continentalization." Here is the premier Conservative historian of the country giving passive assent to a sweeping program of nationalization. Unbelievable.

MR. SHERMAN: It shows you how broadminded we are.

MR. JOHANNSON: Unbelievable. Now this man of course isn't a New Democrat, he's not a member of this government. In fact all this government, if we compare the members of this government to Mr. Creighton, I think we'd have to call the members of this government pikers. They're proposing only to create one Crown corporation, one piddling little Crown corporation. Professor Creighton is implicitly giving approval to a rather large scale operation and the Member from Fort Garry I'm afraid would be rather alarmed by the views of this great Conservative historian.

MR. SHERMAN: Not at all. Not at all. We accept all views. Not at all. I might not agree with it but I agree with his right to advance it.

MR. JOHANNSON: Now I'll proceed from Professor Creighton to another very fine Canadian historian, W. L. Morton, who used to be the head of the History Department at Manitoba and a prominent Canadian Conservative and Manitoba Conservative. W. L. Morton is perhaps the most profound of all the Conservative philosophers in this country - I know there

(MR. JOHANNSSON cont'd.). . . . aren't very many - but he is the most profound of these few. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

A MEMBER: More so than the Member from Pembina?

MR. JOHANNSSON: Oh, I think you might say that.

A MEMBER: He would be number three wouldn't he?

MR. JOHANNSSON: I think he'd have to rank as number four. Now W. L. Morton outlined a Conservative philosophy for our time in Paul Fox's book called "Politics Canada", and one of the key points of his philosophy for Conservatism in our time is the following - and listen carefully - "The frank and loyal acceptance of the welfare state." The Honourable Member from Pembina has -- oh here he is. "The frank and loyal acceptance of the welfare state in order to keep it one humanely administered for people" - that sounds good - "for people who matter as people." And listen to the following: "For the welfare state is not in any conflict with Conservative principles of which laissez faire and rugged individualism are not part." -- "of which laissez faire," translated free enterprise, "and rugged individualism are not part."

Now after reading that, when I listened to the members opposite, the members of the Official Opposition, day after day coming out with doctrinaire free enterprise positions, I wonder about the state of their mental health. There's some problem within that party. There's some, if not mental confusion, at least intellectual confusion and I would suggest that perhaps one reason, one fundamental reason why we are occupying the government benches is because of this intellectual confusion. -- (Interjection) -- On their side, yes.

I'd like to quote also from Disraeli. Disraeli by the way is another Conservative I admire. Dizzy was a great Conservative - a great Conservative, a very charming man, a very fascinating human being and a great Conservative. I'm quoting from André Maurois' book on Disraeli. Maurois was also a Conservative by the way. "I am a Conservative," he said, "to preserve all that is good in our constitution, a radical to remove all that is bad." Another quote: "It seemed to him" - that is Disraeli - "that the duty of a Conservative leader was to have the courage to defend the past insofar as it was living and likely to live, but also to sweep the party clean of prejudices and outworn principles, and above all, to guide it boldly in the direction of a generous policy inspired by love of the ordinary common people."

MR. SHERMAN: Precisely our position.

MR. JOHANNSSON: I hope it is. Another quote from Page 293: "He was anxious" - and this is a description of Tory democracy under Disraeli; this is in 1870 to '74 I believe while he was Prime Minister. "He was anxious that the Conservative" -- (Interjection) -- yes, there were Conservatives then. "He was anxious that the Conservative Party's advent to power should be marked by a policy of generosity. Law after law was passed. Equality of obligations between employers and employed." That sounds like a description of the bills we're going to bring in on labour matters. "Enlargement of the rights of trade unions." This doesn't sound like the same party does it? "Enlargement of the rights of trade unions; reduction of the hours of work to 56 in the week." After all he was a Conservative, but he did reduce hours of work. A remarkable man, Disraeli. It's unfortunate that the members opposite don't take some lessons from him.

Now Donald Fleming once said that there is no creeping Republicanism in the Conservative Party, but after I listened or have listened for the past few months, the past year almost, to the members of the party opposite, it seems to me that there are traces of creeping Republicanism there, a very dangerous tendency.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to return briefly to the nature of the party that occupies these benches. J. S. Woodsworth, the founder of the CCF, the party that preceded the NDP, hung on the wall of his study the sword which his grandfather had carried in the Rebellion of 1837 when he, along with other Toronto Tories, defended the city against the rebels of William Lyon MacKenzie. Woodsworth's forebearers were United Empire Loyalists and Conservative to the core. Now the transition to socialism was natural, if one understands the nature of the Canadian socialist tradition. In other words, the transition from the Conservative Tory of 1837 to the Socialist of the early 20th century was a natural tradition. Canadian Conservatives have viewed the Crown - and note that I use the term "Crown" rather than "government" - members opposite seem to have an instinctive negative reaction when we talk about government but the Crown means something to them. Canadian Conservatives have viewed the Crown as a positive instrument to promote the welfare of the people. Modern democratic socialism is a logical extension of that tradition. In other words, it is a historic development from the Conservative Tory tradition of this country.

(MR. JOHANNSSON cont'd.)

I would like to quote very briefly from Paul Fox's book, "Politics Canada", on the nature of the origins of the CCF and NDP. And he says this about J. S. Woodsworth: "A former Methodist clergyman who was turned in the direction of socialism by religious and humanitarian considerations. Woodsworth knew little about Marxism and cared even less. He was concerned by the plight of the underprivileged. His practical moderate approach was more influential in the long run in molding the cause than the sizzling platform the new party adopted at its founding convention in 1933 in Regina." This was of course the Regina Manifesto.

Another quote: "Sections of the movement continue to erupt periodically with volcanic language, but on the whole the party settled down into the moderate paths trod by Woodsworth and his successor in the leadership, M. J. Coldwell. When the party came to power in Saskatchewan in 1944 it initiated a number of socialist policies - welfare measures, planning, a bit of nationalization but nothing as sweeping as the Regina Manifesto advocated. Admittedly, the province didn't have as much constitutional power as the Federal Government to make wholesale changes, but it's also a fact that that temperance was a reflection of the personality and outlook of the provincial leader, Premier T. C. Douglas, who was another Woodsworth and Coldwell." These are comments on the past history of the CCF and NDP and I think those comments would apply very well to the present government. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Thank you. Mr. Speaker, the more experienced members of the Legislature tell us that the Budget Speech is one in which members can give a full range to their ideas, give a full range to their opinions, and we've had a full range I think of opinion from the members of the opposition, a full range, it seems to me, a full range of baloney. Now baloney of course is quite to be appreciated by individuals once in a while, but the baloney that the opposition has given to us, especially the Member from Fort Garry and the Member from Lakeside, leaves a bad taste in my mouth. It is a baloney that I think is rotten and I hope to -- (Interjection) -- Cheap, cheap baloney, okay. I hope today to indicate to you why it does leave a bad taste in my mouth.

The Member from Lakeside the other night stood in this House and said to us that he was going to speak about socialism and deception, and in his confused mind - and I don't think anyone would disagree with the fact that he is confused - in his confused mind he said those two words were synonymous. Well today, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak about something else. I would like to speak about democracy and truth. The member who just spoke up, the Member from Pembina, is the individual that I would first like to deal with.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): That's good.

MR. TURNBULL: He is an individual whose attitudes, through social reform, have been well exemplified in this House, and he, unlike the others over there, has been very straightforward, very honest and very candid with the members of the Legislature. -- (Interjection) -- That's correct, he stands in the same relationship to his party I suppose as the Member from Crescentwood stands in relationship to ours, and we must assume then that the Member from Pembina is the chief of the Conservative Party because that would be the Member from Crescentwood's own admission, be his position in our party. Now when I first heard the Member from Pembina make his very honest remarks in this House I was inclined to speak about them, because I thought for a while that the Member from Pembina was alone -- (Interjection) -- yes, and I thought for a while that anyone who held those attitudes in 1970, one hundred years after Disraeli, must be joking, but during this budget debate we have heard other members of the opposition and they don't seem to be joking.

MR. HENDERSON: I got several good letters and not one bad one.

MR. TURNBULL: Well I'm glad you got some good letters. I got a few letters about you too - from Pinawa. The Member from Pembina and the others taken as a total, as a caucus of the Conservative Party, I think revealed to members of this House, and to others who wish to watch and wish to analyze what they say, revealed to us a pattern, a very sinister pattern, a pattern that is anti-democratic and anti-intellectual and anti-rational and anti all those things that Manitoba and Canadians stand for and have stood for for a hundred years. What is the attitude of the Member from Pembina that epitomizes so well the Conservative pseudo-philosophy? Well, first of all, he stood in this House and gave us his opinion on social development. He spoke first of all of those who were unemployed and he gave no quarter to anyone who was unemployed. They were not to be tolerated. In his mind, if anyone was unemployed and

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd.). . . . on the welfare roll, it would do them good if they starved. And he's proud of it, Mr. Speaker. It wasn't then the matter of speaking in the heat of debate, not at all; it was something that he truly believed in his innermost soul. And those remarks, taken with other members of the Opposition, reveal I think the position of the Conservative Party in this province.

And what is the attitude of the Member from Pembina on education and our young people. When I stood on the estimates of the Minister of Education and remarked that perhaps this House should be considering programs in education and not merely the money that had to be raised for these programs, and when I stood on the same estimates and suggested that our young people should get some kind of practical education by perhaps being allowed to sit on School Boards, the Member from Pembina sprung to his feet like he sprung from the bowels of the Pembina Constituency and yelled, foaming at the mouth - stupid, stupid ideas he said. Well I think that typifies again the attitude of the members of the Conservative benches.

And what did he think of our educational institutions? He stood in his place and said, Mr. Speaker, and said of our educational institutions that they produced educated fools. Now he didn't qualify which educational institutions he was speaking of and I presume he meant all the elementary schools, all the secondary schools, the University of Manitoba, the University of Winnipeg, the University of Brandon, St. Boniface. . . .

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): No, no, not the separate schools.

MR. TURNBULL: Not the separate schools. All the colleges, the medical college and all institutions of higher learning in this province, he said, produced educated fools. Now, Mr. Speaker, that attitude - that attitude, Mr. Speaker, is anti-intellectual, it is anti-rational and it is anti-democratic, because without an educated populace, without an educated populace we cannot have a democracy. -- (Interjection) -- I went to them all and I'm quite proud of it.

Now, as I said, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't take the Member from Pembina too seriously if it had not been the fact that we had -- (Interjection) -- Yes, that he was fooling, but that we had also a speech from - and I'm ashamed to admit this because his speech sickened me - we had a speech from the Member from Fort Garry, a man who has long been associated with the Conservative Party in this province both at the provincial and the federal level, and the man, who we are told, advised his constituency association to lie low when the long knives were out in the Conservative Party to get that fine radical John Diefenbaker.

Now this individual from Fort Garry is not merely an opposition member in this House, an opposition member to me, but I regret to say he is my Member of the Legislative Assembly. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to speak on his speech, because that man, Mr. Speaker, in the course of his remarks, in a debate which was very heated, revealed his true character. He revealed his character just as ably and just as well as I'm revealing my character today and as the Member from Pembina revealed his character when he said "if they don't work let them starve."

He stood on his feet, Mr. Speaker, and enunciated for us a theory called the conspiracy theory of history, and tried to indicate that the front bench here were the pawns of some unidentifiable, in his mind, some unidentifiable group of Machiavellians in the background somewhere. He didn't know where, he didn't know who they were, he didn't know what they did but they were there somewhere. And that conspiracy theory -- (Interjection) -- yes, they might have been out there in the front steps, right. That conspiracy theory of history, Mr. Speaker, is well known to anyone who has done any reading in political philosophy at all - even the basic reading. It characterizes a particular group of political thinkers. Well I can't call them thinkers - political orators or speakers. It characterizes the fascist party and that is why I found his remarks so particularly sickening to me, Mr. Speaker. If it had just been one reference to the conspiracy theory of history I would have not found it too disturbing, but he continued, Mr. Speaker, citing not only this conspiracy theory but also citing the practice of the fascist party.

He went on to talk, and other members of his group have talked of what we can I suppose term the tip-of-the-iceberg theory, and it goes something like this, Mr. Speaker. Here is the government and they've introduced a bill which is going to establish a Crown corporation, and that, they claim over there, is the tip-of-the-iceberg because down beneath the stormy sea of politics are other bills somewhere being written by those conspirators and those bills - oh, it's very sinister - those bills, Mr. Speaker, according to members opposite, are going to establish all kinds of Crown corporations, one after another until the whole of Manitoba is controlled by

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI (Point Douglas): People.

MR. TURNBULL: Right, you're right - people. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what that man is worried about, that the people might have some control over the Crown corporations and over the economy of Manitoba. Now the point, Mr. Speaker, is that he is trying to make out a case against the government, and his case is based on the idea that there is one bill, and where there is one bill there must be a thousand bills and therefore what we have on this side of the House, according to the Member from Fort Garry, is some kind of Nazi group who wants to put the economy more in the hands of some people of the province.

Now, there is another terminology, another term for this tip-of-the-iceberg approach that members opposite have used. And I want to quote here from a book - a book that I read, I must admit, for the first time after I heard the Member from Fort Garry spew forth with his drivel the other day, the speech that contained the famous reference to the jackboots. This book is in the rare book collection now in our Legislative Library. And what does the tip-of-the-iceberg theory -- how is it called in this book. Well, I'm going to tell you now. The author of this book, who is well known in political circles - was well known in political circles, he's dead now - said that "we start out with a very correct assumption that in the size of the lie there is always contained a certain factor of credibility, and it follows that the masses, with the primitive simplicity of their minds, will more easily fall victim to a great lie than a small one since they themselves perhaps also lie sometimes in little things but would certainly still be too much ashamed of too great lies. Thus such an untruth will not at all enter into their heads and therefore they will be unable to believe in the possibility of the enormous impudence of the most infamous distortion in others. Indeed, they may doubt and hesitate even when being enlightened. Therefore, some part of the most impudent lie will remain unsaid" -- not from you, not after what you told me about your political ideas the other day, so just sit down. They would like to keep me from speaking.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Yes, that's right.

MR. TURNBULL: That's what the people of that political persuasion normally do. When things get uncomfortable they want to shout down the opposition.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the big lie theory of his. And it is practiced much in the same way -- was practiced much in the same way as this tip-of-the-iceberg theory enunciated by members now sitting on the Conservative benches. It's the theory of Adolf Hitler. Now, I find it rather remarkable that they could come so close in the heat of debate to the pseudo-philosophy of Mein Kampf. But I suppose some members would agree that the Member from Fort Garry did enunciate the big lie the other day. He pointed out on Page 1736 of Hansard, that "I'm speaking of the ignorance of many people of this province." Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, a representative elected to this House imputing to the people of Manitoba ignorance?

Now that wouldn't both me either, Mr. Speaker, but you will remember that very famous night on June 25th when the defeated leader of the government of the day, the Member from Minnedosa, in effect said the same thing, because he told everybody in Manitoba who was watching TV that he thought that the people of Manitoba had made a mistake. In other words, the Leader of the Party over there, Mr. Speaker, thinks that the people of Manitoba don't know what they're doing. He thinks too that they are ignorant, just as the member from Fort Garry thinks that the people of Manitoba are ignorant. --(Interjection)--That's right, that is shameful. There's no other word for it. In a democratic society which is premised on the idea of the rationality of the individual, we have the Leader of the Party, we have the Member from Fort Garry insisting that the people of Manitoba are ignorant. That's incredible. They don't deserve to hold those seats, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. ENNS: There's no innuendo in that statement.

MR. TURNBULL: . . . and hopefully they will not hold them in two or three years after another election.

Now the Member from Fort Garry of course might be excused from enunciating the conspiracy theory and the tip-of-the-iceberg or big lie practice. It's very clear that the Member from Fort Garry is himself a tip-of-the-iceberg though I guess. Because who is he? After he was elected in this House, who offered him a job? A life insurance company. Now it would seem to me that what they are doing in effect is helping to pay his expenses while he spends part of his time in the House here. There's one word for that kind of individual and it is --(Interjection)--that's right, I've left my position with the School Board, that's correct. There's one word for that kind of individual, Mr. Speaker, and I think his speech the other day in this House - a foaming, ranting bunch of drivel, a torrent of irrationality - was I suppose

(MR. TURNBULL Cont'd) . . . indicative of the spirit of a lackey. Now the **assumption** of the ignorance of people, Mr. Speaker, is --(Interjection)--"What do you mean it's my assumption? It's right here in Hansard, 1736. I'll quote it to you again; you obviously weren't listening." The Member from Fort Garry is speaking: "I'm speaking of the ignorance of many people of this province." That's a quote right there.

MR. ENNS: The ignorance on the bill that we're faced with. The ignorance on the bill that we're still faced with. The details of the bill that we still haven't got. That's the ignorance that we're speaking about. The same ignorance that you have, you don't know . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. TURNBULL: Well, I must be getting a little too close, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HENDERSON: I wonder if you wouldn't agree that I said that if people were offered work and they wouldn't work that they should be starved. This is what I said and you did not put it that way. Is that not what I said, that if they had work and they wouldn't work that they should starve.

MR. TURNBULL: Well he's included some qualifications in his remarks. As I read it in the paper and in Hansard . . .

MR. HENDERSON: Who is committing this smear campaign?

MR. TURNBULL: As I read it in the paper, Mr. Speaker, it was simply work them or starve them and that was all there was to it as far as the member was concerned.

MR. HENDERSON: Smear campaign.

MR. TURNBULL: Now, Mr. Speaker, this assumption that the members opposite made about the intelligence of the people of Manitoba was also practised by that infamous individual that I was quoting earlier, and to quote again from his infamous book, the attitude indicated over there is well documented here. Our friend Adolf Hitler points out that --(Interjection)-- their friend. "The political" and I'm quoting, Mr. Speaker - "The political understanding of the great masses is not sufficiently developed for them to arrive at certain general political opinions by themselves and to select sensible persons." In other words, this book, Mr. Speaker, lays down in almost the same words the position taken by the Member from Fort Garry and the Member from Minnedosa during the time that this party has been in government.

I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that taken as a totality the members of the Conservative Party, some of the members I suppose, of the Conservative Party evince characteristics that to me as an individual are very disturbing. We have the attitudes in social reaction on the part of the Member from Pembina, an attitude of reaction towards social development; an attitude of reaction towards the practical education of our young people; an attitude of anti-intellectualism and reaction towards the worthiness of our educational institutions. And we have from the Member from Fort Garry, who apparently doesn't like my showing the similarity between his statements and those of Adolf Hitler, we have from him the statement of the conspiracy theory of history - and he said it very explicitly in his speech May 8th; and we have, too, the big lie, the practice of the big lie where we take one particular item which is true and from that we try to create such a tremendous distortion that we get people to the point where they are confused. And finally, Mr. Speaker, we have sensed amongst the members on the Conservative bench, some of the members of the Conservative benches, that the people, the mass of the people are ignorant - as I've quoted from the speech here and referred back to the statement of the Member from Minnedosa - an assumption of ignorance of the people of Manitoba which is anti-democratic. There's no other explanation for it.

And all these things taken together, Mr. Speaker, would indicate to me that some of those individuals over there - and I must say that there are some that are honourable and men . . .

A MEMBER: Point them out.

MR. TURNBULL: Well, the member for Brandon over there - I forget whether it's Brandon East or West - and the Member for Wolseley, I think, and some others, but many of them over there have revealed in these attitudes towards social development, in these attitudes towards the conspiracy theory, the practice of the big lie, and the assumption of the ignorance of the people that revealed the political ideas of fascism . . . I cannot see, and I'd be very interested now in hearing a fairly cogent and logical presentation by members opposite showing me where I'm wrong, but I feel that I've indicated to the House - and I have purged myself of the bad taste of the baloney that I had from other members there - I've shown the House that their attitudes and their practice are similar to this fascist pseudo-philosophy, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that those members opposite who have not evinced the kind of ideas and practices that

(MR. TURNBULL Cont'd) . . . I've mentioned, should perhaps pick up the defence of their party, because the Progressive Conservative Party is one that I admire in this province, and I don't mind admitting it, but I think, Mr. Speaker, that there are some members of the Opposition, such as those who are of Liberal persuasion, should make it very clear that they distinguish themselves or separate themselves from the Conservatives that I have talked about today, because surely Liberalism does not come close to the kind of theories and practices that I have indicated today that are typical of statements made by members of the Conservative benches and typical of statements made in this horrible book, Mein Kampf.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that members here should keep in mind what some individuals in the Conservative caucus are trying to do: they are trying to distort what is going on, they're trying to confuse the public, and they are trying, Mr. Speaker, to seek political advantage from all of these practices.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek.

MR. ENNS: . . . accepting a question? Thank you. Mr. Speaker, then, my question is simple: Would he believe that I was fostering the big lie that he spoke of if I described the automobile insurance scheme as a good Socialist program? Is that, in his opinion and in the remarks that he has made, fostering the big lie?

MR. TURNBULL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy to stand up and explain the big lie theory once again. The point that I was making was in reference to the tip-of-the-iceberg theory that the Member for Fort Garry and others had mentioned, and the point about the big lie, if the Member for Lakeside can retain his seat for a second, is this: that you take something that is credible, something that is true, and on that you build fabrication after fabrication, deception after deception, distortion after distortion, until finally you end up with a big lie, but the big lie always has a point of credibility in it; that's the point.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I realize I could be out of order. I just wanted a simple question. Does he consider calling the Automobile Insurance scheme a Socialist program, as a lie?

MR. TURNBULL: Apparently he didn't understand it the second time around.

MR. ENNS: Is it a lie if I call it a Socialist program?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside did stand up and say, "Probably I'm out of order." It's obvious that he is, and I would suggest that we do not conduct the business of the House even with a member admitting before he says that it is out of order, that we come within the orders of the rules of the House before we conduct any cross-examination.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON: (Sturgeon-Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HENDERSON: May I ask a question, before you carry on? Does the Member for Osborne not agree that these rabble raisers, that cause wilful damage at the universities and this, should not be punished or expelled? Do you believe that they should be expelled?

MR. TURNBULL: I'm not sure which individuals you're referring to. Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what people the Member from Pembina is referring to. I'm aware only of the situation in Manitoba and I have not seen rabble rousers resorting to violence who are students in our universities and our schools.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I rise to speak on the Budget Debate and I intend to speak on the Budget, but never before in my life have I heard two people get up and go through a bunch of philosophy of clear bunk that has been presented here this afternoon. When the Honourable Member from St. Matthews stated that they have philosophers in a party, he should have just looked around us, because there's been nothing but book reading, writing, etc. and absolute lack of experience that I've every seen in my life thrown across this House this afternoon. You know, there's really -- it's a one-track-mind type of thing. The Honourable Member from Osborne reminds me of a fellow that would tear up a calendar of Raquel Welch just because it was December 31st. He absolutely doesn't even think of anything he has to say, and if you want to say that I'm a Progressive Conservative of the worst water that may flow, you can say it, fellow, because I'm a Progressive Conservative and I admit it, and we have the better party of the bunch in this House at the present time.

If you want to take, Mr. Speaker, and just let's look at it, I'd like to compare it to a little bit of business. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is not here this afternoon but he has the habit of getting up and saying: "I didn't say it? You said it." You know, that's a real statement. Last year, during the session in the Fall, he got up and he said, "I hope you keep repeating 'Socialism' when we say something good, because it's going to hurt you, not us," and I remember getting up and saying "Socialism, Socialism, Socialism," and that's exactly what he's talking about, so now we'll tell you what he's playing at.

Let's compare it to a man who walks in to somebody, a purchasing agent, or the people of Manitoba, and they offer a little plan. They come along, Mr. Speaker, and they present a program or a product that's sitting there and they don't buy it, so the little bone gets a little bigger all the time and they still don't buy it, and then what finally happens is we get the brochure, as my friend from Lakeside has presented many times, thrown before them and the package becomes so good that the fellow bought it. That's what the people of Manitoba bought. Then they point out it won't sell; it can't be produced; it can't be done without wrecking the province. And we're sitting with a bunch of rotten inventory around that we've got to damn soon get rid of, and I'm telling you this right now, that he still hasn't said what he bought or what he sold. The poor purchasing agent gets asked by the manager, he says, "What did you buy?" He said, "He didn't tell me," and he said, "Well, he sold you Socialism and the reason he didn't tell you, because it hasn't worked anywhere in the world satisfactory, and you wouldn't have bought it if he'd said so."

Now that's exactly what it is. You're all running around completely afraid to say what you're presenting to the people of Manitoba. Say it, and don't be scared of it. Don't keep pulling the wool over people's eyes with programs that can't be produced. So let's go to the programs that can't be produced.

The Honourable Minister of Finance stands up continually, and has been for the last while, saying, "We shifted \$28 million," and the whole side is saying that, and that's all he's been able to say since that was done. Now, on the Budget, we turn around and we say that's all that's been done. He didn't shift any of the tax load this session. The tax load of the shift that he made is right back on the real taxpayers through the municipalities. There was no help given to the municipalities. In fact money, as we have said, has been taken out of the education program, and Mr. Speaker, the tax rate in all the cities and municipalities are up. St. James-Assiniboia is 3.42; Fort Garry is something like 7, and if the example -- I used an example once before and I was wrong, but this one is not wrong. If you have a \$6,000 assessment in St. James-Assiniboia, and if you happen to be a man making \$8,000 a year and it's going to cost you another \$20.00 a year for your taxes, you've just increased his Medicare payment from \$52.00 to \$82.00 so you've wiped it out many places there. You've wiped it out in places like Fort Garry, and certainly in Winnipeg where assessment's up, it's completely wiped out. So the Minister of Finance is continually getting up and saying, "We made a tremendous tax shift," but the tax shift has been eaten up already.

For years the municipalities and the cities have had increased grants from the province until now, as when costs have been rising the way they have been in education and in municipal financing, and I must say that I have to keep repeating one of the speeches of one of the members on the other side that I think very highly of, the Honourable Member from Kildonan, who did say in a speech in 1968, "What do you mean by balanced budget?" And he goes on through this whole speech and repeats each one of the mill increases that were in the municipalities, so he

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) said, "What do you mean by a balanced budget?" Well, this is right. What do you mean by a balanced budget, especially when your budget is up \$50 million and not one bit of help to the cities and municipalities, and your revenue for that budget is questionable as to whether you'll get it in or not?

The Honourable Member for Crescentwood told the Honourable Minister of Finance yesterday, or Friday, that it's quite conceivable that we'll have a bad year next year and we won't have the revenues that we expected. It is quite conceivable, I agree with him on that, but it isn't entirely the blame of the Federal Government as he said so.

So now you boil it down. You have increased the corporation tax; you have increased - and the Honourable Minister of Finance doesn't like the word "subsidy" - you have increased everybody making more than \$11,400 a year, which would subsidize the people under it as far as Medicare is concerned; and I got taken to task because I used the word the "productive" people of the province, which are the four percent over \$11,300, and I will take that, I accept the criticism. The people that make under that are the productive people. But if you take the entrepreneur, the investor, etc., and you say to him, "You're going to pay the most corporation tax in Manitoba than anywhere else in the country," he's going to invest elsewhere. If he invests elsewhere, the architects, the engineers, the draftsmen, the people that are working in this basis have got to go with him, and I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, the productive people of this province, the people that hammer the nails and do the welding, have to go where he is, so you're not doing them any favour by continually raising corporation taxes and continually using the ability-to-pay concept.

MR. BOROWSKI: Tax the poor; that's your philosophy.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Tax the poor? You're taxing the poor. You will be the one that hurts them in the long run because you will end up with a situation that they can't possibly move in. You will have a society of carrots and vegetables the way you're working. So Mr. Speaker, it's all very well to say we come to Manitoba to have investment, but what person is going to want to come to Manitoba when we have the highest corporation and the highest personal income tax; when there's an ability-to-pay program on for the four percent of the people who earn more than \$11,300, and not only that, a statement that there will be more; you have a government that has gone in business, not only in the auto insurance business - I'll mention that in a minute, but briefly - you've got a government who has decided to go into business, who is buying an equity in a navigation company and an equity in a farm machinery company, and an announcement that there's more to come.

A MEMBER: Not the government. People.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Fine. You say the people. I'll get to that. The government has an equity in it. So therefore, how many men are going to start investing in this province when you've got the highest corporation, people over \$11,300 paying the highest personal income tax, and the people under as well, you've got the government in business against them and more to come, and then when you get to auto insurance the business that's been established for more than 25 years as a firm business in this province, or even more, can be wiped out just with the stroke of the pen, and harm all the people that are working in it. And you fellows actually stood around and say that you're not harming the Province of Manitoba and the small people in it.

I'd like to say the NDP government never did that much for the poor in Saskatchewan, Mr. Honourable Minister of Transport. I lived there. I drove down South Railway, and they were there, and what did they do? So don't let's say that the success of Socialism, as you want to call it, is that much. It has failed nearly every place it's been, and that's what you're presenting; it's on your program; and you stand up and you say, "I don't want to admit it. We didn't say it; you did." Oh, for heaven's sake, if those practices are not Socialism, I don't know what is.

The Honourable Member from Crescentwood is probably very disappointed with me when I say, "So what?" on foreign investment. I say to him again: So what? What's wrong with people investing in this province? Can you tell me? I'll tell you how most businesses were built in this province. They were built because people invested here. Secondary industry started to supply them and that's what secondary industry does - it supplies them, and the secondary industries have grown to where they're good big and large companies in this province doing business with other provinces, and if you don't have investment from outside you're certainly going to just keep killing and giving the people on the inside no chance whatsoever to build up

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) their businesses. And he says, well, it's all been public money that's there; that they own it. So it's public money! I said last session, what is wrong with the province investing in this province, the people investing in this province to advance it? And let's be clear about what a loan is. A loan is where you loan money, you get paid back at interest.

MR. BOROWSKI: You mean like C. F. I. ?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: You can't say whether they've paid it back yet or not, Mr. Minister. You can't. Their terms of paying back never came up yet so you can't make that statement just yet. Let's wait till the proof's in the pudding, and if I'm wrong and you're right I'll let you give me a kick in the rear end out in the hall here. -- (Interjection) -- Well, just the same, a loan is a loan to be paid back. If you take a loan, your banks have people that administer loans. Banks don't always make the right ones. There's some of them go bad and certainly the government will have some that will go bad. But let me say this: the Industrial Development Fund in Manitoba, when it gave loans, you practically had to give your heart, soul, your wife, your dog, the whole works, and if you lost you lost everything and so you should because you'd borrowed the people's money. And when you won, you won, and the money was paid back to the people at an interest rate which was of value to the people. Now you're talking about going in and buying equity in businesses, and government in business has traditionally lost money and never taken any out.

MR. TURNBULL: That's not true.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: That is true. That is true. If you're going to talk about . . .

MR. TURNBULL: . . . submit to a question?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Sit down. Sit down. If you're going to talk about the steel mill down in Nova Scotia, you and I will have a chat about that because I'm in the mechanical business and I'll tell you some secrets about that one. -- (Interjection) -- Okay. Okay. I'll give a little to the honourable member. There's some good and there's some bad but I'll tell you this. The percentage is on the bad side, and in Saskatchewan you have . . .

MR. TURNBULL: Prove it.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Sure. I will. I haven't got the figures here but you'll get them. I assure you of that. Now, you're going to pay the loan back with the benefits of people. You talk about buying a percentage of a farm machinery company. Do you know the government will not take ten cents out of that business if they keep up with the research going on in North America alone? If they even spend enough time researching to keep up with the international companies, they won't take ten cents out of that company. It'll be absolutely impossible. -- (Interjection) -- No we didn't. Oh no. I don't know that we were recommending it, but it had nothing to do -- you're going back June 25th, 1969, and I'm not there then, and as far as I'm concerned there should be no loan for that company because you won't take ten cents out as long as you even keep up with the research of it - and I'll tell you where they have a place. They have a place supporting many other big industries and making machinery and what have you, but if you think that you're going to have a company in this province that will be able to sell enough machinery of the quality that can be built competing with the research, internationally and what have you, in Western Canada you've another think coming because you won't take ten cents out. And this is what government traditionally happens to them.

MR. BOROWSKI: Does the Member for Fort Garry agree with you?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I don't hear you.

MR. BOROWSKI: Does the Member for Fort Garry agree with you?

MR. SHERMAN: I'm just thinking about it, Joe. I don't want to answer too quick.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well I've been given a list here. I wasn't going to give this list but here we are. Crown corporations discontinued during CCF Government: box factory - loss was \$478,000; cannery - \$98,000. I really said that I would get the information for the honourable member and here it is and I will give it to you.

MR. TURNBULL: . . . talking about dollars. He's talking about dollars.

A MEMBER: Read it into the record.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: No, I really haven't got the time. I would table it. -- (Interjection) -- No, I really don't. It's all here. I'll show it to you after, and you can -- if you've got some arguments with it that says it's wrong, I'll accept them and I'll listen to them, but I will not sit there and just have a closed mind on the situation. If you can prove them wrong, go ahead; go ahead. This is the honourable member and a few of the group along the back row

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) that sit and maybe laugh and joke about the Honourable Member from Pembina saying, "If they don't work when they can have jobs, starve a bit." There are several who make jokes about the member in the top row who couldn't carry his shoes around the corner when it comes to achievement. So I would think a little bit more seriously when you get to experience.

Mr. Speaker, I have said very basically that this province cannot expect to have private investment when you are asking the people who have the ability to invest to pay more, when you're asking the people who have the ability to produce, such as engineers, etc., or those over the 11,400 mark - and the Honourable Minister of Finance wasn't here and I wanted to say I stood corrected as to who the productive people of this province are - the productive people are the ones under \$11,300.00 - but if the investor is investing elsewhere, the engineer will be working elsewhere and so will the guy who's the productive person will have to go elsewhere. They aren't going to compete with Crown corporations in any way, shape or form, and they are not going to invest in a province when you can walk in and wipe their business out at the stroke of a pen any time you feel like it, and especially when the government has proved they will do it and they've said that they will continue to do more. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TURNBULL: I would wonder if the Member from Sturgeon Creek would now submit to a question? I would hope that a man of your self-announced experience would be able to tabulate in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Has the member a question?

MR. TURNBULL: It's a long question? -- will be able to tabulate, will be able to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member a question?

MR. TURNBULL: Yes I do, Mr. Speaker. Yes. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I will if they'll give me a chance, Mr. Speaker. . . . would tabulate in dollar terms, the amount of public money invested in Crown corporations in Canada at the federal and provincial and municipal levels okay? - and then see whether they have lost more money than they have made.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: First of all, I would only be able to ask the Honourable Attorney-General if I could borrow the computer for a while. Secondly, if you're speaking of the Crown corporations that are involved in Canada, I don't think anybody on this side has really been all that critical of Crown corporations in Canada when they pertain to something that is an absolute necessity. But to do it because it's the philosophy and you said you'd do it, is another thing. -- (Interjection) -- That's right.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point, I should like to introduce a school which has come in recently to our gallery, 33 Grades 7 to 9 students from Steadman School of Fairford under the direction of Mr. Chuckry. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for The Pas. On behalf of the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, we welcome you here this afternoon.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

BUDGET DEBATE (Cont'd)

HON. AL MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, I would like to exercise an opportunity to speak briefly in this Budget Debate. I confess that I wasn't all that eager to do so until the last few days when I realized I was getting awfully tired - tired of working in my office and then, when I did have an opportunity to sit in the House, I got awfully tired of listening to the remarks of my honourable friends opposite. I found to my dismay that much of what they had to say was irrelevant to a budget debate, and this was slightly disconcerting because I thought that in dealing with my honourable colleague the Minister of Finance's submission to the House, that most of the remarks from my honourable friends opposite would have some significant bearing on the major contribution that he made in that speech. But my disappointment turned to dismay and concern as I heard more and more of the honourable members opposite engage in the debate. I have heard, from time to time, my honourable colleague the Minister of Transportation refer to some of the honourable members opposite in the Opposition as somewhat of a three-ring circus and, you know, I feel sometimes that he overstates or over-simplifies the case, but you know, the more and more I observe, the more I reflect on perhaps the accuracy of his statement. Now the Honourable Member from -- (Interjection) --

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) Well I'll get to you - I'll get to the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek shortly.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I have no doubt that you will.

MR. MACKLING: That body of water, Sturgeon Creek, was flowing mightily during a result of the flood and we had somewhat of a flood of words from the honourable member, which I'll deal with shortly. I'll allow the floodwaters to recede for a moment, though. The Honourable Member for River Heights isn't here and that troubles me somewhat because some of what I had to say dealt with his submission. Now, the Honourable Member from River Heights has been perhaps unfairly associated with the drummer boy, but in many ways he does act like a petulant little drummer boy who has now lost his drum, perhaps by making a discordant noise or perhaps he wasn't in keeping with the rest of the band; because that's the kind of thing he's been suggesting recently, that the contribution he was making the former caucus of the Progressive Conservative Party was obviously not acceptable, because he indicates that he's a red Tory; that he's something different; that he articulated, in committees of the former government, submissions that apparently the former government did not accept. Now in addition to what we might categorize "the drummer boy," we've got the Honourable Member from Fort Garry who made a significant contribution into this Budget Debate, and it's hard to box anyone in this Assembly and I hate to suggest that anyone should, but I have difficulty in assigning a category to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry because after all he is a very nice person. But I like to think of him as perhaps a magician. He is very articulate and he tries to develop fantasies into reality in the presence of the honourable members around him, and they cheer him on much like a magician carrying on his work.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): The happy cavalier.

MR. MACKLING: Well, no, I've got the happy cavalier coming. The happy cavalier - I would use another definition - is the Honourable Member from Lakeside. You know, in many ways he plays the role of the clown or the jester. He colours himself up he puffs up; he develops the stance for it; and then he tells a story. Sometimes they're bedtime stories; sometimes he rises to great heights of oratorical prowess, suggesting -- (Interjection) -- Well, there's lots of room for hot air in this Assembly. We have a large ceiling. But really, really you know, like a lot of the famous clowns, sometimes he was hurting very badly inside. And I think the honourable member has deep hurt within him because I think he recognizes that he has suffered from the ills of fate from time to time in the former administration. Not all of the recommendations that he made to his honourable colleagues obviously were welcome. Not all of the proposals that he had made in respect to very important matters in Manitoba were accepted by the people of Manitoba. And I think within him there is a great well of remorse and anger, and from time to time he strikes out. And I have nothing but sympathy for the honourable member in his moments of frustration. And although he plays the role of the jester, he tries to relieve himself of the great problems that he feels within himself.

MR. BILTON: He can look after himself.

MR. MACKLING: Yes, I'm sure the honourable member will look after himself and I think he's able, at least, to give vent to some of his ill will and vituperation from time to time. But the Honourable Member from Fort Garry is present and I would like to address to him a few comments about his contribution.

MR. SHERMAN: But I've been hurt too. I've been hurt too.

MR. MACKLING: Some of his most articulate, prosaic enunciations, like the muffled cadence of the jack boots, you know, perhaps might be considered to be rather funny, but really it's very sad because, as the Honourable Member from Osborne has indicated, it reflects a thinking which is totally undemocratic, a thinking which is a fear type of response that is suggested should be accepted, not only by members in this House, but the people of Manitoba. And I think that's sad; it's not at all funny.

The honourable member regaled about taxes, for example, and he made much of the fact that he says we're not increasing taxes. But he said, "My goodness" - words to this effect - "Look what the Honourable Attorney-General did with land titles fees, for example. Look at the tremendous increase in fees!" Now whether the honourable member was present in the House when I was introducing my estimates on the Attorney-General's Department dealing with land titles fees or not, I don't know. Perhaps not. But I gave what I thought was a reasonable explanation at that time and either I didn't articulate well or the honourable member did not appreciate the significance of what I had to say, because I had indicated -- I had indicated that there was a relevant proportion between the cost of operations of the Land Titles

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) Office and the total revenues received by the Land Titles Office in the year 1959, which in 1970 was completely disproportionate; that in effect salaries had doubled during the period and yet there's been no change in fees.

Now the honourable members opposite would continually remind us to run government in a businesslike manner. Don't be subsidizing everyone. Run on a fair, competitive and businesslike manner. And I have no quarrel, I have no quarrel with the manner in which the fee structure had been established in 1959, with one exception. When I came to review, as was my lot, the assessments in our sister provinces in this same area, I was amazed to find that far from there being an even proportionate corresponding increase in respect to land titles fees on the more valuable property, that wasn't the case in Manitoba. The little man, the poor man, he paid the same fee across our sister provinces, but in Manitoba the more valuable the property the cheaper the fee. Now I took the attitude, and I think the attitude is right, that what's good in Alberta and Saskatchewan surely ought to be reasonably applicable in Manitoba. And it's true some of the land titles fees in some sectors had gone up 100 percent, and I have no shame, I have no unhappy feeling at all about that, because I say there was a basic disproportionate ratio in the fee structuring with our sister provinces. Now I suggest that that is surely not accidental. Surely the previous administration could compare, as we often do, the fee structure in other areas, and I suggest it was deliberate because the average man, the poor man, can pay but the big man gets all the breaks, and that's the kind of thinking that existed in the previous government's administration and that's why they're on that side of the House.

MR. SHERMAN: That's a ridiculous statement.

MR. MACKLING: It's not ridiculous. Those are facts, and if my honourable friend wants to compare the facts, they can at any time.

Now the Honourable Member from Fort Garry excelled further. He told us about industries that were moving or had moved, and really, I felt very troubled by this when he started to articulate. But when we come down to his categories, his list, he started with one that shocked me, and he said -- here was the list he gave. He said A & W have left the province; Catelli; Kennedy Flooring; Selkirk Chimneys; Salisbury House aren't building or something. Now, just the first one. Just let's take the first one, A & W. My honourable friend from Sturgeon Creek knows of the chap of whom I speak. I see him quite frequently, a prominent member of the A & W family, if we can call it that -- (Interjection) -- Yes that's right. And approximately a month, month and a half ago, when I heard that A & W were considering moving I asked my friend, who is with A & W, what is the purpose of the move, and he indicated to me, "Al," he said, "I know the reaction that you feel. That's got nothing to do with it. We have no views for or against -- certainly not against your government," he said. "It's a matter of company policy that they've decided to locate their head office on the west coast." And that company, the A & W Company, approximately a year or a year and a half ago, was purchased by the United Fruit Company, a United States corporation. They maintain an operation in Canada. The Canadian resident manager decides that he wants the head office on the west coast. It has got absolutely nothing to do with the development in Manitoba of the New Democratic Party government, and for the Honourable Member for Fort Garry . . .

MR. SHERMAN: . . . said he had bought a house in Winnipeg.

MR. MACKLING: . . . the Honourable Member for Fort Garry to suggest -- (Interjection) -- just a minute -- to suggest that that firm was leaving the province in any way resultant from anything this government did, was absolute nonsense.

MR. SHERMAN: Do you think that they're going to tell you?

MR. MACKLING: Absolute nonsense. And if the truth hurts, you're hearing it, and you can react accordingly. The fact of the matter is they did no such thing, and this House has been led to believe that that firm moved because of something this government did, and that's not true. And it's a desservice, it's a disservice, Mr. Speaker, to this company to have suggested that in this House. Now I haven't examined into the . . .

MR. SHERMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the Attorney-General can make declamatory statements like that. I'm telling him my information. He is obviously not going to get the information . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member has not a point of order.

MR. MACKLING: And if you have any doubt, you can ask your honourable colleague the Member from Sturgeon Creek to speak to the gentleman that both he and I know very personally.

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) Just a little more consultation on that side with your colleagues would rectify a lot of the misstatements and ill-founded rumours that are spread by members of that caucus.

MR. SHERMAN: Were you talking to the president?

MR. MACKLING: I indicated to whom I was speaking and I don't care to use the gentleman's name. I will if you want, but I don't think that is necessary. You can ask your honourable colleague whom I'm referring to.

MR. SHERMAN: I haven't spoken . . .

MR. MACKLING: Well, you can.

MR. SHERMAN: It doesn't make any difference.

MR. MACKLING: The Honourable Member from Fort Garry was also concerned about the confrontation that appeared on the steps of the Legislative Assembly. We'll have more to say about automobile insurance when that debate takes place, but I want to assure him that every member on this side of the House will defend and fight for the right for people to demonstrate against any policy of government, and we're not afraid of confrontation; we're not afraid of meeting the people on any subject. And to say and to suggest as has been the case in the debate that has transpired over the course of the last seven or eight days, that there's calculated deception, that we're hiding things, that we're afraid to speak to people, is utter nonsense and the honourable members know it.

MR. SHERMAN: Ask the industry.

MR. MACKLING: When we talk about deception and a reluctance to be fair and frank, surely, surely all we have to do is turn to that northern development, Churchill Forest Industry, and to see the revelation bit by bit of the terrific indulgence of the previous government.

MR. SHERMAN: Oh, oh; here comes the smoke screen again.

MR. MACKLING: A smoke screen? The honourable member is very sensitive about that, and well he should be, because the previous government gave the attitude that they weren't aware of any loan. They weren't concerned about it at all. But the fact of the matter is, as has been pointed out, almost 100 percent of this project will be developed with public funds. And Socialism for the rich is quite acceptable on that side of the House, but Socialism for the people is something that we should be very wary about because somehow, you know, these terrible people might exercise this control and put the establishment in a box of some kind.

I don't want to indulge in analysis of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's contribution in the debate. He seemed to note with some significance that a year had made some difference. It obviously has made some difference. He is looking quite healthy now and quite relaxed, and as a matter of fact he made one of the most significant contributions from the point of view of the Opposition. Certainly he didn't drag in too much innuendo or suspicion or rumour; he did indulge in looking through the prism, though, and reflected on the various shades of colour that he found opposite and I'm delighted, I'm delighted that he found some variation in colour, in political colouring in perspective, because we are a political party that represent a good deal of the cross section of the people of Manitoba and we're proud of it. We have people within our ranks who come from almost every vocation. We have people from almost every religious background that I'm aware of, and certainly a healthy assessment of the cultural mosaic in the languages and cultures that are represented here. And I would be dismayed if any one of the honourable members could find a uniformity in our political thinking at all times, because that would be a very, very sad state for the province of Manitoba and for its government. So we're bound to have differences that are articulated openly and cleanly, without backbiting, without inside fighting, and I respect the honourable members regardless of the shade of opinion they happen to take on various sides of the economic argument that is had from time

The Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek. I would like to say a few words in respect to his contribution. He said, in paying some respect to the contributions of the Honourable Member from St. Matthews and the Honourable Member from Osborne, he said that a good deal of what had been heard was a philosophy which in his mind was clear bunk. And yet, and yet I really can't recall what philosophy the Honourable Member from St. Matthews had enunciated other than a historical recounting of significant contributions, the philosophical political thought, by prominent Conservative historians. And if those political historians have enunciated clear bunk, it indicates . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I still say it's bunk. I don't care who said it.

MR. MACKLING: . . . that his assessment of prominent Conservative historians is a very low one.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: It's bunk. There's no question about it.

MR. MACKLING: Now he suggests that it's obvious that the Honourable Member from Osborne really doesn't know what life is all about, that for some reason or other it would be -- he categorizes the Honourable Member for Osborne as someone who would tear up a calendar with Raquel Welch -- that shows that I'm not totally interested with the female anatomy that some of my honourable members are. I would rather suspect, I would rather suspect that the Honourable Member for Osborne has such a charming and attractive wife that he doesn't need pictures of Raquel Welch and that more than likely the calendars that would grace his home would be the prairie crocus or a field of wheat or something like that. Certainly he would spend more of his time, of his wakeful time on much more serious matters.

A MEMBER: At least tear off one of Tommy Douglas because it was December 31st.

MR. MACKLING: I know that the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek is making some sort of a contribution but it's not too clear. I thought that he had made it before. He suggests that we've got a lot of rotten inventory in the province. Now I don't know just exactly what he was referring to then. We are doing our best to move as quickly as we can on all fields to clean up rotten inventory and I don't know just whether we've caught the particular field that he's concerned about or not.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The reference is to the . . .

MR. MACKLING: He was concerned about -- he did get to the Honourable Minister of Finance's budget in some of his remarks by indicating that he was aware of a shift of \$28 million, and he says that was all that we were able to do -- \$28 million in just over 10 months ago -- and yet the honourable members over there have kept up an insistent clamour that we should have increased taxes, or we should have come up with another 30 or 35 million dollars, out of -- maybe it was out of that magical hat that the Honourable Member from Fort Garry refuses to produce in the House -- and find this money, find this money for this tremendous reduction in municipal taxes. But there's not one of the honourable members, not one of the honourable members opposite, has had the temerity to stand and say where you should get that money. The only suggestion, the only suggestion -- and we have to give them credit -- is for their drummer boy who got up and said: Cut services. Hold the line on Civil Service. Cut out a branch of government -- maybe the Information Branch. Cut down on the political side. Eliminate the executive assistants and so on. He's come up with a lot of new-found techniques since he's on that side of the House.

And oh, what a difference a year has made, in his thinking particularly, because in his contribution to the Throne Speech Debate, the first sitting, the first session of the new government, he listed a long category of rights and grievances that had to be corrected in this province. And he smashed his hand against his fist in a very artistic and deliberate and fiery manner. And oh, what a terrible society we've been living in for 10 years, or 11 years, during the previous administration. And during his course of his administration. And what terrible force had muted his golden lips, I don't know, but he found new strengths on that side of the House and articulated a great catalogue of rights that were demanding of redress. And so it is, the other day his major contribution was: cut costs; slash out government services somewhere. And of course, if and when a civil servant does retire, even gracefully -- and that's happened -- then there's a great witch hunt. You're destroying the Civil Service. You're driving people away. We're losing all our good people. And then the Honourable Member from River Heights would say, "Look at the jobs you're destroying. How about jobs?" He wants us to put people out of work. He wants to slash the Civil Service somehow. You know, there seems to be no consistency. No matter what way we move, there's a reaction over there that's hostile.

Now, surely, surely one of the hallmarks of a reasonable opposition is that they give honest and just criticism, and I suggest the criticism in respect to our lack of movement in respect to the municipal tax field could be just criticism, because we have, as a political party articulated the need for tax reform in this field. But we've said consistently that this will be done. There will be a major shift. But I say it's sham on the part of the members on the Opposition to demand that all this be done in one year, and we've been in office 11 months. This is the argument they raise, but they haven't got the honesty or the purpose of an Opposition to say

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) where those taxes should come from. Oh yes, we've heard it, day after day, "What are you doing for the municipal taxpayer? What are you doing for the municipal taxpayer?" And the question has been put to you by my honourable colleague. Where are we going to get the money? Where do you suggest we get the money? And then there's a deathly pause.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. MACKLING: There's a great heavy silence that hangs over the opposition, because they're afraid. Will they guess wrong? Because they're concerned about political expediency, and I have to divert - I have to reflect for a moment on the words of the Honourable Member for River Heights, and oh, how I regret the fact that he isn't present. He says, and I quote from his speech: "If you hadn't been so wrapped up in your political victories and had spent more time in Planning and Priorities Committee to eliminate redundant programming, you could have found the money to take care of a problem affecting nearly 25 percent of the people of this province." He says we were taken up with politics - with political thinking. He didn't suggest what redundant programming there was. Where is the validity of constructive opposition criticism? These are just fiery generalities that you hope someone will believe. But surely we have a right to expect more lucidity and more clarity from the honourable member opposite from River Heights, who is not present today, who had some experience in government. If he knows of redundant programming, let him bring it forward and call it before this House. It's not good enough simply to say that there's redundant programming. Where is it?

MR. BEARD: Car insurance.

MR. MACKLING: Where is it? Let's be fair and frank. Car insurance. You say we haven't got it yet. God grant we will have it shortly.

He talked about a government being "so wrapped up in your political victories." Oh my goodness, what a difference a year has made! Because surely the Honourable Member from River Heights, being the eloquent former Minister of Industry and Commerce beating the drum as he was for such a going and wonderful development in Manitoba, realized what a sound political stratagem it was to go the people after his party had won three out of four by-elections in February of 1969. Oh, that was clever political maneuvering. And it was just sheer, crass political opportunism that left over 60 bills to fall in the waste basket on the dissolution of the House of the previous administration. And that honourable member has the temerity to suggest that we are concerned about political values, political programming and development, ahead of program for the people of Manitoba. Some honourable members have used the expression opposite, "It just won't wash." Well, let me tell you, all the Mr. Cleans you brought up in Manitoba won't wash away those facts, and the people of Manitoba understand and appreciate that.

The Honourable Member from River Heights - and again how I regret his absence - he said another one of the big reforms that he would carry out in addition to eliminating redundant government spending - and he didn't say where, and let's pray that he will come up with the answer shortly because we're vitally interested in that - and he did suggest elimination of all political costs financed by the public purse, such as executive assistants and other non-civil servant positions. And I really can't understand why they couldn't have done that, you know, when he was in office. He made such excellent use of his executive assistant, we all know.

And then they came up with another gem - eliminating at least one hundred unnecessary boards, agencies and commissions. My, what a sweeping indictment of government! What a complete denial of the former administration of which he was a prominent Minister! Does he actually believe it's possible overnight to eliminate a hundred of these boards and commissions? My goodness, what a condemnation of his former administration! He doesn't list them either. God grant that shortly he will do that for us because I live with keen expectation to find out the listing that he had.

But I do want to get back to the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek. He said, well, when you boil it down that there would be a lot of worthy people, all of entrepreneurial skill that would be leaving Manitoba; they would want to invest elsewhere. And you know, this is the kind of doom and gloom talk that honourable members opposite are wont to give us ad infinitum. But what are the facts?

When some of the skilled people in Manitoba are put on the spot and asked for an honest answer, it's always refreshing when a person is open and fair-minded and gives a full and frank answer. This morning I happened to be fortunate enough to have heard a commentary by

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) Gerald Libling, who I believe is the president of the Manitoba Architects Association, and he was asked whether or not the downturn in construction in Manitoba and the necessary cut-backs on the size and development of architectural firms within Manitoba reflected an unhappy assessment of the New Democratic Party and other factors, and he said, well, the major, the major, if not almost the most completely significant factor, was the anti-inflationary development inaugurated by the Federal Government. Now here was a frank and honest assessment of a downturn in the western economy that naturally is being reflected in Manitoba. It's occasioned by economic factors that are very powerful; the lack of sales of western grain; stockpiles that aren't being moved; a deliberate calculated program on the part of the Federal Government to tighten the screws on economic development in parts of Canada to arrest what they consider to be runaway inflation. As my honourable colleagues, the Minister of Finance and the Premier have indicated, these inflationary pressures stem not from western Canada, but from developments in eastern Canada for which we in the west have no responsibility, over which we have very little control.

These are the significant factors in our western economy at the present time, but the honourable members opposite are quick to cite any downturn in development, construction and so on in this area, but the fact of the matter is, to our sister province to the west it is much much worse and that government, as honourable members know, is headed by a regime that certainly is eager and responsive to every whim of the private enterprise sector, so how can they rationalize the position as they find it in Manitoba? They spread doom and gloom but the truth of the matter is that it's just not correct to make that assessment.

The Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek seems to be highly critical of this government's having anything to do with a substantial investment in industries that cry out for assistance in Manitoba, and that certainly was the situation, obviously, that Versatile Manufacturing Company wanted help in Manitoba; didn't want to move to the United States or any other part of Canada. They needed assistance here and I'm proud to say that our government was involved in making provision for that assessment. It's a very important business in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. And that business -- (Interjection) -- the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek is very pessimistic about that business, but the Federal Government had nothing but glowing words to say about the prospect of further development of that business and the fact that the Barber Commission Report indicated that there was a very high potential for further development of this business. And these are the economic facts, but apparently members on that side of the House, I believe some members, are unhappy that this government chose to assist that substantial business to stay in Manitoba.

The honourable member is also critical of any investment that this government makes in Manitoba, obviously. The kind of investment that they warm to is the kind that was made to the Churchill Forest Industries. This, of course, is a foreign-owned corporation that was given this substantial monopoly position in respect to northern resources. Now that's fine; that's quite acceptable to the honourable member; but assistance, apparently basic assistance for . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . has five minutes remaining.

MR. MACKLING: Thank you very much. . . . for a growing and volatile business in Manitoba is a mistake. He says that the New Democratic Government never did very much for the people of Saskatchewan. Well, the CCF Government in Saskatchewan did provide a lot of what my honourable members opposite believe to be Socialistic programs, and I'm sure that they're very critical of Socialistic programs because that's how they assess it, and I'm sure that one day we'll have several of the members getting up on their feet saying remarks in damnation of these Socialistic programs of hospitalization and Medicare which were enunciated by CCF governments in Saskatchewan. "Damn Socialistic nonsense" I'm sure that we'll hear them say, and of course this . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: . . . using words to change things around.

MR. MACKLING: I'm not changing anything around. These are facts. These happen to be facts and if they hurt, I'm sorry, I feel great sorrow for you.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Twisting. All the lawyers twist.

MR. MACKLING: Apparently he has nothing but doom also for the prospects of the Versatile Manufacturing. He says that research alone will cripple this business, and yet -- (Interjection) -- Well this is what he says; this is what the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek says. He says this in spite of the fact that these gentlemen have shown an ingenuity and

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) an expertise in developing some of the finest farm equipment in North America, and I can assure you that their research is excellent in respect to the products that they have developed.

MR. SHERMAN: Hear, hear.

MR. MACKLING: I note some measure of disunity in the caucuses opposite.

Now what about the budget? I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I finally get to the budget. I had to spend some time in assessing the discharge from the other side which went all so far from the mark, but there's no question, there's no question but there is no major change in the cost of government in this day that can be made without imposing some new tax or providing for a major shift in taxation, and I would suggest that the honourable members opposite would be being fair and frank with the people of Manitoba if they were to suggest, openly and sincerely, in what manner they'd suggest new taxation should be imposed.

Surely we've heard now that they are opposed. The Honourable Member from Riel, I believe, indicated that he was opposed to the roll back of the Medicare tax. He would suggest that we go back to a graduated Medicare tax and he believes that this is the proper and fair form of taxation.

MR. CRAIK: We don't even protest your twisting any more. Just carry on.

MR. MACKLING: You don't protest. Well, these happen to be the facts. Hansard records your contributions and if you have distorted the facts you must live with your distortions, Sir.

The fact of the matter is that opposite we have a petulant, irresponsible, very very cranky opposition, unused to the position in which they find themselves, unable to find proper guidelines for debate, resorting to aspersions, innuendos, smears, any sort of deviation in order to try and adjust their position while awaiting for a new millenium for their political party.

One of the things that apparently is so much troubling the honourable members of the Opposition is that in this year, when my honourable colleague produces a budget with no tax increase, that we have produced and are producing legislation being tabled albeit not with the speed that perhaps some of us wish, a very large number of bills which will produce a substantial adjustment in the rights and freedoms of the people of the Province of Manitoba, and these rights and freedoms are those that the Honourable Member from River Heights found but so recently to be so terribly urgent, and all of these things are being done on a very nominal change in budget structuring - and let me refer to the Bill of Rights - pardon me, the Throne Speech - for a moment, some of the significant rights measures, and this is a government that apparently you can hear the distant muffled or mutated hoofbeats of jack boots, or drumming of jack boots, and maybe the hoofbeats of demons, I don't know.

You know, in the Throne Speech, a Bill of Rights, a Bill to establish a Human Rights Commission; new laws respecting the invasion of privacy; Code of Administrative Practices; Criminal Injuries Compensation Act; amendments to the Garnishment Act to prohibit garnishment of wages before judgment; a new Expropriation Bill designed to protect the individual whose property is being taken in a compulsory way by the state; legislative guarantees; and I could read on. And I say to the honourable members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that your words are hollow sham.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, would the Attorney-General entertain one question? Early in his remarks the Attorney-General referred to the fact that in his view much that had come from this side was irrelevant to a Budget Debate, and I just want to ask him, because I think this is important, Mr. Speaker: does the Attorney-General really believe, under the parliamentary system, that anything is irrelevant to a Budget Debate?

MR. MACKLING: I think that the Budget Debate gives wide latitude for great irrelevancies, but I had expected that there would be some very considered argument in respect to financial structuring in Manitoba, which I didn't find.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave of the House to make a short statement before a matter, which I feel should be announced first in the House, should become a public announcement outside the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't believe it's a matter of privilege. Is the Honourable Minister seeking leave?

MR. PAWLEY: Yes. Could I have leave to make an announcement?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, is this something that would normally have waited until tomorrow?

MR. PAWLEY: I fear that if we wait until tomorrow, it may become public outside the House.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, we will give leave.

MR. SHERMAN: We are agreeable to giving leave, Mr. Speaker.

STATEMENT

MR. PAWLEY: Well, the announcement is, Mr. Speaker, that the Province of Manitoba has approved the Downtown Development Plan that's been proposed to the province by the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg. It's been adopted. It has not been referred to the Municipal boards and has been approved by the Provincial Cabinet itself, and in the approval there is no commitment at this time to financial input but it is an endorsement of the plan itself.

BUDGET DEBATE (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I was not sure I would get in the Budget Debate. I didn't think I would be taking part in it, but I listened to the House Leader the other day, and listening to the Attorney-General I was prompted to get up and make a few remarks at this time.

The House Leader, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, stated that there was no tax increase, none whatsoever, since the government took office, and they made a great tax shift, which is completely without any foundation because there was an increase in corporation tax, there was an increase in personal tax, and I agree there was a shift made in Medicare, and the Liberal Party, last spring session, we had a resolution to the effect that we wanted a tax shift in respect of Medicare; we were for it; but to listen to the House Leader to say that there was no tax increase, I think was completely without foundation.

The other point, the Attorney-General stated that there were some increases in respect to Land Titles fees and so on, and he makes his comparisons to Ontario. I wonder why? -- (Interjection) -- Well, a couple of times you stated that you made comparisons to Ontario and Alberta. I think it would be more in line if we made comparisons to Saskatchewan instead of Ontario. You have to appreciate that Ontario is somewhere in the 25 percent higher income bracket than the average wage earner is in Manitoba, but be as it may, I listened to the Budget . . .

MR. MACKLING: . . . it was the Province of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia and Ontario.

MR. PATRICK: I think on your estimates, Mr. Speaker, on the estimates of the Attorney-General, he stated Ontario at that time only. I believe he included a couple of other provinces today, just a little while ago, but I don't think it's fair, Ontario itself. I would agree that perhaps we should make comparisons to some of the other provinces.

But I mentioned that in the last few days, the Budget Debate, we did hear by the Minister himself, you know, despite that there was no tax increases at all, and so forth, I would disagree because there were no tax increases in the Budget itself, but there were tax increases through the back door, and of course I'm talking in respect to cost of incorporation, new companies, 50 percent increase; there's a cost in Land Titles fees; there's a cost in chattel mortgages, Bill of Sales, 33 - 1/3 percent increase; there's park entrance fees cost increase; permanent trailer parks are increased, and some of them I don't agree with, because there's an area perhaps some people can absorb this increase so I have no argument but I'm just pointing out, I think the government should have said there were increases instead of saying that there were no increases in taxation at all. I'm saying that there are some increases and I agree with some of them.

The other point, the trailer parking have been increased a year ago from \$50.00 to \$100.00, and this year from \$100.00 to \$125.00, which means in a matter of two years we had a 150 percent increase in permanent trailer park. I think this is exorbitant. These people perhaps cannot afford a summer home of their own and in this area I think it's exorbitant.

We had elevator permits increased by a considerable amount - 50 percent in fact - so I think these are pretty substantial increases, and again let me point out I am not in disagreement

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) to all of them. I think if there's an area where we need more revenue, it's an area where we can raise it, fine.

The other point, I think the Minister made reference to the Land Titles Office. I understand that the running of the office costs us in the neighbourhood of \$700,000. The revenue that it produces is \$1.3 million, which is substantial -- that's before the tax increase even, so I'm sure this isn't related to the increase in salaries and wages to the employees.

But Mr. Speaker, I do feel that this budget has failed the municipalities, to give them financial aid. This budget has failed the property owners in respect of property tax. This budget has failed the senior citizens, and this budget has also failed the students in respect to student employment, which I think is very serious and important at this time. That's the area that I feel the government has failed the people of Manitoba, the municipalities, property owners, senior citizens and student employment, because at the present time, Mr. Speaker, I think that the government, not only government but all sectors, are required to put more energy if jobs are to be provided for the increased numbers of students seeking summer employment, and there's very many. I get students calling me every day. I'm getting students coming to see me every day. I think all levels of government, as well as industry and labour, should cooperate on this important matter of student summer employment.

I think it is a very important issue before this House at the present time. Very important. I feel that this government has done little to assist the students. In fact, I feel that this year we are doing perhaps less than we did last year and if this is the case then I think that this House must do something. I think a tribute can be paid and should be paid to the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce in their program "Operation Placement," in seeking the cooperation of industry in order to obtain summer jobs where jobs are badly needed. I know I've had at least three communications from the Chambers in various areas seeking that every industry -- I think they've had contact with every industry in Manitoba, which to the present time I've had no communication or industry has not had this direct communication from the government itself. I think this is an area that the government could have done something, so I'm disappointed. I think that government must make every effort to provide employment for the greatest number of our students so that we can help them in financial matters so that they can be able to go back to college in the fall. I think it's most important and I really do feel that the government is doing very little in this field.

Mr. Chairman, the other point that I want to make reference to -- and I mentioned the four areas where I feel the Budget has given very little assistance, and that's the property tax, financial aid to municipalities and property owners. We just passed a motion in this House on Friday, support for the senior citizens, and I think it's unfortunate because the cost would have been very small, very small as far as the senior citizens are concerned, that this government has given no consideration during this session for those people. I think it's unfortunate that these people cannot retire in dignity in their own home because some of them are forced out. As I mentioned just the other day, certain municipalities are bringing bills, Private Member's Bills, before this House so that they can be of some help to senior citizens. On the other hand, the government has done nothing, and during the last session the government was prepared to act in this area.

In Saturday's Tribune it's pointed out quite well the Metro residential tax increases, and I'll just point St. James-Assiniboia where we have in a matter from '68 to 1970, on a \$6,000 of assessment, there's an increase of \$101.00 from '68 to 1970. Transcona, an increase of \$170.00 on a \$6,000 assessment. Mr. Speaker, this is exorbitant. This continues year after year, so this must be an area that the government has to take action and I would have liked to see some action taken. The government told us they have \$800,000 surplus, and still the government has failed the municipalities and failed the property owners in this area. I could go on: East Kildonan -- \$122.00 increase from 1968 to 1970 on a \$6,000 of assessment and it goes on. When you get a \$170.00 increase in a matter of three years on a \$6,000 assessment, to me, to any home owner, Mr. Speaker, this is very exorbitant. And this is calculated for '68, '69 and '70, increases every year, and what the total figure comes to over the three-year period. For instance in Old Kildonan from 1968 to 1970, -- an assessment has just been mailed out and the tax notices -- the increase is \$188.00 since 1968.

So, Mr. Speaker, as far as I'm concerned, the government and this budget has definitely failed the people in respect to financial aid to municipalities; some aid to senior citizens that live in their own homes. I think that the budget as well, which the Minister has talked about

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) before and I know the budget does make reference to removing some of the sales tax and perhaps increasing it in other areas, but the budget did not mention about removing the tax from used clothing, soaps, toiletries, shoe repairs and things like that.

The elimination of the provincial portion of the estate tax which has been turned down, and the resolution which was debated, I think will also have a significant factor in respect to industry developing in Manitoba. I know the argument and I agree to some extent with the argument. Maybe it's two wrongs will make a right, but the point is we may be waiting for the next 30 years, next 25 years before any change is made. So is Manitoba prepared not to change its estate tax laws and let Alberta, Saskatchewan -- and I know that British Columbia has made some changes this session and will be going in the same area, so Manitoba will be the only province without making any change. I think that if we don't we will lose many of the benefits as far as some of the industries coming to this province.

It seems the Minister took a considerable amount of time blaming the Federal Government for many of its problems, but on the other hand I think the Minister and the Government did very little in respect to the municipal governments in Manitoba. I think we must have the kind of leadership and policies in this province that will attract industry, that will attract economic development, and create a climate that will generate economic development. At the present time I'm not so sure, Mr. Speaker, that this is what we're doing at the present time, that we're creating this climate so that we can develop the industry. I'll not make any reference to any of the companies that the Attorney-General has or some of the other members, but perhaps I'll just pose this question to him. I'm sure that no manager of a company in Manitoba that may cost him personally a couple of hundred dollars tax a month -- (Interjection) -- That's right -- may make a decision to stay in Manitoba. I'm just posing the question, I'm not saying in connection with A & W.

The second point is with many stores and outlets in this province, does he expect any industry to make a direct statement and say, well we moved because we didn't like the government -- or not the government, but the tax climate wasn't favourable. That's the point I should make. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'm sure that you didn't expect him to say anything else, not when they have some 30 outlets in this province that they would say otherwise really. I know that one has -- and again I don't want to get into this type of a debate -- one has and that's the Halifax Insurance Company. They definitely were going to establish here. They had everything in line and they changed their mind. Perhaps again because of the government's attitude in respect to auto insurance, Mr. Speaker. So I think that the budget, as I'm critical of some of the increases in the tax in respect to some of the trailer parks and so on, on the other hand I think that the budget did not do very much in the way of student employment, property tax, aid to municipalities in that area.

Now I will not at this point get into the auto insurance debate, I know that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources did on the budget and so did the Member for St. Matthews. I think that the bill will be before the House in a couple of days and maybe we'll be able to debate that point much better. But the only point I wish to make, I think that the government of this province has failed to carry the most primary function assigned to it by the people, and that is to make decisions based upon fact and reasoned analysis, not on political promises. I know many parties during election campaigns make promises but I'd like to see their decisions made upon facts and real analysis based upon studies, and as far as the report on insurance is concerned, the report itself states they made no such analysis; they made no such studies. In fact it says they didn't attempt to do it. They used an assumption, a hypothetical figure that the cost related to operating the auto insurance in Saskatchewan was -- they assumed a certain figure because it was mixed with the Motor Vehicle Branch, with the life insurance, and it was so intertwined with the other operation that it couldn't establish a figure. And this is in the report. Because if anything is more damaging to the government -- and I say to the government, let them produce the facts and studies and if they're basing their arguments on facts, fine -- but I think the most damaging thing to the government at the present time, if they proceed with legislation and preclude the other private companies from operating, the most damaging thing is the report itself because it did not make the analysis and the study.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm wondering -- it is now 5:30 -- if the honourable member wishes to continue he may do so after the dinner hour. It's 5:30; I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 tonight.