

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, June 4, 1971

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 14 students, of Grade 11 standing, of the St. Charles Academy. These students are under the direction of Sister Tetrault. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

We also have 50 students, Grades 5 and 6 standing, of the Ste. Rose Elementary School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. E. Hull and Mrs. Wilson.

And we have 20 students of Grade 11 standing of the Birch River School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Duek. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Swan River.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Brandon West. The Honourable Member for Radisson. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could have this matter stand, but if any other member is desirous of speaking we would have no objection. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for St. George. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order here for the purpose of clarification. I'm wondering if this motion as amended were to be voted on without myself speaking, nor anyone else, if it would be possible or in order for me to move an amendment to the main motion as amended.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, the honourable member has taken the motion of adjournment. Consequently, if he gives up his right to speak he naturally doesn't have the opportunity to make the amendment. Now he can speak and make the amendment. There is a possibility of making an amendment to an amendment - this is according to our rules - but no further than that. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Sir, I believe that the rule is that it is possible to move an amendment to an amendment, but the problem that my honourable friend is faced with is that he doesn't intend to move an amendment to the amendment. It's a separate amendment that he wants to move on the main motion. So therefore, since it is only possible to have one amendment before the House at any one time on a particular motion, then I don't know how under our rules it is possible for my honourable friend to go ahead unless by leave of the House it's agreed to do that. Of course, by leave of the House we can do almost anything.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River on the point of order.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, is it not fair to say that the honourable member has now spoken and probably you could put the question on the amendment, and then the amendment having been dealt with, then he is in the position to move an amendment from that point on?

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the same point of order, I believe that the member is asking for clarification of his stand in whether or not he would be deemed to have spoken by taking the adjournment. If he does not speak at this time, he would be perfectly free to speak at a later date. This is what he is asking, I believe.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Labour, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General -- oh I'm behind -- I'm sorry, I'm sorry. Mr. Speaker, as

(MR. MALINOWSKI cont'd.) the mover of the amendment to the motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, I appreciate the desire of the honourable member to secure to all citizens those fundamental rights which are the cornerstone of freedom and justice. All of us, when we speak publicly, talk in high-sounding words about the rights of men, but not so many can actually say with conviction that they have had a hand in actually doing something concrete and worthwhile about those often expressed intentions. I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to say that this New Democratic Government has, in less than two years, done more to secure fundamental rights to the citizens of Manitoba than the Conservatives and the Liberal administrations of the past ever did. I would like to remind to the honourable friend from Swan River that Father knows best. Please remember this.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MALINOWSKI: May I continue, Mr. Speaker? I don't just say this because we introduced and passed The Human Rights Act in the last session as important a milestone as the Act it is. But I want to make it clear that fundamental human rights means much more than laws designed to prevent the unfair treatment and discrimination prohibited by that Act. I regret that political considerations prevent the Honourable Member from Assiniboia from giving the government credit for enacting The Human Rights Act and for moving to establish a Human Rights Commission with substantial powers to make an Act a meaningful and important part of our citizens' fundamental rights. Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member on a point of order?

MR. PATRICK: Yes. Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. MALINOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, when I am delivering a sermon so everybody is listening please.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, as my honourable friend knows, one of the prime functions of the Human Rights Commission is to take steps and initiate programs to help everyone in this province know that every citizen is entitled to have his civil and human rights presented, and that matters such as race, creed, religion -- (Interjection) -- Hallelujah! -- colour, nationality, ancestry and place of original . . . might be . . . to take into consideration when dealing and living with his fellow citizens, -- (Interjection) -- Well, this is not a sermon, Mr. Speaker. And when time will come, I will say Amen, may I?

Furthermore, this government has given the Human Rights Commission the right to inquire of its own into instances of a possible discrimination. Its hands are not tied, like similar commissions elsewhere, to waiting for a person who has suffered from discrimination to come forward with a complaint. Too often such persons are too timid and afraid of further unfair treatment to complain, but instances of discrimination affect us all, just as a criminal behaviour does, and therefore it is a right that the Human Rights Commission should take action to expose it to public view.

The Ontario Human Rights Act makes negotiation and private settlements of discrimination problems an important aim of its Commission. We think that publicly harmful discriminatory behaviour should not be settled like a commercial transaction, but that public exposure will more quickly and effectively discourage others from acting in the same way.

This innovation, plus other . . . contained in the Act, go part of the way towards establishing and protecting fundamental rights of Manitoba citizens and illustrates the general concern of this government for human and civil rights. Fortunately for Manitobans, there are other areas where this government has acted. It is a part of fundamental human rights that a person can be certain he can receive medical and hospital treatment without worrying about his ability to pay for it. This government helped to secure those rights by substantially lowering the premiums of medical and hospital care, especially for the citizens who are not so highly privileged as to have large or substantial incomes or wealthy parents, or even uncle in the United States.

As well, this government has enacted the amendments to The Landlord and Tenant Act, the first fundamental revision of the Landlord and Tenant law here for the century. The amendments passed last session have removed certain inequities in the relationship between landlord and tenant. Some examples are removal of the right of distress upon the tenants' belongings for non-payment of rent and removal of the abusive practice often contained with deposits. Tenants have been given some rights then lacked, mostly because of the unusually unequal position of a tenant compared to that of the landlord. The creation of a Rent Review process

(MR. MALINOWSKI cont'd.) recently used in respect to the housing crisis in Thompson, is another example of the increased rights of our citizens under this government legislation.

The question of fundamental rights extends to the citizen's right when dealing with the government and its bureaucracy; the . . . and, increase thus . . . we have created an inducement - I'm sorry, Ombudsman - who has powers to investigate abuses of our rights by civil servants and public servants, and whose position is secure from political influence as a direct officer of the Legislature. Even such a thing as increasing the minimum wages is another example of the things this government is doing rather than just saying it will increase fundamental rights. Such action should be stressed because we should all be aware that low wages often mean deprivation, and deprivation means lack of access to many of the services, cultural, educational and other ways, that make for an access involved and educated citizens. It is important that all people be concerned with human rights and therefore it is important that our citizens have sufficient income to free them from economic worries to that extent that they have time to be concerned with the rights of all men. Increasing the minimum wage is a small step in that direction.

Another important area of the fundamental rights involves removing as far as possible the unequal political power of those who profit by wealth over the average citizens of Manitoba. The present government has acted in this area through the amendments to The Election Act which restricts the amount of money that can be spent by candidates and political parties on election campaigns.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if I may interrupt the honourable member for a moment. We have some distinguished guests up in the gallery. General Kopanski and party are in my gallery here. On behalf of all the honourable members, I'd like to make you welcome to our Legislative Assembly. The General was Chief of Staff of the Polish Army associated with the British Command in World War II. Thank you very much.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS cont'd.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, may I have this privilege to welcome him in Polish?

(MR. MALINOWSKI spoke briefly in Polish, which will appear in a later Hansard.)

MR. MALINOWSKI: May I continue? Thank you.

There are a lot of areas of the fundamentals of human rights which will be felt in this House this Session. Mr. Speaker, the members are aware of the measure I am referring to. Certain abuse of personal integrity and privacy by commercial enterprise will, I hope, be stopped by such measures. The major point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that it is not enough to mouth platitudes of good will about human and civil rights, but one must actually do something useful to implement and protect them. I am pleased that this government has taken the last course and showed that its concern is concrete and not a shadow one. I know that we have not set out the last word in human and civil rights legislation, nor done the last piece of work necessary to secure those rights, and that is why I am not satisfied to merely draft a bill of rights as is proposed by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

I think it is important that the government consider giving the entire field of the protection of human rights in our province a most thorough review to insure that we have done, and will do, our best in this vital area. It has been pointed out to me that it is desirable to have fundamental human rights entrenched in the Constitution of Canada so that such rights cannot be tampered with by the Legislature or Parliament of the day. With this I agree, but feel that there still is a duty upon this House to supplement the constitutionally entrenched rights where it appears necessary to do so. The Honourable Attorney-General will, I believe, present this House with his opinions and ideas concerning the constitutional entrenchment of rights, and I leave this special area to him. I believe that the amendment deserves support for the reasons I have just given. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General, that the resolution be amended as follows, by deleting the second, third and fourth paragraphs in the preamble to the resolution, and substituting therefor the following:

(MR. MALINOWSKI cont'd.)

"AND WHEREAS, as a part of the Federal-Provincial dialogue representing a new Constitution for Canada, recommendations are being considered for the entrenchment of certain fundamental rights including political rights;

AND WHEREAS it would be desirable to review the adequacy of the protection of fundamental rights following any agreement at the Federal-Provincial Constitutional Conference to be held in June 1971;

And that the resolution be further amended by deleting all those words following "this House" in the first line of the first paragraph thereof, and substituting the following: "request that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of a thorough review of the adequacy of the protection of human rights in Manitoba, including the possible enactment of further rights legislation supplementary to such legislation as may be recommended and confirmed at the next Federal-Provincial Constitutional Conference in June, 1971."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question. -- (Interjection) -- Well, he'll still permit a question. Who is the rich uncle you were talking about in the United States - the rich uncle? You made reference to a rich uncle.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Well you know what, I will give you the answer. You know, even if you will be rich enough you might be my uncle as well, not necessarily in the United States but here too, because you know I am a Christian and I believe in brotherhood. Okay?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to make probably one of my few speeches in this Chamber that I have taken the difficulty and time to put down in writing and prepare. I recognize Friday afternoon is not the afternoon if you are looking for ink and media coverage or press to make that occasion, but I serve notice to those few honourable members opposite that may take occasion to listen to me occasionally that I consider this a very serious and important matter and I'm making a serious contribution to the debate at this particular time. Unfortunately, I was not prepared of course for the particular amendment that the honourable member moved just now, so that when that amendment will be perused, it no doubt will call for a further contribution from the Member for Lakeside.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of this resolution put forward by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hope the honourable gentleman realizes he's speaking to the amendment at the moment.

MR. ENNS: Yes, I think so. It's all encompassing. We are talking about human rights, Mr. Speaker, I think. I think while the Honourable Member for Point Douglas has sometimes confused what economic progress has provided for any groups of people or any society or any community of people in the spreading of the good things in life, with human rights it's understandable - you know, confusion on his part, but I don't choose to be too concerned about splitting hairs on a very fundamental issue and I would be sure that my remarks are as applicable to the main motion that's put forward by the Member for Assiniboia as well as to the amendment in its greater and general context, in the sense that we are talking, as I read from the amendment put forward by the Member from Point Douglas, that the government is prepared or is considering some codified process of establishing a bill of human rights in the province. Unless I read the amendment entirely wrong, I think that is the gist of the amendment proposed and to that extent, Sir, I make these remarks. As I indicated, I would like to join with those who believe that we have some reason for dedicating or concerning ourselves with the task of establishing a bill of rights and I am sure many members from both sides of the House feel the same way.

Now let me say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I am not a lawyer and I won't try to speak in a very highly technical way on this subject. We have excellent members of the legal profession in our House and no doubt they will have their contributions to make in this debate. I am a farmer, I also have some practical experience in the business of government, and it's from both these positions that I can see the need for this kind of a legislation. I am chiefly concerned, and I'll be dedicating most of my remarks this afternoon to that body of rights that my friend from Assiniboia described as economic rights, and I hasten to assure the honourable members that I am well aware that that's but one aspect, one aspect of the total picture of human rights.

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)

The Honourable Member for Point Douglas indicated in his amendment political rights, certainly religious rights, many other human rights, but I want to make it clear though that in my few remarks this afternoon that it is with deliberate intention that I choose to speak essentially about economic rights. I think that these rights are at present poorly defined. I think our citizens are subject to a great deal of uncertainty.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: I rise on a point of order. I am having difficulty, and I would like to hear what the Honourable Member for Lakeside has to say, but I'm having difficulty resulting from a very loud conversation on his side of the House between a couple of honourable members, and I would like them to soften their voices so I can hear the honourable colleague speaking.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: I put myself, you know, under your protection and I know that you will protect my rights in this Chamber to make sure that every dulcet, multi-sotto voice and pearl of wisdom that I have to utter in this House will be heard by the Attorney-General. Quiet, the Member from Souris-Killarney.

As I indicated, I'm speaking about essentially economic rights and I think that these rights are at present poorly defined. I think that our citizens are subject to a great deal of uncertainty in trying to anticipate what their rights will be in particular situations. I believe that some clear statement of these rights would be most immediately important in any part or portion of a provincial bill of rights. A bill that would make the relationship between the people of this province and their government more predictable becomes necessary more as time goes by, because we know that no matter what party is in power, the changing nature of our society demands that government play a greater and greater role in many aspects of our lives and that is one of the directions of change that is fixed. Those who share my political views will in many ways regret the necessity of growing government intervention in the lives of our citizens. We will regret the impersonality, the unwieldy bureaucracies and the loss of spontaneity that comes from growing government, and yet we will find many instances where we know that the growing complexity and the growing interdependence of our community means that government must act.

Now some of my friends opposite will disagree with me when I say that there are some that look upon this point of view with regret. Some of them may find the apparent efficiencies of large government units very attractive; some of them may really believe that most of the problems of today's Manitobans can be solved and should be solved by the actions of government. But whether we believe as I do, that it is always preferable for people to work out their own problems and their own destinies with a minimum of government interference, or - and I'm trying to state both sides fairly - or we believe that government should act in all possible ways and with the aim of improving conditions in Manitoba, that in the final analysis we all know, and I know, that governments are growing and will continue to grow. As our cities become larger and subject to overwhelming problems that plague big cities, governments will have to act as our economy becomes even more complex, and as the tasks to be performed in that economy grow more complex our systems of training and education must grow more complex.

I know from my own experience on the farm that the degree of government involvement in every aspect of my life has increased phenomenally in my own lifetime, from the services in my own house to my production and production techniques, and perhaps most important of all, in the area of marketing my goods that I produce, government is there virtually at every step of the way, and indeed, Mr. Speaker, when I was government I had a small part to play, in the intervention if you like, in various ways and means of people's lives insomuch that I was responsible for furthering individual pieces of legislation that had this effect.

I refer specifically to the establishment of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board. We knew that board would change the lives of fishermen in Manitoba; we hoped, and I believe, for the better. We knew that several small private companies involved in processing would be adversely affected by this action so we defined our obligations to these fish processors very clearly, Mr. Speaker. We acknowledged a responsibility to compensate them, but the government changed and the new government defined some of its responsibilities differently than we did, if not in principle then in degree, and the fish processors have no business and to date my

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) understanding is little or no compensation.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to make a partisan speech on this subject and the only point that I am trying to make is that because different political parties, understandably, have different conceptions of the proper role and responsibilities of government, there are occasions, as happened with the fish processors, where what one government had encouraged a group to view as their rights, their economic rights, are repudiated by subsequent governments, and that kind of uncertainty makes government something of a hazard for many of our people.

The question for the purposes of this debate is not whether or not the fish processors should have received compensation - and I firmly believe that they should have - but whether or not the rights of individuals should be subject to drastic change, depending on what party is in power. At present these rights are nowhere codified, no government has anything to go by except its own conscience, and with so much depending on government, I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that that's good enough. I don't think the rights of the people of Manitoba should be a matter of government policy to be announced in due course.

And they have been, Mr. Speaker, under all governments, because we have made no serious and non-partisan effort to agree on a body of rights that shall be sacred, and so one of the first and one of the most important functions of a provincial bill of rights would be to make the possible consequences to law-abiding citizens from government action predictable and limited. And that is important, Mr. Speaker. Our citizens should know that if in fact government action is going to interfere in their lives that the consequences of that action is predictable and limited. The small fish processors did not create the situation that made the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board necessary and they should not have been unduly penalized when the Board was created. They lost their livelihoods. The government program was designed to benefit the people as a whole and so the fish processors were put out of business. In many ways they were innocent bystanders but they were penalized.

Mr. Speaker, more recently we have had other debates in this Chamber, debates over the question of automobile insurance, and here again, a group who were involved in what the government considered to be an intolerable situation, the independent insurance agents of this province, a group that was involved in the situation but who did not create it. Now if the industry was inept and if it was unfair, and even if it was profiteering - and I acknowledge none of these things - but even if they were true, no one could seriously suggest that independent insurance agents created the situation; and if it was impossible for the government to regulate the industry effectively as the Government of British Columbia has done - and I don't believe it was impossible - but even if it were, surely those agents should not have been penalized.

Mr. Speaker, the government has acknowledged an obligation to the agents. They have established a Transitional Assistance Board and they have made an effort to include many of the agents in their monopoly plan. But if you read over the debates of this subject, Mr. Speaker, as I have, you will find that so much of the time, so much of the debate centred around the question of how much the agents ought to be penalized by government action. It centred around the question of compensation; again for people who were, in the final analysis, bystanders to a government action. If the degree to which the agents could have been harmed had been established in a Bill of Rights and if we had known in advance that they would receive such and so a compensation for lost income and such and so a compensation for lost capital value income and value lost as a direct result of government action, we would still have opposed the government's plan on that particular bill, but then the debate would have been about the best way to assure protection to our people. Then we could have considered all the alternatives and the government could have maintained a much more flexible position. I honestly believe the debate on that particular important bill of last session would have been much less bitter; then the fate of the insurance agents would not have become a political football; then, Mr. Speaker, the time of this House would be spent debating the merits of a particular piece of legislation as it should be spent, debating the principle involved in that particular legislation.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the major reasons we should have a provincial Bill of Rights. Surely we can agree on a set of basic guidelines that all governments can follow.

I should make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that I have no great faith in the magic power of a Bill of Rights to limit government action. I'm convinced and history has proven this, that any government that is determined to do so, can violate the rights of its citizens, of any minority group, economic, ethnic, religious or political, regardless of a Bill of Rights. I think that

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) the existence of an independent system of courts, respected and deferred to by all, including, by your leave, the members of the government, is still a more effective guarantee of rights than any Bill of Rights can be. But as I said, I'm no lawyer.

A Bill of Rights is only a statute. This House may pass it and in the future another House may remove it, and like any other statute a Bill of Rights depends for its success on the active support given to it by the government. It can lie dormant on the books or it can be a dynamic thing, a guide to government and a guide to our citizens in their relations with each other. In essence, Mr. Speaker, any Bill of Rights we may pass in this House would be nothing more than a statement of intent by all political parties and it would mean precious little unless it had the support of all political parties. It would be an agreement that no matter who was in power, we will deal in this way and in that way with the people of this province; and it would be an agreement to limit ourselves or to deny ourselves the right to act in spite, to deny our colleagues the right to ramble wrong-headedly over the rights of the people and our institutions and it would be a statement to the people of Manitoba saying, "When you deal with the government you do so sure that these things are true." And to that extent, Mr. Speaker, I think it's a worthwhile pursuit to follow. I think that kind of a statement is important now, Mr. Speaker, for a number of reasons. There are those in Manitoba who are frightened by the intentions and interventions of this government, from time to time - indeed, I'm among them. They are frightened by the examples of the fish processors, the insurance agents, the employees of the Department of Transportation and statements of the kind that I've described could do much to allay those fears.

I'm not suggesting, much as I might like to, that we outlaw things that are properly matters of government policy. I'm suggesting that we make an undertaking to the people of Manitoba that they will not be victimized by government. I think my friends on the government benches could make that kind of an undertaking without compromising their integrity, their intentions or their ideology.

Another reason that I think a Bill of Rights is important now is that as I said before, our society is changing and the role of government is changing and growing too. However much my friends opposite may relish this change, as a farmer I've found the change very often unsettling. I don't resist it blindly but on occasion I am weary of it; on occasion I resent it, on occasion it confuses me. I don't think I'm so different from most Manitobans in that, but I do think the reassurance of a Bill of Rights would render the change less disruptive to our community. I think a Bill of Rights as a guide to governments would render that change that must come more wholesome.

Mr. Speaker, in my examples, I have dealt mostly with what my friend of Assiniboia has called "economic rights", and as I indicated at the outset of these remarks that I would in fact devote most of my speech to this particular aspect of economic rights. That is because these are the rights that are least protected at present; consequently - and I think this illustrates my point - they are most subject to partisan statements and to partisan exploitation. The other group of rights that the Member for Assiniboia spoke of, political rights, legal rights, linguistic rights, and indeed what he's called egalitarian rights, are already subject to a number of provincial and federal statutes. That fact, Mr. Speaker, the fact that in the past few years we have made considerable progress in Manitoba in these areas, suggests to me that we can agree on a Bill of Rights; it suggests to me that there is concern on both sides of the House, and it suggests to me that the preparation and enactment of a statute containing those rights can be undertaken free from partisan conflict. And that is important, Mr. Speaker. If you will recall earlier on in my remarks, a Bill of Rights is really an indication of intent on the part of those political forces operating within any jurisdiction and unless there is a non-partisan support to support this kind of a position, it is indeed merely a piece of paper.

Our political rights are protected in many ways. I understand from the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member from Point Douglas, not sufficiently, perhaps, but there can be no foolproof protection from a government that would violate rights, but we can make an agreement here in this House on this subject. The system of legal aid in Manitoba has been drastically improved over the years, particularly in the last five years. It needs further improvement and it is receiving that kind of attention. There is no opposition to that. We can reach an agreement on legal rights and we can all support government programs to realize them. The Human Rights Commission has been established. We have a Rentalsman. We have an Ombudsman. We can agree on the body of rights and we have already established the

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) instruments to enforce them. The place of the French language in our schools and in our institutions is being expanded and assured. The other cultural and linguistic heritages of Manitoba are also being encouraged and preserved. We can agree on them. But the sticking point, Mr. Speaker, comes on economic rights. We have a Workmen's Compensation Board; we have an Employment Practices Act; we have minimum wage laws; we have a Consumer Protection Act to guarantee our citizens' rights in the market place.

All these pieces of legislation assure some aspect of economic rights but more important, I think, we passed at the last session an Expropriations Act that was designed and intended to assure that no Manitoban should suffer economic injustice as a result of government actions that deprived him of his property. We established a good system of appeal; we tried to render the actions of government less prone to do harm; we tried to make the remedies and the choices of the citizens as broad and as humane as possible. That is a start, Mr. Speaker, an important start, because in it we have embodied what I believe to be the essential principle of the economic rights of Manitobans. We have said with that bill that even though a farmer may have been exploiting and exhausting his land through bad management and that it is immaterial when the government seizes it, we have made it clear that the actions of the government in building its roads, parks, water projects, should not in any way punish that individual. We must agree to apply the same principles to the rest of the government programs, to fish marketing boards, to insurance plans, to agricultural marketing boards. We must embody that principle in a Bill of Rights and then we must take the legislative steps necessary to make it real.

We have seen the alternatives, Mr. Speaker, in the automobile insurance debate. The alternative is a divisiveness, the alternative is injustice, the alternative is a degree of bitterness that harms the programs of government and that harms the life of our province. We will see this problem again when government establish, for instance, its veterinary clinics, as is now establishing them. Grant you, not in a preponderant way because as the Minister knows full well, we just don't have that many veterinarians in this province. But there is a problem of economic rights involved when the government establishes what was, correctly, was built up with a great deal of hard work and initiative on the part of the private practising veterinarians and the government moved in with a government program - which I support, I want to see happen - but I don't particularly want to see an individual, a Manitoban out 30, 40, 50, 60, 70 thousand dollars out of pocket because of that government action; nor do I think that government action should be held up because of that individual, but we need some concern about the economic rights of the individuals involved.

As I said, it is an excellent program and one for which I commend them - and I'm speaking about the veterinary program - and if I can allow myself one partisan aside, I must admit that I marvel at the way by-elections spur this government's imagination. But aside from that, what happens to the veterinarians who are already practising in rural Manitoba, men who have spent their own money building clinics, who have spent years servicing an area; will they be incorporated into the plan? The same question holds true for these doctors in private practice who will be affected by the proposed community health clinics. Will their practices be respected? Will the capital outlays that they have made be recognized? There would be no question about that - (Interjection) -- Certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member stating that a local community does not and should not have the right to decide to arrange its affairs to provide for a certain service within its community?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture raises, I think, a very serious question in terms of our responsibility to the individual members of our society. I don't argue with him for one moment, not for one moment that the local community, municipality, province or anything else has the right to make that decision, but should that decision penalize, harshly, unjustly the efforts of an individual of that society who had no advance warning that this was going to be the direction or change, or is there not a responsibility on society as a whole, who makes that decision that we make that change, who makes that decision that we create a difference, for the better or for the good, but then surely we should take some consideration of it. I see the Honourable House Leader . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Would the honourable member say that the same consideration should be

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) given when private business, with or without government assistance or encouragement, progresses to the extent where it renders other businesses that previously carried on the same service, worthless and penalizes the people?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I recognize the nature of the Honourable House Leader's question. Certainly in terms of effect and consequence the actions are similar; but, Mr. Speaker, unless we are prepared to concede that we, as a public body in government accept responsibility for all things - that I know is a view and a wish that my friends opposite are quite prepared and quite willingly prepared to accept - if you're prepared to accept that point of view and that philosophy, then the Honourable House Leader's suggestion is an apt and correct one. I don't accept that point of view. I don't accept that degree of responsibility. I regret, as I said in my initial statement, the degree of responsibility that government has to assume. -- (Interjection) -- No, no, I know what we're saying, and to that extent there is of course a very serious and indeed ideological difference between the honourable members opposite and myself. Mr. Speaker, allow me to preclude, I have but a few brief remarks on this particular subject. There should be no question about the fact that certain basic economic rights should be respected and guaranteed now even without a bill of human rights being enacted.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I support this resolution - not because I believe that a bill of rights will somehow by magic remove all of the abuses of government or governmental power, or remove all of the injustices from the relationships between individual Manitobans - I support it because I believe that it is important for all of us in public life to place some voluntary restrictions on our actions when in power. I know that rights can be violated; I know that in the heat of particular political controversies they can be ignored. In this House we have already taken significant steps to assure the rights of Manitobans in a variety of areas; a bill of rights would underline our determination to continue that direction.

The changes in our society and in the role of government coupled with the ideology of the current government make it certain that governments will play an even greater role in the economic lives of our citizens. This is a new situation, an unanticipated situation for most of us, and we must establish the limits of action that government will take, or at least the limit of the economic consequences that individual Manitobans will be asked to bear. In this crucial area many in Manitoba are coming to view the government as an economic enemy and that is intolerable, and destructive. A bill of rights can remove much division, much fear, and much uncertainty from Manitoba today. It can provide a humane direction for government, if government is willing to follow that direction, and it can prevent the perversion of politics that sees the fates of individuals becoming the subject of petty partisan quarrels.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend this resolution to the House and especially to the government. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of order. I question whether the amendment is quite in order as it stands. The amendment proposes to delete clauses 2, 3 and 4 and insert two new WHEREASES, but then it continues and it says "that the resolution be further amended by deleting all those words following 'this House' in the first line thereof." Are we speaking of the first paragraph or the last paragraph, because this has not explicitly said so.

MR. SPEAKER: The question the honourable member raises was corrected and the Honourable Member for Point Douglas said "in the fifth paragraph thereof." I heard it, it wasn't in the resolution printed as such, but the correction was stated and it was brought to my attention by the Clerk that in the copy he received it was written in. So there is no point of order.

Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, in regard to the Bill on Human Rights and the amendment I would like to make mention - basically it's on the second paragraph of the resolution and bases back to the second or third part of the amendment. I want to make a few comments that deals with human rights, privileges of the people in the northeastern part of our province. It has to do with the wild rice industry, and not necessarily the harvesters of this product, but the growers. In this area there are several growers that have had trouble during the past two years in obtaining a permit from this government to guarantee them that they will be able to take the rice off the areas, that they go out and cultivate, seed and harvest their crop in the fall of the year. These permits have always been issued on a year to year

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) basis, they have never had any guarantee that they would have any three or four year privilege on any one lake but from year to year they were issued early enough so these people could go in and prepare the beds and cultivate them and seed them. They go in and take care of the bare spots that were shown in the previous year where they were not harvesting anything from and this way making better the areas that the people that normally harvest would be using. The water levels in the lakes are very important in regard to the harvest of the crop. The growers have to construct a type of control dam in many instances and they have to be out on regular check to keep the level of the lakes exactly where they need them. Control channels have to have a close check kept on them and areas where the beavers are getting in, growth of grass and such like.

These growers are using native help, they are not depriving the area of the normal harvest in several lakes within the Whiteshell area, they're not depriving the native people from coming in there and making their usual living. As a matter of fact, I think they are bettering it for them because from time to time they are involving them in employment of their new venture in growing wild rice, rather than harvesting of the resource that is there. The areas have to be watched very closely for water levels. They have brought unproductive spots into this resource, into this industry. Two years ago, previous to our Attorney-General being in this House, somebody was speaking on this very subject and could be heard by the Speaker because the Attorney-General was not interfering with the member at that time.

Last year, Sir, the growers were harvesting their crop before they had permits from the government to let them know whether the crop would be theirs. I say that it's brought very closely for this reason into the resolution proposed by the Member from Assiniboia and along with the amendment from the Member from Point Douglas. These people have no guarantee at the present time that their livelihood is going to follow up from one year to the other.

They have four or five months' work put into the crop before they have a permit to go out and harvest it. They have cultivated the lake bottom, they have spent many, many days of hard work along with many dollars in the cultivating and the seeding. I realize that these growers are independent, they are not what you would naturally think of in wild rice reaping, that they are the Indian and the Metis of this country that go out and pick up a few fast dollars of natural grown rice, these people are growing their own crop. They are in an area that a living is hard to make, there is not that many alternatives. They do guide work, some of them, the more successful rent boats and motors from time to time to fill in their twelve months. They have lived in this fashion for a good many years and they depend really to round out their living, they depend on wild rice.

This entire area of what I speak on is controlled by the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. They are required to get special permits, if they are unable to get enough help from the local people and from the natives, they have to go and get a special permit in order to move in there with any mechanical type of harvest equipment. There are also special permits required if they wish to establish a camp or move into any different area, or if they move from area to area they have to get another permit. I can understand this because it's probably there to govern and keep in line with fire restrictions, and fire hazards of the day. I can understand those people being required to get special permits to move their camp and move their harvest equipment and people that are working on it.

I think, Sir, that the government should take a look at it, and bring these people closer in line to what they are asking for. They are not asking for anything more than the privilege that they've had and to be guaranteed a crop that they as an agriculture man throughout the province would be growing his grain on; if he was making a rental deal with his neighbour, he would want something in writing to know that he could take the crop off that he is putting in the ground and cultivating.

These growers, Sir, also have another reason to believe that they are not being protected by the government of today as far as human rights is concerned, there's several of them got together to get away from where actually they were depending on wild rice in many instances and the cultivating thereof, they have got together and they're working on an 1800 acre site, presently they have dams up or dikes and have a paddy of 600 acres which has been cultivated and ready to seed. They have a problem, the dikes are leaking, they are currently right now putting this back together and reinforcing the dikes. They have gone to the Manitoba Development Corporation, they have asked for money to help them in this venture, they started out with \$100,000 of their own money - the government feels that they are a poor risk - and I

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) question whether or not they would be as poor a risk as what this corporation has in other instances invested in. It's a small amount of money they have invested I agree. It's \$100,000. It's not quite enough money to pay the wages of some of the top people we have in certain jobs in the province that only look after the management end of certain industries in the province, plus building and the likes of. This \$100,000 wouldn't even cover the one man's wages. I realize that, it's small, but they are asking for money to develop the industry that they live by, the area that they were born and raised in, they want money to further and better the industry that they are in.

I don't think they are asking for a lot of money, they have been Canadians right from the letter A; they have brought this industry to what it is. One grower in this province decided to sell out to a concern that comes up from the States - Northland Wild Rice Growers I believe is the name - he sold out to a firm in the States and I don't know what the Member for Crescentwood thinks about this, but to the best of my knowledge and unable to receive an answer from the Minister of Industry and Commerce yesterday, I am told that this American that came in here, borrowed money from MDC . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if the honourable gentleman could relate to the topic we are on. I allowed a lot of latitude, but he's been wandering quite far afield. Would he get with the topic? The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Yes, Mr. Speaker, what I wanted to speak was on human rights within the province for the people that we represent here today. I think really that if our aim is to serve others than the people that are in the Province of Manitoba, I think we are in the wrong concept of what the people want us to represent them for.

I think that these people that are living off the land and they're trying to better themselves, they're trying to find a way to bring this wild rice into the area and market it, as much as the agricultural people do in our province, I think that they should have some protection. I think the fact that they are good enough to go out and rather than depend just on the natural growth of wild rice, they are willing to set up and invest \$100,000 in a communal type thing, which should suit that side of the House - they put \$100,000 together and start working on 600 acres of a rice paddy in order to grow this where there's a good market for it and they have no problem marketing their product.

My basic argument, the reason I stood up to speak, Sir, is because I think that if Northland Wild Rice, and American-owned firm can borrow money from MDC, I think that these several Manitobans who have pooled their resources to make the basic move should get some consideration from the government of today. MDC says they're a poor risk. I think this is where our government should step in and say that possibly these people are reasonable people, they're people that are here and I think that they should get some concession or some support from our government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to take up much time of the House this afternoon. I wanted to say a few words in regards to this resolution and particularly to the amendment as was brought in by the Honourable Member for Point Douglas. Not having perused the amendment, I don't have the exact gist of it but I think it still has some relationship to the main motion. I feel that I do want to say this, Sir, that this is a matter here that we're discussing this afternoon, that I can't think of any matter that has more importance or greater significance to every citizen of our province and of our nation, whereby the Attorney-General of the various provinces of this country are going to meet with the Federal Government and probably discuss our Federal constitution, probably as it relates to the human rights of an individual; and I feel, Sir, that having listened to, and the many things that this government have done in the last couple of years, and when I listened to the amendment that the Honourable Member for Point Douglas brought forth this afternoon, I cannot possibly comprehend how he could bring in such an amendment after the actions of this government have gone through in what I believe to be a complete contradiction of what they really say and how they feel insofar as the rights of an individual are concerned. And there is no better example and my colleague, the Member for Lakeside, I think gave a good many classical examples and I think I want to bring out one of them, and that is the - and he explained so very well - was the rights of the individuals pertaining to the agents selling insurance for insurance companies.

I expressed this, Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister last year, in the most forceful way that I possibly could, and he is one, I believe, and as he is expressed by his colleagues,

(MR. EINARSON cont'd.) that he is concerned about the rights of individual people. I think this is one area where they have made a complete contradiction of what they mean and what they stand for when we talk about the human rights of our citizens. I, too, want to say, as a member, as a legislator of this Assembly, that this is one area in which we have the greatest responsibility, because the legislation that is passed through this House and all other Houses in this nation affect the lives of every man, woman and child in our province and in our country, in one form or another. Therefore, I say, Sir, that it is very important.

And I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, leave this word with the Attorney-General, knowing somewhat of his ideals, his philosophy, I am very concerned, and I think many Manitobans are concerned and we are hoping that when he goes to this Constitutional Conference - and I want to say to him and make it very plain that the present constitution as it now stands is fine with me - and unless he and all the other Attorneys-General and with the Federal Government are going to make suggestions to amend it, I hope it will be one that is going to be of a progressive nature and not one of some of the attitudes that have been presented by this government and how they have infringed on the rights, the human rights of the individuals of this province. I leave this thought with you, Mr. Speaker, and with the Attorney-General, that he has, I would say, one of the most important responsibilities of his entire political career when he attends the Federal-Provincial Conference if and when that comes. Thank you.

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

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Morris. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this for the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member will be closing debate?

MR. JORGENSEN: Correct.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, if there are two things that lend an air of optimism to the prairie provinces, it's the announcement of a rather substantial sale of wheat and some rain, in proper proportions. We have had both of those today and I would venture to suggest that the optimism created by both of these events will be rising in the farming community and that is something that we have been looking forward to for some time.

The resolution that is before the House at the present time was intended to deal with one of those problems since we don't have much control over the rain. I feel that with the proper initiative and the desire on the part of government to assist in establishing and finding markets for Canadian wheat that we can do something to effect the improvement in the western grain economy. The resolution was intended - and I think it was somewhat misunderstood by the Minister of Agriculture when he spoke on the subject - it was intended to ask the governments of the prairie provinces plus the Federal Government to back the loans that may be required by X-CAN.

The resolution does not suggest that the three governments or the four governments involved will actually loan the money themselves. This is not an unusual procedure. During the time the negotiations were taking place on the China grain sale, the Chinese at that time asked for some concessions on that sales, that is they required nine months within which to pay for the quantity of grain that was negotiated under the contract. The Canadian Wheat Board Act at that time, and still does, requires that the Canadian Wheat Board sell grain for cash only, and since it was a fairly substantial amount of money that was required in order to fulfil the transaction, the government at Ottawa at that time by Order-in-Council agreed to back the Wheat Board's note to the banks for the money that was required to pay farmers for the grain that was to be sold and for which the cash would be received within the nine-month period. The Canadian Government at that time passed an Order-in-Council authorizing the government to back the Canadian Wheat Board's note at the bank. That's all that was involved in that transaction.

MR. SCHREYER: The Member for Morris is harking back to the days of 1961 I believe. Is that right? Could I ask him then if it was the thinking of the government of the day, of which he was a part, to accept on good faith the promise of the People's Republic of China, to accept it so much so as to guarantee the Wheat Board's payment of the Chinese promissory note,

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) could he indicate why the government of the day did not see fit to do likewise with respect to recognition of Red China at the time?

MR. JORGENSEN: Well that question, Sir, continuously arises when I speak on this subject. I answered a similar question to that during the course of my remarks when I introduced this resolution to the House. Perhaps the First Minister was not in the House at that time. I indicated at the time that if there was one person who has done anything to effect recognition of the government of that country it was the Minister to which I was parliamentary secretary, the Honourable Alvin Hamilton. But I also pointed out, Sir, that times and conditions do change, and many of us know that things that are generally acceptable today may not have been acceptable ten years ago and may not be acceptable ten years hence. So you take into consideration the changing moods and the changing attitudes of the times which, taken as a whole, are intended to accurately reflect, if not accurately, at least intended to reflect the mood of people and in the final analysis that's, is it not, the responsibility of government, to attempt to reflect the mood and the desires of people. If democratic government is to mean anything at all, then that is what democratic governments intend to do. I pointed that out in my remarks when I first introduced this resolution and I again do it for the benefit of the First Minister.

But I simply wanted to point out to the Minister of Agriculture that this resolution did not ask, as he seemed to imply and suggests in his remarks when he spoke on the resolution, that the government was to seek out the officials of X-CAN and offer them an amount of money. That was not the intention at all, it just simply says that if it is required by X-CAN for the export and the promotion of the sale of Canadian grain, that they make themselves available to assist that organization in the promotion and the sale of Canadian grain.

As I also pointed out the bulk of the Canadian wheat that is sold in overseas markets today is sold by international corporations who have no particular desire to sell Canadian wheat above anybody else's, it's just they make the best deal that they possibly can in the sale of wheat, and if they get it from Canada that's fine, and if they get it from the United States or if they get it from the Argentine or from whatever country it is available. What X-CAN is intended to do is to promote Canadian grain, the sale of Canadian grain, and it is for that reason that I believe that there is, if not a responsibility, at least there should be a desire on the part of government to assist as much as possible in the promotion and sale of Canadian grain because it is in the Canadian interest to ensure that markets are available for these products. Now I know that the Minister of Agriculture said and I agree with him that he is interested in promotion -- (Interjection) -- Yes, of course.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Honourable Member from Morris, since he mentions the fact that for all these years Canadian farmers and the Canadian Wheat Board have been dependent on international grain exporting companies such as Bunge, D. . . , Cargill and one or two others, dependent on these international companies for the handling of the transactions of Canadian wheat, could the honourable member indicate why it was that for so many years Canada and Canadians failed to develop an international grain exporting agency of its own, and why wasn't our Wheat Board given that capability during the years that he had some - and I don't mean this critically of the honourable member necessarily - while he was part of the government of the day, why was the Canadian Wheat Board not given that capability - try grafting it on to the Wheat Board.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Sir, the Wheat Board has always had that capability, however our markets are dependent upon our customers and if a customer chooses, because it is more convenient to deal with a large import-export organization, then surely we as a government or the Canadian Wheat Board cannot force them to deal with anyone else but those groups or those organizations that they choose to deal with.

One other deficiency - and I recommend my speech to the First Minister, the one that I delivered when I introduced this resolution because it contains most of the answers to the questions that he is now asking - I also suggested at that time that one of the handicaps that the Wheat Board suffers under as opposed to a large multi-national corporation such as Bunge, Cargill, International or Continental and D. . . , who are the four major grain handling organizations, they are import-export companies and they may trade both ways. Then some of them own ships, so with a combination of an export-import shipping organization, they are far more capable of effecting the transaction that our customers want than the Canadian Wheat

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) Board which is solely responsible for selling and has no other authority under the Wheat Board Act. And that is not a bad thing. I don't think that my honourable friend would want to criticize the Board for that. The Board has a limited responsibility. It was designed primarily as a bargaining agent for the farmer to ensure that a reasonable price and an average price was paid to all producers, and as it functioned in that capacity it functioned very well.

I think there were perhaps too many limitations placed on the Board in some respects, and then in other respects I think there were too many responsibilities given to it. For example, I believe it was wrong - and that was borne out by the recommendation of the policy committee that recently reported to the Board - I think it was wrong to saddle the Canadian Wheat Board with the responsibility of being the agency that maintained the floor price on grain. I think that should have been separate, a separate function of the Board or a separate function of government. The Canadian Wheat Board should have been given the responsibility of handling and selling grain only, and if it was necessary to support the price of Canadian wheat then that should have been done by the government through either the Agricultural Stabilization Act or something else. The two functions are contradictory. The Board attempts to maintain prices at the highest possible price and in so doing stands the risk of losing a market and a market that may be very valuable to the producers of Canadian wheat.

So in attempting to answer the First Minister's question, I hope that he understands that there was no desire on the part of the government, of which I had an honour to be a part of, to inhibit the Board in their operations. At the same time, we could find no way in which we could force our customers to buy through a certain agency. Now it just so happened that the companies that were located behind the Iron Curtain preferred to deal with a government agency, and because of the fact there has been a shift of Canadian markets from western Europe and from the democratic countries to the Iron Curtain countries, the Wheat Board has found itself in a position where it is negotiating for more and more of the transactions for Canadian grain simply because that is the desire on the part of the customers.

But I wanted to point out that the Minister of Agriculture indicated during the course of his remarks that his government, and particularly himself, was interested in promoting the sale of Canadian products, and I congratulate him for that because in perusing through the News Services I find that he had - and I regret that the newspaper did not pick this up because it was an announcement of outstanding proportions - on May 21st, the Minister announced that there was a huge rutabaga sale under negotiation with the State of California and if he could only now find a market for kumquats the vegetable producers of this province would have their prosperity assured. We are of course very happy to see that the Minister is involving himself in these negotiations, which indicates that the Minister is interested in the promotion of the sale of Canadian farm products and we congratulate him for that. The announcements that come out from the Minister from time to time are very revealing and it indicates an intention on the part of the government. Rutabaga and kumquats are a very important commodity for the agricultural community and we are happy to see that the customers in California are going to be happy with the sales that have now been negotiated.

In concluding my remarks, I simply want to emphasize again that the purpose of this resolution is not to invite the Treasury to hand out money to X-CAN. For all I know they may be capable, they may be capable now of carrying on the function for which they were set up. All I'm suggesting is that in the last few years the market for Canadian grain being what it was, I know that the profit margins of these three co-operative organizations have not been as great as they have been in the past and there might have been some difficulty in getting their sales promotion program off the ground. I think they should be encouraged, and if the lack of activity on the part of X-CAN up to this point has been because of the lack of financing, then I suggest that the government can give some assistance, without in any way requiring any level of government to set out an outlay of money simply to back loans as was done under the first China contract.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Osborne. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, thank you for your indulgence, and before making any remarks I wonder, on behalf of my colleague, if I may call upon the House for a correction of the resolution, and that is on paragraph 3, it reads: "WHEREAS the objectives of a welfare program is to assist with case," - the word "case" should read "ease" instead of the word "case". However, having said that, Mr. Speaker, I let the record speak for itself.

I want to say to you, Sir, that I believe this resolution at this particular time is one of the most important on the Order Paper and I congratulate my colleague for Fort Rouge, for in listening to her comments I cannot help but think that she has put considerable thought and research into her efforts. Primarily, one must say that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge being an urban member, and more important a one-time member of the Winnipeg City Council, makes one feel that she in her duties was and is very close to the problem and is well fitted to give an opinion, the opinion that she did in the interest of bettering the lot of those less fortunate.

Her main thrust, Mr. Speaker, as I see it, is that in asking for an undertaking for total reform of the provincial welfare system, she had in mind the elimination to some degree of the bureaucratic system it has become. She has appealed for a simplified version of getting assistance to those in need by the shortest possible means. This is not to say that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is advocating extravagance to accomplish this, but rather to get the enormous sums of money that are allocated by this House down to the people that it is intended for rather than those who would take advantage of the system, demanding support when they could with some effort take care of themselves, or at least attempt to take care of themselves.

Added to the cost factor, Mr. Speaker, there is a tremendous expense on administration, and I feel confident that this ever-growing cost can be pared back by envisioning the system that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is advocating. The Honourable Member for Osborne, while in the beginning of his speech criticized the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, ultimately agreed that there was room for improvement.

Those of us, Mr. Speaker, from rural Manitoba, live face to face with this problem every day, and it is fair to say that many of us spend a good deal of our time in an effort to help the people in need. We are, of course, concerned many times by those who would abuse the privilege and would engineer reasons for applying for services that are available in the easy way. Mr. Speaker, it is no disgrace to be poor. There's only one way when you're poor and that is up, and I say thank heavens that there are hundreds of thousands of our people who do just that or where would we be today.

Most of us, Mr. Speaker, come from humble beginnings and I would say to you, Sir, and to this House, that many poor people are too proud to accept help but rather in their own way are contributing to the well-being of this ever-increasing army of those who feel that society owes them a living. For my part, and I am sure for them - and I speak for them today - would say, by all means let us provide for the fatherless children, the widows and the orphans and the aged; also those afflicted by disease, Mr. Speaker; by all means this province must see to it that these people receive their fair share of the bounty.

It is common talk, Mr. Speaker, up and down this province - I don't have to tell you this, I'm sure you are aware of it as I am and as every other member of this House is - that there are abuses of all kinds taking place. We have people who have worked all their lives as store clerks and the like, bringing up families, meeting their commitments, paying unemployment insurance out of their hard-earned earnings, find that some welfare recipients are receiving more, not necessarily in cash but by way of rent, heat, light, telephone, medicare, and even the provision of a television at public expense, and this I say to you, Mr. Speaker, is more than some of them can take. In other words, these good people would be far better off on welfare, and who can blame them for thinking this way. A way must be found, Mr. Speaker, to arrest this situation. And again I say, do not deprive those in need - and I want to emphasize that most sincerely - but really in need.

The big mistake in my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, is the slowly eroding and the taking away of the authority in this direction from the local governments. These people know the background of the people that they are dealing with. In my humble opinion, as a former town councillor, I know they dealt with these people fairly. Our present situation is a shambles.

(MR. BILTON cont'd) I said a moment ago that those of us in rural Manitoba, and I'm sure some of the city members too, are confronted with this in their every day life. People in need will go to the municipality and the municipality will say go to the province, and they go to the province and the province said, you've got to have this or you've got to have that or you've got to have the other, and people are frustrated.

And whilst this is all going on, Mr. Speaker, people are hungry. I'm talking about sincere people now that are really in need and somehow or other that authority must be translated or transmitted back to that local authority and a better job will be done. In giving that authority back, Mr. Speaker, if the government in its wisdom should see the advantages of doing so, it will be necessary for the government to give them the support and the back-up that will be needed in order that they can carry it out to the advantage of all concerned. I believe the people for the length and breadth of this province, Mr. Speaker, would appreciate the local authority coming back into the picture in an endeavour to put an end to this race of extravagance that is going on.

It might be well, it might be well to point to a few illustrations. They can be multiplied, I am sure, by others that might take part in this debate. The services I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, to those that are really in need and under the proper circumstances have a tremendous uplifting to the people that we are trying to help, but like everything else, Mr. Speaker, that which is apparently free becomes a habit and this, Sir, is becoming revolting to the moderate people, the moderate wage-earners of this province. Those wage-earners, Mr. Speaker, with their moderate incomes, bringing up their families independently, are the backbone I suggest to you in our income tax system and therefore contributing their fair share, and more than their fair share if it's being taken care of -- being taken advantage of, I should say, by welfare recipients that shouldn't have it.

I know of one case, Mr. Speaker, you may consider it trivial but I think it's worth relating to emphasize the point I'm trying to make, and that is where a telephone was authorized at public expense and a black old-type telephone that I have in my office was provided to a welfare recipient. But, Sir, not for long, not for very long at all. The telephone people were recalled and a colored one provided. That wasn't bad enough, Mr. Speaker, but the public paid for a double installation in that particular case. These are the little things, Mr. Speaker, that the average man are complaining and are up-tight about, the provision of public funds to pay contractual debts in which the province has had nothing at all to do with in the initial purchasing, and many people feel that is wrong that public money should be provided to eliminate debts for items that have been purchased without authority being given.

Community colleges, Mr. Speaker, and good they are and very important they are to our society, in this province to some degree are being abused. People are enrolled for upgrading and are provided for subsistence for themselves and their families for months on end. No one, Mr. Speaker, in his right mind would oppose this effort in the public upliftment, but here again I say there is abuse, and I would like to know how much success there has been in the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars in this particular effort across the province. Here too, Mr. Speaker, workers with average incomes who are the backbone of our province don't like it.

I know of a case where a man came from the Province of Saskatchewan and the wife and four children left him in Swan River, went up to The Pas, secured a job for two months, ultimately became enrolled in a college and was given in the neighborhood of \$100.00 a week. And that went on for some nine months. He took his course - I forget exactly what the course was, I think it was probably a mechanics course - having completed that, that wasn't good enough for him, he wanted to take a baker's course. Now how you could bring the two together or not I don't know, but nevertheless it had the effect of him carrying on on that easy subsistence for many months more.

These are the things, Mr. Speaker, that people are seeing every day, the people that are staying at the benches and they're staying behind the counters, working from early morning till late at night in many many cases for moderate wages, and are continuing and are happy to do so. But it's these abuses that they are living with and they are rebelling against it, Mr. Speaker, and if something isn't done to reorganize this system, to correct this situation, I don't know where it will end, because if there isn't an end in sight those people are going to get tired and they're going to ask for the same consideration which they have every right to do so, and where oh where will the necessary come from to take care of the situation. Something

(MR. BILTON cont'd) must be done to put back the initiative and drive in our people; we must not continue this loose way and encourage the people to live on the public purse.

The other end of the scale, Mr. Speaker, I know of a case where a man and his wife have worked hard all their lives, provided for their future in a small way, farming, and ultimately through ill-health sold the farm and moved into the community. They are presently living on their small savings asking no one for anything. The man is almost a total cripple today, Mr. Speaker, from arthritis, and anticipates that sometime soon he will have to move into the nursing care section of our local hospital. This, Mr. Speaker, will cost him in the neighborhood of \$436.00 a month - no plan takes care of that at the moment. It is not difficult to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, the feeling of this man as to where his small accumulation will go in a very short time, and the tragedy of it all, Mr. Speaker, is that his wife, if this comes about, his wife will be left destitute, all of which is not only repugnant to her but certainly repugnant to him. And here I say again is a man that has reached twilight years, made his commitments to society, contributed his bit to the development of this province, and in those closing years the savings that he has taken care of and put away for his later years is going to go in no time at all and his wife left destitute.

Common sense, Mr. Speaker, suggests that the opinion put forward in this resolution by my colleague requires that serious consideration be given to her sincere suggestion. It is not my thought that the welfare system or those people in society who attempt to care for these people, or the system as a whole should be taken as a whipping boy. That is not my attempt in rising today. My heart goes out, my heart bleeds for those people who find themselves in such circumstances that they have to ask for help. By all means, by all means, as I have tried to reiterate in my few remarks, nothing should come in the way of doing that which ought to be done for those people, but I take exception to the bureaucracy that has been developed and I defy anyone to show me that the bulk of the money that go for this purpose do not go for the subsistence of those people rather than those that it is intended to go to.

We must make every attempt to help these people and their families who are confronted day by day, oftentimes through lack of adequate housing and proper clothing and other necessities of life, Mr. Speaker. Society cannot be condemned for everything. The people themselves have not only a responsibility to themselves but also to society, and together with proper understanding and with a streamlining of the system, I think a better thing can be done, Mr. Speaker. Surely, it is not asking too much to call upon the government to seriously look into the matter at the earliest possible date in order to eliminate the ramifications and current injustices presently created in the attempt to provide for these unfortunate people, many of whom, Mr. Speaker, are down on their luck and need a helping hand at this time.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I hope that other members of the House will see fit to make a contribution to the debate of this resolution, and in the end see what my colleague is attempting to do and give her the support that she rightfully deserves.

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

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, unless anyone else wishes to speak, I move that the debate be adjourned, seconded by the Member for Morris.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Virden. The Honourable Member for Pembina. Oh, I'm sorry. I missed one, that's right. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As this resolution has not been dealt with for some time, I thought it might be worthwhile just quickly to run over its intent. It states that the Federal Government taxation policies have contributed to unemployment in Manitoba; that greater economic activity and consequently more jobs can be achieved by providing incentives to the public and private sector; and therefore that the Federal Government should be urged to introduce immediate tax reductions to reduce unemployment and to provide stimulus to economic growth in Western Canada.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what we are facing in this country at the present time is massive unemployment involving some 750,000 Canadians, but this does not really reflect the actual conditions, because in addition to that there are some 100,000 people in training courses who

(MR. GONICK cont'd) otherwise would probably have been unemployed, and in addition to that there are probably some tens of thousands of people that have dropped out of the labour force and therefore are not even counted as being unemployed. But more than that, this figure that we are given by the Federal Government, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics or Labour Department, tells us the number of people that are unemployed at any particular time, so that as of May 1st there may be 750,000 people unemployed, but if you take the number of people that have been unemployed at any time during the last six months, I venture to say that there would probably be something in the order of two to three million people that have been without work over the last six months, and that reflects, that indicates a kind of urgency which one would have thought would be reflected in a resolution to deal with that kind of problem, and yet we get a resolution I submit, Mr. Speaker, that will barely deal, or deal with the situation in a very inadequate manner and in a manner in which I will indicate is simply not acceptable to members of this House, to members of this side.

I would indicate first that the Federal Government taxation policy has not been the major contributor to unemployment in Manitoba or anywhere else in Canada. Moreover, I would submit has not even been a major contributing factor to unemployment in Canada or in Manitoba. Some many years ago the economist who everybody now seems to agree with, John Maynard Kane, demonstrated that in a private enterprise economic system periodic unemployment, periodic under-utilization of capacity is an inevitability, and what he said is that to deal with unemployment once it has already occurred, the required kinds of policies would involve either a tax reduction or an increase in government spending, or both, as a means of dealing with a situation already in existence.

Now it's true that the Federal Government in this instance has failed to use tax policies as it could have to alleviate unemployment, and they must of course be condemned for that and this resolution does do that, but we on this side are not satisfied with the solution to the unemployment problem which tries to alleviate it after it has already occurred rather than trying to eliminate the causes of unemployment. Our party has proposed at the federal level changes in the economic system so that unemployment will not occur and re-occur and re-occur again as some kind of a curse imposed on the people of this country; and we reject any solution to unemployment which accepts the inevitability of unemployment, that tries simply to help its victims. This is a patchwork solution which this party does not accept. It is a solution which will in no way prevent a further re-occurrence of unemployment some months or perhaps years hence. We feel, Mr. Speaker, that we must get at the root cause of unemployment, at the ultimate cause of unemployment and make those changes in our economic system that will remove the causes, remove the curse forever.

Now, Conservatives and Liberals will see this as Utopia. Eliminate unemployment forever? How can that be? I would say, Mr. Speaker, that they're right, it can't be if you leave the economic system as it is unaltered and simply use the kinds of prescriptions that John Maynard Kane, however right he was about the inevitability of unemployment in a capitalist economic system, if you use his prescriptions for dealing with them all you're doing is dealing with the immediate situation, trying to alleviate the unemployment, but only to see it occur and re-occur again and again. Whether it involves 500,000 people, 700,000 or a million as we've seen in the '30s, people losing their jobs, people coming to depend ultimately on welfare - and which the previous speaker deprecated and in many respects I agree with his criticisms on the welfare system - however, it seems to me somewhat odd that we blame the individuals as categorically as he did for the kind of unemployment situation which the economic system is responsible for, but I intend to get into that debate later.

This party has said for many years, and we say it again, that we will not rest until the economic system has been changed, changed to eliminate forever the curse of unemployment that is being imposed on the people of Canada, and, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that this party, the New Democratic Party, can bring about those kinds of changes because this -- (Interjection) -- I will indicate to the member in due course - because this party is not dogmatically attached to the free enterprise system. Our aim has never been to preserve an existing economic system and manage with that system as best we can, the difficulty that it creates. That's the goal of Liberals and Conservatives, to deal with unemployment yes, providing the solution does not involve any major changes in the economic system, and with that kind of an attitude and that kind of a disposition, I submit that there will never be an ultimate solution to the unemployment problem.

(MR. GONICK cont'd)

Our goal, on the contrary, is to eliminate poverty rather than to preserve an economic system, to eliminate unemployment and to eliminate economic insecurity; in short, to change the economic system so that it supplies human needs. The economic system, Mr. Speaker, is not an end; people are not made to serve General Motors or International Nickel or Great West Life. Economic system is a means, a means to satisfy the material needs of our people, and it's when it fails to meet those needs, as it has, then we have no hesitation whatever in this party in saying that we will change the economic system, turn it upside down if necessary to end the curse of unemployment, to bring an end to the gouging and the cheating and the lying and the manipulation that is part and parcel of this economic system.

So we reject this resolution, Mr. Speaker, not only because it fails to get at the cause of unemployment, but I would suggest also because at this time it won't even give immediate assistance to the unemployed. The Economic Council of Canada has indicated on more than one occasion that once a tax reduction is made the full impact of that tax reduction takes something in the order of a year, and by that time it may be that the main effect would be to fuel an inflationary situation. The trouble with this kind of solution as proposed by the Member for Brandon is that in the normal course of events our government does not have the kind of tools, the Federal Government does not have the kind of tools which are sensitive enough to indicate to it in time the state of the economic conditions, and by the time it discovers that there is a recession usually we are already at the crop of the recession, at the worst moment in the recession, and by the time any tax changes occur and have their full impact we may be in an entirely different situation, in which case that policy turns out to be quite inappropriate, so that it becomes unnecessary or perhaps even counter-productive.

Well, Mr. Speaker, why do we have unemployment in the first place? I suggest that the first answer to that is very simple, it's simply that businesses do not produce enough goods and services to fully employ the entire labour force. That seems obvious. But why don't they produce sufficient goods and services to employ the entire labour force. That's not so simple. Is it because they lack the productive capacity, because if they did that would at least give some economic basis to the situation.

On the contrary, the fact of the matter is that they have too much productive capacity and that is why there is unemployment, because what happens tends to happen in the midst of an economic boom, is the production and the purchasing and the build-up of capacity is greater than what can be used, because what happens is that business becomes sucked into the boom psychology and they are desperate to ensure that they will maintain their share of a growing market and they tend to become overly optimistic and they build up capacity, which when the dust clears it turns out to be excessive, and when this happens they can't sell all that they can produce at profitable prices so they begin to reduce their inventory. They stop ordering raw materials and parts; they stop their investment, their capital investment, and other businesses soon find when this occurs that their sales are down and there's a scramble for the . . . More and more businesses discovered that they have over-produced, they lay off their workers, their work force; their work force has less money to spend and this reduces again the orders for products and services and businesses find that their revenues are reduced again, so they lay off more workers and they simply worsen their situation.

The member says let's produce. Well, that's exactly what I am going to suggest. What would happen if the full productive capacity were utilized? If they did produce more and if they couldn't sell it at existing prices they would have to reduce their prices, and if they reduced their prices they would reduce their profits and that's why they don't produce more, because it's unprofitable for them to do so, not because there aren't needs, not because people don't need things, but they won't be able to sell these things at profitable prices. That's why they don't produce as much as they are capable of producing and that's why they don't provide the employment opportunities that they are capable of providing.

In Canada this kind of build-up of over-capacity is even more systematic because of the nature of our economic system and our dependence on natural resources, because there is a certain economy of scale of investment in natural resources whereby it's quite uneconomical to add to your capital equipment by marginal amounts. Once you begin to expand you must expand by large amounts to gain economies of scale, and so you build ahead of demand, perhaps even for a decade or longer, and once the investment is completed you have a great deal of excess capacity which you were aware of when you began the investment and that sits

(MR. GONICK cont'd) there until demand builds up to your capacity. In the meantime, investment drops off and you have a depression in that industry. When the investment starts again there is an acceleration of investment in that industry to be again followed by a depression in that industry.

So the problem with our economic system, Mr. Speaker, is that we have separate businesses, large businesses, making decisions which affect tens of thousands of people, hundreds of thousands of people perhaps in some instances, and they make these decisions in isolation one of the other, because one of the trademarks of our economic system is secrecy. The result of this is a kind of economic anarchy which may not have been too costly in the good old days of small enterprise where each one was small enough so that its decision didn't affect all that many people and that technology was primitive enough so that it wasn't possible for them to build up their productive capacity that much in excess of what the economy could justify and therefore if there were recessions it was of short order.

But today the costs of this economic anarchy are so severe, so severe, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side suggest that it simply doesn't make sense to burden ourselves with these costs for the sake of upholding some mythical free enterprise system. The NDP has said in the past, and we say it here again, that the anarchy of the profit system must be replaced, and that is our purpose, by economic planning at the national level in cooperation with the provinces and municipalities.

Years ago, Mr. Speaker, the technological system of which we're all part passed by the economic system. The technological system, with its imperative for bigness and huge investment and large financial commitments over decades if not longer, begged for planning—not planning simply within corporations although that is essential, but national planning, national co-ordination of investment decisions so as to avoid excessive build-ups of capacity to assure an even, a smooth and balanced economic growth.

The existing economic system, I submit, is a fetter on production. It's an obstacle to production. Production is restricted in our economy and therefore employment opportunities, not because of a lack of productive capacity but because of an abundance, an over-abundance of productive capacity, because in order to sell all that they are capable of selling, given their productive capacity, they would have to reduce their prices and therefore reduce their profits and that is why it does not occur. We do not produce to our potential, not because there aren't needs, not because we lack in productive capacity but because it becomes unprofitable at some point for businesses to sell what they are capable of selling because they'd have to reduce their profits to do so.

So the economic system is in contradiction with the technological system and what we in this party suggest simply is that the economic system be changed — and I'm going to have some suggestions in a moment — so that it is in harmony with the technological system rather than in contradiction to it. Now what does this mean in concrete terms? It means a national economic planning board. The Conservative Government before us in Manitoba actually set up a skeleton of a provincial planning board. I don't exactly know what their purpose was, but the skeleton that they set up is perfectly suitable for the kind of national economic planning that I have in mind and that our party has in mind. The purpose would be to control and to coordinate investment decisions so as to ensure a smooth and balanced economic growth, an economic growth that is always capable of employing the entire labour force, not only nationally but also regionally. Naturally, this would have to be done in full cooperation with regional governments.

In its very first report the Economic Council of Canada set forth goals for the Canadian economy. If the annual rate of economic growth, it said, were maintained at 5 1/2 to 6 percent a year every year, then we would have sufficient economic growth to have our unemployment level at a 3 percent level, a 3 percent rate or less, and furthermore the growth would not be excessive so as to produce inflation more than 2 percent a year. In short, with a 5 1/2 to 6 percent economic growth rate per year every year, we would have a situation where our labour force could be fully employed up to 3 percent, only 3 percent unemployment rate, and the inflation level would be at a 2 percent level. Both are within acceptable levels I think to the people of Canada. This aggregate kind of performance could then be broken down for each region so that within each region it would be possible to achieve equally the kind of employment performance as could be done nationally. And this would be done, Mr. Speaker, by the control over investment decisions, the coordination of investment decisions, the

(MR. GONICK cont'd) allocation of investment dollars through a national economic planning council.

We have never suggested in this party that this economic planning that we speak of is without problems. There are problems. There always will be problems in any large scale complicated economy. The Member for Lakeside, I'm sure, will rise at some point in this debate and cite to us the failures of the U. S. S. R. in its planning for 50 years. He did it the last time I spoke about economic planning and I suggest he'll do it again; but, Mr. Speaker, I would say that Canada is not the U. S. S. R. nor is it Albania. In this country we have already achieved -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I usually respect the remarks of the Member for Lakeside, but every once in a while he comes through with a degree of simplification of affairs which does surprise me and disappoints me I must say. But I take it that he was joking.

We've already achieved an industrial revolution in Canada. We have a trained and sophisticated labour force; we have a strong democratic position which would mean that abuses, excessive abuses would be avoided such as they have not been in many east European countries. So that what has happened in the U. S. S. R. and Romania and North Korea and Albania would seem to be entirely irrelevant for us in Canada. I find that the worst kind of obscurantism of the issues, obscuring the issues, of fleeing from the issues to present this boogy man to discredit economic planning.

Furthermore, we recognize in this party some of the severe implications of national economic planning to achieve full employment, to eliminate poverty and do the many things which I think all Canadians want to see happen. In the first instance what all of us recognize, I believe, is that the degree of dependence on resources, on the resources sector, must be severely modified, because resource industries are not large employers of manpower. Moreover, I've suggested that investment in resources are necessarily bulky and usually involve excessive capacities built up one year, or of a series of years, and for the next years the industry is in the doldrums with regard to investment expansion.

Secondly, we recognize that there must be a diversification of trade, because 70 to 75 percent of our trade is conducted with one country, the United States of America, and it would be quite impossible for us to achieve a smooth and balanced economic growth in Canada while that economy is fluctuating widely from year to year. And it wouldn't matter whether it was the United States economy or any other economy, if you depend on one single economy to the extent that we do, then it would be quite impossible to be able to plan for a balanced and even economic growth in the face of large scale fluctuations of another economy. So what we must duly recognize is not to isolate ourselves from the world economy but to diversify our creating patterns to find other partners in addition to United States to break down the dependence we have on trade with that one country.

We recognize, too, that we will not gain this diversification of trade if the degree of American ownership of our resources remains, because the reason for so much of our dependence on U. S. trade, much of that trade with the United States is conducted of course between branch plants of American companies and their partners and their parent companies, and as long as there is the foreign ownership, U. S. foreign ownership, there will be trade to that extent with the United States. Therefore, to achieve a greater diversification of our trade patterns we will have to achieve a lesser degree of U. S. ownership of our resources, our economy.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, we recognize as an implication of trying to develop national economic planning in this country that public ownership of at least the commanding heights of the economy will be essential. This means certainly the financial sector. I think perhaps the Member for - the Social Credit member would agree with that. But we would also insist on the public ownership of the major resource industries and public ownership of the larger manufacturing industries, because without these industries being within the public sector it is quite inconceivable that it will be possible for a national economic planning board to actually have control over investment allocations and investment coordination such as would assure the kind of balanced and even economic growth for full employment that we wish to see happen. So there are some very severe implications. It's not sufficient to say that we want to have established national economic planning, there are implications which must be faced up to and I've mentioned at least three of them which this party has taken position on.

Mr. Speaker, the cost of unemployment is unbearable. It's measured not only on the

(MR. GONICK cont'd) agony of families that are cut off from regular sources of income but it could be measured also in dollars and cents. The Economic Council of Canada tells us that we lose \$100 million a week, \$100 million a week in production that is not being created.

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

MR. HENDERSON: Would the member permit a question?

MR. GONICK: Sure.

MR. HENDERSON: Who are you speaking on behalf of when you say "we"?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. GONICK: I am speaking on behalf of the party that I represent, the New Democratic Party. The outline of the course of action which I have presented this afternoon can be found in the national program of the New Democratic Party with regard to economic planning and achievement of full employment. And I will indicate at the end of my speech just how true that is.

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that the economic cost could be measured in dollars and cents. As a result of the lost production and the lost employment opportunities generated by our economic system, \$100 million of income a week is lost. That comes to \$5 billion a year, \$5 billion a year potential output which could be used for any number of things - for schools, for recreation, for housing. If we used this \$5 billion a year for one year in housing, my estimation is that we could create 500,000 new units, 500,000 new units housing three million people, which would all but solve the housing problem which is decried by people in all parts of Canada.

So what we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we know how to change the economic system to eliminate the need for unemployment, the need for economic insecurity, the loss of billions of dollars a year potential output. We don't recognize these as being inevitable, we don't recognize these as being needs, because we know we can develop the economic tools to eliminate them. What is lacking is not techniques, what is lacking is political leadership that is not dogmatically tied to the existing economic system, political leadership that recognizes that the economic losses of the present economic system are far greater than any mythical gains of leaving the direction of our economy in the hands of a few dozen corporate giants. That's what's lacking, that kind of leadership.

So I want to end my speech, Mr. Speaker, by quoting from the former Leader of the New Democratic Party, T. C. Douglas, who ended a speech of his on March 19th, 1971 in the House of Commons in Ottawa with the following - and here he was speaking about the leadership, political leadership at the national level. He said that "they" - these leaders - "who deprecate economic planning should remember with pride that when Canada entered the war, World War II, the economy that had been entirely stagnant became dynamic. We not only put a million men and women into uniform, fed them, clothed them and armed them, but we produced goods we had never produced before. We expanded our economy. We built the third largest merchant marine in the world and manned it. We not only fed, clothed and housed our own people, we fed and equipped our allies. To prevent profiteering and inflation we imposed price controls. We did all this without borrowing one dollar outside of Canada. We did it with the efforts and labour and toil of the Canadian people because we planned our economy.

"The New Democratic Party is saying to the government" - and this is again Mr. Douglas speaking - "that if we could plan the economy in time of war when a large part of our production was not going into non-consumer goods, it would be much easier now to plan the economy in a war against poverty and unemployment in order to provide jobs for our people and a high standard of living for all Canadians. This country, Mr. Speaker," he concluded, "has tremendous potential. Canada is like a great blinded giant that has been handcuffed and bound. What it needs now is leadership and that leadership has not been forthcoming, and for that this government can be justly condemned."

Well, Mr. Speaker, those are the words of the former Leader of the New Democratic Party, Mr. T. C. Douglas, and I believe that he has summarized, better than I could certainly, where the problem lies with our economy, where the problem lies with regard to unemployment, the causes of unemployment and the means by which it could be eliminated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Would the member permit a question? During the course, Mr. Speaker,

(MR. ENNS cont'd) of the honourable member's remarks he reflected on the economic system that we presently have that has - I believe his words were "that imposed unacceptable levels of unemployment on our society," with which I agree with him certainly at this particular point. My question to him, Sir, is would he accept a government imposing employment on the people of any jurisdiction that he would be responsible for?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. GONICK: The people who are now presently unemployed do not have to have employment imposed upon them; they seek opportunities for employment. What I am suggesting is that we unfetter the productive system which we have by employing the kind of technique which I have suggested to provide those economic opportunities. You don't have to force people to work, most people want to work and they're being deprived of it by our economic system.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I wonder if he would permit another question? In my opinion the purpose of production is consumption, and would the honourable member not agree that the reason for unemployment is that there is not sufficient purchasing power in the hands of the people to buy the goods produced and that there is this lacking, that this is one of the reasons.

MR. GONICK: At the present time what I have indicated is that - you can put it in the way that you did but I would rephrase it this way, which I think we're saying the same thing - that the productive capacity at the present time exceeds the purchasing power of our population. I might add in answer to that question that one of the reasons why the Federal Government imposed the kind of fiscal or monetary policy it did was that the purchasing power of our working people through the collective bargaining process and other ways was beginning to rise too fast, and the share of the total national income which was being allotted to that segment of our population was beginning to make inroads in the profits of business and profit margins of business were being reduced, and that is when they began to howl to the Federal Government to protect their profits and that is when the Federal Government imposed its monetary fiscal policy to take away the purchasing power on the part of those people who, if they had been able to maintain that purchasing power, could have purchased the production that the businesses were capable of providing.

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

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, that debate be adjourned.

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

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I believe I've received the concurrence of honourable members opposite that I might now proceed with the various stages for the supplementary supply bill, and therefore I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister for Municipal Affairs, that leave be given to introduce a Bill, No. 23, an Act for granting to Her Majesty Certain Further Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, and that the same be now received and read a first time.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK, by leave, presented Bill No. 23, an Act for granting to Her Majesty Certain Further Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I don't rise to oppose the bill in principle. My concern is that it seems, the whole thing seems too loosely, the money that we're going to spend in connection with the Education Department. I'm amazed at the way these projects are brought about. Earlier in the session we passed a bill . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

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

MR. PAULLEY: May I suggest that the Honourable the Minister of Finance has introduced a resolution dealing with the matter of supplementary Supply . . .

MR. FROESE: I realize that.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . but I wonder whether or not -- this has to be done by leave, does it not? -- (Interjection) -- Oh, he gave leave. I'm sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. PAULLEY: I apologize.

MR. FROESE: No, I didn't rise to oppose it, but as I pointed out, I'm rather amazed at the looseness of the whole thing and the way this particular money is spent. And it's a fairly large amount, \$600,000. Earlier in the session we passed other bills providing money for educational purposes where certain parts of the province were left out in the cold. These people need it very badly, I think in some cases probably worse than what we are doing here, and I certainly can't see the consistency. In one case we're so adamant in not allowing funds to certain groups; on the other hand we're spending it freely without giving it in my opinion the proper scrutiny, especially in this case in the various projects. We don't even know - the Minister mentioned certain projects that had been approved, and others we don't know what they will be and yet we're already supplying the money for this purpose. I just want to make note of this at this time. Later, when we will be discussing the estimates in education, I intend to speak further on it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to consider the following bill: No. 23, an Act for granting to Her Majesty Certain Further Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March, 1972.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 23, an Act for granting to Her Majesty Certain Further Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March, 1972. (Bill No. 23 was read section by section and passed) Bill be reported, Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, 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 Minister of Finance.

BILL NO. 23, by leave, was read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder now, Mr. Speaker, whether we could go back to the Order Paper on Private Members' Resolutions. Leave was given to proceed in respect of this bill.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Virden, The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, this bill proposed by the Member from Virden is a very clear-cut bill and a very sensible resolution; in fact, I hesitate to take the time to speak on it and delay it, but just in case that it might go through without being on record, I'd like to say a few remarks in favour of it, because nowadays farmers are becoming larger

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) and they're also setting up feedlots -- (Interjection) -- yes, I'm sorry - and they're setting up corporate type farms as well as co-operative type farms, they're setting them both up and occasionally they need a lot of storage and in some cases they set up feed mills.

I can remember at times when elevators were sold and they went for a song because nobody had the money available just at the time to pick them up, and I think if this legislation went through and an elevator became available then a group of people would know where they could go right away. The elevators that seem to become available are not the real large elevators because the grain companies want to keep these for themselves because they like to handle volume and they like more storage. So the elevators that do become available are very serviceable to the farmers, especially when they have a feedlot and can purchase an elevator. They've got a dump in there and they've got the storage facilities and they've got the weighing facilities and this is all necessary when a group of farm people are working together and each one is turning in so much grain and needs it kept separate. So I think this is a very sensible bill and I don't see that there should be any problem at all about it passing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of -- the Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Could we have the next resolution stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.
The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Well, Mr. Speaker, it's been a very dull afternoon and I can assure you that I don't think I'll be able to change the course which we started earlier, and unfortunately I'll be quoting to a great extent from both the report from the universities of Western Canada and from a brief presented by the Department of Industry and Commerce in support of a type of educational system for the north, and particularly for - in my case to be started in Churchill.

There is a difference on the thinking of the mover of this resolution and myself in that he is advocating a university which would be highly commendable, but I would like to start a little lower than that and look at it on a basis of a research centre, proving itself to be widely enough accepted to become a university. This in fact means that under my proposal we would have to start at Churchill, whereas I believe the Honourable Member for Assiniboia stated that the university could be placed in communities like Thompson, Flin Flon, The Pas, etc. They do not take away from any of his arguments, I agree with him, but in this case I again fall back to some of the things that we're talking about for the Town of Churchill.

First of all, I'd like to put on record the brief from the universities of Western Canada, and the whole thing got started in late October or early November of 1969. "The proposal for a national research centre at Churchill was discussed in correspondence between Dr. W. G. Snider, President of the National Research Council and Dr. H. E. Duckworth, Vice-President of the University of Manitoba." Dr. Duckworth, University of Manitoba at this time; since then he has gone to the University of Winnipeg. "Dr. Duckworth agreed to Dr. Snider's suggestion that the University of Manitoba act as a sounding board for the possible interest of western universities." Here he is inviting people to consider the possibility of a research centre at Churchill. "As a result of the response to letters sent to the presidents of all universities in the prairie provinces, a one-day meeting was held in Winnipeg on the 26th of January. Representatives from the Brandon University, University of Calgary, University of Lethbridge, University of Manitoba, the University of Saskatchewan, the University of Winnipeg, and Dr. Jacobson, University of Alberta was supposed to be there but he was unable to attend." This is a wide range of acceptance, Mr. Speaker, because it is all-inclusive of the universities on the prairie provinces.

"The general meeting that they had, following the request by Dr. Snider to consider what could be done at Churchill, was held on 26th of January. It was agreed to submit a brief to the National Research Council. Accordingly, the present document was prepared on a basis of the decisions reached at the meeting of the university members and has been subsequently approved by the representatives who attended.

"Research involving the rocket range and the A. . . studies by Calgary and Saskatchewan,

(MR. BEARD cont'd) whose investigators incidentally have been responsible for 64 percent of all rocket experiments by Canadian universities at Churchill, reported that the case was being made separately for continued National Research Council support for the Churchill rocket range. Also, the University of Saskatchewan has separately urged the continuation of A . . . studies for which Churchill area is particularly well suited."

Now then, in going on with the brief, "Through these universities and the comments of the 26th of January meeting, it became clear that the staff members representing a wide range of disciplines would be interested in making use of research facilities at Churchill if they were available. The disciplines that were specifically mentioned in this connection were the following" - and this is the wide range of subjects that our western universities did suggest for the community of Churchill Research Centre. Included in these were "agricultural engineering, anatomy, animal science, anthropology, architecture, art, biology, botany, civil engineering, earth science, economics, clothing and textiles, family studies, food and nutrition, internal medicine, medical micro-biology and micro-biology, ophthalmology, physics, plant science, physiology, social work, sociology, social science and zoology."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that isn't a dream or a hope of a dream, but I must point out that these were the subjects that the western universities were interested in and in fact members from their staff had indicated they were willing to go to Churchill and do the research on that list that I have offered to you just now. "I think we should bear in mind of course that the extent of Manitoba interest may reflect this geographical proximity to Churchill. Nevertheless, the prairie university of Lethbridge, which is situated furthest from Churchill, has also indicated its enthusiastic support for the proposal and has listed nine projects suggested by interested staff members." I think in dealing with this we have to look for the helping hand. And in the brief: "It was agreed at the 26th of January meeting that the prairie universities favoured further study of the suggestion that a national laboratory be established at Churchill." Further, they are willing to assist on actual research council or the inter-department committee of Federal Government departments mentioned in Dr. Snider's letter of the 29th of October. It is decided to examine the proposal in detail.

The brief also suggested that "National Research Council may only be able to discuss facilities under its own control and the use of these by disciplines falling within the National Research Council terms of reference." In other words, in the research the Federal Government are confined to some extent as to what they can enter themselves." Hence, in considering the possible use of other facilities and/or other disciplines, it would be desired to bring into the discussions representatives of all interested groups, federal and provincial governments' departments and agencies, universities elsewhere in Canada as well as industries and private consultants concerned with northern development."

Mr. Speaker, again of course we are encouraged in this in that the province has now purchased the naval base at Churchill and that is an opportunity for the current universities, for the assistance of universities in establishing a working base at Churchill. Dr. Currie had stated in the brief, "The idea of the northern laboratory available to all interested scientists is scarcely novel. DRB set up the Defence Research Northern Laboratory on the fort grounds with that as its major objective. "We have continued," he says, "that tradition and have indeed advertised the facilities fairly widely I believe. Your opinion of course has been fully aware of this and from time to time have made some use of it. Others have also used it who were involved in fields far remote from the studies of the upper atmosphere. Examples of wildlife surveys."

So publicity has been started, the invitation has been made to the universities and they've taken up the task of presenting it to government, and it will indeed depend on the government's willingness to enter into this. In fact, I would say to the Premier that this is certainly one case that he can present to the prairie provinces Economic Committee because in fact the universities from Alberta and Saskatchewan have already indicated interest, all of the universities in Manitoba have. So there is no reason why they wouldn't cooperate with the Economic Committee of the western provinces to establish and develop this research centre.

Further action says, "Those at the 26th of January meeting agreed that this brief should be submitted initially to the National Research Council with the request that the National Research Council raise the relevant aspects at a future meeting of inter-department committee."

Mr. Speaker, I have a fair amount more that I'd like to read into the record on this and

(MR. BEARD cont'd) if you wish to call it 5:30 I could stop here.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman will have the opportunity to proceed at the next time. I should just like to mention, I did hear that we may be on the new rules and I would like some guidance at that time from the House Leader if we are on Private Members in that regard.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my impression is that Legislative Counsel has not completed his draft to the rules. -- (Interjection) -- He has? Well, Mr. Speaker, there will be a motion for concurrence before we get to any change in the rules at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, if I may raise a point of order. I think the Public Utilities, the date was set for Tuesday for the next meeting. However in Votes and Proceedings it is for Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: It was already mentioned in the House.

MR. GREEN: I announced that this morning.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, the House is accordingly adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.