

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 12, 1975

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery, where we have 60 students, Grade 11 standing, of the Springfield Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Smythe and Mr. Ott. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Springfield, the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today Presenting Petitions. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited, praying for the passing of an Act to amend An Act to incorporate Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the 35th Annual Report of The Manitoba Civil Service Superannuation Fund for the year ending December 31, 1973. I believe copies are available for all members.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

NOTICES OF MOTION

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose under the heading of Notices of Motion would be an appropriate time to bring to the attention of honourable members, and I should think in particular to the Honourable Member for Brandon West and the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that Monday next we would purpose to pay our respects to two former members of the Assembly now deceased, the former Honourable Member for Assiniboia, Mr. James Aitken, and the Honourable Member for Brandon in years gone by, Mr. Reg Lissaman. So unless there is some complication I am serving notice of intent for Monday next.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Notices of Motion? Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West) introduced Bill No. 9, an Act to amend the Brandon Charter.

MR. SPEAKER: Questions? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the acting Attorney-General, who I believe is the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he can indicate to the House whether prosecutions are to commence against certain government officials regarding the RCMP report dealing with Schmidt Cartage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of the matter. The honourable member was informed by the Attorney-General that he, the Attorney-General, would be dealing with the question, so I am not able to further elucidate on what the honourable member was previously told.

Mr. Speaker, I previously took as notice in the same capacity a question from the Member for Roblin relative to Gardenhill Craft Co-operative. I am advised by officials of

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . the department that the matter is still under advisement with the Attorney-General.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the acting Minister for his answer. I wonder then if I can ask him whether there has been any communication with him or the law officers of the Crown suggesting prosecution be commenced.

MR. GREEN: With myself, Mr. Speaker? No.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he can assure this House or inform the House at least whether there has been any communication either to himself or to any other members of his Cabinet of the intention to commence prosecution by the law officers of the Crown in connection with Schmidt Cartage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, it would be most unusual for any instruction, if that's what my honourable friend is suggesting, to go from my office to those responsible for the administration of justice. I rather suspect that if I had done so to one effect or the other, I might well be accused of interference in the administration of justice.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. I would like to then ask the First Minister whether he can assure the House the matter of the prosecution, or a possible prosecution with respect to the RCMP report and Schmidt Cartage is not a matter that has been discussed by his office.

MR. SCHREYER: Not, sir, with respect to instructions as to what ought or ought not to be done. In any case may I take this opportunity to point out to my honourable friend that there is some precedent here. If my honourable friend wishes we can refer to a matter of maleficence in the case of a public official back in 1966, in the case of the Easterville-Grand Rapids-Forebay problem, in which case I believe that it was taken under advisement by the Crown as to whether to prosecute or merely dismiss. So there's precedent, sir, whichever way my honourable friend wishes to look at it.

MR. SPIVAK: I asked the First Minister, has the question of whether a prosecution is to commence or not been discussed with himself or the members of his staff by the law officers of the Crown?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend having been at least for a short period of time a Minister of the Crown will know that there is a certain pattern in procedure by which these kinds of matters are dealt with. Certainly it is not my practice to become involved in the routine administration of justice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Has the government started construction on its proposed whey and powder milk processing plant in Selkirk?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BANMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government applied to the Federal Government for a DREE grant for the establishment of this plant?

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BANMAN: A further question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister inform the House as to when the construction of this plant will commence.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, when that decision is made the members opposite will be informed at that time.

MR. BANMAN: A final question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister received any correspondence from the Federal Government with regards to the DREE grant.

MR. USKIW: I don't believe there has been direct correspondence between the federal ministry and my office or the offices of government. I believe the relationship at this point is at the official level.

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

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Resources, and ask him has the Minister been approached by a representative of Tudale Explorations for assistance in the development of the iron mine at Neepawa?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions between various agencies in

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . my department, it may be the Mineral Exploration Company and the department itself, relative to iron ore in Neepawa, but I would not hazard to confirm the names that have been given to me by the honourable . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the acting Attorney-General. Has the Provincial Government joined the Federal Government in approving the establishment of a police commission in southwest Manitoba as proposed by the Ojibway Dakota Council of that area?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice, and I want to tell the honourable member that I didn't fully get it so I'll converse with him in a little while, but I know that I won't be able to answer it in . . .

MR. AXWORTHY: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister also take for notice an enquiry as to what the cost of this proposed police commission might be and when it was assumed it would start functioning.

MR. GREEN: Well the honourable member will appreciate that the question is for the Attorney-General and that I am only here as the Acting Attorney-General. I'll take the question as notice and get the answer as soon as I can.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and my question is for the Minister of Northern Affairs. I would like to ask the Minister if he has any intention of giving us a statement on the condition of the winter roads in Northern Manitoba as he has usually done in previous years?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RONALD McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the honourable member for raising the issue. It's been a prominent one in past sessions and yet it's been very quiet for this session. I can't give you a detailed report offhand. I can tell you that the roads are all open to at least -- most open to heavy traffic, some open to light traffic, with the possible exception of the Red Sucker road which is open for basically tractor-train traffic at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister in charge of the Manitoba Development Corporation. Could the Minister inform the House as to whether the Crocus Foods, the Manitoba government owned Crocus Foods, has made an application for funds to the Manitoba Development Corporation for the purpose of a whey and powdered milk processing plant?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: There was an application together with an advance perhaps a year ago, dealing with a feasibility analysis, or preliminary studies of that kind, but my present information is that there is no intention to be coming to the Development Corporation specifically for additional funds.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. It relates to the meeting that is to take place on April 29th between the Local Government District of Churchill and Manitoba Hydro, dealing with the effect of the Churchill River Diversion on the town and community of Churchill. Is it the intention of the First Minister to be present at that meeting?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there has been an exchange of information already on a number of occasions as between representatives of Manitoba Hydro and the Local Government District of Churchill. Any further meetings on this I suppose would be for the purpose of more refined and precise information that will be available. It is largely, I would think, of a technical nature. I haven't current plans to attend at such a meeting. I haven't been advised that my presence would be required to date.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister would undertake to file within this House, prior to the meeting, the preliminary studies and information that will be used at that meeting, for the information of members here and as well forwarded to the members of the local government district, prior to the meeting itself.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think that can be done. I would also assume that information that's available preliminary to the meeting on the 29th will be forwarded to the LGD in the usual fashion.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and relates to his answer with respect to financing of Crocus Food, and suggesting that it will not be coming through the Manitoba Development Corporation. Can he indicate, or can the First Minister indicate, is it the intention of the government to finance directly by an Order in Council.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, unlike a previous minister that stood in the approximately the vicinity I will not answer that these people have sources of money of their own. I will say that there are various methods by which moneys can be designated to an agency which the Crown wishes to set up. Whichever one is chosen it will be going through the process of parliament.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. In the event the Federal Government does not proceed or allow the DREE--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. SPIVAK: I'll direct the question to the First Minister. The government financing to be given to Crocus Foods, is it conditional or unconditional?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it is conditional on a number of factors.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister could indicate whether one of the conditions would be that of a grant from the DREE from the Federal Government.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, you see answering that question might well prejudice the application before DREE.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question will be directed to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, responsible for the Clean Environment Commission. In view of the recent conviction obtained against the Local Government District of Park in relation to breaches of the Act in operation of the nuisance ground at Onanole, could he advise the House if he has issued a directive to the Commission to proceed with legal action against all of the rural communities that are operating nuisance grounds not completely in compliance with the Act?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: No Mr. Speaker, I've issued no such directive.

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

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Urban Renewal. Can the Minister indicate to the House, has the government defined where the development will take place in the city core or city renewal core? It's been indicated the east and western boundaries. Can the Minister indicate what will be the south area -- how far will it take?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister for Urban Affairs)(Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, it's public knowledge; it was designated by the City of Winnipeg the neighbourhood improvement program area the north-south boundaries are Logan and William.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion and amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Lakeside. The Honourable Member has approximately 25 minutes.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you. Mr. Speaker. One of the advantages of having one's comments or contributions broken up into two parts sometimes is that you can go home and reconsider what you said last night, and even if you didn't like the press clippings of what you said last night, change them. But fortunately I got no press clippings last night so I have no intention of changing anything what I said last night. I will, however, be able to carry on with the contribution that I had intended to make and hopefully will have sufficient time to develop at least some thrust to the theme that I'd like to talk about.

Really, sir, it's the theme that has become, I suppose, of some importance in the last

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . little while because it seems that everybody and his dog is trying to push the Progressive Conservative party in particular into a corner, described as a right-wing corner. We hear it from the Honourable Minister of Public Works; we hear it from our colleagues to the left of us; we hear it from the media, and you know, we hear it from all corners. I believe it's therefore incumbent upon some of us at least to begin to look at the definition of what constitutes right of centre politics in the Province of Manitoba today, and certainly what constitutes my concept of right of centre politics as I see them today. I choose to use, Mr. Speaker, just a few, two or three examples with which I would hope to be able to underline the subject matter that I want to talk about.

It is in this sense that I was quite happy and pleased to hear the latter contribution of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in his plea for discussing, or his suggestion about the definitions of freedoms, and who fights for freedoms, and indeed, you know, what those freedoms may be. I'd like to consider, Mr. Speaker, that if we can in the next little while begin to sort out the chaff from the wheat and have these kind of debates, then we have a chance, sir, of, you know, despite what editorialists like to say about the portents of this session, have a very meaningful session, have very fruitful debates on the matter.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me begin by examining the question of this government's attitude towards land and property. Mr. Speaker, last week the Conservative Party assembled in convention had no difficulty in passing and accepting a resolution that stated, among other things, that we believe in private land ownership and the rights to property. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm well aware that the Government, and particularly the First Minister, is far too astute politically to stand up and take issue with me if I say to him quite frankly and quite boldly, is that none of you do. But the facts of the last few days and weeks and events have finally proven my point. And I say finally because I can recall you know the jibes and the concerns expressed by members opposite when we raised this question, this doubt during the last election. I can recall the kind of derision that we got from one particular editorial writer in the Free Press that suggested, even as late as when the policy document finally came out on "In Search of a Land Policy", that it was indeed a bland document, that it certainly didn't uphold the rhetoric that was heard from this side of the House that seemed to and was used in the last election with respect to land ownership. However, this same journalist has had a conversion. Now I don't know why it is that she would sooner take it from the words of a defeated Conservative candidate instead of 20 elected candidates, but she does and she was helped of course, and we were all helped by none other than the Honourable Minister of Agriculture himself, who is on record in the transcribed debates and proceedings of the Committee that we have just concluded of saying that Mr. Uskiw believes the land should be a public utility, and the Government's aim should be to remove as much as possible the cost of land from being a cost of production.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister is also on record in that same, in those same hearings - I won't attempt to name the pages because I think I speak the truth and the Minister knows that - that he would like to see five or ten thousand farmers in Manitoba take advantage of becoming tenant farmers of the state.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why five or ten thousand? What has he got against the other 30,000? Isn't universality a principle cardinal clause with that group opposite. When we deal with old age pensions, children's allowances, medicare programs, do we find any suggestions from those gentlemen opposite that we should be dealing with, you know, a third of the group, or the most needy, or something like that. And in the final analysis can the honourable members opposite, any one of them, any one of them honestly tell me what is the rationalization? What is the - I will come to that - what is the rationalization? --(Interjection)-- Fine, Mr. Speaker, and I do not. Oh, the Honourable First Minister has correctly brought me to a point that I want to say, it isn't a black and white situation. It is certainly true that previous governments, and other governments in other jurisdictions, have had the same authority and in fact have been active in the active purchase of land. In that agreement that I referred to last night within the development agreement in the Interlake, there was contained a specific clause which enabled me as a Minister of the Crown to go out and actively buy farms, marginal farms - which we did. I think they did more of it, but then I wasn't in office long enough to do that. I can recall, Mr. Speaker, finally getting tired of building ditches around Lake Winnipeg, trying to protect the flood-prone plains of that particular area and suggesting, and indeed bringing in programs

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . to actively purchase those farm lands. And it was good policy, a policy that was pursued and indeed carried out much more vigorously by this Government, which I applauded.

But, Mr. Speaker, we're speaking about, we're speaking about matters of principle and I started this conversation about in what I believe in, and I say - and that's the difference as to what we will do. I'm prepared to accept that they are, and are prepared to work in the democratic framework of this province and this country. And I am prepared to accept the fact that they are not going to force, expropriate or drive farmers off the land. But, Mr. Speaker, the point that I am making is that they do not believe in private ownership of land and property, and I do. They do not believe and, sir, you take it one step further and then you begin to see. Now if you start from that bench mark, then what kind of policies flow from that belief?

Well, sir, let me demonstrate the difference just in brief form with respect to these same tenant farmers, that I may well inherit, or indeed it may be the Member from Fort Garry who has now become a member of our agrarian wing as the next Minister of Agriculture. But what would I do, and I can't demonstrate this in a better way, if I would inherit five or ten thousand state tenant farmers two or three years hence? Well, sir, I would take that lease, I would take that lease and attempt to write out the punitive clauses; I would attempt to induce by legislation the things that I believe in and the things that I would like to see happen, which is a return to private ownership of land. I would be looking at the extension of long-term money loans. I would be looking at outright subsidization of interest, or indeed perhaps outright forgiveness of interest. I would be looking at every way possible to implement those things that I and the Conservative party believes in.

Now what does this Government do, and the true beliefs of this Government aren't that subtly concealed. You know, I refer to the Honourable Member from St. Johns' contribution to the Throne Speech Debate where he, among other things, indicated that he had met some time ago a young couple with four heifers and they wanted to start farming, and all their assets, four heifers, that is our entire ownership. Now I don't want to suggest to him that with four heifers he'll need some other help but perhaps he was planning on getting at that from their controlled central A.I. Distribution agency, but the fact of the matter is that I want to say how this young couple starts farming on their land and they work hard at it, they build a barn, they improve their corrals, they build a house, and five years later if they choose to buy that land they have no guarantee in the lease that those improvements will be credited to them. There could in fact be the situation where they have to pay twice for all the improvements that they made on the farm. Do you mean to tell me that under those circumstances anybody is going to be in a position to buy back? Do you mean to say that a young couple that has bought or leased a farm at the value of maybe 20 or 30 thousand dollars and has by its own means put in maybe an extra 10 or 20 or 30 thousand dollars worth of improvements and that at the end of that five year period that farm is now evaluated at 60 or 70 thousand dollars and that if he wants to buy it he has to pay the \$70,000 for it?

A MEMBER: Oh come on now.

MR. ENNS: Well now, Mr. Speaker, I say, your actual lease reads "Where permanent improvements can be made to the land to improve the income position of the lessee the lessor may" - and I say, sir, in that little word 'may' describes and underlines the point that I'm trying to make. --(Interjections)-- That underlines the point that I'm trying to make. No, Mr. Speaker, I think the question of the matter is philosophically they know what I'm talking about, and I would like to credit them with the kind of integrity or intellectual honesty that at least some of them would stand up and be prepared to debate that in this House. Mr. Speaker, the Member from Inkster displayed it in a different way. I can recall when, I believe it was the Member from Portage la Prairie introduced a resolution several years ago having to do with a concern about foreign ownership of land. As you see, if I can remember, the Member from Inkster's comments at that time was - you know, he asked the question, quite properly so, you know, really what's the difference whether it's a businessman from Toronto that owns that land, or a businessman from Minneapolis that owns the land, the question is public versus private ownership of land. So in that kind of a debate I believe the Honourable Member from Inkster was exhibiting, you know, a concept, a feeling, and a belief that he honestly and genuinely has.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

But, sir, we are not allowed to debate that question in this way. And we're not allowed to debate that question this way honestly and openly with the people of Manitoba. And that, sir, is one of the failings that we are - one of the negligent things that we are doing in this Chamber. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to you that if believing as I do in the right to private ownership of land and property describes me as a right wing Conservative, that I have no difficulty in living with that. I don't know, I don't know where in that definition, or in that particular problem, there is much room for a broad centre highway running in between us for any other political group.

Mr. Speaker, there are those in the general public in Manitoba, particularly in the political circles, that would like to and, you know, there are times that I would like to believe that they don't exist, that the NDP Party in Government has never arrived, that perhaps if we just closed our eyes they would disappear. Well, Mr. Speaker, they are there and they're not going to disappear that quickly, and they are, they are fundamentally responsible for shifting the spectrum of politics which makes this kind of designation right and left and centre a very precarious profession. It's simply not that easy to find anymore.

Mr. Speaker, let me illustrate by another example. Let me illustrate by another example. If for instance the honourable members opposite choose to describe the position of the Progressive Conservative party as veering to the right because we, as so many others in this country, and we represent that feeling, begin to express some concern about where we're at in our whole labour situation, when 95 percent of the news coverage dwells on the ills of the labour and management strife in this country, when our essential services are virtually brought down to our knees, you know, when we have to recognize that with the kind of complex and technical sophistication that is present in our industrialized state, you know, it's conceivable, sir, that in the future one computer program can bring this country to its knees if he decides to stop punching his buttons. So, sir, if we - and furthermore if as farmers we are being asked as third party innocent victims to daily hand out a 10 dollar bill in cold hard cash because of a labour strike not of our making, it is the farmers of Manitoba that have to pay the \$3,000 demerit charges on everyone of those 32 boats that are waiting in Vancouver. \$17 million last year, it'll be \$25 million this year, in outright cash taken from the hands of the kind of people that you're supposed to want, or you want to represent. Well . . . is it small wonder, is it small wonder that particularly a group that has the confidence and the representation of the farm community expresses some concern, and they are evidenced through the passing of resolutions that there has to be a better way found, that there has to be, you know, there has to be some solutions to these problems. Now, and if we express them perhaps not in the best ways because we don't have the resources of the massive Civil Service behind them, but if you want to, and if the parties to the left and the parties across from me want to take that as an expression of a veering to the right that is forever going to put us away into the wilderness, well, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that I will have no difficulty nor do I suspect will most of my colleagues have any difficulty in expressing those kind of common sense, common sense judgments and opinions to their electorates at any future election and will be returned on them.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not known as having a particularly great input into the educational debates of this Chamber, but let me even touch on the field of education, you see and, Mr. Speaker, I don't know. Perhaps - and I have nothing against creating, you know, a province full of basket weavers. But, you know, even basket weavers when they get tired, and their hands get tired of weaving baskets, should be able to pick up a book and read, or should be able to communicate with their fellow workers on their coffee breaks - I imagine basket weavers have coffee breaks too. You know, they should be able to do that. And, sir, when you begin to, when you begin to get with some regularity notices from our universities, notice from other educators, that our system is producing more and more illiterate high school graduates, then there is something fundamentally wrong in our system.

Mr. Speaker, as a Progressive Conservative there is no question that I will, you know, forever be able to share, forever will be able to share in that knowledge that probably no other greater advancement was made in education in the Province of Manitoba than under the decade of the past Progressive Conservative administration. I don't have to apologize or hide for lack of having put forward and being part of the most progressive kind of administration with respect to education, that I can't make that kind of suggestion, that I can't suggest that perhaps

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . a degree of tinkering and experimentation within our educational system has to be looked at in fresh light, and we have to begin to worry about what kind of end product we're turning out, and their ability, and their ability to cope with the affairs of the future of this province.

I believe the Honourable Member from Brandon West raised, you know, a pretty significant point when we are led to believe that debating in the public school systems is elitist, middle-class function that really has no place in our educational society. That coming from a senior department of educational administrator. Well, sir, as the Honourable Member from Brandon indicated to you, pity the future speakers of this House. I suspect that, you know, if the debates, the level of debates, have not always met with your hopes and aspirations, the future speakers have nothing to look forward to.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude just briefly by indicating that last night in the field of the business community, and the involvement of MDC, the Honourable Minister made some revealing and worthwhile comments. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that throughout the Throne Speech there was a lot of mundane material, capital cost of a telephone \$700; it kind of reminded me when I was once party to the development of a Throne Speech and I thought it of sufficient import to include the abolition of the Horned Cattle Fund as being worthy, as being worthy of mention in the Throne Speech. That's rather the kind of Throne Speech that we are dealing with here. But the one, and it didn't escape me, Mr. Speaker, the one area where this Government in my judgment showed an awful lot of guts, it showed that they are not at all prepared to back down under any amount of pressure, is in the expression and the new direction that they intend to go with the Manitoba Development Corporation. Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge that as being a gutsy decision. No agency of Government, as was repeated to us last night, has been perhaps under such constant attack, justified or not; no agency of government has perhaps been such a continuous source of embarrassment to any government, and particularly this government, and one could have accepted or understood the position of a minister or government that perhaps would, if anything, choose to take a lower profile for this much beleaguered agency of government - but not this government and not this Minister. I recognize the author of that particular paragraph from that Throne Speech. It says, "Full Speed Ahead." You know, and he's suggested and he told us, he told us the different system that he intends to operate. He said, "You know, in the past, public money was used only in the event to bail out the system." He referred to Salter Street being built.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in the mid-Fifties, and certainly through the greater part of the Sixties, this system was failing us here in Manitoba with respect to industrial development. The post-war boom tends to gravitate, as it still does, to the "have" provinces and provinces like Manitoba and the Maritimes in particular, although later joined by others, did what has been done on many other occasions, used public input to bolster or to try to pick up a flagging system that was failing in a particular way. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's my belief of the proper use of public involvement and public funds, but it is not this Minister's and it is not this government's. He says it is now, and this is the import that I read with the MDC, it is now the public intention to acquire and to compete, and I must add, using from a position of advantage to take over, or certainly to radically alter the system. --(Interjection)-- No, no, the system. But then let's argue, let's debate that question, sir. You know, when the Premier leans back, typical pose, and is asked the question, you know, how do you see the question of public and private ownership in industry, and he comes up with the motherhood statement: "Well, I think 50-50 would be a proper, you know, proportion." Well that's the kind of a motherhood statement that I suppose satisfies . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister state his matter of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: My matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is that my honourable friend is presuming to quote me, and therefore he ought to bring forward the quotation.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, obviously in the short time that I have I will not be able to document that quotation. If the Minister takes objection to alluding that way to him, I believe I have heard him, I won't say it then with certainty, that on several occasions he suggested that a 50-50 participation by the public versus the private sector would be a kind of an acceptable arrangement for him. My only question to him is, and the question that industry must ask, which 50 percent?

Mr. Speaker, how does industry respond? How does industry respond to that kind of a

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . situation? Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you in all sincerity that we will, and we will have no difficulty in maintaining a position that can be described with any label you like but that will be understood by those who elect us and those increasing number of people who will be electing us next time to form the government of this province. Because, sir, in the kind of dichotomy that has been created with the successful election of this government, and with the carrying out of their government policies, that . . . that has been thought you know, or that luxury of debate that used to be in the realm of the Progressive Conservatives and the Liberal Parties has to some extent evaporated. It's not my doing, sir, I quite frankly don't like that alternative.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is up.

MR. ENNS: But I can't deny the reality of the situation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member for Lakeside is always a difficult act to follow. I listened with close attention to what he had to say this afternoon. I was very pleased to see that he wanted to deal with issues and the position of himself and the Conservative caucus on the political spectrum.

But before I get into attempting to discuss the same sort of things, let me join the traditional way and congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your return this session to the Chair. I am sure that our proceedings will be in good hands as long as you occupy that position.

I also congratulate the Deputy Speaker. I'm sure that we're all pleased to see him return to this session quite recovered and in good health. Having had the privilege of sitting in that Chair for at least part of the estimates last year, I gained some understanding of what the chairman of committee has to go through. The rest of us can applaud or heckle or even walk out, but the chairman has to sit in that lonely seat with an expression of neutrality on his face at all times.

I would also like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne; and also to congratulate the Honourable Member for St. Boniface on his re-election, his return to this House, and the elevation to the front benches of two new members - two new members that will be missed in the back bench incidentally, Mr. Speaker, although we are very pleased in this rather diminishing community in the back row to be joined by the Member for St. Johns. He will add his weight and experience to our deliberations.

I would also like at this time to congratulate the Honourable Member for Brandon West on his new position as Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party; and also to congratulate the Honourable Member for Lakeside on his promotion, I believe it is, from that position. It was pointed out I believe by my seat mate, the Honourable Member for Gimli, that he saw that move as a promotion, and I'm inclined to agree with him, Mr. Speaker.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside had been in the position of deputizing for the Leader of the Conservative Party, and in indicating his disfavour or dissatisfaction with the position taken by his Leader, and indicating that he wanted to see a change from it, then it was really the only position that the Member for River Heights could take in finding someone else to fill that position. There is no doubt at all that the Honourable Member for River Heights speaks for the Conservative Party in Manitoba. He is its properly elected leader.

But I'm not sure whether in all cases he speaks for all of the caucus who sits behind him, and I feel that the Honourable Member for Lakeside following his statement will perhaps be in a better position to speak for some or probably a majority, if not all, of the Conservative caucus in this Chamber. The Honourable Member for Lakeside says that he does not wish to be associated with that - how did he put it? - that fuzzy image that attempts to out-socialize the socialists, I believe he put it, and that he intends to take a more conservative Conservative position. He's a man who obviously thinks the "conservative" part of the name carries more weight than the "progressive" part.

It would appear too from statements that we have heard from some of his colleagues, things that we have read in the press, that indeed he does speak for many of his colleagues. The Member from Riel, who sits just slightly to the right of the Member for Lakeside, has also indicated his dissatisfaction with this wishy-washy waffle position that the Leader of the Conservative Party has taken, and he has told us in no uncertain terms of his position on the political spectrum.

A little farther to his right on the front bench, we see the position of the Honourable

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. WALDING cont'd) . . . Member for Swan River, a Conservative of the Imperial school. Behind him, the mercantile Conservative from Roblin who has assured us of his conservative principles in the past. Behind both of them, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. He's never one to be slow in coming forward and telling us of his very strongly held position. It is not for the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek to be taking any wishy-washy or fuzzy imaged expression in this House. Similarly his colleague on the back row from Charleswood, whose blunt sentiments also show him to be a man of the right.

Without wishing to go through every member, we have been assured by many of the rural members, we have been assured by many of the rural members, Mr. Speaker, just where their sentiments lie, that they would prefer to be known as Conservatives rather than Progressive Conservatives. Even my friend from Pembina will put forward his right-wing philosophies in the most forthright of terms.

So I can assure the Honourable Member for Lakeside that we on this side look to him to show us some leadership of those caucus members who subscribe to his particular position. I can assure him that we will listen most carefully to those conservative principles and policies that he will be putting forward in the months to come as I am sure a part of his election campaign to succeed the gentleman who presently sits immediately to his right.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside mentioned the event of the weekend, the Conservative Nominating Convention. And I did notice one of the television newsreel reports of that, that there was a banner displayed very prominently in the hall where these meetings were to take place, a banner that said: "Freedom Now", and they will correct me if I misread it. It was on the television. But it said: "Freedom Now", and I am sure that that was a sentiment subscribed to all of the members opposite and indeed all of the delegates to that convention. But it didn't say freedom for whom, Mr. Speaker, it did not say freedom to, it did not say freedom from.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside mentioned two of the particular topics that were under discussion at that convention. I would like to have a look at those two particular issues too and see whether they fitted in with that particular slogan of "Freedom Now". They didn't say whether it was freedom from Conservatives, for Conservatives, that they wanted, whether they wanted freedom from New Democrats or freedom for farmers, freedom for the elite, freedom . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member state his point of order.

MR. WATT: On a point of privilege. The honourable member said that the convention was held, and a Nominating Convention it was not, it was a policy convention.

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

MR. WALDING: Well I do thank the Honourable Member for Arthur, Mr. Speaker, for correcting me. If it was a slip of the tongue, I do apologize. I recognize that it was in fact, as I have been told, a policy convention.

One of the policies that was reportedly adopted at that convention, Mr. Speaker, one that we might assume is supported by the members of the Conservative caucus opposite, and a position that we have heard put forward to the meetings of the Land Committee, even by ex-Conservative candidates who assured us that they were non political, was that the Conservative Party is opposed to the government's land lease program. Now that was the report that I read in the press; I did not see the particular resolution. If it happens that the Conservative Party is not opposed to the government's land lease program, then I invite any of the honourable gentlemen opposite to correct me before I go any further.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur have a point of order?

MR. WATT: It was not the land lease, it was the land acquisition that we were . . .

MR. WALDING: The Honourable Member for Arthur seems to see a difference in land acquisition and land lease. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. ORDER PLEASE!
The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: I'm sure the Honourable Member for Arthur, Mr. Speaker, will have the opportunity to speak in this debate and will make his points of order crystal clear, as he so usually does.

It is the present policy of this government, Mr. Speaker, that any farmer in Manitoba is free to buy land from whomever he wishes. He is also free to sell his land to whomever

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. WALDING cont'd) . . . he wishes, whether it's a neighbour, someone in the family, a corporation or co-operative, whether it is the Government of Manitoba, the Government of Canada, or a foreigner, or a foreign corporation, he is free to do that. A farmer in Manitoba is also free to lease his land to whomever he wishes. He is also free to lease from whomever he wishes, including the government, including foreigners, including Manitobans, people from Nova Scotia, Americans too.

But the Conservatives would have us believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is too much freedom for the Manitoba farmer. That all this freedom is heavy stuff and that the farmer of Manitoba cannot be trusted with so much freedom. So they propose, Mr. Speaker, to take away from the Manitoba farmer some of this freedom that he presently enjoys. They would take away the freedom from the farmer to sell his land to the government, if he so wishes to do, despite the fact that he might get a better price for it. The Conservatives would deny the right to the farmer to lease land from the government, a right which he presently enjoys.

Not only that, but there is another right involved here, and that is the right of my city constituents, Mr. Speaker, to own farms. Now there are precious few of my constituents who own a farm, although they are free to do so if they have the inclination and the money. They are also free to buy a farm in partnership or as a corporation, if they so wish. But they are also free, at this moment, to be part owners of quite a few Manitoba farms, their tax dollars have contributed to the purchase of a number of farms that they presently own. The Conservatives propose to take away the right of my constituents to be part owners of some of Manitoba's farm land. So much for the slogan "Freedom Now".

Another major policy, as reported to us in the press from that convention, was a resolution to do with labour, and we read by the report that the Conservative Government would take away the right of some of Manitoba workers to strike. They have classified the ones, in very general terms, who they would refer to. They were referred to in one newspaper that I read, as those in "vital" services, and in the other paper as "essential" services.

A MEMBER: What's wrong with that?

MR. WALDING: Now I didn't see the wording of the resolution so I don't know whether it was vital or essential that was used, but they both suggest to me to be the same sort of thing. What a Conservative government proposed to do would be to take away that present right to strike from some Manitobans, those that they say are employed in vital services, or vital industries. --(Interjection)-- Essential. I've been corrected by the Member for Swan River who has said that the wording was "essential". But now I'm getting a different story from the Honourable Member for Fort Garry who says that it is not so. --(Interjections)--

I seem to remember from the last Session, Mr. Speaker, when such a policy was presumably still in force by the Conservative party, a resolution which asks the Cabinet of the Government of Manitoba to declare which were essential services, and to ban strikes within those areas. I wasn't aware at that time that it was the policy of the Conservative party that they would ban strikes in essential areas, and if they want this proposal, this policy, to be taken seriously by the voters in this province, then I would suggest to them that they tell us just what they mean by "vital" or by "essential." They should tell those people in Manitoba who they consider to be vital or who they consider to be essential. And I would expect the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, perhaps at some future date, to spell out to us just who he considers to be vital.

They will presumably, Mr. Speaker, segregate the workers in Manitoba into two groups - the essential ones and the non-essential ones, and I will be very interested to know which of those workers in Manitoba are non-essential, and I'm sure those workers too would be very interested to know what the Conservative party thinks of them. Or on second thoughts, are there to be some workers who are more essential than others? Are doctors more essential, for instance, than garbage collectors? Or are nurses more essential than train drivers? Perhaps we should know this from the honourable members opposite before we can proceed to debate it.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a point of order?

MR. L. R. SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Well, I believe I do have a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I don't think the Honourable Member for St. Vital would want to leave the wrong impression, or the wrong representation, on the record. The reference was at all times to vital services and not essential and there is a clear difference, I think, in the minds of all in the labour relations field.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

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

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad that the Conservative party has now ascertained just what a resolution said, and the Honourable Member for Fort Garry has told us that the word was "vital" and not "essential". Now he apparently can see a very clear difference between them. I'm not sure that I can unless the word vital has something to do with life. Possibly if it does, he might be referring to those persons in the medical profession; possibly the police or firemen too. Again, would he consider that the removal of garbage was a health position and could be a vital service? But anyway, he should tell us or his colleagues should tell us too, because they are proposing, as I mentioned before, to take away from those vital workers that present freedom they now enjoy to go on strike. While they are considering which workers are vital and which workers are not vital, perhaps they should also consider that if they are all lumped in together as being vital services, then presumably they are all as valuable to the province of Manitoba and perhaps they should all be paid a comparable rate; that we should have maybe two classes of workers in this province, the highly-paid vital ones and the more lowly-paid non-vital workers. But that is a problem that my friends opposite have and we'll leave them to sort that out.

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

MR. WATT: On the point of privilege, could I ask the member if the strike in Vancouver right now is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a matter of privilege. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the honourable member has been a member of this Assembly long enough to know the difference between a point of privilege and a question.

I wanted to get away from the matter of partisan politics for a moment, Mr. Speaker, and deal with a matter more of a parliamentary nature, and it arises from the unfortunate absence from the back bench this Session of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood --(Interjections)-- Oh, I hear some remarks of "hear, hear" from the opposite benches, Mr. Speaker, and for those members opposite who seem to take some comfort from the absence of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, let me just review briefly for them the reasons why he is not here. We're getting some smart remarks from Gladstone, Mr. Speaker, another member who seems to lack a proper understanding of the democratic process in this province. I'd be very glad to expound on that for his benefit.

Mr. Speaker, in the bookcase over there, there are approximately 23 or 24 volumes of the Statutes of Manitoba, passed by this Legislature, laws that we have made for the people of Manitoba to abide by. And the people of Manitoba, in general, abide by those laws, not because we have a policeman on every corner and not because we have a police state or an informer on every block, but they abide by those laws, Mr. Speaker, because they are the laws of the people of Manitoba as enacted by the fairly and democratically elected representatives of those people. It follows from that, Mr. Speaker, that the most important of those laws has got to be the Election Act, because once people fail to have confidence in the Election Act and the procedures under that Act, then they will lose confidence in all the other acts of the legislation that have been passed subsequent to an election.

If honourable members take the time to read through the Election Act, they will find, running through it, two basic and sometimes conflicting principles. On the one hand, there is the principle that the right to vote and the practise of voting should be made as easy, simple, as widespread and as fair as it's possible to be. The enumeration, the court, the review, the fact that a voter can come along on voting day, the fact that the voting procedure itself has been simplified, a simple mark on a piece of paper - it does not have to be an X, it does not have to be even in the pencil provided - and a number of other provisions of a similar nature to facilitate the voting by as many people as wish to do so.

The other principle running through the Act is the protection of the people who are voting from various abuses that might occur, or possibly have occurred in the past, and a simple reading of the Act will show what some of those are. There are sections in there against carrying firearms, there are sections in there preventing personation, of ballot stuffing, ballot box stuffing, voting twice, markers on election day, posters near polling booths. There are provisions, too, to protect the anonymity of the voter so that no one can know afterwards

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. WALDING cont'd) . . . which candidate the voter marked his ballot for. As I mentioned before, those are the two themes running through that particular Act, and occasionally they come into conflict with one another.

One of the clauses, one of the sections in the Act -- I believe it's 1054 -- states that where there is found to be more ballots in the box at the end of the day than there are names crossed off the poll lists, that that suggests that extra ballots have been stuffed into the ballot box. And so there is a precaution, a protection against that. It says, "Where this happens, any ballot not bearing the Returning Officer's initials, shall not be counted." Now obviously this is one of those items in the second principle which is to protect the voting rights of the people in that poll. In other words, if someone has come into the voting place fraudulently and put extra ballots in the box, those ballots could not possibly have the DRO's initials on them, and so when the time for the count comes, the extra ballots can be discarded and the wishes of the people in that poll can be properly tabulated. Added to the votes of the other voters in the constituency, the choice of the people can be determined.

Now what happened in Crescentwood? Well, it happened that in one poll, poll 14, that at the end of the day there were 166 ballots in the box and there were only 165 names crossed off on the poll. I really don't think the honourable members opposite appreciate the seriousness of the situation. The Member for Charleswood obviously doesn't. He seems to find the matter quite humorous, Mr. Speaker.

In accordance with the relevant section, the ballots were examined and it was found that only 16 out of the 166 ballots had, on the back of them, the initials of the DRO. The outcome of this -- and that was only in effect because there was one extra ballot in the box than there were names crossed off the DRO's list. The outcome of it was that the 150 votes in that particular box were disallowed. It was later discovered why there was this discrepancy of one. It was found that a group of four persons had come in to vote together. All four of them had been given ballots, but only three of the names had been crossed off the list. And this was found, incidentally, by contacting everyone on the voters' list who had not voted, and it was found out by talking to these 80-odd people which one had in fact voted but not been crossed off the list.

So what had happened, in effect, was that had those 150 votes been counted, the winning margin would have been in the order of 56 votes; 56 votes would have been quite enough to elect the Honourable Member for Crescentwood instead of by the one vote, as in fact he was elected. And it was on that basis of having just one vote that he came into this House.

The ironical thing, Mr. Speaker, is that the provision in the Act that was used, 104 (5) was a section of the Act which was designed to protect the voting rights of the voters in that particular poll. It was used to disenfranchise 150 people who voted in that poll; and because of that, it disenfranchised all of the people, all of the voters in Crescentwood, and they are now without representation. I will admit to having a certain bias in this matter, that I know Harvey Patterson and I think that he is a fine fellow, was a good MLA, and I believe that Crescentwood would be better represented by him than by anyone else. But, Mr. Speaker, it is the principle of the matter that concerns me, the fact that a section designed to protect against fraud and ballot stuffing was used for precisely the opposite effect in disenfranchising 150 voters in that poll. The intent of that section was perfectly clear. No one reading it could interpret the meaning of it, the purpose of it, in any other way; but simply because of the wording of that section, it was interpreted literally and those 150 ballots were disallowed.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude on the same note that the Throne Speech concluded, and that was a recognition that 1975 is International Women's Year. It was recognized in this country with a small slogan "Why Not!" which apparently means different things to different people. Some people have objected to it because they read certain things into it. I would like, as my contribution, to suggest a different slogan with no guarantees as to its originality. It's a slogan that means exactly what it says, and I would leave the thought with honourable members. The slogan -- "A Ms is as good as a male."

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I was unable to complete my remarks when I last spoke on the sub-amendment and I'm therefore rising, Mr. Speaker, to complete those comments that I began to make at the completion of my last standing.

Mr. Speaker, I want to state to you that I dealt a great deal in my last speech with many of the things that I feel are extremely important to government, many issues that I feel should be dealt with more adequately during a session, and in fact, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out a number of areas where I was in support of the government's actions particularly in the social field. But, Mr. Speaker, having run out of time I did not complete what I wanted to say regarding the matter that is found so distasteful by so many on the Government side and obviously by those in the Liberal party. And that referred to my comments in regard to the relationship that existed centering around the CFI investigation.

I point out and underline again, Mr. Speaker, that my reason for rising in the initial instance was the fact that the Liberal Leader within, I believe about the first five minutes following his election as the Leader of the Liberal party, took the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of accusing me of being dishonest. Mr. Speaker, I have never called anybody dishonest but he took that opportunity to do that. He not only called me dishonest, he called a number of other people, friends of mine, colleagues of mine, dishonest, who I know are not dishonest. Now we didn't check him up on that, we didn't threaten to take him to court, ask him to step out into the hallway, because he did it from the stage of the Convention Centre. I suppose there's always a tendency for all of us to look at a person and say "He's new, he's now with a minority group". He is given whether consciously or otherwise, he is given more of an opportunity than someone else who rises. Mr. Speaker, when I rose I was - as I say I was instigated in the initial instance to speak because of his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to my remarks to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and his relationship to the legal firm of which the new Leader of the Liberal Party is also a partner, I simply say to him that I think there is an old saying that runs back through history that is even more important now since the Watergate affair and the present climate in which political institutions operate. The old saying is "That justice must not only be done, it must appear to be done". Now, Mr. Speaker, that was the main point that I was making. Now despite the qualifications that have been put forth by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources for his former law partner, Mr. Mitchell, who was made one of the three investigators who were to cross-examine all those involved in the CFI case, despite all the qualifications that he thinks Mr. Mitchell has, Mr. Mitchell was also his law partner prior to the Member for Inkster coming into politics and Mr. Mitchell after 1969 going into the government as the chairman I think of the Municipal Board and then on to, as his former law partner on to one of the three, and probably the driving force of the three investigators set up as a Commission of Inquiry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is it any surprise to you or to anyone else that someone would say, does justice appear to be done in this case? The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources said last night that he was surprised that Mr. Meighen's questions to him were of the nature of a question was, "Was it not your intention to nationalize this company? Was that not behind some of your motivations?" Mr. Speaker, if you had read Mr. Alistair Stewart's memo, the so-called nutmeg memo or chipmunk memo or whatever it's referred to, is it any surprise that we should think that justice may not be done in this case. Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and the Attorney-General find that out of all of the dozens of law firms in this province, and particularly the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources when he wants to leave the Government for only a short period of time, of all the dozens did it not cross his mind that it may not appear that justice was being done. Is he in any way suggesting, Mr. Speaker --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, I don't believe I've raised a point of privilege or order . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. The honourable member is suggesting that I worked with one firm. I already advised the honourable member that I worked with several firms. I was hired by Richardson and Company on a consultant basis. I was hired by other firms on a consultant basis. I did not park my hat there. My office was within

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) my residence. I had my own secretary, my own stationery, my own telephone, at home, my own library, at home and hired myself out to various clients of whom Richardson and Company were one, announced publicly at the time and not alluded to by my honourable friends at the time.

A MEMBER: I'll get it straight.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this doesn't take away from the fact that the association and the travel to it and back by the Minister and the travel to it and association with it by the recently deposed Attorney-General most obviously raised the question --(Interjection)-- No. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have not suggested by his going to it and coming back from it there was anything illegal. I said that before and I'll say it again. I simply am referring to the very important principle that justice must also appear to be done. And who in his right mind, Mr. Speaker, is going to in any way suggest that looking on it as a person who went before that Commission and was the victim of it - yes, Mr. Speaker, the victim of it - where also the partnership that he joined had been hired to represent him as counsel at the hearings and all his colleagues on the front bench, at the expense of the taxpayer, Mr. Speaker, while all the rest of us were the victims of it. Could not even afford to buy the transcript from those hearings let alone get full-time legal representation at it. That is justice? That is a complete miscarriage of justice. And his contribution and the contribution of others and their actions in their bad judgment was to add to that to prove beyond a doubt that justice did not appear to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I make no amends for bringing up this topic, and I want to add further that I make no amends for my comments with regard to the new Leader of the Liberal Party and I'll add to that, that I don't enjoy doing it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to add one more . . . --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is quite capable of drawing his own conclusions even if they are often wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to add one more chapter to this, and I want to again demonstrate to you a classic case to underline the example that I've just given you. And that refers to the former Attorney-General's activities in this House and after he's left this House with regard to a particular issue.

On April 22, 1970 the Attorney-General in this House was asked by the Member for Lakeside with regard to his involvement in a company that was in competition with another company that the Liquor Commission had to make a ruling on. Mr. Speaker, the specific issue was with regard at that time to the difficulties pertaining to a firm named Shakey's Pizza Parlour, and it came to light through the Member of Lakeside that the Attorney-General may in fact have a vested interest in a firm in competition by the name of Gondola Pizza. And when it was raised in the House on April 22, 1970 it was almost as if the Member for Lakeside had brought in something that was very mean, dirty and below the belt. As a matter of fact the Attorney-General wrote it off as a lot of muckraking. But at the time the Attorney-General said that the only benefit he derived from the companies was as an active lawyer, he said, and he quit practice when the NDP Government came into office. He said in effect that he had a one voting share like many lawyers do to fill the requirements, I suppose of the Company's Act therefore it was a very unfair accusation. Well time passed, Mr. Speaker, it received some comment at the time but documented in Hansard, in the newspapers, that in fact Mr. Mackling's interest was only that of a token shareholder and not as an active participant in the company, and furthermore he was out of business after he got elected in 1969.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we find now that in November of 1974 a statement of claim is filed by Mr. Mackling for a one-third interest in the sale price of the shares of that company, running into six figures, on the basis that he not only owned one-third interest but in addition to providing legal services was involved in all aspects of the business of the company. Now, Mr. Speaker, how can we accept that, how are we to be led to the belief that justice was either appeared to be done or in fact was being done. Documented in Hansard, headlined in the press at the time and in spite of that, filed a statement of claim in the tens of thousands of dollars for a third interest, not as a one-voting member to act as secretary of the company to fulfill some legal requirement, but saying he owned a third of it and he was participant in the operating decisions of that company. Mr. Speaker, not only that, that case was drawn up and represented by the Leader of the Liberal Party. Is that what we're led to believe is honesty? Do

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) you mean we're going to stand here and be accused of being dishonest when that sort of nonsense is going on? Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most devastating cases I think . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, again on a matter of privilege, and it's become very difficult when the honourable member is not sitting here. Is the honourable member suggesting that the Leader of the Liberal Party in filing a statement of claim on behalf of Al Mackling, citizen, which I assume will be tried in court and which I assume that the statements made in Hansard will be part of what is available to anybody to decide, is acting dishonestly, that the filer of a statement of claim acts dishonestly?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I asked the member if this is what we are to accept as a definition of honesty. Let me ask the Mines Minister, that he might reply at a convenient time, Mr. Speaker. What is the position of a lawyer - what is the position of a legal advisor when he takes on a case? Does he not examine to see if the person in fact has a legitimate case, or does he simply say I will represent you in spite of all previous information? Mr. Speaker, I'm not well versed in the law, Mr. Speaker, in this respect, but I would think that any lawyer . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: I really don't even wish that my honourable friend should be sort of stopped from further display in what will ultimately prove to be, in my opinion, his great ignorance. But this is a matter which is obviously now before the courts and the courts will deal with all of the questions that are being raised by the Honourable Member for Riel. They are not matters which the House are going to deal with. It is an issue before the courts, and on that basis, Mr. Speaker, and the honourable member disclosing that it exists, I would suggest that we should not be discussing what the court will decide either about the honesty of the lawyer - of which, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I personally haven't got a shadow of doubt about, not a shadow of doubt, about the honesty of the lawyer presenting the claim; and as to the validity of the claim, that will be dealt with by the courts.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the point is well taken. The matter I imagine is sub judice. I suggest that the honourable member carry on with the debate.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that the matter is before the courts. But if it is before the courts, if it is sub judice, then I won't speak about it further and wouldn't have spoken about it today. I was not aware that this matter was before the courts. The information that I am giving is common knowledge information.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I know that the honourable member has indicated his own ignorance, but his ignorance can't be so abysmal that he doesn't know that when he produces the statement of claim which puts it in court, he also says he doesn't know it's before the courts. --(Interjection)-- Well, you got a lawyer beside you - mind you, maybe he can't tell you very much, but a statement of claim puts a matter in court.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Well unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that some of us perhaps do suffer from ignorance in comparison to the great brilliance of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. But that unfortunately is one of the failings of human beings, and not all human beings are lawyers. Not all human beings are supposed to understand that when you go over to the firm that you went to and sit there, you know, with them, your comings and goings, and the Attorney-General does the same thing. They don't maybe understand all this relationship that goes on.

A MEMBER: Incestuous relationship.

MR. CRAIK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat it again, that it was an incestuous relationship in its entirety. I've looked up the definition and don't find it unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker. It simply defines, Mr. Speaker, the conception that the average citizen has when he looks on this requirement that justice must not only be done, it must appear to be done.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say, I repeat again, that I don't particularly enjoy bringing this up. I didn't start this, but I'm not going to sit and take it I'm going to tell you when someone who is new on the political scene, stands up and makes accusations that he cannot - or should at least substantiate, and has not yet, and should be substantiating, if in fact he wants to use that

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) kind of a smear tactic, generally, against many of the people who are elected to this House.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I haven't anything more to say on this matter. I'm not going to speak on this matter further until I determine whether in fact it is in the court.

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to stand up here and engage in quasi-innuendo or in muckraking. I'm going to take a few minutes of the House to talk about a little bit of the history of economic development within this province. I think the topic of economic development is obviously one of great concern to all members of the House, certainly it has occurred in many speeches of members on both sides of this particular Chamber.

I think, without belabouring the point with various statistics, I think we in Manitoba at this particular time in our economic development, should be very happy with the fact that relatively speaking, relatively speaking, we remain an island of prosperity in a sea of recession that unfortunately is plaguing our cousins to the south and that is plaguing Eastern Canada and to some extent the Pacific Coast of Canada. Our unemployment situation could be better but it is still relatively better than other parts of Canada, certainly better than the United States, and our inflationary situation compares favourably as well. We would like less inflation but nevertheless the degree of inflation that Winnipeg has experienced - and I refer to Winnipeg because this is where the Statistics Canada survey relates to, this is the only city in Manitoba that is covered by that survey - that the degree of inflation that Winnipeg has experienced is no greater, in fact has been less than that experienced in most other cities during the past several years. At the same time, we have new developments occurring, both industrial and commercial, that makes one think that there are many new and exciting job opportunities that are opening up to our province. That I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the 1970's in Manitoba compared to the 1960's is a decade of employment opportunity, relatively speaking, it's a decade, a period of time, where we have, if anything, been short of workers, particularly workers in various skill categories, to man the factories and the offices in the various institutions that we have in the province.

I contrast this to the 1960's in Manitoba when this province was virtually on its knees, looking for jobs for its people. Maybe it's because we were on our knees, figuratively speaking, certainly the Conservative government appeared to be on its knees, if the record of this government and the way it operated the Manitoba Development Fund and the entire story of a particular forestry development is considered. I think the development in this forestry industry is the classic example of the fact that the previous government and that this province was desperate for jobs for people. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are normally speaking two types of investment that we think of, two types of ownership. One of course is the private investment or private ownership that we see about us and there is also government investment or public ownership. But I would submit that under the previous administration we had a third category. That category was that of disguised public investment. It was supposed to be private investment but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that what we had with CFI was phoney private investment and, really, disguised public investment.

The story of CFI is well-documented in the report of the Commission of Inquiry into The Pas Forestry Industrial Complex at the Pas. This report was issued in August of 1974. We have not had an opportunity to debate it in this House. I therefore take this opportunity in the Throne Speech Debate to make some reference to the conclusions and observations of this particular Commission of Inquiry. I think that there is a setting that you can perhaps understand the CFI fiasco arising out of. As I said, a situation where Manitoba's economic growth was seriously lagging, in the 1960's. A situation where the government had a philosophy or a policy of crude economic growth. Of growth at about any cost. A situation where power had been given to one particular person, namely the Manager of the Manitoba Development Fund, Rex Grose. Perhaps too much power. And a person who became obsessed with his objective, with his goal of building a pulp and paper plant. But, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, according to the Commission of Inquiry, the setting also includes the factor of an incompetent cabinet, an incompetent Tory government which signed an open-ended agreement, which concluded it in a matter of hours, virtually, and which the Commission of Inquiry points to as one of the serious failings in this entire episode. It concludes that the cabinet committee, consisting of

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. EVANS cont'd) Premier Duff Roblin, the then Minister of Industry, Gurney Evans, Mines Minister Sterling Lyon, and the Provincial Secretary, the late Maitland Steinkopf, was negligent, that this committee, according to the Commission, was negligent in failing to involve legal counsel during the process of negotiating the Monaco proposal, the CFI proposal. The Commission said the Board of MDF, the Manitoba Development Fund, the precursor of the Manitoba Development Corporation, played no part in the negotiations and that Mr. Roblin was in error when he stated in evidence to the Commission that the MDF loan agreement with Monaco was negotiated by the Fund.

Well what happened, Mr. Speaker? It's no secret that the government of the day placed a huge advertisement in the newspapers with the heading "\$100 million Loan Fund Available for Industrial Breakthrough". --(Interjection)-- The idea was that there was \$100 million kicking around that would be available. \$100 million it said in July of 1965 was available to finance operational industrial breakthrough. And, according to the Commission, this particular advertisement and the way it was placed, was virtually to solicit the interest of profiteers and of development racketeers. As a matter of fact, this particular ad was found in the offices of the group that were known as the CFI consortium in the offices of people who worked for Dr. Kasser.

The other factor is that the government of the day signed a loan agreement for \$40.7 million which was virtually a 14 percent equity, supposedly, by the so-called private investors. And at the same time according to the agreement, the government, through the MDF was committed to paying 60 percent of everything above this \$40.7 million original amount. In other words, there was a completely open-ended agreement that was agreed to by the Conservative cabinet of the day. Furthermore, there is no evidence as to how exactly the \$40.7 million was arrived at, and there's no satisfactory explanation that was given to the Commission of Inquiry as to how the \$40.7 million was estimated. And it goes on to say that that failure to get this information was also an act of negligence.

What else characterized this particular deal? Well a multitude of concessions: Municipal taxes, concessions of cutting rights on 43,000 square miles, practically half of Northern Manitoba in effect, or seemingly so. And also the need to put in various community infrastructure by government. On top of that, Mr. Speaker, the entire episode was veiled in secrecy. You could not ask a question in this House as to the operations of the MDF. As a matter of fact, it was intimated to do so and to criticize perhaps it --(Interjection)-- was sacrilegious, exactly. It appeared to undermine, in fact it was stated that it would undermine the economic development of this province. We should not criticize what the government was attempting to do. There's no point in asking anyway, Mr. Chairman, because by law, by law, you could not obtain any information about the financial operations of the Manitoba Development Fund.

Perhaps memories are very short, but contrast this with the situation today, where we make available, on a quarterly basis, through the Manitoba Gazette, all of the loans, all of the equity positions, all of the money that is loaned or invested by the Manitoba Development Corporation is itemized, and the terms of the loan, the people involved, this is made available as a matter of law that this government brought in. And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we made it law and mandatory for the Chairman of the Manitoba Development Corporation to appear before the Legislative Committee on Economic Development to bring forward documents, financial statements of those companies in which we have an equity position, to discuss these and to answer questions from the members of the Legislative Economic Development Committee, and any other member of the House that wishes to come down at any time to be at that Committee hearing. Contrast this with that day when the entire CFI arrangements, arrangements made by the government, by the cabinet, and there's no doubt about that, was veiled in secrecy. And indeed upon being asked it turns out that Gurney Evans - I might add because I've asked on a number of occasions, there is no relationship by blood or legality or any otherwise between myself and Gurney Evans, there's no relationship whatsoever.

A MEMBER: There's no blood.

MR. EVANS: I'm not even sure of that. But according to the commission, Gurney Evans misled this House on March 8th of 1966, when in answering questions about the proposal, the CFI at The Pas, he stated that the Manitoba Development Fund was not committed to make a loan to CFI. But the Commission noted in its report that this statement was entirely

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. EVANS cont'd) misleading because on previous year, October 8, Mr. Gurney Evans had sent a letter accepting a proposal by the Swiss firm of Monaco AG to set up what became CFI and attached to it was a memorandum of financing specifically stating that if the project went ahead "the Fund shall lend in Canadian funds to the operating company 86 percent of the total investment required". Well a pure and simple case of misleading this Legislature. You didn't have any Manitoba Gazettes to look at and see what the data revealed as you can today. You did have no opportunity to go to the Legislative Committee on Economic Development and ask questions directly of the chairman of the MDC. And I'd like to remind particularly the newer members of this House the fact that today you do have this openness of lending procedure by the MDC, and I find it very ironical when certain members opposite get up and claim that they haven't got sufficient information. What a contrast today with the situation back in the 1960's.

Mr. Speaker, what concerns me particularly is that I wonder what would have happened if the people of Manitoba did not have the foresight to elect the New Democratic Party to office in 1969, what would have happened with regard to this particular development, with regard to CFI? What would they have done? Well, I can surmise what would have happened by looking at some of the speeches that were made in this House as late as 1970 by members opposite, members of the Conservative Opposition who are still members of this House. They were very concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the resignation of Mr. Gross that took place in March of 1970.

The Member for Morris on March 31, 1970 was very upset at the fact that the chairman, Mr. Grose, the chairman of the MDF had resigned. And I'm quoting, Mr. Speaker: "Mr. Speaker, the chairman has now resigned according to the report in the newspapers this morning. I need not tell members of this House the role that Mr. Grose has played in the activities and development of this province, without question one of the top civil servants in this province or any other part of the country, winner of an industrial development award last year, a man who has devoted his energies to furthering the interests of this province. Not it would be interesting to know what the reasons are for his resignation. It would seem to me that the House is deserving of some explanation as to why this purging of civil servants." And then there is further debate and there's replies by the Premier and so on. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jorgenson, as it states here, the Member from Morris showed utmost confidence in this particular person, this manager, this senior civil servant. And I say contrast his confidence in Mr. Grose with the observation of the Rhodes Smith Commission on CFI which described Mr. Grose as acting in a very incompetent and a very negligent manner in this particular transaction.

That was from Hansard of Page 414; and then on Page 419 of Hansard, the Member from Lakeside also indicates his great concern about what has happened- he was relating to the resignation of Mr. Grose: "Well Mr. Chairman, I wish to participate in this debate with respect to the report of the Standing Committee of Economic Development, that the report of the Standing Committee on Economic Development be received. Mr. Chairman, in view of what has happened in the last few days, not only should the report be received, Mr. Speaker, if any action is to be taken, it would be the instant and immediate resignation on the part of the Minister of Industry and Commerce."

Again, Mr. Speaker, what I'm suggesting is that there's quite clear evidence from a senior member, former member of the Cabinet, that he too had complete and utter confidence in Mr. Grose. I read further his remarks. He was also relating to the resignation of the Deputy Minister of Industry and Commerce. I quote him on Page 420: "We are facing the reality of losing two of the best and competent people that we had in that department with no indication from that government, from that Minister as to what his alternative approaches are going to be." And then I read on further where he predicts we are entering into a serious recessionary stage in the economical development of our country. I'm quoting: "And what do we have, Mr. Speaker, when we lose those key individuals, those forces that have done so much toward development in this province, with a shrug of the shoulders. The fact is that this public servant who has given" and I'm quoting: "the fact is that this public servant who has given 22, 23-odd years of service to the Province of Manitoba has been acknowledged throughout the land, width and breadth of this country as being a foremost leader in this type of development, in this type of work, and we have a situation developing where the First Minister

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. EVANS cont'd) has to divert attention from the seriousness of his leaving and so on." Well these other remarks are irrelevant. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that contrast this view of Mr. Grose by a former member of the Cabinet with the observations of the CFI Inquiry Commission, where I repeat, Mr. Grose is very clearly pointed out by the commission as being negligent and virtually incompetent in dealing with the entire matter.

Then I go on, Mr. Speaker, to read further in Hansard on March 24th, this is a few days before. I look at the remarks made by the now Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member from River Heights. And now he's waxing eloquence about CFI: "Well now just for a few moments let me talk about Churchill Forest Industries. It was made abundantly clear yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition, " it should be Liberal Opposition, "and supported by the professional consultants who he quoted, that the agreement with Churchill Forest Industries is a minimum requirement for the successful development of the northern forest resource." Then I skip a couple of sentences and read on further: "And what do we have in the north today. We have four not one" - this is in March of 1970 - "not one, whose plants are in the process of being completed and this means more men in construction work, more wages in the north and more jobs for our people. And what do we have in the Legislature? Both former Opposition parties, one now being the government, are carping and crying and criticizing the deal. I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that the kind of people who for years sat in this House and poor mouthed this province and carped and criticized everything that was done to try and move our province ahead would have matured, and yet last week we had them coming back again spending the time and effort and attention of this House in unworthy attempts to discredit the previous administration. Surely there's much more work to be done."

And get this, Mr. Speaker, get this.--(Interjection)--They would have stopped it? Well look, this is March 24, 1970 - 1970, Mr. Speaker - and this I particularly would like to emphasize. The Member from River Heights, the Leader of the Opposition goes on to say: "Churchill Forest Industries was a project of foresight, imagination and effort. The problem was one of creating more jobs in industry, more jobs in industry in the north, and the government of the day, which was the administration I was part of, struggled with it to make the best deal for Manitoba." Well, some deal, Mr. Speaker. Some deal, Mr. Speaker. The very best deal for Manitoba.

Well, I would invite members of the House to read the Commission of Inquiry's report because it documents very carefully, very precisely, very clearly, the fact that this was the deal that the Conservative Government had made. It's quite clear that it was a deal made based on a very short meeting, in effect a couple of days, with those Ministers present as I stated, the former Premier of Manitoba, Duff Roblin, in addition as I said, Gurney Evans, the Minister of Industry then, the Minister of Mines at that time, Sterling Lyon and the late Maitland Steinkopf, the then Provincial Secretary. It was they who made this deal, and the commission makes it very clear they were very negligent and made for the people of Manitoba a very poor deal, a very bad deal. And yet, March of 1970, many months after the previous - well not so many, nine months after the previous administration had left office, making way for this administration - you have the Leader of the Official Opposition stating - I'll be glad to answer a question in a minute - stating, Mr. Speaker, that this was the best possible deal that the government of the day made for the people of Manitoba. You know, so considerate, the confidence - considering the confidence that the Member from Morris indicated that he had in Mr. Grose, considering the confidence that the Member from Lakeside had indicated in Mr. Grose, the Manager of the MDF, who was the organizer in the deal, the fact that the Leader of the Opposition has indicated it was the best deal they could possibly make, you know, a virtual open end agreement, and an agreement with a group that they didn't even know who they were dealing with, It's quite obvious, it's very clear here that the Cabinet of the day did not know virtually who they were dealing with.--(Interjection)--Afterwards.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that what would have happened, I ask, what would have happened if the Conservative Party had been re-elected in June of 1969 - what would have happened with CFI? I suggest that given the secrecy provisions of the MDF, given the obsession that Rex Grose, the Manager MDF, had to build this, given the incompetence of the Roblin Cabinet in making the open-ended arrangement, the open-ended deal that they made, given the crude growth philosophy of the previous administration, given their seeming willingness to engage in what I call phoney private investment or disguised public investment, their

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. EVANS cont'd) willingness to do that - given all those things, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the CFI deal would never have come to light. The people of this province would never have known about it, and we would have had, as we have - there would have been a pulp and paper mill in place, and I would suggest that the owners would be Dr. Kasser and his associates, possibly Rex Grose would have been President, and the government would be telling us what a terrific investment this was, and it shows the confidence that private enterprise has in the Province of Manitoba and how they were willing to invest millions of dollars in this province. Because you wouldn't know, I wouldn't know, the media wouldn't know, because it was all secret, by law it was secret, you couldn't ask these questions, as you can today. And therefore, Mr. Speaker--(Interjections)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. EVANS: Well who knows. They may have subsequently brought in Mr. Kasser to be the next chairman of the MDF or something, I don't know. But, Mr. Speaker, the point I'm trying to make is that the Conservative Party in Manitoba has to take the responsibility for signing the contract that was signed by Duff Roblin and his associates back in the 1960s. And the fact is that we did have - I agree, we did have a struggle for creation of jobs in Manitoba in 1960. But I would submit, Mr. Speaker, in the 1970s in contrast to the predictions of doom and gloom proposed by my friend from Lakeside as to what was going to happen to this province, and possible recession and so on, that Manitobans have never had it so good in the 1970s. We had more jobs, our population has increased, we're over a million people, well over a million people, there is developments occurring in Winnipeg, in other centres around this province that never occurred previously, and our standard of living is higher than it's ever been. And I think Manitobans are generally satisfied with the rate of economic progress we made.

But I submit, Mr. Speaker, never again will this province, at least under this administration, see this type of phoney private investment. This is the type of private investment we don't need, Mr. Speaker. Now we're going on, we have had further investments by the MDC, but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, we know who we're dealing with and we know where the money is going. It's not going into some unknown Swiss bank account, it's going into the pockets of the workers of those companies located wherever they may be located. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister entertain just one short question? He indicated his amazement that on March of 1970, the statement that he read into the record could have been made. My question, Mr. Speaker, is, did he not want us and particularly the rest of the people in Manitoba to believe the statements made so ebulliently by his First Minister and his government, that after having met with the principals of CFI in August I believe of '69, and having told us all that he had renegotiated . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. ENNS: . . . the deal, that it was now a good and proper thing that should be proceeded with, did he not want us to believe his Premier?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, based on the subsequent statements made by members opposite, I don't know whether they believe anything that we say. But the fact is that Mr. Grose had resigned and the Premier had indicated the reasons for his resignation, and these were stated in the paper, and having seen that, without any further questioning on the part of the members of the Opposition--what were they interested? They thought that the Minister of Industry and Commerce should resign, and they thought the great tragedy was that Mr. Grose had gone.--(Interjection)--You still think that? Well my God.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would first like to wish you well on your continuing role as Speaker of this House. I would also like to take the opportunity to congratulate the new members of the Treasury Bench. I would also like to say that I'm happy to see most of the members back in good health.

Mr. Speaker, in replying very briefly to the Minister of Industry and Commerce it's perhaps interesting to note that the Minister is supposed to be the captain of the Industry and Commerce Department in the province, and is telling us all about the exciting benefits of development that have taken place in the province under his leadership, and yet he spends all this time dredging up the report of the CFI Inquiry Commission.

A MEMBER: No. He tried to bury it.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, having said that I would like to continue. I would like to first of all say that I realize that the Speech from the Throne is a traditional document serving notice to the public of the Government's intent in the coming year, and I suppose traditionally it's the role of the Opposition to make critical comments about it. I should say that had the Minister made an announcement as Alberta had the other day of cutting taxes by 28 percent, I would have applauded him wholeheartedly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express some concerns that my constituents have expressed to me over the last little while. Referring specifically to the Throne Speech, first of all I would like to say that being a rural member and having smaller communities in my area I am happy to see that Manitoba Telephone System is going ahead and taking an aggressive role in going ahead and increasing the number of lines in rural areas. I've mentioned in the House before and I'm happy to see that people that may have possibly ten parties on one line are really inconvenienced, and if Manitoba Telephone System is going to go ahead and maybe cut that in half and leave three or four people on one line, that of course is a benefit to rural Manitoba.

I would also say that I appreciate the fact that Hydro is looking at the CANDU Reactor, the nuclear reactor. It's possibly a long way off but I think that Canada can be proud of the developments it's made within the field of nuclear energy.

I would also like to say that I'm pleased to see that we are making some attempts to develop an industry in the eastern part of our province, and I mention specifically the camping, cottaging and canoeing area out at Bird Lake. Falcon Lake being in my riding is very dependent upon the tourist industry and I think all of eastern Manitoba will benefit from any developments that happen in that particular area.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express some of the concerns of my area but personally let me say that I think by allowing a session to run from five to six months it enables us as representatives from different areas to go out and once again talk to the grass-roots of the people and get some of the feedback and some of the real concerns of the people. I think very often we sort of isolate ourselves - I know this. I've only been here one session but last session you form opinions and very often things that are important to this House, and seem to be important to this House, are not of real concern to the people of Manitoba. So I appreciate having that opportunity to get out and talk to the people.

One concern, Mr. Speaker, that has been expressed to me by many constituencies, and I should say they sort of breathed a sigh of relief, if you want to call it that, after the visit by Max Saltsman out here to see the Honourable Premier and he went away with a definite no, which meant that the Premier would be around for another couple of years I suppose. You see, the people of La Verendrye, Mr. Speaker, are concerned about what would happen if he should leave in the middle of a term. Perhaps someone like the Minister of Mines would take over and, let me tell you, if it was the Minister's intention of establishing an image in rural Manitoba of wielding a sledgehammer in one hand, knocking down the farmers and cutting him down with a sickle on the other, he surely accomplished that. As one farmer put it to me he says, "You know, that Minister must eat little guys like me for breakfast instead of the cereal crops I grow on my field."

Mr. Speaker, I'll take for instance the Attorney-General, and you can take him. One of my constituencies when it was announced that he was on a holiday to Cuba came and expressed the concern to me that he was possibly over there temporarily taking a leadership

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. BANMAN cont'd) training course. I wasn't too concerned about it but when the same person came back to me several weeks later and showed me a newspaper article reporting that he had been asked to stay a little longer, extend his stay in Cuba, and that the Cuban Government was going to pay for his stay there to discuss possible trade negotiations, my constituents expressed even more concern. He was scared that the Minister, he was scared that the Minister was teaching the Cubans a couple of tricks instead of them teaching him something.

Mr. Speaker, then of course there's the Minister of Agriculture, and I think most of the rural members know that he's blown it so bad out in rural Manitoba that there's no hope for him anymore. Whether it be the AI Program, the Dairy Industry, the Land-lease Program, the cow-calf problems, he's got his hands full, Mr. Speaker, and he doesn't seem to be able to handle it. I suggest possibly that maybe what he should do is instruct his MACC people to buy up as much farmland in his own constituency and lease it out to people of his political persuasion so that he would be assured of a re-election next time.

But, Mr. Speaker, of course we really don't have to worry about this now that the Premier is going to stay, and I'm sure that he will guide us through the floods, Autopac, Saunders, Flyer, Provincial Auditor's report, etc., etc., over the next little while.

Mr. Speaker, what has really shaken and troubled the people of Canada, and, I think, whether it be urban dwellers or rural dwellers, is the fact that the governments as a whole seem to, whether it be federal or provincial are having a very very hard time providing accurate and competent information regarding our economy. People are asking what direction we're taking and they get the feeling, and I think it's probably a proper feeling, that the governments are floundering and groping around just like they are. I think the next couple of years will be very crucial. Take for example the rising costs in health care and education. If we look at the increases that we will be faced with this year, if there is any indication that can be gathered from the requests that the hospital boards are handing in and the requests of the different school divisions, we're looking at increases of about 20 percent, which means that over the next four years we could be doubling our health and education budgets - which means that we'd be spending over a billion dollars on education and health care. Mr. Speaker, there are still only one million people in this province that will have to bear the burden of those taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I would direct just a few remarks here - I see the Minister of Health is in his place. I would ask him that he tread very lightly when he's talking about amalgamating regional hospital boards. I think the reference that bigness is better has proven to be somewhat of a fallacy. For example in my riding within a very small vicinity of Steinbach we have the Greenland Nursing Home, the Ste. Anne Hospital District, the Steinbach Hospital District, Rest Haven Nursing Home. These people, and especially the nursing homes, employ a lot of people who volunteer their help. There's local pride involved. They run the particular nursing homes with great pride. I think if we would go ahead and make one large regional board I think, number one, you'd lose the pride of the community and you'd lose a lot of the volunteer work that is presently being offered, with the end result of course of costing the taxpayer more money for it.

Mr. Speaker, the other day I listened to the Member from St. Johns, the former Minister of Finance, asking the Opposition for some constructive advice, and I would like to offer some at this time. I realize most of the things I mention are in the federal jurisdiction but I'm sure the province could petition the Federal Government to go ahead and change some of the present income tax laws.

First of all let me say that, to start off with a small item that has been brought to my attention, for instance a mechanic, an automobile mechanic or an aircraft mechanic, is not allowed to deduct the tools of his trade as an expense. Carpenters are allowed this privilege; there's other tradesmen that are allowed this privilege - mechanics not.

Mr. Speaker, another problem area of course today is housing, whether it be in urban areas or rural areas. And I think instead of the Federal Government setting up a big bureaucracy and going ahead and setting up a tax rebate system, or a house credit mortgage interest credit system, it would be very very easy to allow people to deduct a certain amount of mortgage interest from their income tax.--(Interjection)--At the end, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. BANMAN cont'd)

Another area of concern is the fact that in the farming community unless a farmer is incorporated he is not allowed to share his income with his wife. Surely in this day and age with civil rights legislation, the year of the woman, we should have a good look at allowing partners, marriage partners, to share in the profits of their work. We all know how important and what an asset a good farm wife or good housewife can be to the benefit of a family. And I think it's time that we had a real good look that any income derived by that family is shared equally between husband and wife.

Mr. Speaker, the constituency of La Verendrye has several small urban communities and of course has a large agricultural mixed farming population. The problems faced in the smaller urban communities are very much like that of the City of Winnipeg. They are faced with service lots' problems, they are faced with planning problems, and again let me say that I think the Government when discussing planning should possibly take a large overview, develop a master plan, if you want to call it, for certain communities, plan ahead, plan 20 years ahead, develop that plan and then as the town grows they could be okaying sub-divisions, sub-division plans, and these sub-division plans wouldn't be held up for a year or two or three years like we are presently experiencing. This is one of the factors that's causing a lot of problems in rural Manitoba. For instance in Steinbach we jumped from building 40 homes a year to 200. That's a growing-pain problem and it's very very hard for smaller communities to cope with a situation like that.

Another concern of course, Mr. Speaker, and several of my colleagues have already mentioned it and I won't go into it in great length, but the problem of the real property tax is really starting to hit rural Manitoba, whether it be on productive agricultural land, on the small homeowner, or even on the small businesses involved in that area. I think that the government should have a real hard look and re-examine the grant structures and allow a system to be set up which would alleviate some of the hardships now being faced by the real property tax.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn a moment to agriculture because agriculture is one of the mainstays in my area. I would like to talk, number one, about the stocker program - it's mentioned in the Speech from the Throne - and show what happens when a policy is implemented without the consultation of farmers or lending institutions. The stocker program states that you can get \$100 per calf up to \$5,000, an interest free loan. But what has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that the only farmers that can apply for this loan are people that don't owe money on their cattle. In other words, the government wants to have the mortgage or the chattel on the cattle. Now the problem with that is, if you're a farmer and you're in trouble, and you're in hock to over your ears, the banker isn't going to release those cattle for a \$100 loan. It's as simple as that. So what is happening is that you are not helping the guy that really needs it. That's what's happening. And if you think the cow-calf operators, and even the dairy people, are having an easy go of it, you've got another guess coming. The other day I was talking to a farmer and he had just sold two bull calves, six weeks old, and he got \$2.00 apiece for them. Six weeks old. People ask why . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, some of the comments coming across show the lack of concern for rural Manitoba that some of these members are displaying.

Mr. Speaker, when you travel east towards Hadashville, Pravda, the agricultural problem increases. We have some aggressive people out there who would like to expand their farming operation but they are severely hampered by lack of land. Now, I have a case here where the gentleman has been dealing with the government since 1969, has been trying to acquire land. Several months ago he finally got a letter back stating that he would be able to lease the property. Now that's fine and dandy, Mr. Speaker, except that he would like to clear that land, he would like to make improvements on that land, he would like to grow proper crops on that land, but he can't do it under the lease agreement because all the expenses incurred by him will be reaped by the government should they take the land back.

Mr. Speaker, it's a real problem and I know that the Attorney-General has had many representations by Local Government Districts to him on this matter. Local Government Districts are concerned about this because the expansion of their tax base is very very much hampered by the restrictions put on by the government.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. BANMAN cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, there's been something said about the government in search for a land policy and I won't dwell on that very long either. But, Mr. Speaker, the thing that bothers me is that Mr. Uskiw--I'm sorry, the Minister of Agriculture has said in the past that it's up to the public that have to take a major responsibility for any policy developed; and yet, when any farmer presented a brief that was not in agreement with what the government thought, they sat there and picked the poor guy apart. And, Mr. Speaker, that of course has been a very effective way of alienating a lot of the farming population.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to dwell very briefly also on Crocus Foods but I think that, having asked the questions today, I have some idea of government's intent and I think I'll be talking further about that during the agricultural estimates. It's of real concern to New Bothwell in my constituency, which is a cheese-processing plant, and I know it's of real concern to Grunthal in the Member from Emerson's riding.

Mr. Speaker, moving on, let me just touch on Autopac also, and, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to do much more than touch on it. You know, Mr. Speaker, I suggest it's a possible lack of concern by the members opposite about these rate increases and everything, because not too many of them have to worry about paying Autopac. You've got 17 cabinet ministers there. I know the gentleman that parks beside me, the Member for Thompson, also has a big government van standing there. He's not even a cabinet minister, he gets a truck. If he had to insure that vehicle on his own it would cost him in excess of \$300, but he doesn't have to worry about it now because he gets it given to him. The Manitoba taxpayer pays for it. It's a beautiful set-up. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that the members opposite, as far as Autopac, have solved their war on poverty there.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say that the people of La Verendrye feel very, very strongly that in order to preserve personal freedom we have to preserve economic freedom.

Mr. Speaker, this government is taking more money out of the hands of the individuals and doling it back the way it sees fit. This government is bent on controlling the capital of individuals and, Mr. Speaker, the citizens and the people of La Verendrye more than ever realize that this government has to go.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. ADAM (Ste. Rose): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I hope you'll accept my apologies for the sound and the tone of my voice. I'm a bit hoarse; I'm developing a chest cold. So I hope you'll bear with me and if I have to cough from time to time --(Interjection)--I will apologize in advance to the Member for Lakeside who is already getting into the act. Thank you very much. I am very happy that I have the Minister of Health just in front of me here. I may have to call on him for a pill or two before my speech is over. Mr. Speaker, it is customary when speaking at a new session on the Throne Speech, to congratulate you, sir, on again being Speaker of the House, and I hope that you won't find me causing you too much trouble. I sometimes like to speak from my seat as well as some of the members from the other side, but I will do my best to keep the decorum of the House as you would like to have it, sir.

I would like to congratulate also my colleague here from Logan on his being appointed to the Deputy Speaker. I like to see him there once in awhile because he really lays down the law, which I think he should. So I congratulate him on accepting the position as Deputy Speaker.

I would also like to congratulate the Member for Thompson and the mover of the Throne Speech, and the seconder, my colleague from St. Matthews. They both, in my opinion, did a fine job on delivering their speeches and I was impressed with the content. You know, the Member for Thompson really expressed sincerely what he felt the concerns were in the Thompson constituency.

I would perhaps extend my condolences to the Deputy Leader of the Conservative party on being demoted to--oh, he's still there on the front bench anyway. He's still down . . . So I would offer my condolences.

When we were at Dauphin I heard a new phrase, a new word, which may be adopted in Webster in future. That was the word "skinee." Somebody was referring to the Western people being exploited by the East or Central Canada, and I thought that was a--he had searched

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ADAM cont'd) . . . quite diligently for a long time to find a word and he came up with the word "skinee", to indicate the people of Western Canada who had been skinned by the East.

I heard another word in this Legislature. The Member from Gimli coined another word, "Spivakitis", that caused quite a controversy here. It was a new word, so my vocabulary is expanding. As time goes on, I'm finding out new words that are perhaps comical or . . . There is no doubt that the Conservative party is having their problems and we regret that. I believe, sir, sincerely, I believe that in order to have effective government you must have an effective Opposition, and I say that in all sincerity. I'm sorry to see what is happening in the ranks of the Conservative party and I hope that they shall overcome their problems, their internal problems, so that we can have a very effective Opposition. And I want to say that I have great admiration for the present Leader of the Conservative party. I understand, you know, as far as I'm concerned, he still has the monopoly of ability and brains on that side of the House. And as far as I'm concerned--and I'm not talking about the small Liberal group because--I exclude them in my remarks for the moment. So I hope, sir, that the Conservative party will mend their ranks, build--you know, mend their fences, and that they can present a good Opposition. I believe that in this way we will give better government to the people of the province of Manitoba, to have an effective Opposition.

I am sorry, though, that the Leader of the Opposition, when he delivered his address, spoke for I think an hour and a half or an hour and a quarter, I don't recall how long he spoke. But I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, that all I listened to was recrimination and criticism for the whole entire speech. I never heard a policy, I never heard a constructive alternative to those things that he did not like, what was happening in the province or what this government was doing. It was strictly criticism. And I don't believe that this is effective opposition. And I say that he still has the monopoly on the ability, so that does not say much for the rest of the members on that side. I know that perhaps the Leader of the Opposition didn't make his own speech, he was reading from a typed speech. It was quite a long speech and I guess it's necessary to--if he wanted to be concise on what he was saying, that he had to have it typewritten. But I would advise him to get another writer. Maybe he could get one from this side to do a better job.

I am amazed, Mr. Speaker, to hear people criticize--Well, the Leader criticized Autopac, and I'm amazed that there would be people criticizing Autopac and the service that public auto insurance is giving to the people of Manitoba, because this particular program is one of the programs that I think we should be applauding. I think it is well run. I notice that the Opposition is no longer talking about the rates because that's no longer in contention. The rates here in Manitoba have been proven conclusively to be much lower than in other areas, and it's no longer an issue. So that is why they no longer talk about rates. I don't intend to talk about the rates, although I'm going to make one small mention here because I just happen to have received a policy from a person who is now living in Ste. Rose and who just moved in from Ontario and who was living, according to the policy, was living in a rural area, RR2 in Grand Valley, Ontario, and he was driving a 1972 Volvo and his premium for 1974, which expired on the 26th of February, 1975, was \$303. He had \$300,000 coverage, liability for bodily injury or death. That was \$119 and payments for death or bodily injury \$11.00, and he had an all-peril \$25.00 deductible. He paid \$173, for a total of \$303. This did not include his licence fee which was extra, and his registration fees were extra. I have a copy here of the same vehicle in Manitoba, the same Volvo 1972, and I have here his old sticker, his registration here, and he pays for the same car, \$73.00 for all-purpose, \$6.00 for \$300,000 deductible, and \$33.00 for \$50.00. The licence fee, the registration fee is \$14.00 and the total for the package is \$126.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear, hear!

MR. ADAM: So, you know, we don't have to talk about rates any more. I could even table this if anybody wanted it, and I could get copies made. So I think we should be applauded. Mr. Speaker, we should be applauded for Autopac. And I want to warn those fellows on that side of the House, and particularly the Member for Minnedosa, that if he does anything, if they do anything to destroy Autopac in this province, the people will run them out of the province and tar and feather them as well. --(Interjection)--They'll run you right out of the province if you destroy Autopac, I can tell you that. In any event, sir, they have lost a battle on

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ADAM cont'd) Autopac. They tried to use that as an issue, they got the press with them on their side, and they lost a battle. They lost a battle.

I want to just say again, I want to repeat again that I would--you know, it would be advisable if the Leader of the Opposition would perhaps look around on our side to find a new writer for his speeches, because whoever wrote his speech was intellectually bankrupt.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye, you know, the member who was concerned about picket fences last year around public housing, he was worried about picket fences, you know. He said, why do we put picket fences or fences around public housing? How ridiculous! How ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. In ten years in office they never even drove a nail on public housing. Not a fence, not a house, nothing. He's complaining about fences. And then he criticizes the advance payments. I just heard him a few moments ago criticizing about the cash advance to the livestock producers. He says that that's no good; we shouldn't do it. Is he saying that we should do away with the cash advances on grain as well? Is that what he is saying, Mr. Speaker? Would the farmers support that stand, Mr. Speaker? I say they wouldn't.

A MEMBER: He wants to go to Cuba.

MR. ADAM: It might do him some good. Somebody said he wants to go to Cuba. It might do him some good if he spent a little while there. He might learn something.

A MEMBER: Get him to cut sugar cane.

MR. ADAM: Our small Liberal group. I want to say a few words about our small Liberal group. You know, they've really come down and had a lot of misfortune over the last few years, and I want to congratulate them for making much better speeches than we've heard from the Conservatives.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear! Hear!

MR. ADAM: I don't agree with all they're saying, but I at least appreciate that they are trying to make some constructive alternatives, you know. They are so few, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to take them under our wing. (Applause)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ADAM: I don't know whether they would dislike that too much, you know. I kind of feel sorry for them, but you know it's their own fault that there's only three members here, you know. It's their own fault. I want to give them some advice - they can take it or not. But I believe--you know, they have been searching for an answer. They meet in caucus, they meet in convention, and they look at one another and they run around like maybe--what do you call these - prairie chickens; when they're mating or something they've got this kind of a chicken dance. And they're wondering what happened. They're wondering what happened. --(Interjections)--Well please, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ADAM: They're wondering what happened to--"Well, how come we've been so unfortunate? Why can't we get elected? What's happening to us? 'you know. And I have my own opinions on why, and I say, you know, they haven't realized it but the Douglas Campbell administration was, in my opinion, the most Conservative government that this province has ever seen, and that they moved so far right that they even passed the Conservatives on their way right. And in all sincerity, I believe Mr. Roblin was a progressive Conservative.

A MEMBER: No, Liberal.

MR. ADAM: And I believe the people of Manitoba would like to see a middle-of-the-road government. Without knowing, the Liberals went right of the Conservatives and the two parties were replaced in their specific positions in the political spectrum. But the problem is--that is not the bad problem. The problem is that you hear the Liberal Party get up on the public forum and say, "We are the middle-of-the-road Party. Vote for us." You know, people are not stupid. They know where you are. They know that you have moved right of the Conservatives, and there is no middle-of-the-road Party in Manitoba. We're not even there; we're still right of centre, so how in hell can you be? (Laughter) So my advice to you is: Don't posture. Don't mislead the public. Stand up and be counted for what you are, and the people will appreciate that. There are still people who would like to support a right-wing government, and they're supporting the Conservatives when they should be supporting the Liberals, and that's misleading the public. And there are people who would like to vote Liberal,

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ADAM cont'd) they should be voting for the Conservatives, because they are closer to centre than the Liberals are - or have been, in the past.

Anyway, if the small group - and I really admire them - if they want to come over, well, there's no room on this side, but we'll stretch over and cover you if you would like us. So my advice to you, sir, is: Don't posture. Stand up and be counted for what you are. Don't try and mislead the public. Myself, I believe in this middle-of-the-road government, but regretfully we haven't reached there yet and I hope that some day our Party will move further left and become a middle-of-the-road Party. (Laughter) And I'm sure that the people of Manitoba would like to see a middle of the road. People of Manitoba, by the way, are very progressive. They are very progressive. They voted for Duff Roblin because he was a progressive, he had a progressive platform. They voted for him with one of the largest majorities in the Province of Manitoba, and in the last election I believe we also set a record, or a near record. We set a record in Manitoba for the highest plurality. And I want to thank the people of Ste. Rose constituency for having again given me their confidence, and I was elected with a plurality of approximately 45 percent. And any time you fellows with your GG boys, with your GG boys and your deals under the table with the Liberals, any time you want to come to Ste. Rose, I'll take you on. Make your deals in wheels, I'll take you on.

You know, we had a lively opening in the session. On the first day we had the students demonstrating for better accommodations, larger building universities, and so on, larger classrooms. You know, I'm sorry, I sympathize with the students, but I certainly--you know, to start expanding on university buildings and accommodations there, I would put that quite low on my priorities. I can find a lot of higher priorities than that. I spent a day there on the 1st of March - we had a housing seminar there - and while I was there I had an opportunity to see all the new buildings that have gone up in the last few years. There's literally millions of dollars going in there. And I want them to know that when they complain about their living accommodations, Mr. Speaker, I would ask some of them to go up into Northern Manitoba. And my colleague from Thompson can verify this, and the Member for Churchill and the Member for Flin Flon can verify that, as well as the new Minister from Rupertsland. I can tell you that some people there live in houses that you could throw a rabbit right through the wall and not hit a loft. And the wind is coming through the windows, and it might be a one-room house with one bed in one corner and a bed in another end, and a sheet or something hanging in-between for privacy. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30, the honourable member will have an opportunity to continue tomorrow.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I was just wondering if the honourable member had concluded his remarks, because if he has, then I would like to move the adjournment.

MR. ADAM: I will finish my remarks when we convene again, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Thursday)