

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, February 27, 1973

THRONE SPEECH

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I should like before getting into the serious parts of the debate here this evening to express my congratulation to the Member for Flin Flon who was chosen to move the address in reply to the Speech. I notice that he's not here this evening but I would like to congratulate him, not so much for what he said but for his having been selected to say it, and in the manner in which he said it, which I thought was direct and very much to the point in respect to those constituency problems which he explained to us.

There were two areas I think that I would take some exception to, that I might just dwell on for a moment. The Member for Flin Flon in describing certain of his constituency problems made reference and described his constituents as yoyo's. Mr. Speaker, I recall an instance when I was sitting in a classroom in eastern Canada and a professor in describing the source of certain political sounds that were then coming out of western Canada said that they came from the yahoo's on the banks of the Saskatchewan; and I remember my connection with the Saskatchewan wasn't really very close but I felt a little upset and disturbed that we should be described in western Canada in that fashion. So I think I'd have to object to the Honourable Member from Flin Flon because I have a lot of friends in northern Manitoba, and I know that we wouldn't want them to be thought of as the yoyo's from the constituency of Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Point of privilege?

MR. BARROW: Point of order. The member is distorting my speech entirely. If he will check the Hansard I think he'd think his attitude, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Not a point of privilege. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I think that the point which the honourable member makes is one of very subtle distinction. I have read his remarks in Hansard and I know - I think what he meant, and I am merely in a lighter vein attempting to suggest that probably it wasn't exactly as it came out.

Mr. Speaker, there was one other area in which the Member for Flin Flon suggested that because of some difficulty which he described in the transmission of power to power users in Flin Flon, that there was an urgent need for some changes to be made and that if the negotiations didn't take place rather quickly this spring they would simply, he meaning the government, and I presume he spoke for the government, would resort to expropriation. You know I thought that was hardly the language that the government side would use in a circumstance like that, but having been aware of the reports and the information that has come to this House today, I'm beginning to think that perhaps that was what the Member contended would happen, and that this spring is only a few weeks away, Mr. Speaker, and I would think that those people in Flin Flon who are involved in negotiations should take some warning from the remarks of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

May I say just a word, too, in congratulating the Honourable Member from Radisson who was chosen to second the motion. The honourable member made a fairly wide-ranging coverage of the economic problems in the province of Manitoba and I think most of his points were fairly well developed. He did mention that one of the areas in which we should perhaps do more positive things was in the processing of primary materials in our province. This would broaden the productive base and provide greater employment. I think this certainly has general agreement on both sides. I recall there was a resolution presented from this side that the government should consider the advisability of encouraging this kind of development.

But it did remind me, Mr. Speaker, that there was a rather curious way of dealing with the intent of one corporation who had an interest in developing an oil seed reduction plant in the western part of Manitoba, and Mr. Speaker, the way in which the government and the Department of Industry and Commerce proceeded to encourage this development was rather curious in my view. So while the Member for Radisson may believe that this is a proper way to approach the development of our economy it is very difficult to reconcile his views with those which were demonstrated by the department in dealing with this interest.

(MR. MCGILL cont'd)

Sir, the document and the Speech from the Throne contained a number of ideas with which we found support, which we found we could agree, and the leader of our party, the Honourable Member for River Heights has expressed our concurrence and our desire to support those measures that would extend medical and hospital benefits to senior citizens. There's no-one I think in this Assembly that doesn't support this kind of legislation to the extent that we are able to provide for it.

I had intended to deal with a number of other of the suggestion under the Speech from the Throne, but, Mr. Speaker, the events which have occurred today have somewhat reduced my desire to develop the somewhat minor points that are covered by the speech. It seems to me that there are one or two very key paragraphs, one in which it's indicated that there would be a guideline for the 70's, a document would be presented to this House that would indicate the general pattern for development in Manitoba, and I presume that basically this is what we have come to know in a general way as the Manitoba Manifesto. And at the same time there was a paragraph indicating that there would be a pattern and a program for the development of our northern resource industries, and we have today received this document by Professor Kierans which is, we are told by the Minister of Mines, already being seriously considered - in fact one or two of its recommendations have already been made effective. So it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the pattern and thrust of the government direction is pretty clearly laid out now for us.

We were aware in the Throne Speech there was no indication that any reduction of taxes would take place; that in spite of the fact that we have experienced a bouyant economy and revenues are exceeding those which were projected; in spite of the fact that this would have provided an excellent opportunity to stimulate the private sector by reducing taxes; in spite of the fact that it would have been in my view a time to, if there was a serious intent on the part of the government to encourage growth in the private sector, it would have been a time to stimulate that growth and to have produced more productive capacity, more sustaining, meaningful jobs, rather than to continue with the program of make work types of grants, to continue with programs which are in the form of direct government aid. Mr. Speaker, it may make more political sense to stimulate the economy on a piecemeal basis with this kind of a program but it certainly would not appear to be in a long-term economic sense the way to develop a broader base of production in Manitoba.

In western Manitoba and the Westman area we've had a bouyant economy - that seems to be the popular phrase. We've had a bouyant economy essentially because of the dramatic adjustment that has taken place in the basic farm commodity prices. We're having a great increase in agricultural machinery sales, all of those things that go with better purchasing power in the farm economy, and they're being felt directly in the Westman area.

We think that transportation improvement certainly will be important to regional development. It can greatly enhance the ability of an area to develop economically, industrially, to have good transportation facilities; and one paragraph in the Throne Speech certainly gives us some encouragement that the government will proceed as quickly as funds are available to continue with the program to provide additional traffic lanes on Trans Canada No. 1 West. I think the sooner this can be done the more stimulus will be given to growth in that area.

There's another exciting idea in transportation that could greatly enhance the ability of western Manitoba to grow, and that is the proposal by the original air carrier Transair to provide direct air service between Brandon and eastern Canada. Now, it's rather an odd fact, but nevertheless it's true that it's impossible to travel to any part of Manitoba by scheduled airline except by going by way of Winnipeg. Now, while this is perhaps desirable in the sense that it does benefit the Winnipeg economy, it certainly does not enhance the reputation or the ability of an area of the province to attract industry and business if it's not possible to get there from here; and without paraphrasing the old story about you can't get to the Post Office from here, many of the people in other parts of Canada say, you can't get to Brandon from here, you have to go to Winnipeg and start from there. So this really is an important step, and I think that it is one that has great opportunities for success because a great deal of air traffic, a great deal of community of interest in western Manitoba and in eastern Canada, and possibility eventually in western Canada as well, to the far west. I would hope that the Provincial Government would give all the support it can to the institution of such a service, and I think that the traffic that it will develop will in all probability justify its continuance.

(MR. MCGILL cont'd)

Of the other industrial development in Brandon, of course, our largest industry is that of health care. There's a six million-dollar budget involved in our active and extended treatment hospitals, and in view of the kind of directions in which the government is going in the public sector, I would suggest that if they have any intentions of takeovers in the health care field in the Brandon area that there is a fairly large local equity in the acute care hospital as well as in the new Assiniboine Centre, which will likely be ready for occupancy by the end of this year. Over a million dollars of that total budget of five million was provided by the City of Brandon and by the adjoining municipalities of Cornwallis and Elton and Whitehead. These levels of government, these local taxpayers have provided a substantial amount of the money involved in the building of these facilities.

Second only to the health care industry in the Brandon area is the Brandon University, and while it's true that there have been some budgetary problems in the past year, I think essentially they have happened because Brandon University is a new institution; it's young, and it's small, and it's in the growing stage, and while it is able to maintain its position and to pay its way on the grant formula of the University Grants Commission, while there is normal projected increase in enrolment, this institution along with others in Canada suffered a decline in enrolment last year, and this in a new institution, and in a small enrolment institution, is a particularly acute problem. So I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is some reason for providing some flexibility in grants from the province to the university inasmuch as it is an industry in a regional area which is receiving grants for other reasons in other departments, and it's a university that probably will when it achieves a certain minimum size be able to accommodate fluctuations of enrolment without a serious financial problem.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the question is asked, how much bigger should a university be before it can continue to stay within the grant's formula? - I presume that's it. I would think that an institution should be enabled to grow under some special assistance until it's in the neighborhood of 4,000, and this is the kind of figure that would indicate some basis of strength. Now, as long as the projections are accurate and the growth and enrolment, or the decline is predicted, and the staffing patterns and the program patterns are related, I think the university can live within its formula grants, - but I think it's necessary to have the flexibility that should apply to the new institution, its capital debt structure, and so forth is very much greater in proportion than is the case where an institution perhaps has existed for many many years.

However, Mr. Speaker, the university need not always be directly tied to the financing as it is received from the government in the form of university grants or from student enrolment fees. There is a peculiar situation in Brandon University that has some hopes for the future - and I refer of course to the fact that Brandon University owns 90 percent of McKenzie Seeds Limited. The university some years ago received 90 percent of the stock which was turned over to the Province of Manitoba in trust to be operated for the university; so McKenzie Seeds Limited is an industry that we have heard a number of reports of from the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I think it was two years ago in December 1970 that the Minister first reported that there had been a dramatic turnaround in the financial experience of the company and that after many years, or several years, of loss situations, they had achieved a profit, a modest one, of \$30,000.00. A year later in December, and incidentally, this was the kind of accountability in a public operation that we rather applauded; we were able to know a month after the close of business for McKenzie Seeds that the profit had been \$30,000.00. A year later in December of 1971 the Minister reported that the profit had increased fivefold. In fact, the company had made \$152,000.00 on its year's operations, and this we felt was an indication of even better things to come. However, Mr. Speaker, in December of 1972, in last December, we had hoped that there would be an announcement that would indicate that Brandon University might now be receiving some dividends on its 90 percent ownership, and I was somewhat dismayed when the Minister of Industry and Commerce did not make his usual December announcement about the profits but he did mention that there had been a resignation of the two top officials and that the President, Mr. Skinner, had resigned. . .

A MEMBER: Too Bad.

MR. MCGILL: . . . and then a few weeks later, Mr. Alex Cham, the Chairman of the Board, had also resigned. Now, Mr. Speaker, this may not be the kind of omen that I expect that it is but I think it's somewhat significant that there was no good news announcement by the Minister of Industry and Commerce and that there was at the same time an announcement of the

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) resignation of two of the principals.

A MEMBER: What about the dividends of Brandon College. . . ?

A MEMBER: That's the dividend right over there - some dividend, some dividend Len.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, while the announcements were made about the resignations, the Minister did say to the press that he thought that they had had a good year, and that they might even exceed the profits of the previous year. However in the same newspaper his deputy suggested that he thought maybe they were in the black this year but he wasn't sure, it had been a year of adjustment.

Mr. Speaker, we have dwelt at some length on the necessity in a government, particularly one which is expanding its sphere in the public sector, necessity of accountability to the people of Manitoba. We're wondering if in this case there isn't some kind of selective accountability by the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and why if there is a profit, or a loss, to report, why it was not reported in the same time sequence as in previous years.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. MCGILL: We think, too, Mr. Speaker, that there should be some direct accounting of the operations of Mackenzie Seed to the principal shareholder, Brandon University. To my knowledge the government has never made any direct accounting to the university as represented by its board of governors, and I think they should have certainly a great interest in a firm as large as this one, and one so important to Brandon, and one which we all hope will have financial success which will even exceed those reported in the years of 1970 and 71.

And on the subject of accountability, Mr. Speaker, we talked yesterday, and the Minister of Mines in answer to my question said that he had received the Annual Report of the Manitoba Development Corporation but he had not been the minister in charge so he couldn't tell me when the report had been received, and I accepted that because there had been a change of responsibility. But according to the Development Corporation Act, Mr. Speaker, that report was required to be presented for the year ending March 31st, 72, on or before June 30th, 72. Now if in fact the report was received within the time limit as specified by the statute, why then was it not tabled in the Legislature as is also required by the statute because the Legislature was in sitting and did continue to sit during the first half of July. So I think that that report should have been tabled. . .

A MEMBER: Last spring.

MR. MCGILL: . . . and to my knowledge it has not yet been tabled in this Legislature.

A MEMBER: Hard to believe.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the document to which I refer, the Annual Report of the Manitoba Development Corporation, would enable us to have some further information on the equity positions being achieved by the government in other areas.

One area which has always been of interest to me is that of the Saunders Aircraft Corporation at Gimli and, Mr. Speaker, at last report the total involvement of this government financially in that operation was in the neighbourhood of \$9.3 million and it was indicated to us at that time in June of 1972 that the equity position of the Manitoba Government was 87.5 percent of the ownership. Mr. Speaker, I think this is an area in which the taxpayers as major investors are entitled to and should know the changes that from time to time occur and are entitled to know the financial position of this company.

The First Minister in December indicated that we needed to be patient with Saunders Aircraft Corporation, that visible results would not probably be apparent for four or five years. Mr. Speaker, the problems which beset the Saunders Aircraft Corporation have been previously discussed in this Legislature and they have not materially changed over the past eighteen months. We have frequently asked the Minister responsible whether or not Saunders Aircraft Corporation had been able to obtain a U.S. certificate of airworthiness for the ST-27. The answers in most instances were that this application was in process and that this was expected. It was also indicated when the project first got under way that the major market for the ST-27 was in the United States and that a U. S. certificate of airworthiness was therefore a vital document in order to enter that major market. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that U. S. certificate of airworthiness has not been received and further would suggest that it's not going to be received in respect to the ST-27, and if the government and Saunders are going to penetrate that market they are going to have to proceed with the second model, the ST 27B I believe it's called, which is almost a completely new design of aircraft and will not be just a modification of the obsolete Heron airframe. Mr. Speaker, why was this not known previously? Why was it not admitted

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) . . . that this aircraft was not going to be acceptable to the U. S. Aeronautics Commission and was not going to be certified as airworthy. I think this is important information for the stockholders in the company, these are the stockholders of Manitoba who have 87.5 percent of the ownership of the company.

A MEMBER: . . . you don't care who you sell it to.

MR. MCGILL: The sales record of this company is not encouraging. . . .

A MEMBER: . . . What's the sales record of. . . .

MR. MCGILL: . . . and the Minister has indicated that they had sold two aircraft to South America and that a third one was likely to be sold, and I believe that it is now in the flight test stage. But, Mr. Speaker, when the First Minister indicates that we have to be patient with this industry and that the visible results will not be apparent for four or five years, I have to say that unfortunately in this case time is not on the side of Saunders Aircraft. The original conception, the original market in 1968 may well have been there but time has--- and technology in the industry has pretty well outdated and made the possibilities of sales of this type of aircraft pretty remote, and I think these things should be recognized, and I think it is not an easy thing for a member in opposition to take a particular position in an industry of this type because it is an industry in which I have a special interest, one in which I have had some experience, and I would like nothing better than to see an industry of this kind succeed in Manitoba. Where the mistakes were made was in the improper assessment of the potential of this business when it was attracted to Manitoba. Somebody didn't look at it properly; somebody didn't realize that an obsolete aircraft would take some years to hit the market, and that by the time it did it wouldn't be saleable.

A MEMBER: million bucks.

MR. PAULLEY: And you're prepared to knock it.

MR. SHERMAN: Somebody up there doesn't like you.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the members opposite said we're prepared to knock it.

MR. PAULLEY: You are.

MR. MCGILL: There's nothing more difficult to do than to stand up in a house and knock an industry that is employing 300 people but my greater responsibility is to the taxpayers of this Province of Manitoba.

MR. SHERMAN: You walked into that one Russ.

A MEMBER: He's worried about the taxpayers. Who else is there left?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I had some remarks in a previous occasion about the Manitoba Development Corporation and some of its activities and I suggested that it was becoming somewhat of an academic playpen. I see that we have a report from Professor Eric Kierans of McGill University which proposes certain programs for the north country. I'm wondering now, Mr. Speaker, if northern Manitoba is going to become a playpen for Mr. Kierans.

A MEMBER: Yes.

MR. BILTON: Gonick.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I wish to conclude with a very few remarks. The Minister of Mines in his comment this afternoon suggested that Mr. Kierans was a New Democrat in a hurry.

MR. GREEN: No. I said some would that.

MR. MCGILL: Oh! Well then I would say, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Minister of Mines that we should say his report might be described as a New Democratic Party program in a hurry.

MR. GREEN: Some would say that.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the clue perhaps to the direction in which we're going, and the clarity in perspective in which it's coming today, perhaps was provided by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood when he was in British Columbia a short time ago and he said he'd lost some of his faith in the objectives of the New Democratic Party because he didn't think that the ability-to-pay tax system was a fast enough way of providing for a transfer of wealth. . . .

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Shall I spank him now or later?

MR. SHERMAN: Just you wealth around, Harry, that's all.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, he's obviously convinced many people in the Cabinet of this Government of Manitoba that they should take as well the means of production and stop playing games with the private sector. I think, Mr. Speaker, we can forget the gentle,

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) patient courtship of the Manitoba voter by the First Minister. Whether he likes it or not the waffle group in his government has clearly taken the initiative and through such documents, Mr. Speaker, as the Manitoba Manifesto and the Kierans Report. . .

A MEMBER: President of the Montreal Trust.

MR. MCGILL: . . . they are saying to the resource industries in Manitoba as their first list of takeover priorities, they are saying to them, Mr. Speaker, enough of this love-making. The political rape of the economy of Manitoba is about to take place.

A MEMBER: Say it over and over again.

MR. SHERMAN: That's far enough, Ed, that's far enough.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to wind up with a bit of quotation here and you know I almost hesitate to read it, and that's how badly I've gone in this process, how badly I've been taken in, but I'm going to read it anyway because I think while some of the people opposite will understand it none of them will believe it, and here it is and it's from Justice Learned Hand who was an eminent jurist in the United States and I know the Minister of Mines knows of him and his reputation. He was a judge of the federal bench for 37 years and a total of 55 years or 52 years and 37 years on the United States Court of Appeal and he said about the subject of liberty: "Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women. When it dies there is no constitution, no law, no court can save it. No constitution, no law, no court can even do much to help it. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that is right. The spirit of liberty is a spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside their own without bias. The spirit of liberty remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded."

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I think it's wise for the people of Manitoba to consider what liberty means to them and how far we're going in the direction of a totalitarian state. You know, Mr. Speaker, I objected, I objected in the first instance to the Minister -- to the Member from Flin Flon referring to Manitobans as yoyos. Mr. Speaker, we're not yoyos yet but the string is getting shorter and it's getting tighter.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

. continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I first of all suggest to the honourable member who has just spoken, I am not a "yo-yo" either.

MR. MCGILL: Yet.

MR. PAULLEY: Or yet. Or do I expect to be at any time, but I do want to say to him that I listened with a great deal of interest to his diatribe and that the more I listened to the honourable member the more I am convinced that Brandon is not represented truly insofar as is his area of Brandon is concerned. But as one, Mr. Speaker, who has had the opportunity of being in this House longer than any other member, may I suggest that I regret that the leaders of the parties opposite have deviated from tradition in this House. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that neither the Leader of the Official Opposition or the Leader of the Liberal Party -- (Interjection) -- that's all right, has not adhered to general tradition and given due cognizance to the position that you uphold, Mr. Speaker, that because of their avaricious approach during this session that tradition has been cast aside and that neither the Member for River Heights or the Member for Wolseley have recognized, Sir, that you are the presiding officer of this Assembly. And I suppose that it's natural for the Leader of the Official Opposition and the Leader of the four party members of the Liberal Party in this House that they are so concerned with their possible future progress that they do not recognize tradition, they are neophytes and do not recognize tradition but are only concerned with their own advancement and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that neither of the Leader of the Opposition or the Leader of the Liberal Party will advance from the positions that they now hold in the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba.

But, Mr. Speaker, as one who has had the honour of being a representative in this Legislature for some 20 years I do want to pay a tribute, Sir, to you and to the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne. Yes, and even my honourable friend from Rupertsland could read my speech because it is in simple language. And my honourable friend -- my honourable friend who interjected could only read speeches in simple language and I give him credit for being able to read simple speeches and I've listened to my friend for a number of years and simplicity of course is one of the major facets of my honourable friend from Rupertsland. I didn't expect him to, Mr. Speaker, to agree with me on this particular occasion. It was he that decided that his speeches were simple, not me.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to pay tribute, however, on this the first occasion that I have had the opportunity of speaking in this session to one that I've had the honour and the opportunity of working with for a few years. I do want to pay tribute to my former colleague in Cabinet, the representative from the constituency of St. Johns. I do not think -- I do not think -- I do not think -- no, the honourable member has not retired and you will be as a result of the next election my honourable friend. I do, Mr. Speaker, want to pay tribute to one -- and this may be alien to the Member from Sturgeon Creek, that anyone pays tribute to a member of this Assembly -- he is one -- I'm speaking of the Member for Sturgeon Creek -- who berates anyone and anybody who makes a contribution to the well being of Manitoba but -- and even the Member for Swan River is that same type of an individual who is not prepared to recognize talent in Manitoba. But I do want to pay a tribute, Mr. Speaker, to the contribution that the Honourable Member for St. Johns made while he was the Minister of Finance -- and if the rabble would just desist for a time -- (Interjection) -- yes, and even the Member for Arthur did make a contribution as limited as his capabilities were as Minister of Agriculture during the previous administration, and he readily admits it -- I do want to pay a tribute, and I think this House should to the Honourable Member for St. Johns who conducted himself so admirably as Minister of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, -- (Interjection) -- yes, I know the Honourable Member for Minnedosa who has just come into this House is not really oriented to the contributions that have been made by individual members in this House and I suggest that he will not be here long enough really to be knowledgeable of the contribution of members from constituencies. We have been challenged -- we have been challenged to call and an election will be held -- and I suggest to my bank manager friend from Minnedosa that he might enjoy the opportunity of being a member of this Assembly, all so briefly as he will be. But I do suggest to my friends that they should recognize talent, and there's a lack of it within the Conservative ranks. They should recognize the talent of my colleague on this side -- (Interjection) -- Oh you have no talent at all and you recognize it, you recognize it my friend from Swan River and I am damn

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd): sure that your constituents recognize it too and as a result of the last election in Swan River is an indication that if you want to gracefully withdraw from politics in Manitoba, you should do so because anybody who was only elected with as few -- a handful of votes as you were, I think you had better get the hell out of politics in Manitoba. But, Mr. -- (Interjection) -- But, Mr. Speaker, I am not here to argue with the Honourable Member for Swan River but to point out . . .

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Thompson state his point.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, this Assembly is not used to the kind of language we are hearing and we wonder if the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BOROWSKI: . . . that the member should desist from using those inflammatory words.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a point of order. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, and as far as inflammatory words are concerned, I think that the Honourable Member for Thompson is one of the characters in this Assembly who has used them more than anybody else, not only inside but outside of this House as well. My purpose in rising tonight, Mr. Speaker, is to draw attention to this House to the points raised by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and I'm sorry that he is not here tonight, which is quite typical of the Member for River Heights -- because, Mr. Speaker, he is so wont to raise his objections to the conduct of Manitoba and its direction under this government and to withdraw after having made his remarks to the hinterlines so that he is not subject to criticism in his opinion.

A MEMBER: Bunk.

MR. PAULLEY: Bunk? Of course his criticisms are bunk and I agree with that, Mr. Speaker, and there is no one who is more competent to say that his Leader constantly issues utterances of bunk than the Member from Sturgeon Creek because his news reports indicate to us one of the severest critics of the Leader of the Official Opposition, the Member for River Heights, is in fact the Member for Sturgeon Creek. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Sturgeon Creek if he could have the opportunity within the Conservative Party of challenging the leadership of the Member for River Heights, would so do. But he, the Member for Sturgeon Creek, is nothing more or less than a fellow traveller in the Conservative Party and he hasn't -- he hasn't got the intestinal fortitude to challenge the leadership of the Member for River Heights. I can understand this, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure -- I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Sturgeon Creek would agree with me privately if he would not publicly.

A MEMBER: Bunk.

MR. PAULLEY: Bunk? That's right. Bunk is right and, Mr. Speaker, I have never in all of the history of my involvement in politics seen a political party that has been so painted with bunk than the Conservative Party of Manitoba today.

A MEMBER: Poppycock.

MR. PAULLEY: Poppycock? Yes. And if one analyzes, if analysis be the proper word to use, the contribution of the Leader of the Opposition, one is more inclined to think that the Conservative Party is bereft of any intelligent approach to the problems of Manitoba. I have had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of being in this House during a period of about ten years of the ineffective Liberal Government followed by a more ineffective Conservative Government for ten years, and I now see -- I now see -- (Interjection) -- oh young lady, you just keep quiet for a moment and I'll talk about you and your ineffectiveness. Yes.

And here is the Member for Lakeside going out of the House because he cannot take criticism, and there is no one in this House that should receive criticism more than the Member for Lakeside in his ineffective approaches to the situation that prevails in respect of Southern Indian Lake throughout his years as the Minister, his approach created more problems for the people of Southern Indian Lake than any other individual and his leader now is trying to make excuses for my now departing friend, the former Minister of Agriculture.

But what do we find, Mr. Speaker, of the Leader of the Opposition and of course I indicated a little while ago he is not present today or this evening to hear criticism of his utterances on the Speech from the Throne and, Mr. Speaker, isn't this typical of the Member

(MR. PAULLEY: Cont'd) from River Heights, that he gives gusto and utterances to his condemnation and he does not stay to listen to any criticism of himself. If he were here I would say how egotistical an individual he is, but he's not here so I won't say it. But my honourable friend and his government, or his previous government, has the audacity to stand up in this House in this criticism of this government, Mr. Speaker, to say we will support the steps outlined in the Throne Speech to lighten the crippling burden of special health care required by our senior citizens. He and the Member for Fort Rouge and the Conservative Party for ten years, Mr. Speaker, had an opportunity . . .

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Not me.

MR. PAULLEY: Not you, but you're coming in on the tail end of the wagon. For ten years, Mr. Speaker, the Member for River Heights, aided and abetted I presume by the Member for Fort Rouge, had the opportunity when Duff Roblin and Walter Weir and others had the opportunity of doing something for the senior citizens of Manitoba, gave lip service, but the senior citizens of Manitoba went without. And now -- and now the Leader of the Opposition, and I presume Mr. Speaker, that one of these days the honourable lady, the Member for Fort Rouge will stand up with much gusto and say "We thank you for doing what we did not do ourselves".

A MEMBER: Never, never, never.

MR. PAULLEY: And this is the type of tripe that the citizens of Manitoba are receiving from the Member for Fort Rouge and the Member for River Heights. Of course it's a shame. What nonsense! How in the heaven's name can either one of them, from Fort Rouge or from River Heights face themselves when they look at each other in the mirrors in the morning. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I have listened to them -- I have listened to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge on a number of occasions, stand up in this House . . .

MR. JEAN ALLARD: They have adjoining rooms.

MR. PAULLEY: I don't give a continental whether they have adjoining rooms or rooms together, it bothers me not; but as far as their psychology is concerned, it's identical. They're prepared to get up and criticize because something is not done and then stand up and say, "Well, it's too late". What utter nonsense. I've stood idly by and listened to the diatribes of the Member for Fort Rouge, the Member for River Heights, for a number of years, and I question, Mr. Speaker, the sincerity of either one of them, because they had the opportunity, the Conservative Party had the opportunity and they did it not. And now at this late date the Leader of the Conservative Party says, "Especially Mr. Speaker, we will support the steps outlined in the Throne Speech to lighten the burden of special care, health care required by our senior citizens."

For ten long years, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party and the Member for River Heights, the Member for Fort Rouge and their respective party had the opportunity of so doing and they didn't do a damn thing about it. And now, and now in 1973, they stand up here, they stand up here and say, "We will support you". What nonsense! What hypocrisy of the Conservative Party of Manitoba, and the Leader of the Conservative Party now saying that we will go out and ask the people of Manitoba to support us -- in opposition, Mr. Speaker, in opposition to the New Democratic Party. And what is meant by opposition? Does the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, or does the Honourable Member for River Heights, who is not here, mean in opposition to this government, that we will go out to try and reverse what you have done. No, of course not. Where is what's historically been considered parliamentary honesty? This, Mr. Speaker, will be the approach of the Conservative Party in the next election.

I'm prepared to challenge Fort Rouge or River Heights on the basis of the utterances and utter nonsense of the Leader of the Conservative Party. They say through their leader who is absent, that we, the government will have our support in this. Dufferin Roblin was elected at the head of the Conservative government in 1959. Mr. Speaker, at that particular time, I had the honour and the responsibility of heading a New Democratic Party group in this House.

MR. BUD SHERMAN: In the wilderness.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, in the wilderness -- that's right. We're not in the wilderness now though, Mr. Speaker . . . the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is saying that I have had the honour of leading a party in the wilderness. He is true, but we came out of the wilderness. And the only reason, Mr. Speaker, we came out of the wilderness is because

(MR. PAULLEY: Cont'd) . . . of the ineptitude of the Conservative government at that time, and the people of Manitoba are being well served now. And that Johnny-come-lately, that Johnny-come-lately from Fort Garry, from Fort Rouge and from River Heights are now saying, "We are prepared to follow you". But, Mr. Speaker, at that particular time they rejected all of our propositions, to the shame . . .

MR. JAMES H. BILTON: Let that be a lesson.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, and you'll learn your lesson, Swan River, at the next election. And one thing holds, one thing that the Conservative Party did do -- and I give them some credit for it -- they made provisions for a pension fund so that the Honourable Member for Swan River will be the benefactor of that as a result of the next election. And he -- he will be able to --

MR. BILTON: What about you, what about you? You'll get one too.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, but I will continue as a representative of Manitoba, my friend, and you will not. And then -- and then as I listen, or as I read, as I read -- (Interjection) -- as I read, Mr. Speaker, in the contribution, if one may call it a contribution of the Member for River Heights -- I know of course he's not here -- he's one of those characters who fires his gun and he goes away fearing ricochet of the bullets. That is the type of leader of the Conservative Party, there's no question or doubt about that. He hasn't got the intestinal fortitude of being here and listening to criticisms of his party. And then my honourable friend, the Member for River Heights, continuously in his remarks say, "We will support advance legislation in the field of health. We will support the removal of health insurance premiums for the aged. Bring forward the legislation, we will support it". Where now stands the Member for Fort Rouge; where now stands the Member for River Heights; where now stands the rest of the members of the Conservative Party who opposed this time after time when it was advanced by the New Democratic members of the Legislature? They rejected it in government and now, Mr. Speaker, they put on a facade and I suggest that it is only a facade of support for this type of legislation that we are bringing in.

Many years did we in opposition suggest to government, a Conservative government, with a capital "C", for many years, Mr. Speaker, we suggested that the burden of nursing and institutional care costs should no longer be borne by individuals. It was rejected, Mr. Speaker, by Roblin, by Weir and the members of the Conservative government, including Harry Enns. The Member for Swan River -- yes, you opposed it -- and what now Mr. Speaker is the utterances of the Leader of the Conservative Party faced with a forthcoming election in the Province of Manitoba -- "We will support it". In the meantime, over the years, many people in Manitoba have been medically made poor because of the ineffectiveness of the Conservative Party -- (Interjection) -- they were not concerned, that is right, they were not concerned, Mr. Speaker, and now faced with the possibility of an election, what do these hypocrites say? "We will support it". We brought in . . .

MR. BILTON: Who brought in Medicare? We did.

MR. PAULLEY: You did like heaven's name, and Mr. Speaker, I could be far more clear, except that I am not inclined to use unparliamentary language in my assessment of the Conservative Party of Manitoba. You didn't have the guts, you didn't have the fortitude, and you were only protecting the vested interests of the Province of Manitoba. You did not, Mr. Swan River or Mrs. Fort Rouge, you didn't give a continental or a damn for the ordinary people of Manitoba. But now, what a change, what a change on the brink of a provincial election and the announcement in the Throne Speech of the alleviation of the requirement of the payment of premiums for Medicare.

MR. ENNS: You didn't have to worry about . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, and Mr. Speaker, my Honourable friend from Lakeside says that we didn't have the economy built up so that we could pay for it. Under their ruddy government we didn't have the economy but under our government we've said it and we're going to damn well do it. And he -- he -- of all creatures . . .

A MEMBER: You've got a point there, Harry.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . of all creatures, should not say that. No, we built up -- my friend from Lakeside is so correct, Mr. Speaker -- under the Conservative regime of Roblin and Weir and also -- I forget his name, who is the Leader now? -- I believe it's Spivak, under their leadership day we didn't have the economy in order to . . .

MR. ENNS: Point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside state his point of privilege.

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is -- and I hate to interrupt the Honourable former House Leader. There is a rule of some sort we restrain ourselves to when we refer to each other here in a proper manner, such as the Member of this. In his speech in the last little while he has strayed considerably from that practice, Mr. Speaker. I would ask him as a privilege to this House to constrain himself in this direction.

MR. PAULLEY: I have been around here long enough to realize that the point that he raised is valid.

MR. GIRARD: Too long, Russ.

MR. PAULLEY: Too long? I'll be here a hell of a lot longer than you will be.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the point raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside. I should not have referred to a member who is now seated in this House by name; but I would say, I would say, Mr. Speaker, I am correct in saying that under the leadership of the Conservative Party by the name of Roblin -- he's not here; by the name of Weir -- he is not here; by the name of the Honourable Member for River Heights, who also is not here, the Conservative Party didn't give a damn about the people of Manitoba in respect of health care. And I think, Mr. Speaker, in saying that I am not violating any of the rules of the House.

MR. JOE BOROWSKI (Thompson): Yes you are, you're violating the first one.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh yes, my friend from Thompson says it is repetitious, and I want, Mr. Speaker, to say to my friend, the Honourable Member for Thompson, that I'm going to be very repetitious in any forthcoming election, and I will do my utmost to tell the people of Manitoba how phony the Conservative Party in Manitoba is; and I am sure, I am sure that the vast majority of the people in Manitoba will agree with me that that never has there been a more phony party politically than the Conservative Party of Manitoba.

MR. SCHREYER: Here, Here.

MR. PAULLEY: And never in the history of Manitoba has there been a more phony leader and a more phony following than we've got at the present time in this House. Mr. Speaker, I ask you whether this is unparliamentary or not and in asking you, Mr. Speaker, will you temper your judgment as to whether it is phony or as to whether it is accurate. And I would suggest, I would suggest that if you assess this that you would have to agree with me that of all the phonies that have been foistered on the Province of Manitoba and this Assembly they are the phoniest of the phoniest we've ever had.

So we go on, so we go on to some of the utterances contained in the reply to the Speech from the Throne by the Honourable Member from River Heights. He talks, he talks of industrial development. Mr. Speaker, was there anything more phony than the meeting called by the Leader of the Conservative Party in this House than the meeting that was held at the Metropolitan Theatre a few years ago when he enticed, when he was the Minister of Industry and Commerce, people from all corners of Manitoba to come to listen to a number of speeches on the development and targets for the 70's at a considerable cost to the taxpayer of Manitoba.

A MEMBER: A submarine to Churchill.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right, he surely did. He brought people in from all quarters of Manitoba as the Minister of Industry and Commerce at taxpayer expense, he has the consummate gall and so have some of his colleagues to criticize this government because the Minister of Labour for instance, Mr. Speaker, went to Malawi to take part in a Commonwealth Conference to learn how other parts of the Commonwealth live and yet, Mr. Speaker, by comparative costs the former Minister of Industry and Commerce in the Conservative regime, the Conservative Party at that particular time and the cost input amounted to about five per cent of the cost that it took to send me to Malawi to find out about the suffering of the people in the Commonwealth of Nations. Does the Conservative Party in Manitoba have no concern at all for the people of Malawi, Malaysia or other jurisdictions?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, the ...

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I only want to say this they were suffering while I was in Malawi as a result of the general approach of Conservative government in Great Britain and in Manitoba and in Canada to their fellow humans, and that is what we are trying to

(MR. PAULLEY: Cont'd) . . . overcome. I say, Mr. Speaker, a pox on the whole damn works of them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate you, Sir, on being the Speaker of the House for another session and wish you well in your venture. I would like to congratulate the Member from St. Johns for being with us and we hope that he will be with us for many more years. In fact I would like to congratulate most members on their return, and I would like to offer my deepest sympathy to the Minister of Labour.

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I haven't had sufficient time to prepare a speech such as the Minister of Labour has demonstrated to us he has but of course he has a staff to help him which I have not and that might account for some part of the difference. I like to learn from my senior members in the House and when I see what might happen to one who has stayed here for 20 years, Mr. Speaker, I can but wonder if I'm on the right course. I will be able to say however in, as predicted by the Minister, maybe very few months, although my duration in the House was not long I saw a great Manitoban during his dying days of political career. I enjoy his contributions and I look at him as a close friend. I can just visualize him seeing each other in the mirror every morning. And he is safe because he never shoots any bullets, he is afraid of ricochet so he uses powder puffs. To take him very seriously might be a mistake, but I can say that I feel he has saved me some money, some money quite recently. I was contemplating a visit to Disneyland and now I feel it's all unnecessary. But however, Mr. Speaker, if only we could find a way to harness that kind of resource, if only we could learn to harness the kind of information that he spewed out tonight, if only we could convert that to energy, Mr. Speaker, I feel we could probably replace the Nelson River. I wonder, I wonder, I wonder if that is one of the reasons why the Premier has brought him on his righthand side.

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the Minister that we from our side certainly did not criticize his trip to Malawi. At least for a long time we didn't because for at least half that trip we had considered it an investment. We have had second thoughts, Mr. Speaker, but nevertheless we are glad to see the Minister back and we hope that he will be back with us for some time yet.

A MEMBER: He will be. Longer than you.

MR. GIRARD: I'd like to bring attention of the House however to maybe a more serious matter, one that has bothered me for some time and one that we are starting to hear about, but really we don't seem to be able to grapple with the real problem or bring about a real solution or maybe not just soon enough. I take advantage of the fact that I happen to represent a rural constituency while I'm an urban dweller, and I notice in the Throne Speech one phrase that was rather catchy and one phrase that should be made more than a phrase, it should be converted into action and that was that comment on the "stay" option. This principle, Mr. Speaker, needs much more than verbalization but it will require a great deal of effort in order to become effective and real. I am a little confused as to exactly what it means and probably it is normal because I have had some communication with some of your Ministers about this very fact and I could relate one very specifically, Mr. Chairman, for the edification of my Minister of Labour.

I met with the Minister of Industry and Commerce on one occasion and it was no surprise dealing with the reconstruction of a mill in Sprague which some of us have heard about, and during that discussion the Minister went on about how well we were functioning in Morden and how well we were functioning in Gimli and that we had discovered this new "stay" option thing and that was going to allow people to live in their community and I was secretly applauding the Minister because I thought that he had really come upon something worthwhile. -- (Interjection) -- Well because I didn't have the opportunity at that time, and there was only a few of us.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I was happy not to have done it publicly because his second comment was a little different. You see in our presence we had one man who lived in Sprague who had bought a house in Sprague, who had bought a truck to haul pulp in Sprague and he found himself without employment. House payments, truck payments, this young man was in serious trouble. And I asked the Minister, what can we do for people like this, and he is not the only one. And after having enunciated the same principle, after enunciating clearly what the statement for stay option was he looked at him and he said, "Would you like a job

(MR. GIRARD: Cont'd) in The Pas?"

Now I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my confusion over what the "stay" option means will be clarified at some time. I hope that the Minister of Industry and Commerce didn't mean that as being a stay principle where we only bring people to one spot. I hope that it will be made meaningful to all people of the province including those people of Sprague and I think, Mr. Speaker, that it's something that we ought to give some serious thought to. When we consider the Province of Manitoba as a whole we are told that approximately one-quarter of our farmers are going to be disappearing in the next ten years. Some 10,000 farmers will be leaving the rural community in the next ten years, that is the prediction. And that is only one occupation, I suppose that we could enlarge that to include several other people as well. Why are they leaving? Well they're leaving no doubt for a number of reasons. They're leaving because of a high cost of starting up an operation in the rural area. The farming industry in the communities that I am most familiar with require a great deal of capital outlay in order to start an operation. That is one reason why people, the young people of the community are unable to remain in their community. That is one reason why the "stay" option might have a challenge when put in practice.

It's strange to say, Mr. Speaker, but I think that one reason why people are leaving is that they find that the tax, especially that on property, is one that is not equalized across Manitoba. Some people are facing very serious tax burdens and I suggest very unfairly, by having their assessments increased and sometimes doubled -- all the while their productivity has gone down. And I can remember making this kind of remark in the House last year when the Premier stood up and brought the assessments of his home quarters or his parents' home quarters and said "Well look, the taxes really haven't gone up that much." I think it was an effort on his part but a very weak one because if he had done a little more research he would have found that in some areas of the province at least there has been exceptionally high increases in assessment and in other areas, exceptionally high increases of mill rates requiring an unfair burden of property tax to be paid by some rural portions of Manitoba. Strange you say from an area that is not crippled or not harmed a great deal by the income tax because of their net revenue being low. I suggest that by levying the highest income tax in Manitoba we are sometimes hurting the very ones we should be wanting to help. I would refer you to the people who work in the northern portion of Manitoba who because of their isolation are recompensed to an extent at least by higher salaries are caught paying more income tax than they should be by the very nature of our income tax structure in Manitoba.

MR. SCHREYER: I thought you were worried about property tax.

MR. GIRARD: Well I'm worried about both property tax and income tax. What I'm trying to point out to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, is that in some areas, in some areas because of the structure of our tax system we tend to levy on the basis of our urban population center a majority of our people and we sometimes forget that rural communities outside, far removed possibly could be hurt by a system of taxation which we consider here justifiable and yet we forget to think of the small groups on the outside that sometimes could be hurt rather badly. --(Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to quarrel on the length of duration of the Premier's stay in Manitoba, I'm trying to emphasize that in some cases we are working hardships that we should be aware of but we are not taking proper precaution. A serious reason for which people are leaving and an obvious one, they're leaving the rural community because of a lack of employment.

MR. SCHREYER: More left per year when you were in office than now.

MR. GIRARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, well, Mr. Speaker, that might well be so but my objective tonight is not -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GIRARD: Now my objective, Mr. Speaker, is not to say who is guilty or who is not guilty, when who left where, but it's to tell or try to convince the government and more specifically the Premier that there is a problem and I hope that maybe he will condescend to have a look at it and maybe evaluate some of the suggestions that are given him rather than having information flow only one way. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how much information the government has with regards to problems of communication in the Province of Manitoba and in this particular case we can talk of roads in the south, roads in the north, we can talk about the problems of the freight rates and we have heard over the last few months people speak, and more specifically the Member from Wolseley mentioned how the western

(MR. GIRARD: Cont'd) . . . provinces were not really "in" with the eastern provinces of Canada. Somehow the big eastern interests are controlling us. And I suggest that maybe if we look a little closer to home we will find that that attitude prevails right in Manitoba. If we travel through the north or the south you might find people saying we wish we had a little more to say in the control of our own affairs rather than to be dictated by the top echelons, the ivory towers of Winnipeg. Did we look at the CNR freight rates in the north? Are we aware that it could be possible that there are unreasonable rates being charged in that area? Are we -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier keeps asking me what I have done about it and I'm not -- I'm not asking him to sympathize with me but really I haven't had a chance to do much about it, I've been here for four years or three years.

A MEMBER: Gee it must be nice to live in the past.

MR. GIRARD: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if there is thought being given to a suggestion that might be considered facetious but I think with some thought become one that might be sensible; that thought of reducing telephone toll rates, maybe not eliminating them but rather reducing them or equalizing them across the province. That is one of the reasons why people leave isolated areas. -- (Interjection) -- I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to you, Mr. Premier, that in the area of school taxation you have had less fortitude than the previous government had. The previous government in 1966 and 67 did provide Manitoba youth with the most equal opportunity of education they have had this far. I suggest to you that there is greater inequality in the tax structure supporting our education today than there was in 1966 or 67. -- (Interjection) -- I don't care just how much the province is providing, I'm saying that the inequality that exists today is far greater than that inequality that existed in 1966 and 67. And I'm suggesting to you further that if you had the courage of your convictions in terms of equalizing education, you might even look at the possibility of using the Greater Winnipeg equalization levy across the whole province, if you're convinced in the equal opportunity of students across the province. But you haven't thought of that. You haven't thought of that because that is more than you're willing to pay. You're not prepared to gamble to that extent, no. What we'd rather do, Mr. Speaker, in this government, is to pick isolated little communities and treat them with a bandaid and we'll give you an extra grant for one year, but we don't know what's going to happen next year. And we call that an educational policy. We call that rectifying the finance problems in education. We're even saying now that we're going to lower, we're going to lower, and the Minister of Education who knows full well to what extent the general mill rate is going to be lowered but he's not quite prepared to announce it yet, and we're going to increase in some school divisions that grant, that per pupil grant, up to even \$50.00. Now just think of that. Just think of that. And if we increase it up to \$50.00 that means we're increasing it by \$22.00 and the per pupil increase per year is \$50.00, therefore this year we're doing a great thing by increasing the grants of \$22.00. -- (Interjection) -- No, Mr. Speaker, we didn't have per pupil grants at all but we had grants under the Foundation Program that were updated enough that per pupil grants were not necessary at that time and you should know that full well.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GIRARD: I wonder if it's possible that some people of the north are concerned about their hydro rates. I wonder if the Minister of Labour, that great man, I wonder if he has thought that his labour laws, including the minimum wage, which in some quarters are perfectly justifiable, and maybe justifiable at large but nevertheless might well be a cause for fewer jobs in areas that can't afford that kind of -- that kind of salary. I wonder, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier has thought that maybe that small amusement tax is working a problem on some little theatre out in the country which in the city really wouldn't apply because where we pay \$1.50, \$2.00 per movie here, you have to charge only 75 cents where people can afford it. I suggest that in many cases the communication between the government and the rural community has been a little bit one way. And I think it's rather understandable because many of these people, excluding the Premier of course, have had little experience in living in a rural community. I wonder . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GIRARD: I wonder why it is that the people of the outskirts feel that we are asked what we want but we're never given a chance to partake in the decision-making. Somehow there is a breakdown in those communications. It might be the same breakdown that we find

(MR. GIRARD: Cont'd) . . . in that caucus across where they have to ask each other questions during the question period. I don't mind if they're serious questions that need information but I detest that kind of question is designed simply to pat somebody on the shoulder; those that are well rehearsed I object to, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the government has given any thought to the fact that some people in the outskirts feel the Liquor Control Commission in their laws are a little bit autocratic. Winnipeg is not seeking to increase its population. I think that they themselves realize -- the people of Winnipeg realize that it is not to our advantage to increase our population, and certainly not at the cost of depopulating the rural communities. A net increase here and a decrease in the rural area can only cost more money to Manitoba. I think that the government in its advocacy of the "stay" option, although it's a very good idea, will have to show some teeth in order to put it into practice.

I think one thing that will have to be done or should definitely be done, is that of decentralization of government. And we've mentioned that -- and I know that you can accuse past governments of saying it and not doing it, but some time, Mr. Speaker, it's going to have to be done. And I find it kind of odd as I travel through my constituency, which in some parts lie 100 miles from Winnipeg, to find that my social worker, and he's a very fine fellow, drives out to -- (Interjection) -- Yes, it's not a psychiatrist, Sir, it's a social worker -- drives out to 100 miles or more three times a week, and I suppose he starts his work at 8:00 in the morning and he works till 4:30 or 5:00, and he spends four hours on the road and he serves my community for the rest of the time. Why can not that kind of person, why can we not find a service that will be located in that community? Are we serious about the "stay" principle? Why is it that in the area of mines and resources that our people who look after the -- I'm looking for a word -- looking after the water control, looking after drainage, why is it that everything has to be centralized in one locality? Why is it that the municipal assessors have to be in Winnipeg, but they have to do their work out there, and on and on. Why is it that we have to have this government so centralized? I suggest that if we believe in the "stay" principle you might well have to ignore the suggestions of the civil servant who says, "Well no, it's not going to work you know," because maybe in fact they'd rather not move out there and you have to maybe go right ahead and do it. I think, Mr. Speaker, we would be -- we would be . . .

A MEMBER: What part do you live in?

A MEMBER: Windsor Park.

MR. GIRARD: Yes. Yes, Mr. Speaker, very much like the Minister of Industry and Commerce I regret that I don't live in my constituency, but I'll tell you that it is by necessity rather than by choice. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it's been said before that somehow we must encourage industry to locate itself in the rural community but it is fair also to say that from my observation it seems that industrial developers of any magnitude seem to have lost confidence in the rural community and hesitate to invest outside of a populated area. I wonder if it would not be true to say the government seems to have lost the same kind of enthusiasm, or same kind of confidence. -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll be prepared to admit, I'll be prepared to admit -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I will suggest to you that I am prepared to admit that these things might well have to be done at some higher risk and some higher cost, but let us take for example the famous sawmill or particle board plant in Sprague. Now that it belongs to the government -- I don't know if we've been establishing that or whether it's established -- let us suppose for the moment I think that there should be no compulsion on the government to rebuild it but I think that the government has a responsibility, that if they do not rebuild it and they have a number of people who are residents of that community who have been dependent on that mill for some years and are suddenly given no option because the mill is closed, then that is a shrinking away from your responsibilities. I would believe that a government who is serious about its responsibilities then would see that employment would be provided some other way if necessary, but some other way that ought not to be. And might I just echo the words of the wise member from Crescentwood who deplores the -- deplores any industry, especially that of mining who should cause a lay-off, but yet would condone a government pulling out in that fashion. I don't think that's justified.

I think that if we look at our demographic scale we soon find that a good number of our young people if not most of them are leaving the rural community. As a matter of fact as

(MR. GIRARD: Cont'd) . . . school principal I often ask students who are in Grade 12, what are you doing next year? That was of interest to me. And there was no thought given to the fact that they might stay in the locality. There was no thought given to that because it was an impossibility -- (Interjection) -- because there is no employment available.

MR. PAULLEY: They're coming to Transcona.

MR. GIRARD: Yes, they're going to Transcona where we're building all kinds of bus manufacturers and so on, fresh marketing people. I know . . .

A MEMBER: Where's the financial statements?

MR. GIRARD: I know, Mr. Speaker, that this might have been treated lightly, and that maybe I should have included many statistics to suggest that this has to be true. But I think it's rather evident my only concern is that I don't think that we're treating the matter seriously enough. Should we not grapple with this problem in a matter of a few years, I feel we will probably regret it. Because if you follow this depopulation to its logical conclusion, it seems to me that the only way that the now sparsely populated areas will become more sparsely populated is by corporate ownership or government ownership, and no one likes either. And so I suggest to you that we will have to look at this problem very seriously if we want Manitoba to remain an area that is populated not only in the urban areas but in the rural community as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wants to speak, I would take the adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There were three other gentlemen on their feet. Anyone of them wishes . . . The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. WILLIAM URUSKI (St. George): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll just be fairly brief in my remarks.

I would like to first congratulate the mover and the seconder to the reply to the Speech from the Throne on their excellent job and the comments that they have made in respect to their constituencies, the problems that they have in them as well as the problems that they have outlined in Manitoba.

There were some comments that the Leader of the Opposition made in his remarks concerning Lake Winnipeg regulation and in those remarks, along with those that he had made, the Leader of the Liberal Party this afternoon said that this government was stifling debate on the Churchill River diversion and the whole program of hydro development in Manitoba. Well I'd like to point out that I am on the Manitoba Water-Commission and the commission did hold meetings on the proposed regulation of Lake Winnipeg and there were opportunities given to members. In fact the previous Leader of the Liberal Party, the previous Premier of Manitoba, Mr. Campbell attended these meetings not once but I think -- I believe he attended them four times, and he espoused his views on this government's proposal to regulate Lake Winnipeg and how we should abandon it and flood South Indian Lake by 30 feet as this was the most economical and cheapest possible way of obtaining hydro development in Manitoba. And yet his own party -- you know this is what I can't comprehend -- his own colleagues who are in the House now, and I'm sure they were, there must be one or two of them who were probably part of the same caucus at the time that he was Leader now have completely reversed their thinking and the now Leader of the Liberal Party is saying, no dice, don't you guys listen to our previous leader, I'm correct, he's wrong, and I'm the leader now and don't listen to Mr. D. L. Campbell because he is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I know that my honourable friend would not want to be deliberately inaccurate and he refers to the previous Premier talking about an additional 30 feet. I think that the previous Premier was talking about a 754 level, a level higher than what is now being done, but not 30 feet.

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

MR. URUSKI: That is correct. I thank the Honourable Minister for bringing that point out.

In the hearings on Lake Winnipeg regulation what I found very, you know, strange that there were members of the Conservative Party or previous members, Mr. George Johnson came to the meeting and, of course, the previous Assistant General Manager of Hydro, Mr. Kristjansson came to those meetings, and the former Attorney-General, I

(MR. URUSKI: Cont'd) . . . believe, the Honourable Sterling Lyon, came to those meetings and they were -- of course they were not being political at all, they were just concerned citizens as Mr. George Johnson said, they were concerned citizens. Now these people were given the opportunity to express their views on Lake Winnipeg regulation and I didn't hear anyone objecting or shut them up, or not give them the opportunity to speak, not even once but on several occasions I believe they attended two or three of the meetings and in the last meeting a long detailed brief was presented by the former Attorney-General, the Honourable Sterling Lyon. Now there's one thing that I really can't understand or I wonder about the credibility of the Conservative Party when they mention -- and even the members who attended the hearings always said that you are flooding Lake Winnipeg. You are flooding the people around Lake Winnipeg when you are going to control Lake Winnipeg in the regulation. Now I just can't understand and I went around to the people in and around Riverton and Arnes and Hecla Island and I've asked them, okay here is what the levels that the Department says are today and they are at around 716, and this was last year, and these were the prevalent levels of the month. Now you tell me if the lake is going to be regulated at a maximum height of 715, providing that there is no wind action on the lake, is that going to flood you? Well they say, no. Well then I am saying that how could the Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member from River Heights, say that this government was going to flood the lands around Lake Winnipeg by regulating it at between 711 and 715. You know, if in effect the level today is at 717 and we lower it to 715, is that flooding? Well you know -- (Interjection) -- I am really glad. Then I can go out -- the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge has said, yes, that's flooding. Well I certainly will make sure that my constituents know the feeling of the conservative flooding about lowering the level by two feet is flooding. Now I certainly will make sure that they hear about it. In this whole issue of hydro development, you know, that really intrigues me, and I'd like to make this point because I've heard so much about it. The Leader of the Liberal Party has said that we are going to ruin so much prime tourist land. Well I can tell him, you know, if there is money to be spent on tourist development at the community of Moosehorn, Steep Rock, Hillbury, is just crying for some facilities that have been totally neglected throughout the years, and we are finally getting some development in these areas, and I can tell you that there are hundreds of miles of lakeshore along Lake Winnipeg that are yet untouched that have beautiful beaches along the lake if you fly up to the northern area of Lake Winnipeg and you have a look at them. Just put a road into those areas and you will have some of the most fine beaches -- (Interjection) -- on both sides, on both sides.

You know I have heard the comments made about that there will be some detrimental effects to the type of species of fish. Now I understand that the type of fishing is white fishing on South Indian Lake now primarily, and that with the change of water regime on the lake that the prime species will probably be Jackfish and the like. Now the Leader of the Liberal Party is saying that we are ruining sport fishing or tourist attraction. Now, you know, what is the tourist after? Is he after the whitefish or is he after the sport fish in the major -- rough fish that will apparently abound in the lakes after there will be a change in water regime -- and this doesn't come from my knowledge, I believe that comment was made by a Mr. Gerry Malahar who was the previous wildlife director in the Province of Manitoba.

I will just leave that area right now and go to one topic that the Leader of the Liberal Party mentioned that the government is going to be the chief landlord in the Province of Manitoba. Well I can certainly tell him that if . . .

A MEMBER: He's not here.

MR. URUSKI: You know he makes his remarks and then takes off. I don't know -- there are so many comments that he has made that I would like to touch on, but on this one it really gets me because there is no developer in the Province of Manitoba that I know of that has yet met the needs of the lower income people in providing housing, and why? Why have they not developed in that area? Why haven't they built senior citizens homes in the communities, in Arborg, Ashern or Eriksdale, and places like that? Why haven't they built some decent housing or financed some housing for our lower income people? Why hasn't there? Why can't a teacher for instance in -- or a garbage collector in Arborg afford a decent house? Because there has never been one contractor in the Province of Manitoba been able to satisfy the needs in the way that the public housing scheme has today.

(MR. URUSKI: Cont'd) And you're talking about the government being a landlord. That's baloney if you ever heard it. You know the thing to do, the thing to do is certainly cut out the speculation that is occurring throughout this country in the purchasing of land and the land assembly by private investors. Then you're going to -- you know you have to step on the fingers of your buddies. Only then will you say that if there are no profits to be made by them -- (Interjection) -- Well -- if you . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 10:00 o'clock the honourable member will have an opportunity to continue tomorrow. The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday afternoon.