

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, March 14, 1975

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 47 students of Grade 11 standing, of the West Kildonan Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Butler and Mr. Klassen. This school is located in the constituency of the member for Seven Oaks, the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here this afternoon.

The Honourable Member for Roblin was on his feet before noon recess. He has 25 minutes. Take 30.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's rather difficult to keep the tenor and the drive of your comments in a speech when you have to take a break for the noon hour lunch because I, Mr. Speaker, like you like good food and generally after a meal of the food that's in this city, and it's comparable to anything across the country, I kind of tend to relax and not carry on the thrust that's expected of members in the debate.

But, Mr. Speaker, I will go back and start again on the cost-of-living factor, the cost-of-living index that's of great concern to the people in Roblin constituency and hopefully in the debates ensuing during this session finally get the Minister of Consumer Affairs to his feet and give us some idea, not only the people in my constituency but the people across this province, whether in fact we need that department, whether in fact we need that Minister, or what he has done in the last 12 months.

Mr. Speaker, I well know his position on the problems we were having with sugar last year because he said nationalize it. I'm waiting and waiting and waiting to hear another statement, whether in fact that is where the thrust of the Minister is. Is he going to nationalize the sugar industry as he told us in the House. Is that the answer for the problem, or if in fact he's done anything. I searched through this document with a microscope hoping that it would give some evidence of what this Minister is doing for the cost-of-living factor.

Let's move on to other fields. The increase in the cost of bread or butter, or what did he do about the egg fiasco where my deskmate over here, the Honourable Member for Morris, could actually sell eggs cheaper than most other jurisdictions in this province and has built himself up quite a lucrative business? But I'm wondering if this Minister has any comments or in fact has he got nothing to say at all about the problem. It's a serious matter.

I also become uptight, Mr. Speaker, and the people of my constituency are most uptight about this investigation about meat prices and the problems with the meat industry in this province. It was not the Minister of Consumer Affairs that set up the inquiry, it was the Minister of Agriculture. Now I thought, you know, that this Minister of Consumer Affairs would have some drive, some initiative, some suggestions of the problems in the industry. But no, Mr. Speaker, it's the Minister of Agriculture that's doing the inquiry. So with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I leave it to this Minister - and I thought he'd be one of the early ones in the reply to the Speech from the Throne because in my priorities for Roblin constituency, that is the second priority, the cost of living. Is this Minister going to do anything about it? Has he got any suggestions at all, in fact is he going to speak?

I suggest the latter, Mr. Speaker, because there's been ample time for him to get to his feet and give us some evidence of the thrust of his department and his government. I can only see something about telephones in this great document. That really is going to save the cost-of-living index and help the people today that are having so many problems with the cost of living, that now we are going to have a record increase of 33,000 telephones. And that's likely the type of message and the kind of thrust that we're going to get from that Minister because basically I don't think that he knows what the cost-of-living problems are at all. Of if he has in fact got some suggestions, let him wade into this debate and put his name on the record on what his department has been doing for the last twelve months for the people of this province.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, let us move on to the problems of labour which has become of great concern to the people of my constituency whereby we see today the ports tied up, Bangladesh, farmers grain sitting out there which is supposed to be delivered to the people of Bangladesh on an emergency basis, ships not being loaded, some of our consumers, the Japanese and other places where historically we've had markets for years, the boats sitting there and no grain is being delivered. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am told yesterday that the ships now are loading at American ports, that they've gave up on the problems of this . . . And it is a difficult subject, Mr. Speaker, and it's one that I don't take very lightly. But I think, Mr. Speaker, in my concept, that the state must protect itself and the vital interests of its citizens in labour matters. I watched the Honourable Minister of Labour and I watched the Honourable the First Minister to come through with some suggestions, where does the state protect itself and where does the state protect the vital interests of our people in a labour dispute at a national level or where in the case of the problem with the nurses in this province, Mr. Speaker. And I recognize, I just briefly saw the report of the Honourable Minister which came across my desk and I read in a paragraph there the concern of the Minister of Labour in his report where he said that labour-management relations across Canada are real and serious and that is part of the . . . But, Mr. Speaker, I wonder where are we going to go? Is this going to be a historic problem for the next twenty years or is somebody in the labour movement going to be serious, how it's going to bring this country to its knees, how the elevators and the farmers in this province today are told that you cannot deliver grain due to a matter which they have no jurisdiction over whatsoever and the economy will be destroyed, unless somebody, Mr. Speaker, has some answers.

I've listened to a lot of speakers in my political career, Mr. Speaker, and I wonder, is there not somebody could get back to the formula where you get paid for what you do. Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared as the MLA for Roblin constituency to go out and try and negotiate with those people at the coast today and say, look if you'll do twice as much work, if you'll load twice as many ships, I'll give you twice the wages. If you load three times as many ships or load them three times as fast, I'll triple your wages. If you load them four times as fast, I'll give you four times the wages. And, Mr. Speaker, why is that formula not accepted? --(Interjection)-- Well I'm sure you will. But, Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering - look I'm not the government, I'm sitting in the Opposition benches and I'm asking these questions on behalf of the people that I represent and I expect some answers or some suggestions from this government. You are the government, you are the treasury people and you're supposed to come up with the answers, and questions have been raised across this floor, historically, the last session, at this session about this serious problem. And it is a serious problem; everybody knows it's a serious problem. And, Mr. Speaker, we don't get no answers.

The First Minister espoused here last night for an hour and a half; the Minister of Mines the other day went for an hour and a half; I never heard anything suggested at all, even one little inkling of what this government is prepared to do or what in fact does it stand up for. Are you going to let the agricultural economy of this province be brought to its knees and sit back and not do anything: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to try to do something. I'm going to try to speak in this Legislature and again remind this government that you are the government of this province and you are the ones that have to stand up and offer some suggestions. I'm offering suggestions today, you can tell me I'm wrong or I'm right or I'm partly right, but at least don't try and sweep the matter under the carpet thinking it isn't serious. It is a very serious matter, Mr. Speaker, and one that is of great concern to the people that I represent.

Mr. Speaker, let us now take a look at Autopac. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, in all my years as a member of the Legislature that I've had more concerns expressed to me than I have on this subject matter. Mass confusion, people are getting charged for this or that and they don't know where they're going. And, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that that Minister must be in trouble. That that government must be in trouble on Autopac, because practically every member on the NDP benches that rose in the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne spoke on Autopac. That's the first sense that I got there's trouble.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd)

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we find the Honourable Minister who is in charge of the Corporation rising to his feet on two occasions in the debate. In my years in the Legislature I have never saw that. The First Minister has the right and the Deputy Leader has the right, but I've never seen a Minister in my time here rise twice in reply to the Speech from the Throne on a matter unless it was a serious matter. So I suspect it is serious, because the way that Minister was speaking today, Mr. Speaker, and the way he was shaking, he's got a lot of skeletons in his closet. He's got a lot of skeletons in his closet.

Mr. Speaker, I'll even go farther and say that that Minister's got a guilty conscience. He's got a guilty conscience, Mr. Speaker. And I wonder why now . . . Mr. Speaker, if in fact it will bail him out of his problem, I'm sure on the Opposition bench we'll let him speak here morning, noon and night to try and bail himself out of that problem. Because once he starts speaking, you see, he immediately found the Member for Virden's car within a very short time once it was brought to his attention in this House. So when we get him to his feet and get him debating we likely, the Opposition will help him solve some of his problems if he'd only listen. But, Mr. Speaker, they won't listen. They won't listen because they know, they made the promises to the people of this province, we didn't. You made the promises, all the savings! you made the promise of how smooth this corporation would run. You didn't tell the people of this province you're going to run on a deficit financing basis of 10 to 20, 30 million. Nobody knows what the cost is going to be. Mr. Speaker, they got all those skeletons hanging in their closets and even their own supporters now begin to doubt the judgment of this government. And as I said earlier, you can't define the indefensible. You can't defend the indefensible in this debate, Mr. Speaker. I could give you many reasons why you can't. You cannot use an insurance corporation in this province nor any place across Canada or the United States on political grounds. You can't use a corporation in automobile insurance and use it as a vehicle for politics or political gain. --(Interjection)-- Well I know they did and that is their first problem, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ENNS: When are the rates going to go down next Wally?

MR. McKENZIE: Sure, they're going to go down before the next election unless we may exchange.

Mr. Speaker, we've caught the government with their hand in the cookie jar, we've caught them with their other hand in the mousetrap because their both hands are tied. They committed themselves to a corporate system, that they promised the people of this province tremendous savings - and go and read them, I don't have to go back to that rhetoric, it's there, it's in the record. And now they can't produce. And they're standing up over there day after day after day trying to get me to go back and tell my people that all's well. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to do it. I would never do that to the people of my constituency; at least I'll be honest with them and that's more than we're getting from this government.

Mr. Speaker, we have evidence of falsehoods being told in this debate on automobile insurance. Go and read the records. Mr. Speaker, we've caught this government having to sweep all those promises that they made in that insurance debate, sweep them under the carpet, and they're trying to get them all swept under there now. My gosh, Mr. Speaker, the carpet isn't big enough for to sweep all those promises back.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister about the hidden costs that's in the corporate structure. Yes, I do. Put them on the table. What about, in the auditor's report, the 2.4 million, the special warrant for the Motor Vehicles Branch? Explain that. Mr. Speaker, explain why the RCMP is being used in this province today to go out and charge people and they're not getting paid for it. The municipalities are paying for it. But you're using the RCMP as a vehicle or as a collection agency for the Corporation. What does that cost? I don't see any evidence of that being . . . Oh, Mr. Speaker, the subsidization of the driver's licences and the surcharges which are not listed in the rate schedule, where there's two or three or more drivers in the family, you're not showing that. You're not showing the costs which are from the Attorney-General's department which you're using. And it's put into the part of the corporation. It's all hid. And the reason it's being hid, Mr. Speaker, is because they can't afford to put it on the table. And as long as we're going to have a minister sit as the chairman of his own board and run his own corporation on political grounds the way he wants it, whatever the front bench, it won't work. It will not work. You can use it as a

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd) political vehicle, which you're using now, but you'll not use it to compete on the marketplaces of insurance across this jurisdiction or any other jurisdiction.

If you read the summary of the New Brunswick hearings, it will spell it out where there are other concepts. Certainly, and read what they said. And read what they passed the other day. Not by a Minister of the Crown running a private corporation for political gain, Mr. Speaker. That's the kind of insurance that I want in this province. And I don't want to see this minister standing up here day after day, screaming and yelling at us and trying to justify something that we didn't do. We never caused you the \$10 million deficit last year. We never caused you the \$10 million deficit this year. And what about the future? And for him to stand up there is just unjustified, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not going to take it on behalf of the people that I represent. Either that minister is going to have to be credible and honest with the people or turn his portfolio in. And I'm fed up. He's like a glorified speaker at a labour union. He makes these expounding statements reading from books and they all peer behind.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want more facts than we are getting from this minister and this government today on Autopac, and I associate myself with the remarks of the Member from Minnedosa. --(Interjection)-- At least I know whose shoes I'm shining and I also know where to hang my hat. And, Mr. Speaker, I advise the minister: Look, you have people in your own group who have some knowledge of insurance. You have people over there and we told you at that time the problems that you're getting in with Autopac, but you wouldn't believe it. No, the Opposition was wrong. Remember the Member for St. Boniface with his crying towel on that day, when he cried in the House, that he had to support Autopac. Crying to the people of this province. Remember those days? Well I sure remember them. And what have we had ever since? Disaster. Disaster. So I remind you people over there again, be honest to the people of this province; they'll pay the shot. They will. Everybody knows the problems of the insurance industry, but don't try and mislead them, don't give them half truths, don't give them quarter truths, give them the facts, Mr. Speaker, and we in the Opposition will help you put that corporation on the rails and make it sensible and reasonable and justifiable.

Mr. Speaker, let's move on to the problems of education. I listened with great interest to the honourable minister's comments this morning, and I know he gave his remarks this morning in the same tone he is now, laughing, Mr. Speaker, because he knows better. He was laughing this morning when he made those comments about where education is going and he's laughing again. So he's not sincere. He's not sincere to the parents of this province. He's not sincere to the teachers of this province. I happened to be at a convention where the President of the Manitoba Teachers Society espoused some remarks about this minister the other day, and I didn't realize it was that bad, Mr. Speaker, but it's in the record books and it's there, and I join their sentiments because of the number of concerns that have been expressed to me about the way this minister is leading the Department of Education in this province. --(Interjection)-- You'll have your turn. You could have read it in.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me first of all prove . . . But this minister is well-known in this House, Mr. Speaker. First of all, he hasn't got the ability to administer the problems, the problems that the students had with their loans and their inquiry for loans. I sent many to him. Other MLA's sent many. And what do we get? A standard kind of a class question back that the matter is being studied and it will be . . . And, Mr. Speaker, I still have no evidence in any remarks that he made in his speech today that it's going to be better next year. Did you say anything today that we could tell the young people of this province, you've cleaned up the problem, it's resolved, and they're not going to have that problem again? I listened, Mr. Speaker, with keen interest. I listened with --(Interjection)-- That shows the intelligence of the minister, Mr. Speaker. He's asking about what problems. He doesn't even know where the problems are in his own department, Mr. Speaker.

Let's talk about the other problems of taxation. Where are these school divisions going to go with the grant structure that you offered to them the other day? Is that the answer? It's going to be the same next year and the same the year after and the year after. Now where in this document do I see the comments of the Minister of Education where we're

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) going to go with education. --(Interjection)-- I'm not talking about figures today. We'll get to them later. I'm making a broad statement. I just ask you the Minister of Education, to give me some evidence that this document in my hands is what is the future for education in this province under your stewardship. You are the minister. Mr. Speaker, he has failed the people of this province because there's nothing in there. Nothing. Absolutely nothing. One of the high priorities in this province is education, and we have a minister who will sit back there and laugh and chuckle and thinks it isn't a serious matter.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you and I say to the people of this Legislature, it is a serious matter, and this minister better start digging his heels in and be more serious about education than he has been up to this time, rather than laughing and chuckling across at me as I try to relate some of his problems today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal very quickly with the Parkland library concept, and I will no doubt in further debate deal with it in a more specific manner. But the answers that the minister and the government has provided in the area where the pilot project has been held are not sufficient. There's either a misunderstanding . . . But, I wonder, have you had a meeting with the people out there? Because I don't want to make a political issue of it. It was a tremendous . . . It shows you, Mr. Speaker, the intelligence of some of the members across. Mr. Speaker, the pilot project was an excellent pilot project. It is one that gained the total respect of everybody in the Parkland region. As the minister well knows, the interest and the amount of reading that was done from the time that that pilot project started it was a five-fold increase in people reading books. And I don't think, in my honest opinion, that we can force that back on to the municipalities at this time - and I'll give the honourable minister the reason: because the municipal tax base in rural Manitoba in Roblin and Parkland Regions, has been so eroded due to the problems of the minister on his left there and other problems that they have, that there's no way that the municipal people can be asked to get into that at this time. I don't see --(Interjection)-- Yes, well, under the Libraries Act they are asked to contribute considerable sums of money, and I would much sooner that the minister for the Crown . . . all that that pilot project costs, my God, you just knock off one-tenth of the last loan to Saunders Aircraft and it would keep that project going for a whole year. And that was a good project. Well, I'm sure that we'll hear some more comments from the minister later on, but I don't think it should have been phased out. I think you should have looked at the report of Dr. Newsom . . . Yes, you have, but you're not following the guidelines that he set up, Mr. Speaker. That's the tragedy. And I've read it too. Because Dr. Newsom espoused, and it was a wonderful thing, and something that maybe we should do for the whole province, and that's the grounds that I would like to debate the matter on.

Mr. Speaker, let's move on now to some problems of Hydro that I came across recently, because I was asked to go up to the people at Nelson House and hopefully discuss with them the 30.5 feet of water that those people are going to be flooded with this November, and I asked them, first of all, where's their MLA. They said they hadn't seen him for months. Hadn't seen him for months! And especially on this issue, the flooding at Nelson House. That minister - the minister! The Premier should have been there to talk to those people and so should their MLA. But this is the tragedy. Why, through this Cass-Beggs plan which costs the taxpayers of this province likely 4 or 5 million dollars, why did you not tell the Indians in Nelson House till last August that they're going to get 30.5 feet of water this November? I wouldn't do that, Mr. Speaker. I wouldn't do that to my worst friend. I'm telling you, I wouldn't. To go in and deliberately . . . and, Mr. Speaker, it's gone so far that some of those pioneers at Nelson House - you know what? The graves of their ancestors are already under water. They had no official notice whatsoever that this was going to, this great Hydro change that Cass-Beggs brought into this province, was going to create the problems for those people up there that they have today. That is a serious matter, Mr. Speaker, for those people at Nelson House, and I understand that their legal counsel was the Leader of the Liberal party, Mr. Huband, and he hadn't even been there. I understand he received a substantial retainer fee, but he hadn't been there yet. Now maybe he's been there now, I don't know, but he hadn't been there a month ago to help those people solve those problems, which are very serious.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, we see a \$2 million school just been built at Nelson House. It's going to be flooded, or else the kids are going to have to go by boat. We also saw, Mr. Speaker, you know - and this is one of the tragedies of the North - the sewer and the water pipes that went into the lake were within 50 yards of one another, where the water was being drawn out of the lake for the school and the sewer was run in maybe 50 or 100 yards away. When they had to close down the water system they had to close down the school, because the sewer was contaminating the water supply.

Those are serious matters and I was pleased to go up there under invitation from the Chief and his council to deal with and hopefully get those problems resolved. But I did not know, Mr. Speaker, until I went there, that those people at Nelson House were not informed until last August that they are going to get 30.5 feet of water this November. Mr. Speaker, this is some of the things that this government can be doing. Sure, Cass-Beggs is long gone and his legend will be here for thousands of years, and what he cost the taxpayers of this province, but I'm surprised, I'm surprised that the Premier didn't go and tell the people at Nelson House, I'm surprised that Cass-Beggs didn't go and tell the people at Nelson House, and I'm surprised that their own MLA didn't go and tell them of some of the real serious problems that they're facing today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

REV. DONALD MALINOWSKI (Point Douglas): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all I would like to offer you my sincere congratulations on having assumed once again the important post of Speaker. I am confident that you will rule with your usual fairness, and with the great ability you have acquired. I hope members on both sides of the House will conduct themselves in a manner that won't add difficulties to your job, or cause you to get more gray hair, if you have any yet.

I also want to extend hearty congratulations to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface for his victory in a by-election. I also want to congratulate him on his appointment to the very important post of the Minister of Health. And he looks really healthy. Knowing of his ability I am sure he will be a very able Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker --(Interjection)-- If you want to say something you may stand up and say it.

Mr. Speaker, in our democratic set up we have political parties who form government and political parties who act as opposition. I accept that as a necessary part of the political process in a free country. But, at the same time I believe opposition should be fair and constructive. To offer destructive criticism or to offer opposition for the sake of opposition defeats the democratic process. So I make my usual appeal to my Honourable friends of the opposition to be fair and more constructive. --(Interjection)-- This is not the time. Maybe later.

Our world is so full of strife, fighting and bickering I hope honourable members on both sides of the house will try to maintain a high level of debate without too much heat and anger.

Having preached my little sermmon on the need for good behaviour, I will now deal briefly with some of the issues before us.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has moved a motion of non-confidence in the government because his party feels that government hasn't done enough in the field of housing.

Mr. Speaker, I readily agree that government hasn't done enough yet. I am sure no one of my colleagues on this side are satisfied that enough housing units have been constructed. There is still need for more housing. But Rome wasn't built in one day or in one night. And not even an NDP government should be expected to solve such a critical problem as housing in less than two terms in office. Give us a chance. If we'll be for five terms I assure you we'll do much more.

But I am voting confidence in the government because I believe its record in housing is an outstanding one. I will not quote all the statistics here, but the statistics are there for all to see, and for those who can't see the statistics, they can look at the houses that have been built in the last six years. The buildings are easier to see than the statistics.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(REV. MALINOWSKI cont'd)

To mention my own constituency of Point Douglas, Mr. Speaker. We've built already approximately 500 housing units in our constituency. Constituents of Point Douglas which was neglected for many many years and finally we as a New Democratic Party who are in power right now that we did something for those people who are really in need. This has been a tremendous improvement in the housing conditions for many of my constituents. Not only in Point Douglas, but many people are coming from the north end to those buildings, which we have four of them.

A MEMBER: Winnipeg Centre.

REV. MALINOWSKI: Winnipeg Centre yes, that's right, yes.

The opposition has been very critical because of Autopac. This is a subject which everybody's talking and wants to do something about. My honourable friend the Minister in charge of Autopac is an able, conscientious and hard-working minister, and he is trying the best for the people of Manitoba. He has made a very able defense of his department. He is still a very young man and I don't want to see him get gray hair because of the unfair criticism of your people from the other side.

I will not repeat the facts with which the Minister has refuted the charges of the opposition. I am firmly convinced by the facts in Saskatchewan, and in this province, that public auto insurance is cheaper and better than that provided by the private companies. And this is my last word about the subject. Now, if we have a chance, Mr. Speaker, when we have to vote again concerning Autopac maybe I will be the first one who will vote against. You know why? Because it's too cheap. --(Interjection)-- I'm entitled I believe to my own opinion.

A MEMBER: But it will be cheaper in '77.

REV. MALINOWSKI: '77?

A MEMBER: Yes.

REV. MALINOWSKI: This is your opinion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with another industry under public ownership. This is an old industry which was established under public ownership long before the NDP came to power.

Sometime between 1905 and 1910 we had a Conservative Government in this province. It was led by Premier Sir Rodman Roblin. He was the grandfather of Duff Roblin, who became premier in more recent times.

The Conservative Government of 65 years ago believed in public ownership - at least it believed in public ownership of the telephone system. So did the governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan as well. In all three provinces the telephone system was established as a public enterprise. In Ontario and Quebec the telephone system is under private ownership. What is the result? I will give you the figures.

The result is that people in Ontario and Quebec pay a higher rate for their telephone service. I won't bore you with many figures. I just want to give you a few figures for towns of similar size in Manitoba and Ontario. Be patient, I will give it to you.

In Thompson, Manitoba, the rate is \$3.20 per month; in Atikokan, Ontario, which is, well, not close, but almost on the border of Manitoba the rate is \$4.46, which means \$1.26 difference. The people in Brandon pay \$3.62 a month; at Port Hope, Ontario they pay \$5.04, which means \$1.42 difference. It is higher. In Winnipeg we pay \$4.10 a month; in Burlington, Ontario they pay \$6.09 a month, which means \$1.99 more per month.

I am sure my honourable friends of the opposition would not wish to deny that public ownership established in this important field has over the years proved of greater benefit to the people than private enterprise. And I want to give the governments of those days, whether Conservative or Liberal, full credit for their wisdom and foresight.

Mr. Speaker, I could give other examples of industries that have been established under public ownership under Liberal or Conservative governments. I hope my friends on the opposition would take note of that fact. I cannot understand why they are so strongly opposed to the idea of public ownership today when Conservatives of bygone days favoured it; they at least favoured it in a number of cases. So the idea can't be all bad.

Public ownership in Auto Insurance is working well now, and it will work even better after it has been in operation as long as some of the public enterprises established by

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(REV. MALINOWSKI cont'd) Liberal and Conservative governments long ago.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal briefly with a matter I know very little about. All I know about farming is what I have learned from honourable members who come from rural areas, especially from my colleague, the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose. But I know many changes have taken place in farming communities in Canada. Farming has become a big, costly operation. It requires large amounts of capital. There has been a steady drain of population from the farms to the cities. I believe we are all agreed that this is not a healthy trend. On both sides of the House we are aware that it is very difficult for young people to get established on a farm if they don't inherit a farm from their parents.

Young people can get the necessary training to enter any profession. They can take up a skilled trade or enter into a wide range of jobs in business and industry. But farming has almost become a closed occupation to young people because of the large amount of capital needed to get started.

To make it easier for people to get established on a farm the Department of Agriculture has established a Land Lease Program. That's what you are looking for, I believe. I will not argue whether this is the best program or the best way to cope with the problem because I am not too familiar with the problem.

But, Mr. Speaker, the only point I want to make is, that honourable members of the opposition should not oppose and condemn everything this government does unless - and I'm repeating - unless they are prepared to offer something better. --(Interjection)-- You didn't for many years. You were in power. You didn't do anything. So don't tell me that right now you are able to do something. If you believe in miracles that's your privilege. I don't. We are realistic.

A MEMBER: What?

REV. MALINOWSKI: Realistic, I said, we are. Mr. Speaker, I am happy for once to be able to quote the Winnipeg Tribune in support of some policy of this government.

As you know, the Leader of the Official Opposition has been very critical of this Land Lease policy. In an editorial of January 22nd, the Tribune says, and I quote: "It is difficult to see why Mr. Spivak is so perturbed . . . it is stated government policy to buy up farmland and lease it to the young farmers who, because of the high cost of land, would otherwise not be able to engage in agriculture."

The Tribune editorial points out that the buying up of farm land by the government is done in the open - there is nothing sinister about it. The editorial then goes on to say the government plan is working well, and that 50 percent of the land acquired has been leased back to young farmers under the government's program. What are you expecting more, I am asking you?

The Tribune editorial ends up by asking this question: "What is wrong with the Crown owning and leasing land?"

Mr. Speaker, I will cut my speech short. I want to be generous and give my honourable friends in the opposition more time to state their views.

I just want to point out to them that we are living in a world full of serious problems. I ask them in all sincerity to look about them. Let them look for example, to our great neighbouring country to the south, the United States. Here is a country suffering from grave economic and social problems. It has an exceptionally high crime rate. It still has large pockets of poverty. It now has over 8 million, 8 millions unemployed.

Every day the talk on radio and television is about the coming depression in the United States. But is that because of public ownership? Certainly not. No country in the world is so completely under private ownership.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we on this side realize there is no special magic in the term public ownership, nor that it is the solution to all economic problems. Surely honourable members of the opposition should by now also be aware that leaving everything to private enterprise is not the answer.

In our efforts to cope with the problems facing us, we on this side of the House are willing to use any and all methods, private enterprise, co-operative enterprise and public enterprise to solve the problem.

I believe the policy of this government is to pursue policies that will bring the greatest benefits to the greatest number in the shortest time. Thank you very much.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate you for being returned to your office. I know you have a difficult job but I'm going to assure you that you won't have too much trouble with me.

I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder for the Speech from the Throne, the Honourable Member from Churchill and St. Matthews, maybe on being asked to move and second the speech rather on the contribution they made, because I don't think it was very worthwhile. The Member for Churchill could have done far more justice to his people of the north - or Thompson - if he had talked to these people from the North in a different way, and the Member from St. Matthews just must have figured there was a storm coming against Autopac and he had to start talking and defending it already.

I want to congratulate the Minister from St. Boniface who was elected in the by-election; he's of a different party but the very fact that he won and was returned to the House shows that he must be a terrific campaigner.

I'm sorry that we lost the Honourable Member Paul Marion because I considered him one of the Conservative Liberals, and I'm much more favorable to a Conservative Liberal than I am to a Socialistic Liberal, and I won't name that one but I think it's very clear. I won't mention any names but I don't think there's any doubt about it.

I'd like to congratulate the Member from Logan who is being returned as Deputy Speaker, and I'm happy that he's here with us and I'm very pleased to see him.

I wish the Premier would call a by-election in Crescentwood and Wolseley because regardless of the outcome of that election I believe those two constituencies are entitled to be represented by a member, because no matter which political party this member might be elected from I believe that he would be doing his very best to represent the people in that constituency whether they belong to the same political party or not. In fact I believe that all members try to represent everybody in their constituency no matter which party they come from and he does this maybe for selfish reasons, maybe one of the main reasons is he wants to be elected, but I think most of them feel that when they were elected they were put in a position of honour and then they have taken it with responsibility and they're going to do their best for everybody in that area.

I have listened to the members opposite and at times I must say that I feel sorry for them because they seem to have arrived in the position of government a lot sooner than they expected and they've never been capable of the job. They've been getting involved in different departments and having to make statements which are less than true which seem to be getting them into trouble, and which is causing the public to lose faith and respect for them. I'm referring to them like the Minister of Autopac when he makes statements saying that the rates will be 14 and 19 percent and then they come out so much higher, and then he gets into a whole lot of trouble. The Minister of Agriculture when he was looking after the Northern Co-ops, he was making statements which maybe you can't call lies but they're things which are misleading and they get him into trouble. The Minister of Northern Affairs was in the same boat.

This is now our 6th term since I was elected and I think probably I haven't changed very much even though I've listened to the honourable gentlemen over there because I think if you're honest with yourself when you make your first speech and speak your convictions and those of your neighbourhood, you really can't change much although you may change a little bit, but you're not going to change very much. And that can easily be borne out by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources because we can pretty nearly tell how he's going to react every time because he'd true to his political principles.

I'm still very concerned about abuses in government programs, and I don't know how really you can get them all stopped. We have the abuses that went on in the Northern Co-ops, and we have the abuses that go on in the welfare system and yet while we have all these things we have governments both at the provincial and federal level that is discouraging thrift and savings, and really almost advancing this other type of thinking where it is somewhat disgraceful to do a hard days work and to try to save money to look after yourself but you're supposed to be depending on the public to do it.

In this welfare I still feel, as many members on this side have said, that local welfare could be controlled much better by municipal people at the local level, especially in

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) the rural areas. I think the rural members would accept this responsibility because I know that they are in touch with the people and can do a better job; I am not so sure about the city people, but I really am sure of this in the rural areas. Our educational costs are continuing to rise and so is inflation. It's really going up at an alarming rate, and we're beginning to wonder how much more we really can afford to spend on these things.

We know that the teachers are asking more, the bus drivers are asking more and so are the caretakers, and I suppose if I was in their place I'd be asking more too. But as taxpayers and as people in the community we have to be saying, "When is it going to stop?" or "Where is it going to end?"

I'm concerned about education with all its new policies and courses and frills that they have in the different departments. I don't believe these are necessary, especially when they're expecting them to be paid for from the public purse. I am one of these persons that believes that if people want to go on to education and post-secondary education that they should be contributing to that extra expense themselves and not expecting the public to pay for it. And I can believe that this should be done in the form of loans, loans where they could take more risk and be far more generous, but I certainly am opposed to bursaries as they're handed out in this province. I hear many complaints. I'm really opposed to them as they're handed out. My idea of bursaries is they should be given out as a scholarship or from the Legion or the Kinsmen, or some group like this, for certain merits that they see in certain students but as --(Interjection)-- Has the member a question? He's forever butting in and it's getting rather sickening. Have you a question, and you can ask it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd be interested in knowing what some of the complaints are that the honourable member has received about our student aid program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Bursaries.

MR. HANUSCHAK: About our student aid program ?

MR. HENDERSON: Well if you don't know and you're the Minister you're pretty stupid, because there isn't a member in this House that hasn't had many and many of these students coming to him --(Interjection)-- Yes, and we're receiving them because you never dealt with them properly. That's why they're coming to us. I have phoned in to the office, you've said, the girls, or whoever has been there, went through the files and said, "Yes something will be coming through." Three weeks later the students have contacted me again, it isn't through. But what's the trouble? --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. HENDERSON: You're acting stupid. I said I believe in loans. It's bursaries and the way you're handling them that I don't like. And while you have bursaries and are handling them, why don't you make a job of it?

A MEMBER: Hear. Hear.

MR. HENDERSON: It's the way you're handling it. You're handling it like as if you had no business ability at all. You maybe learnt to teach but you didn't learn an awful lot about business.

I'm really concerned that the government continues to go into business more and more all the time, and especially when they're going into so many before they have cleaned up the ones they're in. They're continually having more troubles and yet they're stepping into more and more programs. Now why don't they just slow down and get one working.

Here we have them in Autopac; they're talking about one rate, then they're putting on demerit points, more cost on demerit points, higher driver's license, and putting extra money on the cost of gas, when really all that they needed to do, when really all that they needed to do was to tell the truth and raise the rates. That's all they needed to do. Everybody knew that cars are costing more, that labour was costing more, and that parts were costing more, and that people were even driving their cars more, so there was every excuse for the government to really raise the rates. I can understand that in 1973 politics being what it is that they avoided it that year, but why do they keep on doing that? Now this whole fuss that you're having about Autopac this year, whether you've been quoted right in the Press or the Tribune, is all nonsense. All that you'd have really needed to do was to have

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) told the truth and raise the rates, and that would have been it. You've got the monopoly anyway but you may as well have done it the right way.

I'm concerned about the office of the Attorney-General and the law enforcement in this country. I'm almost sick of do-gooders in organizations, and lawyers who are forever trying to get people off who never hesitate to kill or hurt other people and rob people. Our juveniles are getting treated in such a jovial way, and really our jails are really considered a joke these days. If it wasn't for the disgrace that goes with going to jail for a term, it's a very easy way out. There may be some bad policemen but they're very few. And I think that it's high time that we get back to supporting our police officers and law enforcement. And this pertains to the federal people, but I believe it don't hurt us people to say our bit too because I believe that we should go back to capital punishment. I certainly do. I have no hesitation of saying at all for people that have killed policemen when we have it on the books and we don't do it, I just don't know why we do it. In fact I'd even go further than that. If I had to do with it, I'd even give them the lashes. You bet I would. Let's not get mixed up in it, I wouldn't beat around the bush about it.

There is one other member that I would like to congratulate, he's the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre who has been appointed to the position of Corrections and Rehabilitation. I'm really very happy to see this department formed even though it is another expense, because when we consider that 20 percent of our hospital costs is caused because of drugs of one form or another, whether it be drugs, or whether it be grass, or whether it be alcohol, it's a very serious problem. And this isn't taking into consideration the time that's lost through work, the broken homes, and the automobile accidents, and everything else that's in connection with this alcohol and drug abuse. So I wish him every success in that office, and I suppose in a number of years' time he'll probably be getting criticized like everybody else, but I'm glad that we've established that office and that we're really putting a sincere effort forward in it.

Now the Minister of Agriculture - he isn't in his seat just now and I wouldn't mind if he was - the little man that I always think is Napoleon from my history lessons in school and I don't think he stands, looks like little Napoleon; he's never daunted even though he's up 'agin' a wall he still stands there and preaches his gospel.

MR. GRAHAM: Trouble is he has his hand in the farmer's pocket instead of his own vest.

MR. HENDERSON: Well he's been in nothing but trouble. He started off pretty good as a Minister of Agriculture and had the respect of some people, but he's done so many things wrong that he's really on the downhill road. He's in wrong with the Hog Marketing Board; his AI Program was a flop; the beef producers have no use for him; the cow-calf producers have less; and the way he treats these farm people now isn't very good. He got into trouble with the Northern Co-ops. I guess probably the turkey growers might like him a little better and maybe the potato growers. But lastly but not leastly, he's got into trouble with his Land-lease Policy because actually what happened is it backfired on him. He went out to the country and thought that he would discredit all the owners, the foreigners and the local people that own land that didn't farm it, all to the advantage of promoting the government's program. That was his purpose in going out. He wanted to go out and promote the government's program. Well now it has been proved without a shadow of a doubt that what the people were concerned about was the government buying too much land. It's been proven without a shadow of a doubt and yet he stands up there and preaches with a look on his face like as if he believes it himself - and he must know from all the hearings he's heard. He's accused us people on the other side of packing meetings, or lining up people against him. Well at Morden we did have 250 people out, and I did tell them he was coming, and I did ask them to go. But I didn't tell them which side they had to present a brief on. This was their own thinking. --(Interjection)-- Yes, the Minister of Agriculture has been going downhill and he hasn't been representing the views and the things that the farmers wanted at all. --(Interjection)-- And while we can talk about him as on skid row or something like that, I can refer to him as to what happened to Napoleon in the end of his life. He had been a great man in his time but he continued going down. He was exiled to Ste. Helena and then he came back again, and he was exiled again and put at Elba, and that was the end of him. Well maybe the Minister of Agriculture will end up by being put out onto Hecla Island and we won't hear

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) anymore of him. He'll be put out in retirement.

MR. GRAHAM: What have you got against the people on Hecla Island?

MR. HENDERSON: Well, I don't want to wish him anything too serious but I mean, he certainly hasn't been representing the people of agriculture. And he is certainly so convinced in his own mind that he just seems determined not to listen to them. He knows best and they'd better listen, that's it. And if they don't do what he says, let them suffer till he gives them what he thinks is right for them.

Now there's one thing else that I should take a lot of time on but I don't think I will today because I know there's other members who want to speak and there isn't too much time. But one thing that is of great concern to my area is the people at Carman and the problem they're having with flooding continually year after year. Now this isn't fair at all because I've been following it for years and it's not really caused by the people of Carman, it's caused because of things that happened west of them: drainages with ditches that's been put in; land that's been cleared and the way the thaws come. And this is something which is continuing and which is causing a great deal of damage there. And it's not really fair to those people of Carman. I don't care if a cost-benefit study shows that it doesn't pay to do it or not. We've done a heck of a lot of other things since you people became government that didn't balance out in a cost-benefit ratio.

So, I don't think I'll take any more time than that other than say that I hope that the government will at least take its time with its programs and give them a chance to work, because the way they're going they're just causing the people in the country to be sick of them. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Well, first of all, Mr. Speaker, with the rest of the members of the House, I congratulate you on your position again this year. Also, our three new ministers. Also the Deputy Minister on regaining his health again for another Session.

The Throne Speech. I didn't intend to speak, Mr. Speaker, but I'd like to say just a few words, and I'll kind of make a little switch of the general way people speak. I understand you're supposed to speak about what's happened in your constituency, or what isn't happening, and go on from there. But for a change I'd like to just take this article from the Tribune. It's on the convention, the Conservative convention, and --(Interjection)-- In spirit I was there. Northern Manitobans say they are paying discriminatroy rates for electricity generated in the North and flowing South past their doorways, and insisted Saturday that Manitoba Hydro rates must be the same across the province.

Well, that's just beautiful, Mr. Speaker. Flin Flon for many many many years did not have Hydro and through the efforts of this government we made Hydro possible. There's 200 cabin owners in the Flin Flon area that have power that never had it before. There's people who had power through the . . . that was very weak, very ineffective; they're quite happy. The people are building new houses, putting in electric heat; they're quite happy. Mr. Speaker, just to prove one point, there were five cabins nine miles from a source of supply and they put on a lot of pressure to have power put into these cabins, and meeting with them I agreed to bring officials of Hydro up to meet with them, and they stated their case, and what really appealed to me, Mr. Speaker, was one young lady, Mrs. Stevens was her name, who after a lot of speaking said, "There's no surplus power in Manitoba until every Manitoban had power." This was the key, and today those five cabins have power. Now there's a minority group that came through. Then it goes on to say: "Northerners also want to pay a lower income tax rate to encourage more residents, and they want local councils to control decision making in finance," they told a policy-making session at the Progressive Conservative convention.

Mr. Speaker, this government has gone more than overboard in having people make their own decisions. We have councils and mayors in small communities that never had it before. The LGD system, who was protected by this side of the House, is being destroyed. Two of my areas or two . . . of my area are going for incorporation, self-government, so they have nothing there.

Income tax. Mr. Speaker, I will admit we do pay high income tax. We're also high paid in the north. But the people I do feel sympathetic towards are the pensioners, low

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. BARROW cont'd) income groups, and I admit they do have a small point there.

They demanded a long-range program of all-weather roads, including winter roads, run by the Highway Department, directed by the Northern Affairs Department, and transportation subsidies to encourage the northern fishing industry. --(Interjection)-- None. This is amazing this road. Yeah, I'll tell you about Wabowden. I will tell you, and I will give you credit for No. 10 Highway. They did build a road there, but since that road has been built, it's taken an awful beating, it has to be re-done. Now we are going to build a new road from Flin Flon to Big Island, a distance of 10 miles; it'll only take 3.6 miles, at a cost of \$2 million. We'll do that this year. The road to Snow Lake, 392, and I full remember before '69 when every four years the government would pave 10 miles, 10 miles of road before elections. But that's not the worst of it, Mr. Speaker. There's a road in Wabowden, and the mayor, a very honest man, Donald McIvor . . .

A MEMBER: A forthright man too.

MR. BARROW . . . he stopped the bus and he said: "Here is a demonstration of Conservative road building, it's 75 feet long, it doesn't start anywhere, it doesn't go anywhere, but it was put in just before the election." There's your road building.

The attendance at Saturday's three-hour session ranged from 22 to 40 delegates, most of them from the north, that's half of them from the north. "Full convention discussion of northern resolutions would promote better understanding to bare our problems and air our solutions." Garth Profit of The Pas said.

Mr. Speaker, I met with the Chamber of Commerce two years ago, and I agreed to ask every Minister in this House to attend their meetings, which is not easy 600 miles north. But every Minister agreed. Now one day, it was on Friday night, we had the Minister of Consumer Affairs up in the morning, the Minister of Transport in the afternoon, and who should drop in but the Minister of Tourism - three in one day. They had the meeting outnumbered. They got service, Mr. Speaker. They met at open meetings and discussed their problems, and got solutions, both on the second TV set, transportation. And then it came up, well Autopac, Autopac - I said, look I will call my colleague and see what I can do. This was Friday. Monday afternoon, the Minister of Autopac was on Hot Line, a general meeting, and met with any group that was available and solved all the problems. Now if this is not service, Mr. Speaker, what is?

I went to Flin Flon in 1952 and I wouldn't recognize the members of this House of representatives before that, didn't know who they were. And you talk about representation. There's where Buck Witney missed the boat, a good man, articulate, a radio announcer, lost his touch with people. Where did he go? Not to the Union Centre. No. Not on the street. Up to the manager of HBMS. --(Interjection)-- Right.

We feel there's a tremendous amount of misunderstanding between the north and the south. . . . the northern members were not quite happy with the southern members. This, my honourable friends is completely untrue. We have a very very good understanding. As long as they give us what we want, we can live with them.

"Such a move" - this is talking about Hydro parity. "Such a move would not win the party any votes in Winnipeg," the Member for St. James told the session, "if it meant Winnipeg Hydro rates would go up." --(Interjection)-- Beautiful. We'll use that in the next campaign. Party Vice-President, Inez Trueman for Winnipeg, suggested - she's a lady - suggested the resolution could not be discussed because it had not been submitted by the deadline by the Resolution Committee. So there's a good example of a woman's setting policy at a convention who spoke for two or three years on welfare abuse. Welfare abuse, day after day, and she's a gun in your Party. I'm afraid you're dead, gentlemen.

"These are very vital things for us who live in the north, and we want to have our say here today", said Brian Campbell, former Mayor of Thompson. There's a case of, you know, this gentleman is a mouthpiece for Inco. You know, I won't elaborate on it either.

A MEMBER: A former Liberal.

MR. BARROW: Right.

A MEMBER: Turncoat.

MR. BARROW: "I'm thinking about six northern seats that could win the election for the Conservative Party", said Kip Thompson, former Mayor of Ilford. "We're here to get northern ideas on the floor, not to split the Party." Kip Thompson was a strong NDP, the

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. BARROW cont'd) Mayor of Ilford, an opportunist. He wants winter roads so he can build them and get paid for it. Get the contracts . . . Split Lake and Shamattawa, and all those places, and then for them to come in and sit in his beer parlor and drink his beer, that's Kip Thompson, a hypocrite.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member has a question? Order please. Order please. Order please. I would like to suggest to the honourable member it is out of order to raise a point of order to ask a question. It is not a point of order to ask a member whether he will answer a question. Privilege or otherwise, it's still not a privilege. Order please. Order please. That is not a matter of privilege.

MR. BARROW: My honourable friend, you'll never know, but you'll never see it over here either.

"Delegates insist that elected councils in the north must have more control of the money spent there and accused the Provincial Northern Affairs Department of spending more money on administration than on community improvement." That's just out of this world. And here's a gem: "Ofttimes from mouths of babes fall gems" - I think that is . . .

Here's a gem from the Member from Birtle-Russell: "The department is run on the payroll basis", accused Harry Garham, MLA for Birtle-Russell. "It's not what you know, it's who you know. We like to give the money to the people who do some good rather than let it be resiphoned off." Well if my honourable friend from Birtle-Russell was getting paid for what he knew, he'd be bankrupt. He referred to my colleague, the Minister of Northern Affairs as an idiot, and said northerners can't talk to him. "Saskatchewan had a better road system 25 years ago than Manitoba has today," he said, and that's Mr. Campbell. This is utterly ridiculous. There's not a man more approachable than my colleague from The Pas, and we know each other quite well, as we drove together many times from The Pas to here and back. And he's spent many many nights going to people, finding out their problems. And he proved it at the last election where you ran one man, an independent Liberal. Was it?

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. BARROW: The ratio was two to one.

A MEMBER: Where is he now?

MR. BARROW: Back in Japan. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will give another example of Conservative policy procedure. Since the last 30 years Flin Flon has been - oh, plagued with an air pollution problem. And Mr. Witney would say: "You can't make profits without putting up with some abuse." My friend, Mr. Jobin: "You can't get meat without bone, fuel without stone." We didn't believe that in '69, Mr. Speaker. As I said, we would cure that problem, or we'd attempt to cure it. And through all this past year, we put up a ratio on gases that are dismissed from that stack at .18. And I asked a question in this House, if they did not meet that standard, what would happen? My friend, who is now Minister of Tourism, said, "We will shut them down." So we can live without those stacks. The stack is 350 feet, and they had hearings and hearings, and I went to all those hearings, and this stack was going to cure all evils. And I hate to bring this up my friend from Portage la Prairie, but the former member from here, Mr. Jobin representing the Council, time off work from the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company, two councillors to attend that hearing, and when it came time he was the speaker, he was the guy that was going to speak. And he said, I'll quote him, it's in the record, he said: "I don't know of anyone that's died from pollution in Flin Flon. I don't know anyone who's in a care bed from pollution." He said, "You know, ladies and gentlemen, this company has so much blood and I want my share of it". And he was representing the people of Flin Flon as a councillor. So I asked him one question: "Is that the Council's views or your views?" "Mine", he said. But today they changed it from 350 to 450, now it's up to 820, and we have clean air in Flin Flon and hopefully they'll get it in Thompson some day, because we've set the example as we have in the past and probably . . .

Then we'll go to water pollution. Ever since that mine operated they've dumped their tailings into a stream, the stream went into the lake, the lake into a chain of lakes - beautiful lakes, fish, all kinds, beautiful beaches, and they poured it in, and nothing done by any government until the Honourable Minister of Mines passed legislation that no tailings go in there, none. So, four, five, maybe ten years, that lake will be pure, our water will be pure. It can be done. But it will have to be done by this government.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

A MEMBER: Right, if it's got the guts.

MR. BARROW: Now, I should say a few words about the leadership - and I feel sorry for you over there cause our people say to the Honourable Leader . . . we say we say we are happy you're our leader, and I am happy he is the leader. But I would be happy with any of the leaders on this side of the House, any leader. I'd say any backbencher sitting here - and we're a modest lot - could take the place of your leader.

A MEMBER: My God, I think you're right.

MR. BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. McKELLAR: I'd like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on . . . I don't know how you stand all that talk that you're getting from this debate. This has been a most unusual debate. I never saw so much hand clapping and desk pounding as there has been in the last eight days. It's most unusual. One thing sure most of the members will never go to sleep as long as they pound the desk. But I'd like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on the office which you hold and represent and try to keep decorum in this House, and I know you're doing an excellent job.

To the Deputy Speaker who has now taken the Chair I'd like to congratulate you, sir, on the position to which you're elected. I know that when we start the estimates on Monday that your work will start, and I know that you'll do an excellent job.

To the mover and seconder I'd like to congratulate them. It's not very often you start - I think they set the stage for this debate because the Member for Thompson he really went after us and tore a strip off us. The Member for St. Matthews he did likewise, and also tried to convert us to Autopac, which I don't know why he was trying to convert us, he should have been talking to people in Manitoba. They're the ones he's got to convert, he's not going to convert us.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, it's been quite a debate and in one hour's time we're going to all sit here and relax and we'll start our estimates and we'll find out what the government are going to do in the various departments. When the rules are changed I'm sure that the Ministers are going to be put in a different light this year simply because they haven't got the protection of the time limit. And they're going to have to answer many of the questions that were asked in other years and we never got answers. It's quite easy, Mr. Speaker, I'm talking from experience. I'm talking from experience. I sat over there 11 years. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I guess I got the record here for having sat in the Legislature 17 years and never even got in the front benches. I suppose I never will either at the rate I'm going, because I'll likely retire before we ever form the government, but it isn't a bad idea to set the odd record in here and someday I'm going to catch up to the Minister of Labour. He's got me beat by five years. Now I'm going to catch up to him I know that.

A MEMBER: He's slowing down.

MR. McKELLAR: He's slowing down and, Mr. Speaker, I understand he's going to get the Old-age Security, the Canada Pension, the Legislative Pension, and everything, in about another years time, and the CNR Pension, but he's going to be in the same position as our Member for Swan River. He's got so many things he doesn't know what to do with them. I only hope he enjoys his contented life. That there's no strikes after he leaves his office, and I know there won't be because there's been confusion galore under his term of office, and I know that Manitoba labour will be a lot happier when he decides to retire. I'm sure of that, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure of that.

Mr. Speaker, we've had a real good debate, a real good debate on many subject matters. The government of the day have been attacking us like I never saw - you'd think we were the government over here the way they're going after us. You'd think we were the government. We will be, we will be shortly. I never saw such an attack as we got last night by the First Minister. My gosh, you know, I always knew a history professor was good for something. I always knew they were good for something and, you know, the history professor he went back and he went back, and we got back into even the Liberal days of Manitoba back before 1958, and we had a rehearsal of all they did, and we had a rehearsal from '58 to '69 - and those days weren't very good according to the First Minister. But I remember when he was over here he never made those speeches when he was opposition. We weren't that bad then. We're sure a tough looking outfit right now. It must be the different bunch we got in the back row from

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) what we had then in those days. It's a different day. But when you haven't got an argument of your own, what do you do? The best thing, and I know from experience, you attack the other fellow. We did it, we did it. If we didn't have an argument we tried to bluff them off, we attacked the opposition, we attacked the Liberals. We did it, we did it. It's the easy way out, easy way out, the easy way out. And I know . . .

A MEMBER: If you've got a weak argument, raise it.

MR. McKELLAR: I know you holler louder, you holler louder and talk longer, that's the way to get out of your mess. Well I tell you they've been talking louder this Session; they've been talking longer, and the mess is still there, and it's going to be there for some time because we've seen the result of six years in office by a government that's getting tired, they're getting old, they're getting weary, and it's about time the public of Manitoba had a second look at them; and they will in '77.

Mr. Speaker, our troubles when we were in government started the same year, started the same year, six years in office. We were full of vim and vinegar, we came in and we revolutionized things and nobody says we didn't do anything. We did too darn many things, that was our trouble. We brought in agricultural credit; we brought in crop insurance; we brought in the Development Fund; and we brought in a hundred and one things in there during those first years of office. And I tell you you can do things too fast and be in too big a hurry, and once you get too far ahead of the people then that's the trouble, Mr. Speaker, they're just a little bit too far ahead of the people of Manitoba right today. Just like a general in the army being a thousand yards ahead of his army. What happens? The army's shot and he's away ahead, there's no army. So this is what's going to happen. The people of Manitoba aren't going to be with them, they aren't going to be with them two years from now. I'm just giving you a little bit of advice.

Mr. Speaker, we've heard all about education today, we've heard about agriculture, we've heard about Autopac - we haven't heard about Corrections yet, and we haven't heard about Lands and Forests, and we haven't heard from - I don't know whether there's any other Cabinet Ministers haven't spoken or not. Oh yes, the Minister of Municipal Affairs hasn't spoken either, he was away all week. We've had a real lecture on all the various departments of government. We haven't heard from Urban, I don't think we heard from Urban Affairs either or the Minister of Health. I don't think we heard from them, but they got a lot of talking too.

What was in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker? What was in it? That's the 22nd Throne Speech I've heard in the 17 years I've been here. 22nd. Not a thing in it, not a thing in it, nothing for the farmers. What was in there for the farmers? A little mention of land-lease. What was in there? What was in there about Autopac? The great subject, Autopac. You're going to build a Head Office. Where was the Head Office supposed to be, Mr. Speaker, when they brought this in? In Brandon. In Brandon. Did you ever see the General Manager of Autopac in Brandon -- only at the Red Oak Inn to have a swim -- at their board meetings. That's the only time he ever went there to have a swim in the Red Oak Inn. That's the truth. That's the truth. I want to tell the Member for Brandon East, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the lies you told us when you said their Head Office was going to be in Brandon. What nonsense, what nonsense, you misled the people of Manitoba. And I tell you, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, we are getting the same . . . today from the Minister of Autopac, the same kind of nonsense. And I want to tell you, I want to tell him a thing or two about insurance. I've had 25 years experience in the insurance business. --(Interjection)-- He's an instant expert in insurance, an instant expert. Fourteen months exactly in the insurance business. My goodness people put a whole lifetime in the insurance business and they don't pretend to know it all. But he knows it all, he knows it all. In fact, he can go back and tell the turkeys at Drybrough a little about autopac. Now I'm sure of that because they'll digest that the same as they digest the wild oats he feeds them up there on his ranch. That's not the way you run a business. You can't be an instant expert.

You know what. The best man that you want to hire in the insurance business is a humble man, a man that will listen, a man that doesn't know it all, a man that's willing to learn. The direct opposite to what we got right here. A direct man, a chairman of the board of directors, and there's the board of directors right there, it's not Mr. Dutton, it's not Mr. Wiley out there at Wiley Motors, or any of those fellows, and there's two or three of them

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKELLAR CONT'D) last week that resigned. The man down at Red River Mutual resigned this year. There is the Board of Directors right there of Autopac. That great Corporation that was established here four years ago with the record it was going to save the people 15 percent.

I want to talk about that 15 percent, that great 15 percent we're supposed to save. That great 15 percent, it's a real story that, long story, a long story. This is a record second to none. Let's look at the private insurance companies. Let's look at what they have to do and I know, I'm a director of one, I know. You have to be responsible to the Superintendent of Insurance at Ottawa, at Ottawa, and your reserves have got to be such or else you're cancelled, and I tell you there's a lot of companies in trouble this year, and I'll tell you why they're in trouble. It's not under . . . --(Interjection)-- If you'd shut up I'd tell you. You have to have 115 percent of your reserves sitting there to cover your losses. And I'll tell you what's happened and the governments of the day — do you ever know what the stockmarkets have done? You fellows don't have any money to invest except in Pioneer Life Insurance of Saskatchewan. That's the only place you invest and you got it all with Mr. Borowski. That's where you invest it all, the whole bunch of you. --(Interjection)-- The whole bunch of Pioneer Mutual or Pioneer Life Insurance in Regina, Saskatchewan. That's --(Interjection)-- I congratulate him, he bled a lot of money out of you fellows. He made the commission. He's the best free enterpriser that ever . . . He's had a change of heart. More power to a man that can go out and make a profit and make some commission. I'm proud that I . . . I don't know whether he makes 6 percent or 7 percent but it's in that ratio, but I know that. But more power to him. More power to him. I hope he sells you fellows lots of them. I hope he sells you fellows lots of it, and it's a good investment, I'll tell you that too.

I want to tell you what? The stock market has dropped at least 40 percent this year. The bond markets have gone down 30 percent. The investments of all the private insurance companies, which they had to account to the Superintendent of Insurance at Ottawa has made them on a border line. A . . . loss or underwriting loss has caused them all their trouble.

I want to tell you a little bit about that and this is the problem. What's the difference between Autopac? They don't have to account to anybody except the people of Manitoba, it's the people of Manitoba they're going to account to. And they're going to account in 1977. That's your day that you're going to be elected on the board of directors or defeated. That's the day. That's the day. And I tell you, I tell you with a record like you've got, I tell you I wouldn't smile, I wouldn't smile like you did today and laugh at us. A 10 million underwriting loss on \$50 million premiums, 40, 50 million dollars. Can you imagine what that would do. You know if a private company did that in one year the Superintendent of Insurance would close them down. He'd close them down and the board of directors would be fired, be fired overnight. That's what would happen to you if you were a private insurance company.

And then he has the nerve to compare rates all over Canada and he has the nerve and I want to - this is the thing I've really been waiting for him. He had the very gall yesterday to tear the General Manager and the President of the Canadian Indemnity, and the General Manager and the President of the Wawanesa Mutual to pieces. I tell you he can talk about shining shoes and all that. Ye God, you've got your gall. I tell you you've got more gall than ten barrels -- I tell you you haven't grown up yet, you haven't grown up. Mr. Claude Trites has spent a lifetime in the insurance business. And the Wawanesa - and I want to dwell on this subject. Wawanesa Mutual was started in 1896, and I don't have to repeat that again. It's a co-operative company, a co-operate - get that into your head. It's not a private company like some of the rest of them like Pioneer Mutual, like you bought into. It's not a company, it's a co-operative owned by the policyholders all across Canada and the policyholders this afternoon, at 2:30 this afternoon elected three members whose terms were retired this afternoon, in Wawanesa, too. I was hoping to be there but I couldn't be there because I had to talk to you this afternoon. And I tell you that's the most democratic system of a corporation that you can have, is a co-operative company like Wawanesa Mutual, second to none. A record second to none. I tell you a record second to none. Nobody can duplicate the Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Company. They can't duplicate it because it's got a record second to none all across Canada, too, from Vancouver right through to Newfoundland. That's the record, and I tell you, and you can talk about Quebec. Certainly it went into Quebec. They don't write fire insurance in Quebec, they write automobile insurance. They tried it once or twice then they went over the

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) counter. Do you know how many premiums they sell, dollars, about \$15 million over the counter in Quebec, the Province of Quebec, they sell that much. And it's been good business to them because they know how to underwrite it and they set their rates to break even, too. --(Interjection)-- No, no. I know they haven't. That's the only province that don't have agents; every other province have agents. Why don't they have agents? Because they don't sell fire insurance. When you have fire insurance you've got to sell.

Now I want to dwell on one other subject. This man was trying to make the people of Manitoba believe, believe that he could sell insurance for 19 percent. I'll tell you why they can sell it for 19 percent, and I'll tell you why. All I gotta do is talk to the Member for Assiniboia, the Member over here for Roblin, and they'll tell you, and I'll tell you, the commissions on fire insurance are 20 percent, 20 percent. Twenty percent with Portage and Wawanesa and most of the general insurance companies. Now the Co-op Fire and Casualty operate on a different base. They operate about 20 percent when you write a new application and five percent on all renewals, five percent on all renewals. Now you start comparing 40 percent and 19 percent, you're getting into a kettle of worms. There's no way you can write general insurance for five percent and keep the stores open. And the Member for Assiniboia will tell you and the Member for Roblin will tell you. It's quite simple, quite simple. You can't keep your doors open. I'll tell you what you gotta do, you gotta hire a barber for an agent, you gotta hire somebody that's going to have people coming in to us to supplement their income, if you're going to pay a man five percent commission. That's the only reason why they get by. If it's the month of February they can put a few people in their office and sell Autopac for one month, the other 11 months they don't have to staff it, except one man maybe a few hours a day. Quite different altogether. You can't compare the two. And I tell you what. You're going to get the greatest shock of your life when you go into the general insurance business, because you haven't got the people who know how to run it. Your board of directors here, the Cabinet Ministers - sure we have the Minister of Agriculture saying, "I was an insurance agent, last night, I was an insurance agent." The Minister of Municipal Affairs, I know his record, he was an insurance agent but he never sold a policy. I know his record. And I suppose they got a few more insurance agents over there too that tried this. An insurance agent doesn't live or die in one year; he lives on a lifetime in the business, it's that important. It's a career, it's a career. And I tell you there's no career men over there, none at all in the insurance industry.

I want to dwell on a couple of other things here, important to me. One is education. We heard the great Minister the other day dwell on increased grants, and he told us today, he tried to tell the Member for Pembina we gave the people of Manitoba 16 million. Sure he gave the people of Manitoba 16 million. Whose money was it? But that's not the point. That's not the point. The teacher grants haven't been changed since '67. Same grants as we brought in when we were over there. Same grants, never been changed. We've had the per student grant increased, we've had one or two other grants, we raised the transportation this year \$15.00.

A MEMBER: How much?

MR. McKELLAR: \$15.00. But what happens in a high assessed area like ours, and maybe the Minister doesn't care about my area. But I tell you what's going to happen this year. Our mill rates going up about 15 mills on education. And I want to say a word here on that. I'm not concerned about the little man, a fellow that owns a house in town. That's where the difference . . . He'd get by because his taxes in my town are \$100.00 - \$100.00 or less, all the houses in my town. --(Interjection)-- No. I'm concerned about the commercial land. The man that's going to pay 125 mills this year, 125 mills. Do you know what the life blood of our communities are, Mr. Speaker? I say we shouldn't have to tell you. It's the main street in every town. When the main street dies, the town dies. And I tell you, it's just that important? And I tell you, let's not have our main streets in our several communities die.

I tell you, Mr. Minister, you can laugh all you want. You haven't got five cents invested in any main street in any town. You've not got five cents. You'll let Eatons and Hudsons Bay look after this main street. But I tell you we rural people got to look after our main streets. And you're killing them one by one. I don't have to tell what's happening at Brandon. They put the shopping mall in the outskirts. Brandon, Rosser Avenue is going to have one terrible

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) time, one terrible time. You add 15 mills on to the tax rate in Brandon commercial, 125 mills. They're going to be in trouble, just like that. And I tell you, we told you last year you better do something about that. You can do it yet. 33 mills on commercial on the general levy. You can do something about that. If you don't want to help them on the special, do something on the general. Help the businessman in the Province of Manitoba. As I say, he's the life blood of our community. Who employs all the people? The businessman. He employs them.

Mr. Speaker, they thought they had all the answers on property tax credit. We tried that when we were over there. They laughed us out of the - so one year that was enough of that nonsense. One year. We brought in a grant structure that looked after the biggest portion of the cost of education. I tell you, they don't really pay that much attention to it - in fact I think he's the weakest man in the whole Cabinet, because he's getting less attention than the rest of them. I tell you that's the trouble, and when we get at his education estimates, I tell you if you get any more than a dollar, you're getting too much. I tell you that right now. And that's all you're going to get too.

Let's get down to agriculture. I happen to be one of those farmers in this House, I don't see many over there, except a turkey farmer and a potato farmer. We've heard so much about the economy in the Province of Manitoba. The First Minister mentioned how good the economy was. Sure we had one of the best years last year. I'll show this to the press. Somebody's got nothing to do but write notes here. That comes from the Opposition, I know that, I watched them write it. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, we heard, we heard about all that great economy - the boost in economy this last year. Sure the farmers went out - I tell you they're individuals and they went out and did the right thing and they've grown some real good crops over the last couple of years. And the prices went up, and they took advantage of it. So what's going to happen this year? This bunch are going to have more revenue in the month of April than they ever saw in their lifetime. Forty-two and a half percent of all my surplus income is going to that bunch. And I tell you I'm not very pleased. And then they come along and they say, well, we're going to distribute the wealth. Well they're sure doing a good job. And I tell you, they got a war on poverty over there too. They got the best war on poverty I ever saw in my lifetime - 17 Cabinet Ministers, 10 Legislative Assistants and about two - I guess - I don't know if anybody has got a second job or not. The best war on poverty that ever existed. But they say they're going to distribute some wealth. They're distributing it from me over there to pay their extra salary, that's the distribution of wealth.

This is a great phrase you know, it sounds good, you know, when you say it on Portage Avenue down here, we're going to distribute the wealth, we're going to make everybody the same. We're going to make everybody equal. Well I tell you. You know what's going to happen, Mr. Speaker. If you leave that bunch in there long enough, there won't be anybody have any money. Then how are you going to distribute it then? How are you going to distribute it then? Well I tell you, that day may not be so far away, a lot closer than you think. Because I want to tell you why, Mr. Speaker. We're experiencing right now the greatest decline in the farm economy as you ever had. What have we got? The price of flax has dropped from \$12.00 to six dollars and a half and my flax is still in the granary. The price of barley has dropped from \$3.00 down to 2.00 and my barley is still in the granary. The price of oats has dropped from \$2.10 down to \$1.40 and my oats are still in the granary. The price of wheat has gone to \$6.00, and I don't think you can sell it because the elevator man told me the other day in Killarney, on Wednesday, that he can't even buy any, they don't want any . . . wheat, you can't sell it, you can't give it away. And why has this all taken place? Why has this all taken place? Because of the fact that the governments of the day, both federal and provincial haven't got enough interest in the farmers' economy to say to all these, put these people back to work. I know that you fellows, you say, that's not our problem. But I tell you, if I was the government of the day I'd go down to Ottawa and I'd sit on the doorstep until they got those guys back to work.

Do you know what's going to happen in April? Do you know what's going to happen in April? Do you know what's going to happen in April? The Lakehead's going on strike, just the time that our grain in Manitoba starts shipping. And we're going to have a blockade, no grain's going to move till June. I can forecast that right now. What's going to happen next year? I tell you the people - if you think the farmers are crying on doorstep of the Legislative Building

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) right now, just wait a few more months. It's that serious right now, it is serious. And I'm telling you, it is serious. Farmers are going to be in trouble. Fertilizer's practically 50 percent higher this year than last year. Sprays are up. Everything's up, everything you buy. Machinery, tractors, you name it, 30 percent higher than a year ago. Repairs and so on. And I tell you, it's serious, Mr. Speaker. But all we get is laughs. All we get is laughs.

Mr. Speaker, they think that the Land Lease Program is going to cure all the ills. I tell you if the Minister of Agriculture stayed up all night, worked day and night for the next two months, he wouldn't have enough time to devote to the farmers' problems in the Province of Manitoba. It's that serious. Because a livestock man was never in any more trouble than he is right today, never in any more trouble - - 35-cent steers, 35-cent steers, they can't survive, they're going to be down. And I tell you, it's about time the government paid some attention. And pay it in a hurry. Don't wait till tomorrow, tomorrow's too late, tomorrow's too late.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm getting near the end of my time here. But I get frustrated, you know, get frustrated at listening to this nonsense that's poured out across the way. I know what it is to be responsible on the government side. I spent 11 years in it, and I tell you it isn't easy, but it's that important that you represent the people. Because we can't govern this side, the 24 on this side don't mean a thing. It's your decisions over there that are going to fall or otherwise. I tell you it's your decision, your decision, you've got to account to the people. Somebody said, well - the Member for Point Douglas said: "The Opposition have got to come up with alternatives." I agree they have to come up with alternatives. They can decide when they want to come up with alternatives. They can decide when they want to criticize you. That's what the opposition are there for. I tell you, when we were the government we had a good opposition over here I always thought, a real good opposition. They kept us on our toes, they kept us on our toes. Sure they did. Sure, that's good, that's good. But you know, we listened. We listened. We didn't always do everything you said by a long shot, but we listened, and I wish you people over there on the government side would pay a little more attention. Pay a little more attention. Some of them are green, you know. If they'd sat over here - I know the First Minister and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Urban Affairs sat over here, and they're a hell of a lot quieter. I know, I watch them, I watch them, they're the ones that are paying attention. You boys that come in there the last two years, they're the noisemakers in the back row. They haven't learned, they haven't been polished off enough yet. You gotta listen. It's all right to heckle, but don't laugh at anybody when they're trying to make a point.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there's only one thing that bothers me. I live in the City of Winnipeg along with the other rural members here about four to five months of the year. And you'd think to listen to the government side that we never did a thing, that the Liberal Government previous to 1958 didn't do a thing in Winnipeg, and I guess the previous governments before that didn't do a thing. Well, the same old story. It's all right to pat your own back, but other governments did something too. And I remember when we were first elected. There were only two little old lanes coming in from Headingley right through to the Grace Hospital. Two little old lanes, you could hardly get down, 20 feet wide. But that was improved. I guess we never told the people that we did it. Maybe we should of told the people. There have been lots of improvements. We did it. The Campbell government designed the Perimeter Highway. They built a lot of it, we built the rest of it. You paved some of it and everybody takes a little credit. That's good. That's the way it should be.

We built the big ditch around Winnipeg here and everybody said that was a disaster. I remember the First Minister, he wasn't all - I don't know if he was in favour at that time or not. They said that the rural members will all be defeated in the next election. Everybody said it was a disaster, it would never be used. Well, we saw a little water trickling down it. We saw a little water trickling down it a year ago, it helped. It helped. And that's good, that's good. We built the ditch at Portage la Prairie. Everybody said it was never needed; it wouldn't solve the purpose, that we should have had that great big dam at Holland, that was the answer. We should have built the big dam at Holland. Yeah, that's the First Minister's argument. He was going to build the big dam. Well, we decided we'd build a big ditch at Portage. We put the Shellmouth Dam up there and stopped the water, the headwater. Between the two, I tell you, it served a purpose. Sure. Last year a little excess water on that land . . . on the

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) Minister of Mines for letting in a little excess water and there's only so much water. That is the problem it caused in this - no, I guess it was my seat mate here, his constituency. He flooded --(Interjection)-- If the Minister of Mines would have gone out and checked that valve out there and kept the water down to a certain level, they wouldn't have bothered. But that ditch is doing all right. Shellmouth is doing all right.

We started the Sprucewoods Park. We started the Turtle Mountain Park, and Birds Hill. But I guess we don't blow enough. That's our problem I guess in our side of the House. We gotta start blowing a little more about the accomplishments that we did over the years. . . . to the First Minister last night - well I tell you, that was an exercise. You know and I admire the First Minister, he was a history professor, you know. We got the greatest lecture in history. The only trouble, the First Minister should go back to teaching history. He's have a lot more to talk about now than he had when he was back here, back in the days of '58 and '60 when he was a professor out at St. Paul's College. --(Interjection)-- Yeah. I think he'd be a lot better now; he'd have more to talk about now! he's got more practical knowledge, a lot more practical knowledge. He'd be a lot better man, and I think the St. Paul's College would be able to afford him a lot more money with the grants that are being paid to the various universities at the present time.

But I tell you, I tell you, I say to the First Minister, he and I come in at the same time into the Legislature. We come in at the same time on June 16th, I think it was, in 1958. We were both here. He went to Ottawa, he took a little detour to Ottawa in between '65 and '69, and then came back. And I went from over there to here, so I think the next term will be backwards and we'll just change positions here and get back. But I say to the First Minister, when you haven't got a case of your own like you had last night, you tear the other fellows to pieces, so you go back to '58 and '69, tear them all to pieces. Say of every program that they brought in, they didn't either do anything or they did something and did it wrong. And that's all he did for an hour and a half last night. And I admire him for it. I admire your case. I admire your case. You didn't have anything to tell about your own fellows, or your own programs there because they're worn out; they're all worn out, the programs you've got there. You haven't got any ideas. My goodness, Mr. Speaker, if they had any ideas, they would have put it on that - where is that time sheet here? No, that great - where's that Throne Speech? Where's that Throne Speech? I want the Throne Speech. Where's that Throne Speech? I want the Throne Speech. Here it is. Well it must be on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, they didn't have anything. They couldn't think of any ideas. Here it is. They just about - you know, I know you wrote this. I know you wrote it, either that or your brother-in-law, one or the other wrote that. It must have been your brother-in-law; I can't blame you for this. Well there's just nothing in it, there's nothing in it, nothing in it. In fact it was so bad that the Lieutenant-Governor had trouble digesting it. It was so bad. There's nothing in it. You know what, if I had had a billion dollars, if I had had a billion dollars, I'd have had some ideas. --(Interjection)-- Well, I know you're trying to get in bed with these fellows, but don't get in bed with us, don't get in bed with us. No, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, there's just nothing in it. The Conservatives could have wrote a better one than that. In fact we had better ones, at least with ideas. We had all the Liberals in the front bench, and we had all the Conservatives in the back bench, that was our trouble. That was our trouble when we were the Government. I don't know who our speakers were but they were a lot better than that, Mr. Speaker, a lot better.

Now, I want to - I don't know how many minutes I got left. Could you inform me?

A MEMBER: Ten minutes.

MR. McKELLAR: I want to extend an invitation to everybody before I close here, because . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has about 18 minutes left.

MR. McKELLAR: Eighteen? Oh. The only time I ever spoke 40 minutes in this House, I think was at ten to five in the morning in 1973, and I started at ten to five and I spoke to 5:30.

A MEMBER: Do you want a magazine to read?

MR. McKELLAR: I didn't read them though. I don't need to read a magazine to make a speech in this place. All I need is look at you fellows. It gives me ideas. It gives me ideas.

Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the City of Winnipeg and I got diverted. I was talking about the City of Winnipeg awhile ago. Well, the great plans. You know, public housing.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) That's a favorite subject, it's been our favorite subject here for many years. And who built the first - I attended the official opening of public housing in 1960, 1960, and it's out in the constituency I think of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resource. I don't know whether that housing's still there or whether it burnt down or fell afoul. It's still there. Well that was built by the Conservatives and that's built by the Conservatives, and I'd like to say that to the people. I . . . low rental housing too, low rental housing based on the same - that was the policy of the Conservative Government you adopted --(Interjection)-- Built by the Conservative Government. There wasn't many on our side left only the Member for Arthur and myself were around when that was built. And I tell you we built public housing, and we opened it and we filled it, and we were going to - it was always the intention to build a . . . move people out, tear an area out and build up new housing. And I tell you, I tell you with all the talk that is in this here thing, I just bet you there isn't a thing done in the next 12 months. I know what detail you've got to go through. There wouldn't be one city block in Winnipeg north or Portage Avenue ever torn out or is being developed. I know that because it's all talk. I know that from experience. It won't happen. Even if you got 90 percent federal money you won't do it, you won't do it. I'll tell you, I'll go down and sweep a whole city block north of there if you do it. I'll sweep the block. But I know I won't have to keep my promise. I know I won't, because I know it's all talk. The whole thing, you're going to develop it.

I remember the plans at Point Douglas. I haven't seen hardly a house torn down unless somebody wanted to build up a little business. There just hasn't been anything done in that Point Douglas. --(Interjection)-- Sure I hear all this great development there, CNR development. I've heard about that, but it won't happen this year, next year. It'll still be in the speech next year. It'll still be - somebody's going to revolutionize something in Winnipeg.

I don't mind helping Winnipeg out. I know when Winnipeg prospers my little village of 30 people prospers too,--(Interjection)-- 30 people. It's going to prosper. Somewhere along the line it'll prosper.

A MEMBER: Where is that?

MR. McKELLAR: Nesbitt. Smallest little town in Manitoba, but it's a good one anyway. But I tell you it helped. Where Brandon's developed you help Brandon, it's going to help me. I don't care. If you help Killarney, it's going to help me. But we're building a \$900,000 shopping mall. It's going to be open the end of April in Killarney. Built with private money in Killarney. A \$900,000 shopping mall. I tell you those are the people. They have initiative. They don't wait for governments to go out and hand them money. They did it on their own, a great big beautiful shopping mall. And I admire those people, and I've got a little money in that too, and I'm proud of it too. I tell you that's the kind of spirit you need in the Province of Manitoba, that's the kind of spirit.

You know what you've done to all the housing. You're trying to do it all yourself. What about the money in Monarch Life and the Great West Life over here, and all these other corporations? There's lots of money in the Province of Manitoba. We've got the money but you've chased it out, just the same as you've chased all the insurance companies out. You've chased all the private money out. You can't do it alone, Mr. First Minister. You can't do it alone. You can't do it alone. But you leave the impression that government's got to do it all. I tell you --(Interjection)-- Yeah. That's what you say right now but that's not the way the other fellows talk behind you. You want to hear all those echoes that are coming at you from behind, because I tell you that's what the government of the day are trying to do. They're trying to accomplish everything themselves, and you can't do it all. You must work with private industry, you must do that. I tell you --(Interjection)-- What? Who's building it? We got enough gumption out in the rural part, if we want to do something we dig in. I tell you we don't go crying and begging the government for everything.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I know I'm getting near the end of my . . . Speaking of Killarney I want to tell you something about Killarney. I wish that Alice Kruger was up in the press gallery because she's from Killarney, and she's not there today I see, but we have tomorrow. But tomorrow in the Town of Killarney we're going to have a celebration second to none, and I want to extend an invitation to everybody to come to Killarney tomorrow. St. Patrick's Day celebration. It's happening on the 15th. We have green beer and we have green ice cubes, and we have Irish stew and we just have everything on the celebration there, yes sir. We'll

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) have Miss Manitoba, we'll have races, wheelbarrow races; we'll have everything, hockey tournament, curling bonspiels, you name it. And I tell you it's really a day to remember if you go into Killarney on St. Patrick's Day. I welcome everybody to come to Killarney. It's a great community, the same as all the other communities are in my area. We've got a lot of good communities. --(Interjection)-- Tomorrow. Tomorrow all day long. Dance at night. If you want to come to the dance we'll get you tickets too. It's a real day for the Irish.

When we had Erick Willis in here, the former member for Turtle Mountain, every day on St. Patrick's Day, we had a little green plant that he presented, and the First Minister will remember that when he was the - he remembered St. Patrick's Day. I guess I'm not that good an Irishman, in fact I'm a Scotsman, or else I'd be the first one. But I think we're all proud of the Irish anyway tomorrow. I do hope that if you can't make it tomorrow that you'll come out . . .

Now one other thing in 1976, and I know this is - I'm going to close off -. In 1976 the Bi-Centennial of the United States, a celebration is taking place, in 1976. And in that year they're going to celebrate - and the celebrations, a lot of them in North Dakota will take place at the Peace Gardens, and I would welcome anybody to come to the Peace Gardens. I understand there's talk that they're inviting Lawrence Welk, and some people don't like Lawrence Welk but I like his music. They're trying to get him to come to the Peace Garden. He's a North Dakotan anyway, Lawrence Welk is, and I think this is going to be a year that we're going to remember for a long long while.

A MEMBER: Turtle racing.

MR. McKELLAR: The Member for Pembina talks about the Turtle races. Yes. Well that's in August and we won't be here in August but that's a weekend to remember too.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the members for listening and I know they paid more attention to me after I gave them a little lecture and I told them not to laugh or smile, just to listen and absorb a person that had some experience from the government side. You got a responsible job and I tell you it's a big job, it's bigger than it ever was before, and getting bigger. I tell you the people of Manitoba make their judgment, they'll make their judgments on your record over the years; they'll make it eventually on election day. So I say to you listen to the people, listen to what they have to say to you, and I tell you you won't go wrong, but you're not listening close enough from what letters and fan mail I'm getting. And I tell you you can't go wrong by listening to the people. I tell you they're right most of the time, most of the time the people are not far wrong on issues of the day. They know more about what we're doing in here than we know ourselves, to be truthful. And I tell you, that's the way it should be too. Yes. So thanks, Mr. Speaker, for the privilege of speaking and I do hope that the government lose the vote at 5:00 o'clock.

. . . . continued on next page

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister for Urban Affairs) (Seven Oaks): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and may I join with others in congratulating you and all's well. I wish you well for this Session. You've had your trials and tribulations of this House in the past. I hope that this year will perhaps be a little easier on you.

I want to join with others who have expressed their congratulations to the Deputy Speaker for his return to this Chamber and I hope that this year he will serve as he has in the past with that powerful gavel that's been referred to.

I want to congratulate some of my colleagues who've joined Cabinet. The Minister for Corrections and Rehabilitation, the Minister for the Renewable Resources, and particularly the Member for St. Boniface whose election I must admit I awaited with bated breath, and was most anxious that it be successful. I was delighted of course to learn that not only was he re-elected, but he was elected with a comfortable majority. I know that in his present portfolio he will do an excellent job because I have great confidence in him, and I indicated that of course some time ago when I appointed him as the Chairman of the Health Services Commission because I knew he was the kind of man who could handle that kind of job and he'll certainly be able to handle the portfolio, and I have every confidence that the people of Manitoba will be well served by the Member for St. Boniface.

Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy listening to the Member from Souris-Killarney. I enjoy his delivery, you know, he's a free spirit. He says what's on his mind at the moment, and I recall in years gone by when he didn't hesitate to take a strip off his own government. It didn't happen very often but the odd time it did happen. I recall when he sat on this side of the House and he's right, he made the reference today that their problem was that their front bench was the so-called progressive wing and it was the back bench that was the more conservative wing. They had their split, and it was obvious very often during the course of debate. So it would appear the suggestion here is that the radicals are all behind us and the front bench are the conservatives.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Souris-Killarney made reference to a couple of points I'd like to dwell on for a moment. One in particular was the matter of public housing, and I recall in the comments by the Leader of the Official Opposition that he too made comments about public housing and said "Well what's so new about that. It was started under the Conservative Government. It was back in 1967", he said, "that the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation was formed". And he's right. It is true, that was when it started. What he didn't say, and what the Member for Souris-Killarney didn't say, or maybe the Member for Souris-Killarney doesn't know, of course, is although they did in fact create the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, and they did in fact have statutes so that there could be public housing built on the very sections of the Act, the CMHC, there was little requirement in Manitoba which nullified the whole thing, and that little requirement is a very simple one. It was mandatory that the municipalities would have to contribute financially to the capital cost of projects and to the ongoing operational subsidy cost. That means the municipalities, whether they be Winnipeg or Killarney or Brandon or The Pas, would have to chip in their share, whether it be 12-1/2 percent or 50 percent. As a result despite the legislation, despite the - I remember the preamble was really beautiful words, glowing words, very different than what is usually found in statutes. It was more like an editorial comment.

The result was though that nothing happened, but nothing. It didn't happen because the municipalities could not and would not participate financially. They were not prepared to do that, either because they didn't favour public housing or they didn't feel they had the resources. Whatever the reasons, there was no program in Manitoba. The only difference therefore between them and us is that when we took office we said, "Well forget about that, we'll use another section of the Act. We will not impose any requirement on the municipality. They will not have to participate financially either in the capital nor in the operating subsidy, it will be picked up through consolidated revenue." And as a result of that there are thousands of units have been built which never would have been built, but never.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Souris-Killarney also suggested that he's been through this before where there's going to be housing built, and there's going to be changes, and there's going to be renewal, and he recalls the days, the good old days, when you went in with a bulldozer and you wrecked it all and then eventually new units, new housing units were put up.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. MILLER cont'd) Well he's a little behind the times. That day hopefully is gone and the bulldozer will not be used, because that was not the way to build new housing. That was not the way to rejuvenate an area because in the process of bulldozing people had to scatter. Then in the two or three years that will be required to build anything after that the number of people who actually were resident there before and then moved back was negligible. So you really dislocated people, forced them out of their neighbourhoods and a new element came in.

I think that was the point that the Member for Fort Rouge was trying to make that in fact that is not the way to have restoration and rejuvenation of an area. But the Member for Fort Rouge however went one step further, and I couldn't understand why. He said, "Bricks and mortar don't mean a thing. It's a social problem, and how do you deal with a social problem"? Well of course there's a social problem, we're aware of it. There's no government in Canada that has addressed itself more to the social problems of the culturally and socially disadvantaged than this government, and we've gotten hell for it. We tried it in northern Manitoba through Co-ops, through Manpower Corps, through any number of devices to give people the opportunity, a chance to do for themselves. I think those are the words that the Member for Fort Rouge uses. Every time we've done it there have been problems because you're dealing with people who don't have the sophistication, who don't have the knowledge, who lack the skills, and when you give them the job to do and they try it on their own, they do get into problems, and of course the chickens are coming home to roost. Now we're being accused of not being businesslike, of not being administrators. And what we really did was try to make it possible to give some people some pride in doing something for themselves and it has been tried, we've done it throughout Manitoba, through rural Manitoba, through northern Manitoba, from Churchill all the way south.

So this is not new and so the Member for Fort Rouge says do something in that sense. We've done it. We have programs launched in Manitoba which are being copied across the nation. Northern Manpower Corps, which was a model for the nation; New Careers programs, which is being now duplicated in every province of the nation. They're all joining in. Our Student Employment programs are being duplicated across the nation now. They all came here to find out how. Sure some of them didn't pan out as well as we would like to but we're an activist government and we make no apologies for it whatsoever. The Member for Souris-Killarney says, "Well we're too far ahead of people and that we're not listening anymore, and that he hears that we're far - from his point of view that this government's in trouble.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that people are listening. I suggest to you that when we launch programs every program touches somebody in its own way. And you don't need headlines for it, and you sure don't need the kind of knocking and ridicule that you get from the other side. I have every pride, and no hesitation, in saying that we stand behind and will not withdraw at all from programs such as Pharmacare. Let them knock it. Ambulance program, let them knock it. Personal Care Homes, let them knock it. Home Care programs, let the Conservatives knock it. Elderly person housing and public housing, they can knock it all they want. And the legal aid system that apparently the Member from Pembina was so critical about, that legal aid system, Mr. Speaker, is an essential part of any democratic system and we have it and we're proud of it. And other provinces have it too, including even the Conservative provinces. And there's a Human Rights Commission, something that wasn't here before. And there is an Ombudsman, some that wasn't here before.

And, Mr. Speaker, we have made very conscientious efforts to do what the Member for Souris-Killarney scoffed at, redistribute the wealth to make it a little more equitable. There's no . . . I mean it is nonsense to say we're going to bring everybody down to a certain level, and so on. That's nonsense. But there's got to be some way to take some of the edge off the inequity. And so we introduced the Property Tax Credit Plan, and again the Member from Souris-Killarney said, "Oh, that's old news, that was done by Mr. Roblin back in the early Sixties, and we had to give it up." Well, there's as much relationship between that plan and our plan as day and night. The Property Tax Credit Plan that we have, \$150 of which is paid directly to the municipality on behalf of the ratepayer, and the balance of \$100 which can be claimed, depending on income, on the filing of an income tax return, has resulted in over 80 percent of the pensioners in this province, not a nickel of education tax, that is a fact. And that is redistribution. That's what it's for, because it isn't a 50-dollar flat as the former

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. MILLER cont'd) government had, irrespective of income, and only to the owner shown on the property. The tenant didn't get anything, absolutely nothing. The owner, the ratepayer, the company or the man whose name appeared on the tax bill, that's who got the 50-dollar rebate. The tenants, not a thing. In our plan the tenants do, when they file their income tax, get rebates, and this helps to ameliorate the pressure; this helps to ameliorate, to make it possible to pay their municipal taxes. --(Interjection)--Yes, even though they live in St. James, and the Member for St. James tried to make a case for it this morning. He talked about the fact that the cost of taxation, education, municipal costs are escalating. That's right, they are. And I think it's the Financial Post that headed up its story saying, that municipal and school costs are escalating from Bona Vista to Vancouver Island, and that's a reality. Conservative provinces, Liberal provinces, New Democratic provinces, that is a reality. They are going up. Of course they're going up, as all other things are going up.

The suggestion however that the Member for St. James made that people are being forced out of their homes, I've heard in this House for five years. There's absolutely nothing to prove that it is so, except the rhetoric that one hears. The fact is, as I said earlier, over 80 percent of the pensioners have their major costs paid for, property costs paid for under the Property Tax Credit Plan. As well, the renters are also relieved of certain costs, so that no one, or very few to my knowledge, have been forced out of their homes. And many who have had very limited resources at least now have an alternative. At least now we have the Elderly Person Housing Units, where people can live in dignity, where people can live in clean quarters, where the housing is adequate, where they are together, where there is a feeling of community. These things were not available before. Sure there were organizations, and I give them full credit, who got banded together, or organized and had a few elderly person housing units built under the old E & IPH Act, the CMHC Act, the E & IPH provisions, but they were mighty few, and as fast as we build them, the waiting list continues to grow.

Which brings me to a matter which I think should be known to this House; that in fact we are concerned, we are concerned about housing in Manitoba, not because it's a problem unique to Manitoba, but rather because it's a problem that Canada faces. And I'm very concerned, and expressed that concern at the recent Ministers Housing Conference in concert with all the other provinces of Canada. And I recall being quoted in the press saying, if there had been a vote, the votes would have been ten to one against the Federal Minister of Housing, but nonetheless the Federal Minister won the vote. There is a crisis because even the Federal Government admits they need about 800,000 units across Canada. And what they've come up with is a program which might - and I think they're being optimistic - deliver about 210,000, not 800,000.

Last year, 1974, showed a drop in housing starts, the first drop in a four-year period, when it should have been going the other way suddenly it dipped. And there's absolutely nothing in this year to indicate that it's going to be any better. And I suspect it's going to be worse. And they're employing a tactic that I think the Member for Fort Rouge will appreciate, because he's suggesting we do it. He suggested that the Province of Manitoba shouldn't try to be building these homes, all these units by itself, it should go to the private sector, make money available at a subsidized interest rate, so that the private investor will be attracted into the field. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Rouge knows, he knows very well, that in fact that is the thrust of the whole federal program. The increase to CMHC funding this year is about 16 to 18 percent higher than last year, which just barely - it doesn't really keep up with inflation.

But even allowing for that, where the major thrust is, where it really is, is that what is known as Section 15E - and what is 15E? 15E is the carrot to the private sector to induce them to invest money in housing. If you have money, many of the professionals who don't know what, you know, have no way of investing it otherwise and would have to pay very high income tax, can now use that money which they would have to pay in income tax, it's a tax haven, to go into housing. You get eight percent money, and they would have to guarantee certain rents for - it's indefinite, anywhere from five to 15 years. And this is the gamble that the Federal Government's going into on housing. And it is a gamble that I predict will lose, because that was in effect all through the Sixties and all through the Fifties, and it never built homes.

And I am not critical of the private housing sector nor the private lenders in business. They are there to maximize their profits. Now why should they build a unit for \$20,000 when

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. MILLER cont'd) they build a unit for 40,000 in a tight market and sell it? And they're going to make more money on it. And if I was in the house building business I would do exactly the same thing. So it's absolute nonsense to think that the private sector can hope to even scratch the surface of housing needs. There's no way they can do it. And to simply suggest that, well if you pay the private sector, if you give them a carrot and if you give them money at a special interest rate, that will induce them to invest. It didn't work before; I don't see why it should work now because the fact of the matter is they make a lot more money by investing in that shopping centre that the Member for Souris-Killarney mentioned. The commercial shopping centre has a much bigger pay-off, a much better return on their investment than has any public housing or low-cost housing or medium-cost housing. And being a good investor, I don't blame people for going where the yield is highest.

They're going to continue to go that way, unless and until the Government of Manitoba ever gets the guts to say to the private banking sector in this country, you can invest as you will, at whatever rates you can get, but a certain portion of your portfolio has to be made available for social housing at an interest rate that is equitable and fair and which you will not necessarily make profit. But that is your cost of doing business in this country. And I think it's high time maybe that was done, because the interest rates of 12 and 13, even though they're dropping now, they are still too high and it forces cost of housing way beyond what the average person can afford, and not even the average person, but even those with the slightly above average income.

Reference has been made here to renewal, and the Member from Fort Rouge spoke on it. He's concerned about what's going to happen. I can tell him, and he knows, that we are following the Federal NIP programs. We've designated two areas in Winnipeg, with Winnipeg, jointly with Winnipeg, an agreement signed by Winnipeg, the province and the Federal Government. And in that area there will be housing, and housing is the name of the game, and the housing is the reason for the whole exercise. Not government buildings or any other buildings. So when the Member for Fort Rouge says, well how are buildings going to benefit people living in the area, I say to him they are not, but the buildings that we're talking about are not going to be in the NIP area. The buildings may go somewhere in the periphery of the NIP area. And why shouldn't they? We could put a building on Broadway, yes. We could put a building on Portage Avenue somewhere, we could put a building in Fort Osborne Barracks, I suppose, but what is wrong with going into the centre core and try to revitalize it by putting in areas where homes are not the factor, putting in some modern buildings and getting rid of some junk that has been lying around for decades. Because, Mr. Speaker, unless you rejuvenate a core of the City, eventually the rot spreads. You cannot have a rotten core, because it will affect the healthy part of the body politic.

Mr. Speaker, I see that the members - that the Clerk of the House is here, and time is running short.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make these few comments. I'll have an opportunity again to speak in the debate, but I can assure the honourable members present that to the extent that is possible, the extent that CMHC money is available - and I'm afraid that it's not going to be available in the amounts that we want - we'll continue with our land banking program, we'll continue to support co-operative programs, we'll continue to support non profit building programs. We have in the past and we'll continue to do so, providing the Federal Government lives up to its basic responsibility as set back in 1946, and they've been fiddling around with it ever since. They turn on the money one year, they turn it off the next. It's like a tap, on and off whenever it suits them. Mr. Speaker, that is not a housing policy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. According to our Procedure Rule 35, I must now half an hour before adjournment put the main motion.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there being no requests for the calling of ayes and nays, I take it the motion is accordingly passed. And at this point in the proceedings, I would then move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Urban Affairs, that the Address of His Honour be engrossed and be presented to His Honour by such members of the House as are of the Executive Council, and the mover and seconder of the Address.

MOTION presented and carried.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Administrator of the Province of Manitoba transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Estimates of sums required for the services of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1976, and recommends these Estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. SCHREYER: I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that the message together with the Estimates accompanying the same be referred to the Committee of Supply.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources, that this House will in its next sitting resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, that this House will at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as is customary at this point in time, and while the Estimates are being distributed to honourable members, I would in my capacity as Minister of Finance like to make a brief statement regarding these expenditures. I want to stress that --(Interjection)--there is the required concurrence. I thank honourable members. I would like to stress, Mr. Speaker, that the Estimates that are being tabled here today represent the Government of Manitoba's commitment to carry out as best it knows how, as best it can, on a sound, financial basis, the ongoing day to day programs which to the degree possible promote greater equality and distribute equitably to Manitobans benefits provided by public services, from the production of wealth generated by the industrial, agricultural and natural resources of our province.

The Estimates also show the government's awareness of its requirement to initiate some new programs in line with meeting the evolving needs of mankind and of our citizens here in our province.

During the lengthy expenditure estimate review, and it has, if I may say as an aside, sir, been indeed a lengthy review - we have devoted considerable time, effort and energy to ensure that all our programs encompass the principles which underscore the philosophy of this government and at the same time represent the most efficient management of the taxpayer's dollar.

Estimated current expenditures for fiscal 1975-'76 are at the billion-dollar mark, or to be more precise, at \$1,009,257,300 as compared to \$849,268, for the current fiscal year now coming to an end; An increase of approximately 160 million or about 18.8 percent. If one were to exclude the debt service cost which since it is statutory is not a controllable expense for purposes of the budget, the estimated expenditures would be in the order of 985,100,000 approximately, as compared to 839 million for the previous fiscal year and on that basis the increase would be in the order of 17-1/2 percent.

It should be recognized immediately that growing rates of inflation have had serious effects on all levels of government spending. We have attempted to reduce as much as possible the impact of inflation on our expenditures for the coming fiscal year by reviewing priorities, policies and programs time and again so as to attempt to weed out any non-essential, non-productive socially unnecessary or non-productive spending. We believe that this exercise in restraint which has been undertaken by departments and agencies has been at least to a degree, sir, without exaggerating the words, has been to some degree successful, and that the estimated expenditures we present today have been trimmed to a reasonable possible extent. We

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) must however remain convinced that governments must do more than simply hold the line. Our government is prepared to embark in new direction in relation to meeting social and economic needs of our citizens.

The Manitoba Government has accorded, and continues to accord a high priority to the provision of educational opportunities in recognition that education not only enriches the individuals desire to fulfill his or her own potential but also contributes to the well-being of the community as a whole. The educational services offered must be as comprehensive as possible while at the same time maintain excellent standards in the classroom. In total the Department of Education, Colleges and Universities have forecast expenditures of \$285 million for fiscal 1975-76 as compared with 239 million for the current fiscal year now coming to an end. This represents an increase of approximately 19 percent. It could be said, sir, that 28 percent of our total budget for 1975-76 will be on some form of education or training. And I must also say in passing, sir, that the percentage increase involved here is slightly higher than that for the provincial estimates taken as a whole.

The estimate of expenditures of the Department of Health and Social Development for fiscal 1975-76 are at some 308 million as compared to 281 million approximately in fiscal 1974-75.

So that in aggregate in the general area of Health, Education and Social Development these account for about 593 million, or 58.8 percent, of the government's fiscal 1975-76 current expenditures as a provincial jurisdiction in Canada.

Other government initiatives are being taken in the development of our province's resources in the north with expenditures of the Department of Northern Affairs being increased by some two million five, or 17-1/2 percent approximately, in comparison with the previous fiscal year.

Manitoba municipalities will also benefit from a planned increase of \$4,046,300, or some 22.3 percent, in expenditures of the Department of Municipal Affairs. This is arrived at by comparing with the 18 million that was appropriated by this House for the current fiscal year.

There are no frills, or perhaps I should say in a more tentative way and with less extravagant certainty that there are, at least I feel, sir, very few frills indeed in the expenditure estimates which I have tabled here today. We have arrived at these figures through the most arduous review procedures, knowing that our obligation to the people of Manitoba involves undertaking a prudent financial responsibility, while at the same time fulfilling our commitment to enhance the substance and spirit of more equal access to services and more equal conditions of life and living for Manitobans. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, at this time also with leave, since we have some time yet I would like to introduce consideration of Interim Supply before we adjourn if that's agreed. (Agreed)

So then accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that, by leave, Mr. Speaker, do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion before the House, that a sum not exceeding \$246,009,325, being 25 percent of the several items to be voted for the departments as set forth in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1976, and laid before the Legislative Assembly at the present session of the Legislature, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1976.

The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I have a very brief introductory amount of information here to put on the record which may help honourable members in considering the amount of supply now being requested by way of interim measure. Some of it is pro forma but I believe some of it will be useful. Sir, Bill 7, which is in effect before us now, is required to provide interim spending authority for departmental expenditures in the 1975-76 fiscal year

SUPPLY

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) commencing April 1. We are asking for interim supply in the traditional way, pending approval of the Appropriation Act for 1975-76.

To allow members of this House the fullest opportunity to debate this bill, I am introducing it at this time immediately following tabling of the Main Estimates. The amount of spending authority requested is as you have read out, sir, some \$246,009,325, being the amount arrived at by taking the usual 25 percent of the total amount to be voted in the Main Estimates. This supply would by definition then be the amount sufficient to cover requirements of Her Majesty until the end of June, approximately the end of June, of this year.

Sections 1, 2, 3 and 4 of this bill are the same as in the 1974 Interim Supply Bill with the exception of the amount in Section 2. While the amount to be granted by this bill is 25 percent, as I've indicated, honourable members should be aware that this restriction does not apply to individual appropriations.

Section 3 permits expenditures up to the full amount of each individual item to be voted.

Section 5 will provide authority to transfer necessary amounts from the New Canada-Manitoba Planning Agreement Appropriation to distribute it out to the actual implementing departments. As honourable members are no doubt aware, the planning agreement is a sub-agreement under the Canada-Manitoba General Development Agreement.

Section 6 of the bill provides authority to encourage expenditures for provincial land acquisition and public sector advertising and production in anticipation of matching recoveries from other appropriations and agencies. Land acquisition is a nil vote and without this authority no initial expenditures would be legally incurred.

Public sector advertising is not a nil vote as it is contained with the Queen's Printer appropriation. The amount involved is in the order of 1.9 million, and because of the timing of advertising contracts early in the fiscal year, and expected delays in recoveries from other appropriations, this special authority is required to permit those contracts to be signed and billings from advertising agencies to be paid prior to receipt of recoveries.

The 1974 bill also included the Office Equipment Branch in Section 6 as it was a separate nil vote in Public Works where expenditures were fully recoverable. In 1975 the Office Equipment Branch has been relocated within the Public Works Central Services Division where the total vote is deemed to be sufficient in size to cover initial expenditures in anticipation of matching recoveries. For this reason it does not appear in the 1975 bill since it is not a requirement in the same sense.

And with those remarks, sir, I recommend consideration of the Interim Supply measure as embodied in Bill 7 to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have certain questions to ask of the First Minister and it deals with both the Estimates and obviously the proportion dealing with the Interim Supply. I wonder if he can indicate where in the Estimates the Manitoba Property Tax Credit Plan is to be found, and the Manitoba Cost of Living Tax Credit Plan is to be found as an expenditure in the estimates that he's just submitted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think it's a case of finding it on the pages relating to the Department of Finance, Page 21. Yes. Page 21, about midway down the page. Does that answer both questions?

MR. SPIVAK: Then I take it that the amount that was actually budgeted or estimated for this past fiscal year is substantially higher than the actual amount that will be budgeted for this coming year for the Property Tax Credit Program. Is that correct?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is correct. There was a higher cash requirement to meet the provisions of the Property Tax Credit legislation than was deemed to be the case at the time when the estimates were drawn a year ago.

However, I don't think it's a gratuitous comment when I say that in the global sense while there have been special warrants amounting to several tens of millions of dollars, there have also been some lapsings, or will be by the end of the fiscal year, so that the net special warranting will be in the order of, well, 40 to 50 million dollars, although the Leader of the Opposition will appreciate I can't give a final definitive figure because all of the accounts

SUPPLY

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) aren't closed until about mid-April. But again everything is relative, sir. The amount of the special warrants here, Manitoba's not in isolation, inflation has necessitated special warrants all across the country in all provincial jurisdictions, and our special warranting is by no means excessive in that context.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the First Minister then can indicate whether it's the intention of the government to offer to the municipal taxpayer any additional relief over and above that that has been offered in the past, plus the Property Tax Credit Program. In other words, if the estimates are as he's indicated, it would mean that there is not going to be any substantial relief given to the municipal taxpayer for the rise that will take place in his property taxes, unless it's the government's intention to introduce a supplementary estimate in future adding to the Property Tax Credit Program or in turn adding to the Manitoba Cost of Living Credit Program. And if that's the case, I wonder if the First Minister would declare that as his intention at this time.

MR. SCHREYER: I wouldn't at this time, Mr. Chairman, although it's a rather interesting proposal that the Leader of the Opposition is making. If I understand him correctly he is in this case urging some greater, as he would call it, expenditure by the province, although I take it it's really a transfer payment, and there's a good deal of money in these estimates that are in the nature of transfer payments. If he is indicating support for an increase of that, perhaps that's a departure in the usual kind of debate or proposition in opposition that goes on in this Chamber. But seriously, sir, there is in these estimates provision to the extent of about 20 percent increase in unconditional grants to municipalities and that goes part of the way towards increase of assistance.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, the debate at this time is to really obtain information. I think there'll be other occasions in which the First Minister and myself and others are going to be in a position to debate the relative merits of the government's funding of the municipalities and the cities and the problems of the municipal taxpayer.

But, Mr. Chairman, the average taxpayer in the City of Winnipeg, that is the average property taxpayer who owns his own home is going to have a municipal increase of approximately \$150.00. And I wonder whether the government is proposing any additional relief in this connection. It's not obviously contained within these estimates. And I then put it to the government, are you going to be bringing in supplementary estimates to provide an additional relief? And if so, what will that do to your estimates that you've projected as to what the actual increase in spending has taken place by comparison this year to the past year?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not as expert on the rules as the Honourable the House Leader or the Honourable Member for Morris. I like to think I have some knowledge of the rules, and it seems to me that we are now entering into a procedure here, the Leader of the Opposition and I, which is at variance from what is the normal procedure when considering the Supply, whether Interim or Main Estimates Supply. The Leader of the Opposition in effect is now engaging in asking questions for clarification, I take it. In which case we can continue to have these exchanges for the next few minutes, but the usual procedure is to consider the bill section by section. If it's a case of clarification only, I suppose I can try to answer it.

. continued on next page

SUPPLY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the Premier sort of asked for an indication on the rules. I would expect that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would have sufficient ingenuity on Interim Supply to talk about anything. The question really is, whether a consideration of the total estimates and the total program of the government, or any part of it, is now the best place during a consideration of a resolution of Committee stage, to discuss Interim Supply is the best place to do that. If the honourable member is giving us warning that he won't pass Interim Supply unless we adopt the proposal that he is making with regard to financing of Greater Winnipeg, then he is using it for that purpose and it would be well known. If it's a general questioning of what is contained in the Estimates, then I suggest that although the honourable member could probably with ingenuity do it, I question whether it is appropriate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources begins the tactic that he just adopted, I always become very suspicious, because usually there's something that he does not want to be known. And I now put it to the First Minister, I think that I'm within the rules in now asking for questions to be answered, and I ask him again, will there be any additional relief provided over and above that in the Estimates, for the municipal property tax owners, property taxpayers in Manitoba, and if so is that to be provided by Supplementary Estimates?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, clearly by definition, if there is to be any additional provision of transfer payments beyond that which is provided here in the main Estimates, then clearly it'll have to be provided by Supplementary Estimates, but that's by definition as it were. I wouldn't want the Leader of the Opposition to assume, however, that there will be Supplementary Estimates bearing on the matter of local government finance, because as we go through these main Estimates, which is what this Legislature will be doing in the course of the next considerable while, then in certain departments such as Municipal Affairs and Education, there will be shown to be augmentation of transfer payments to local government. That being so, my honourable friend can raise his points as to adequacy or inadequacy at that time.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, having listened to the Premier, then we are in this position. If in fact by way of an additional Supplementary Estimates, additional relief by way of transfer payments, to use his terminology, is to be provided by the municipal taxpayer, then you would really have a percentage increase in comparison of this Estimate to the previous Estimate, and therefore the figures represented by the Government today of an 18 percent increase could very well be a 22 or 23 or 24 percent increase. And --(Interjection)-- no. It's a question of knowing now, and I think the people of Manitoba and the taxpayers, the municipal taxpayers, are entitled to know, are entitled to know what relief, additional relief is to be provided by the Provincial Government.

Mr. Chairman, when we are presented with these Estimates, we are presented with the government's estimates of spending. It should be, Mr. Chairman, as complete a picture as possible, and if in fact there is going to be an additional Supplementary Estimate coming through, which is going to add to the tax credit programs that are now provided, as an additional means of providing for the municipal taxpayer additional relief, we should know it now, and we should be in a position to be able to make a judgment when we can make the comparisons of, be it this series of estimates, with last year's series of estimates. Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, what happens is that the statements that the Premier has made of the comparisons, are inaccurate, and in many respects misleading, and I must suggest, Mr. Chairman, we have already witnessed this with respect to Autopac and the declarations that were made with respect to what the actual increases were. Mr. Chairman, we are entitled here to be put in a position of being presented with accurate information. Accurate information, sir, which would allow us at least the opportunity for a proper comparison. One has to recognize as well, Mr. Chairman, that there was an additional amount of approximately \$37 million in special warrants, and one would have to anticipate that this amount would probably be realized again to make the judgment as to what we really are comparing.

Mr. Chairman, having accepted the fact that the Tax Credit Program is involved with respect to the area of finance, I wonder if the Premier is in a position to indicate why there appears to be a substantial rise in the Public Debt Estimates.

SUPPLY

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, listening to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I think that his own words prove that he is determined to make a point at whatever cost. I would simply concede the point that by definition these main estimates cannot cover those as yet unanticipated expenditures that we may as executive council decide as a matter of judgment at a later date to recommend to this House. How can we predict that with certainty in advance? These estimates represent the spending which to this point in time we regard as being definitive and certain as being required for the public good and well being for the Province of Manitoba. There may be Supplementary Supply requested, and if so, is that a mortal sin, because, sir, and again I don't apologize for referring to past practice. How many years out of the years that they formed the administration did they succeed in avoiding having any supplementary supply brought forward to this House? It is almost a matter of routine annual, if not daily, administration of any province or any jurisdiction. And he mentions this Special Warrants of 37 million. I say that they're slightly higher, they're more like 45 to 50 million. But does he want to live in isolation of the world around him? Does he suffer from xenophobia, that anything that happens elsewhere in the world is irrelevant? Because yes, 45 million in Special Warrants here as compared with something approaching 100 million in Special Warrants in Saskatchewan, 200 million in Special Warrants in Alberta, 300 million in Special Warrants in British Columbia. All of this I believe has to do with the fact that inflation in Canada is burning away with double digit impact. So all these facts have to be taken into account, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

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

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Thompson, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The House Leader wish to make a statement for next week's . . . ?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the order of business next week, I am suggesting that Public Accounts Committee be called on March the 18th, that's Tuesday, March 18th at 10:00 o'clock in the Committee Room, to consider the report of the Provincial Auditor; that the Committee on Economic Development be called on March 20th at 10:00 o'clock to consider the report of the Manitoba Mineral Resources. And then, Mr. Speaker, it will be my intention to attempt to call Committee regularly on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and perhaps on Mondays as well, but those are the first two Committee meetings.

When we get to the Committee of Supply to consider the Estimates, we will be calling the Attorney-General to begin with, followed by the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House now stands adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.