

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
10:00 o'clock, Friday, March 17, 1972

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery, where we have 48 students of the Red River Community College. They are under the direction of Mr. Harvey and Mrs. Larsen. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements; Tabling of Reports.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, in view of the great interest in the Port at Churchill and its function as a northern supply center, I am pleased to inform members of the House that as part of our continuing program to promote and enhance the development of this facility, the Department of Industry and Commerce has recently published a small pamphlet entitled "Churchill Northern Supply Center", and I would like to take this opportunity Mr. Speaker, to make these copies available to each and every member in the House.

I would also indicate that we made a special effort, among others, to insure that the Russian Embassy in Ottawa obtained a copy as well.

TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour and Railway Commissioner) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of Manitoba's Ombudsman for the last calendar year. You will note, Sir, it is well decorated in honour of St. Patrick.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I should also like to direct the attention of Honourable Members to the Loge on my right where we have a past member of this Legislative Assembly, Mr. Gordon Fines.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. CHERNIACK introduced Bill No. 5, the Succession Duty Act (Manitoba); and Bill No. 6, the Gift Tax Act (Manitoba) by leave. (Recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can inform the House the eligibility for application for the PEP program.

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

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Employment Program is a very extensive program involving municipal governments, involving local hospital boards, involving local school boards, involving agricultural societies and also involving worthwhile and well established community associations, so it's a rather extensive program as the honourable Leader of the Opposition should know, and we apply various criteria, the criteria being very simply twofold: (1) That people are put to work who wouldn't have been at work otherwise, that is, either they are drawn off welfare roles or they are taken off of the unemployment role of the Canada Manpower Centre; and Secondly, that the project being a socially useful, socially worthwhile project...

MR. EVANS cont'd) . . . . .

I think that by and large the Provincial Employment Program has proved to be a tremendous success because last year I know there were 4 to 5,000 people at work in the Province of Manitoba and probably an equal number, and perhaps more this year, because we haven't got all the figures in yet, who are at work today who wouldn't be at work otherwise. I think this is one of the most progressive employment programs in the Dominion of Canada . . .

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder whether the Minister can inform the House whether the Department or Government has a formula to apply for man hours per dollar spent - man hours of new employment created per dollar spent.

MR. EVANS: Well, I can't give you the exact figures but I do know that we are getting a terrific return for each dollar spent. I would say this, it's probably one of the best ratios in Canada. I would also point out that in most cases, the Community Association or the Municipality, if we are talking of municipalities, are also involved in providing expenditures on materials and supplies.

For example, last year, if my memory serves me right the municipal governments around Manitoba spent nearly as much in purchasing supplies and equipment in order to carry out various winter works programs. The provincial contribution was to pay the wage bill, 100% of the wage bill at current and prevailing labour rates. So all in all, I would say that for the money that we have spent, we have had a very high return in the amount of employment created.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder whether you can confirm Mr. Ternette's claim that of the 109 applications that were processed by the government, of 109 PEP programs, 45 percent were for public relations.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the statement that the honourable member refers to and I don't know whether that particular gentleman which the honourable member refers to, has the confidence to judge on the type of programs that we have engaged in.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, in case there is any lingering doubt about the question that has just been asked, I can advise my honourable friend that those figures which he mentioned I dismiss entirely as being wildly inaccurate.

MR. SPIVAK: I rise on a point of privilege. I would suggest that the First Minister check with Mr. Ternette who said that the Premier doesn't know what he's talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions, first to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is he taking any action against Air Canada who is presently planning on phasing out flight dispatch at the Winnipeg Airport which will eliminate 15 jobs?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll undertake to look into this matter immediately and do whatever we can to offset this move, if this is being planned.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, the next question is for the Premier. Is the Premier going to take any action against Mr. Dave Courchene for running the same type of filthy tent operation at Ruttan Lake, which he is presently condemning at Ilford. May I simply add that the job at Ilford had Mr. Courchene's and the Indian Brotherhood blessing when it was originally set up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, everyone who has any knowledge of the frontier, knows that life is hard in bush camps, whether permanent or temporary. I think it's a matter of mutual and general desire on the part of all concerned that we try to make ameliorations and improvements as we go along.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Does the government possess an up-to-date list of DREE grants which the province expects to receive in the next year?

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

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, we do get information from the Federal Government on DREE applications and approvals, but I cannot say that we have advance information as to all approvals that may be coming up. We are aware, of course, of many business expansion

(MR. EVANS cont'd) . . . . opportunities and as a matter of course we also in the Department of Industry and Commerce, help many businesses, particularly the very small businessman, in preparing material to make an application to DREE. So we have a fair amount of knowledge of DREE applications that are in process and are likely to be approved, but I cannot make a blanket statement that we have all knowledge, foreknowledge of what is about to occur in the way of DREE approval.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): My question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce in regards to the PEP program. I wonder if he is reconsidering the application of Wabowden for an \$8,000 program to build an airfield which would supply jobs for 8 people?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice. We'll look into the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. It relates to the government involvement through MDC and the Lighting Materials Limited firm now in receivership and the loan advanced of \$752,000 to this firm. My question is did the Province of Manitoba have to make good, in addition to the loan, on a bank guarantee of a loan by this firm?

MR. EVANS: I am sorry because of the noise in the House, I didn't hear the last portion of your statement or question.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, if I may repeat my question. Did the Province of Manitoba, which guaranteed a loan by this company from the bank, have to make good on its guarantee?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a question that I should take as notice, but I can say this, that this loan which was made by the MDF originally under the previous administration, has been well secured I am advised, so that if there is any loss, as I indicated the other day, the loss would be minimal. Now I am not aware just specifically how the loss may occur, but we will look into the matter.

I would also advise members of the House that I would describe this particular operation as a reduction of activities, because there is one operation involving plastic manufacturing which will carry on. I am also pleased to advise the members of the House that the space that will be vacated by the Lighting Materials operation is soon due to be filled with some other industrial activity. We look forward to further industrial expansion.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I thank the Minister for his information. If he is not able to tell me at this time whether the loan was called by the bank, could he provide this information?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should just like to indicate to the House that we have had some technical questions and also some questions which relate to a lot of statistical information. I think it would be a courtesy if the honourable members who have intentions of asking these questions would notify the Minister in advance and we could expedite the procedures in this House; otherwise we are going by memory and then accusations arise later on as to the accuracy of what was said and what was asked.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce also, and ask him is the government conducting a survey of the number of businesses closing in Manitoba? If so, what are the latest figures?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, there is no such survey being carried on. However, I can advise the honourable member, that the Federal Government through Statistics Canada, does keep track province by province, of commercial failures including bankruptcies and so forth, and I can tell you that the situation in Manitoba is no worse than any other province by and large in this country. In fact, I think, and I don't have the information with me, I think you will find that our situation is considerably better than most provinces.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, in connection with low rental housing units. Who makes the decision as to who can occupy a certain unit once it's available and ready for occupancy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Commissioner of Northern Affairs) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, in respect to the question, I know the honourable member

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . . would be thinking in terms of Altona where there is low rental housing in the process of being constructed. There would be a local authority, an old local authority which is made up of representatives in the local community. They appoint a manager and the selections are made accordingly from that group.

MR. FROESE: A further question. Is there provision for appeal to the Minister or to any other authority?

MR. PAWLEY: I know of no provision for appeal. There is a point system that is utilized by the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation people in liaison with the local people in calculating need and the other merits of particular tenants that are applying to move into the units in question.

MR. FROESE: One further question. Is there any provision in the regulations prohibiting people occupying such a unit of having a dog or a pet?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think I know the case referred to by the Honourable Member for Rhineland. We are not speaking of one dog or one cat, according to my knowledge, but some more than that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Commerce, I think it would be his department. I wonder if the Minister could indicate to the House whether he has, or the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet have any forecast of the amount of private construction that's likely to take place in Manitoba up to the end of the year, the forecasts of that nature.

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

MR. EVANS: I believe the honourable member is probably concerned with various types of investment, total investment and so on. The most authoritative source of information for this is a survey again done by Statistics Canada and it's done I believe twice a year. There is one done around the end of the year, or released around the end of the year, there is also a mid-year survey, and a forecast is made of expenditures in various types of industries and by provinces. But again it's a forecast and I would warn the honourable member that the forecast usually is subject to considerable change.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Acting Minister of Mines and Resources. Can he advise us what resource studies, ecology studies have been done on Apachawana Lake?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, that is a detailed question; however, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has the investigation report been completed into the bankruptcy and liquidation of King Choy Foods, and if it's completed will the report be tabled in the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Point of order. The member asked that question a few days ago; I indicated it will be taken as notice and reply given at the earliest opportunity. He knows that, he can wait.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. I should like to indicate to all members that this has been occurring repeatedly. Questions have been asked and then two or three days later the same question has been repeated. I should like to indicate -- order, please -- I should like to indicate to all members that it does take up a lot of time having these questions repeated, and further to that answers if they have been promised I'm sure will be forthcoming. There is also an obligation on members to realize that there is no obligation for an answer to be given to any question. A member should take that into consideration, that if an answer has been promised they will get it.

The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. McCILL: Mr. Speaker, my question is again for the Minister of Industry and Commerce and relates to the operations of the Manitoba Development Corporation and is one which he may wish to take as notice. Could he tell the House what proportion of the total loans now on the books of the Corporation were in arrears as of March 1st of this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, this is another one of these detailed questions. It is very difficult, considering other matters that Ministers have to concern themselves with. I would say, however, that because of the open policy of this government, the fact that we are the first government in Manitoba to make loan details available both in annual and quarterly reports and in reports at the time of loans made in many cases, that we are quite happy to accommodate members of the House in all kinds of questions and if we can accommodate you we certainly will.

I looked at a rather interesting figure just yesterday. I notice that since the inception of the MDF there were 23 failures and 20 of them occurred from loans made under the Conservative Government of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, there will be plenty of occasions to debate the MDC . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order! Order! I would ask all members to restrain themselves. Does the Honourable Leader of the Opposition have a point of order or a question?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, a question was asked of the Minister, he either can answer it or he can reject it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe I asked the honourable gentleman whether he has a question or a point of order. Would he indicate to me on which point he is speaking.

MR. SPIVAK: Speaking on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Very good.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the Minister can answer the question by answering it by saying he'll get the information, by saying he has the information, by saying he won't supply the information. But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable gentleman has not stated a point of order. He is debating the issue. Would he state his point of order.

MR. SPIVAK: My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that the Minister was debating the question, he wasn't answering it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to indicate that probably this is a fault of the House. Since questions are asked without the courtesy of notice they'll be off the cuff and probably they will take up some of the time and not be precise and concise to the point. I think it is a matter of cooperation between all members and then we may have a better and more efficient procedure in the House.

The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro, I'm not sure which one it is now. The question is: what studies have been done to indicate whether or not the economic viability of the Indian communities at South Indian Lake will be affected by the lower diversion flooding there?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the studies that were made relative to Southern Indian Lake and Churchill River diversion were studies that were undertaken by Underwood McClellan and tabled in this House quite a number of months ago, approximately 18 months ago, perhaps even longer than that. In the interval since then, of course, further consideration has been given to all of the combination of the factors that would impinge on this community as a result of any change in water levels of Southern Indian Lake.

MR. GONICK: If there have been interim studies since the original one, I wonder if these could be tabled.

MR. SCHREYER: I said, Mr. Speaker, that there were interim considerations, further considerations based on the studies initially referred to.

MR. GONICK: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if there will be a detailed report tabled in the House showing . . . the economic effects of the lower level flooding on South Indian Lake.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I'd require further elaboration of precisely what it is that the member has in mind, since obviously if one want to be very precise about it studies could be commissioned one after the other virtually in perpetuity.

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

MR. GONICK: My question, to repeat it, Mr. Speaker, try to make it more precise . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member has had two supplementaries.

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) . . . . I should also like to indicate that he is a member of the caucus and I'm sure that he could satisfy his curiosity in that manner.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the First Minister. I understand that there was an appropriation of money of some two or two and a half millions of dollars for a study on South Indian with federal and provincial monies. Has that study been undertaken?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I assume that the honourable member is referring to the federal-provincial water resource studies that have been arranged for. They are being carried out with respect to Lake Winnipeg and Southern Indian Lake-Churchill River effects. The precise cost-sharing formula on that, Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately don't have in mind at this moment but I can get that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the First Minister if he can answer a question as to whether Apachawana Lake has received priority examination in this study?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, when the honourable member asks whether it's received priority I believe it could be said that it's received priority but as to precise nature of that priority I couldn't say at this moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I wonder if the First Minister can confirm whether the lake, Apachawana Lake, is even being considered in the study that's being undertaken now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. CHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as that lake is part of the Churchill River Watershed it does enter into a study that is being made of Southern Indian Lake and the Churchill River.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to raise a point of order in connection with the admonition you gave to the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, namely that he was asking for information through the channels of the House. I think this should be given to him through this channel so that we as members are also aware of the information he is seeking.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister on the same point.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, and I do so with some trepidation, Sir, because I realize that you have ruled on the matter, but if I may have your indulgence I would suggest that the Honourable Member for Crescentwood if he would care to submit his question as an Order for Return in writing so that we may know more precisely just what information it is that he is seeking, I'm sure that we'd be able to accommodate him. However, it is difficult in the extreme to be able to answer a verbal question asking whether there have been studies. There have been many studies, Sir, and it's difficult to know precisely which studies he's referring to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): On that same point of order. I don't know of anything in our rules that precludes any member of the House from asking questions of the ministry whether or not he belongs to the government caucus. The question of propriety is simply up to the member himself and the government, but there is no rule that precludes him from asking questions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: If I may. In that you did make it clear I believe that two supplementary questions had been posed. The rules permit two supplementary questions and I, Sir, want to be on record as defending the Chair in making a proper decision.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. In regard to the point of order that was precisely what I said, that the honourable gentleman had had two supplementaries. That was my ruling. The other was just a suggestion and had nothing to do with any ruling.

The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to elicit from you the admission that it was not a ruling, simply a suggestion; since you already make it I accept it. I would not want it recorded in the book that you are somehow preventing backbenchers from asking the government even though they may be embarrassing questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege which relates to a question which was asked in this House yesterday and which under the rules because of your ruling, Sir, I was prevented or unable to answer. My point of privilege is that I note that in at least one of the news media the report is gone out that a question was asked relative to the making of a certain grant under winter works and that the First Minister would not reply. I should like to make the point, Mr. Speaker, that the question having been asked, if it had been permissible under the rules and in your judgment, Sir, I would have replied as I would reply to any question asked in this House, and I would reply in the same tone perhaps as the question is asked, nevertheless I would reply.

If I may, while I'm on my feet, I would like to give further information on the question that was asked with respect to this particular grant made under the Winter Works Program. The grant was made to the Community Affairs Centre which is attached in turn to the University of Winnipeg. Now I cannot say whether it is a direct or indirect relationship but in any case two professors at the University of Winnipeg are in charge of this particular effort, Community Affairs Centre, and they in turn through that organization, the Community Affairs Centre, arranged for the hiring of three persons for a period of four months to undertake certain work which in their opinion and the opinion of those responsible for the administration of the PEP program deemed to be socially useful work. I might say further that one of the three gentlemen in particular that was hired, one Michael Ternette, I understand did at one time, and perhaps still does -- I believe still does -- have a membership in the New Democratic Party, but then again I am quite sure that a number of persons for all I know who have been hired under the PEP program probably have some membership or association with the Conservative Party or the Social Credit Party; I have no way of knowing. And that in any case Mr. Ternette was not hired directly by anyone in the employ of this government. As to whether or not one feels that the program that is involved here socially useful is a judgmental thing.

I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the government can no more be held responsible for the fact that Mr. Ternette's employed under this program than we can be held responsible for the fact that public money is being used to advertise contracts and tenders in the Free Press, the publisher of which is one Brigadier Malone. I think it's rather irrelevant. Perhaps both gentlemen's mention is irrelevant.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, since I've asked a question I would still like a clarification as to who was responsible. This board, who was this board that was responsible for putting their stamp of approval, and I thank the Minister for the answer he has given.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it would be correct to say that the application for this would have emanated from the Community Affairs Centre. The approval of the application would have been given in the Winter Employment Office, Winter Works Employment Office or job office of the Government of Manitoba. The exact names of the individuals I cannot give offhand, but that is the particular administrative locus where the approval would have been given.

May I say also, Mr. Speaker, that it is a matter of fact, whether the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition wishes to accept it or not, it is a matter of fact that this kind of program is not typical; I'm not suggesting it's unique, but it certainly is not typical of the great majority of projects that have been approved under winter works because the great majority have been construction type projects.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

#### TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may have your indulgence and the indulgence of the House to go back to the tabling of reports. I have just received the report in your name, Mr. Speaker, of the Board of Internal Economics Commissioners and I would like permission to table it now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable House Leader has the agreement on this side of the House to revert to motions for the purpose of tabling that document.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Vital and the amendment thereto by the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SIDNEY GREEN Q. C. (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in the Throne Speech debate which I have done in all of the sessions of this Legislature, whether in opposition or as a member of government, and I certainly wouldn't want to make myself conspicuous by my absence of participation. I also rise to participate for other reasons.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a custom to address certain remarks to the Speaker in congratulation of the job that he is doing and I again don't wish to be an exception in that regard. I would, however, perhaps venture in a different direction as well and try to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that despite the fact that from time to time you find that the members indulge in activities which probably are not specified as being entirely permissible within the rules. It's been my understanding that parliaments have existed this way for hundreds of years. Certainly under the previous administration and the work that they have done, it became necessary in terms of the long and enduring process of a legislative session for people to have a way of feeling comfortable within the session, if I may put it euphemistically. And although the Speaker may find this from time to time, being not completely in accordance with the rules, I suggest to you that parliaments have done very very well for many years, and in particular, it's often been said of this particular parliament that we've passed 300 pieces of legislation and we have done so, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that from time to time Speakers might have considered us to be bad boys. So when you go into your frequent admonitions of the breaches of the rules and indicate the time that it takes, may I say with the greatest of respect to you, Mr. Speaker, and knowing that you do this in terms of your duty and responsibility as the Speaker, that sometimes the admonitions take a lot of time, too, and if certain things were passed over, probably the House would manage somehow as it has managed in the many many years to get its work done.

I want to say again, Mr. Speaker, in opening my remarks that I particularly want to welcome to the Chamber the Honourable the new Member for Minnedosa. I think that being elected to public office has always been to me an indication that any person receiving that type of public acclaim and that public mandate has had good reason for the support which he has received, and I therefore look to the Member for Minnedosa as being able to make a valid and valuable contribution to the House by virtue of the support that he has received from his electorate, which indicates to me that he has qualities which could indeed make a contribution to this House.

I was certainly justified in that feeling yesterday when he made his first remarks and I even felt a kind of affinity with the honourable member because my first speech in the House, which was made six years ago, I urged the members on both sides, as I have continued to urge them as not a new member of the House, to try to judge particular propositions on the basis not of ideology of one kind or another, but as to whether there are more effective ways of doing things, less expensive ways of doing things and more equitable ways of doing things, and I rather caught some of the same type of intentions by the honourable member. And therefore I stand here, Mr. Speaker, and I undertake with the honourable member that I am prepared to listen to everything that he says and to try to either accept it or challenge it on the basis of whether it makes good sense; and I would ask him to do the same thing in relation to the remarks that I may make from time to time. And if my remarks don't make sense from anything but an ideological point of view then I tell him to reject them out of hand. But if my remarks don't happen to coincide with his ideology but make sense, then I would ask him to judge those remarks on the basis that he himself indicated when he got up in the House.

I think that it was Jonathan Swift in Gulliver's Travels who said that "whosoever is able to make two blades of grass grow where one grew before, deserves more credit from mankind than all of the politicians put together." And I would concur with all of what Swift said with the exception of the fact that possibly a politician is able to do something which would make two ears of corn grow or two blades of grass grow where only one grew before. If we can engage in debate at that level then I would certainly be happy to have that kind of thing take place within the House. And I take it that if it did take place, then the honourable member would not find, for instance, as I've heard so many times and with some desperation of understanding from members on the opposite side, that if you had 2,000 civil servants and they were doing something and performing a service, that somehow this would not be good, but if you had 4,000 people employed in the private sector who are not performing a service that somehow they should continue to be employed, and that the debate has centered around getting rid of civil



(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . service, creating jobs which may not be doing anything just because somehow civil servants don't perform a service and people working in other areas do. Well I know in advance that the honourable member will not be taking that kind of position by the remarks that he has made.

I want to deal, Mr. Speaker, with my position with regard to the Speech from the Throne. I think that the government in having prepared the particular program that it has announced to the House in the Throne Speech has said to the public of Manitoba that over the past three sessions we have done things which we feel have been the main implementation of our policy thrust upon which we announced our appeal for electoral mandate. We made a substantial shift from non-equitable taxation to equitable taxation. We moved into the public sector a \$30 million industry which we felt on substantial ground could be better handled by the public sector than could be handled by the private sector. We took a City of Winnipeg administration, over which there had been complaints for 20 years and we said that we are going to set up that municipal government in a different way. In addition to that, we did many many other things relating to the Manitoba Development Fund which we made an open fund rather than a closed fund. We did things with regard to laws affecting employers and employees and we set up Crown corporations under Bill 17. We've changed the nature of our Hydro program. We did all of those things in less than two and a half years of office, and that we came to the Legislature quite truly and said that this year we are going to make sure that our administration can handle the kind of changes that we have introduced. We are going to see to it that the administration catches up with the policy changes that have been made. And we are in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, not going to stop legislating but we are in fact going to consolidate the position. Mr. Speaker, I have no criticism of that particular position. I think that the government is doing a sensible thing, that coincidentally it falls into the advice that was given to us last year by the Leader of the Opposition, who is not here and I regret that.

The Leader of the Opposition said that the real problem with the New Democratic Party government is they are trying to do too many things too quickly, and that what they should do is settle down to administering the province. I can't agree, Mr. Speaker, that we are accepting that advice because I feel reluctant about saying that I would accept the advice of the Leader of the Opposition. But coincidentally, and in this case only, our position or the position of the government as it relates to what this session of the Legislature would be, corresponds rather closely with what the advice of the Leader of the Opposition was at the last session of the Legislature. I say coincidentally, because I don't believe that we ever get to be of one mind with the Leader of the Opposition, and the Leader of the Opposition has in fact borne me out, because no sooner that the Speech from the Throne was announced, then he had forgotten the advice which he gave us last year and immediately said that the government is tired, the government has run out, the government is collapsing, because they are doing what I told them to do last year.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the honourable member that we did not really take his advice seriously, at least I don't believe that the government did; that the government in good conscience decided that the kind of legislative session that it should have this year was the kind of legislative session which would give it an opportunity to have its administration catch up with the policy decisions that it has made and at the same time continue with its program for the betterment of the people of the Province of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, what did we do at this particular session? The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is right, we consolidated our position and we are giving ourselves a chance to catch a second wind. I really don't feel very apologetic, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member says that some of the members of the government are tired. It may be true, but what he ignores, Mr. Speaker, is that when this government is tired that it compares with the previous administration running at full speed, because what we have had happen, Mr. Speaker, in this tired session of the Legislature - the Honourable Leader of the Opposition refers to as being a tired session - that what has been announced in the Speech from the Throne is that we are going to introduce a gift tax, that we are going to provide for taxation to shift again \$20 million worth of inequitable taxes into a hopefully more equitable form; that we are going to introduce an entirely new Labour Code which involves five or six statutes of the Government of the Province of Manitoba; that we are going to have legislation with regard to a sewer and water program; that we are going to completely change the Clean Environment Act to conform to a new style of administration - which I think would find favour with the Leader of the Opposition; that we are going to pass new laws for employees engaged in hazardous occupations; that

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . we are going to pass legislation relating to estate tax; that we're going to pass legislation relating to consumer affairs; to other matters, Mr. Speaker, which in this Throne Speech may appear as incidental, but if . . . as one of the pieces of legislation in the previous administration's Throne Speech would have been the major policy legislation thrust.

Mr. Speaker, I can remember the last session of the House when it became necessary for that administration in the Throne Speech to make mention of the fact that it was going to legislate with regard to horned cattle, that that was a piece of legislation that had to be made mention of in the Throne Speech because that is the . . . of the policy thrust that they have made. So while we are doing all of these things in a stand pat session, and while we are catching our breath, we have decided to hold this session of the Legislature when we would do those things and when we would also relax and find ourselves completely sort of at ease doing those things and also engaging in a little debate as to whether the public should give money to the support of private schools and schools which are involved in the indoctrination of religious or other beliefs. That's a tired session of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, in the view of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

But, Mr. Speaker, we know that the Leader of the Opposition has a problem, and I want to get on almost a person to person basis because the Leader of the Opposition said something in his remarks in which again I found an affinity as I did with the Member for Minnedosa. The Leader of the Opposition, full of vigour and full of enthusiasm, and I respect this, said that when we are in government next year, and the members of the Conservative Party took him very seriously and they banged their desks and they were charging forward--as a matter of fact I really couldn't understand their enthusiasm because I don't see that the optimism is really there but they certainly picked it up. The Member for Lakeside followed it through, said when we are in government next year--some of our people really couldn't understand where this optimism comes from.

Well I think that possibly that only the Leader of the Opposition, myself and maybe two or three other members of the House really understood the significance of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's remarks, because the phrase which he used "in government next year" is really a phrase that has meaning in the background of the Leader of the Opposition and myself and other members of the House, because Mr. Speaker, as Jews, every year we go back to our history and we say, Mr. Speaker, we say "Le Shana Haba-a B' Yerushalyeem" which means, "Next Year in Jerusalem" and I want to be completely sincere about my remarks, because I believe that the phrase has great importance to Jewish people and I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition takes his role of Opposition so seriously because this is what he should do, as to say, with the best of intentions, with the best of hope, with all his heart, "next year in government" because "Le Shana Haba-a B' Yerushalyeem" means "Next Year in Jerusalem," and the Jewish people have a tradition where every year they are reminded that their object is to be physically in heart, in spirit and in every other way, "Next Year in Jerusalem." That's a perfectly legitimate expression of intent, of sincerity and that should be the feeling of every person in Opposition; next year in government.

But let us remember, Mr. Speaker, that we say it every year, that the great majority never arrive; that some people do, but although it is said every year, it is said as an expression of intention, again I repeat, to be physically, spiritually and every other way to have arrived. But many people go through life and never arrive. And I know that when the Leader of the Opposition made those remarks, he made them with that feeling that even though one may never arrive, the statement must be and is, "next year in government". I respect that. But I also, Mr. Speaker, feel that he should know that he may never arrive and I would think, Mr. Speaker, that that will be the ultimate situation.

Another thing that the Leader of the Opposition did, which again I found affinity with, is that he talked very strongly about agriculture and he said that there are two reasons why he's talking about agriculture, and I think he gave the two reasons, one was the plight of agriculture and the second was the great opportunity for advancement in agriculture.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can remember when I started giving attention to agricultural problems, and I have no criticism again of the Leader of the Opposition for the position he has taken, but there are more than two reasons, Mr. Speaker, for the Leader of the Opposition to be talking about agriculture. There is a third reason, a very important reason which I myself use, because I started talking about agriculture in a serious way approximately about the same

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . time as the Leader of the Opposition started talking about agriculture in a serious way. When I decided that I was going to make myself available to do as much as any society could demand of me, I knew that in an agricultural province that it was necessary to discuss agricultural questions, and the Leader of the Opposition wishes to be the Premier of a province which is essentially agricultural based or has been for many, many years, and surely one of the reasons that he started talking about agriculture is to overcome the fact that as a city lawyer he has a problem in not only appealing to the country as an agricultural spokesman but he has to do so for his own caucus. And again I say this in no criticism, I say this in commendation, that if he seeks to be the one who has the stewardship of this province under his direction, he should be involved in agricultural questions. He started to speak about agriculture, Mr. Speaker, approximately, oh I would say six or seven months before he announced his role as a candidate for the leadership of the Conservative Party, and it would be interesting, Mr. Speaker, to see what he says then and what he says now about the agricultural problem, because he stamped his hand on the table and he said, there isn't one redundant farmer in the Province of Manitoba, that all of these farmers are going to stay on the farms. I commend him for that because I think that's the kind of thing that this party has been saying with regard to the family farm. I think that's the kind of position that we have taken, that it is not a mark of efficiency to have bigger and larger farms and to have farmers driven out of their rural surrounding, that that if anything, that was a mark of inefficiency, not a mark of efficiency. But, Mr. Speaker, that's not the kind of statement that the honourable member made, when he first started talking about agriculture and about the fact that he married a girl who lived in the country. Because at that time, today, a week ago, there is not a redundant farmer in the Province of Manitoba - that every single one of them has got to stay on the farm.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is what he said and I seem to have recalled hearing it, but I wasn't certain and I went back and checked; April 14, 1970, he's talking about getting jobs for people who will no longer be employed at their regular employment, and here's what he said, "Who are we going to get jobs?" - this is April of 1970 - he said that we have to get jobs for people entering the labour market, and then he said, "for those in the agricultural community who are going to have to leave the farms." And then he asks the question: "And is anyone going to suggest that this isn't going to happen in the next decade? They want to be in a position to know that when they leave their farms that they are going to be able to find jobs in the rural areas in which they live, or is it going to be necessary for them either to move to Winnipeg or move out of the province?" And he said, Mr. Speaker, "and is anyone going to suggest that it isn't going to happen in the next ten years - the next decade?" Mr. Speaker, the implication of this statement, and I put it to everybody, so that they can listen to it, and I let my honourable friend argue his way out of it, the implication of this statement is that the developments that are taking place in the country - he said the next decade, which doesn't mean during the period of our administration. If it's next year in government, which is what he is saying, it means that it's going to happen during his administration - he says that they are going to have to move from their rural surroundings into other jobs. This week there isn't a redundant farmer in the Province of Manitoba. Well, I am happy with the honourable member. I am glad that in two years and with the realization that he is going to have to deal with agricultural questions, that he has made that observation.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that if we look very carefully, at the position of the honourable member in Opposition who says "next year in government", we know, and I think it was mutually agreed last year that the position of the Leader of the Opposition is that he must defeat the government and become the new administration, and in doing so, it becomes his legitimate role to pick up those areas of government sensitivity and to see whether he can on those areas of sensitivity undo the government. And if, Mr. Speaker, and I ask particularly the new members to look at this, if the member can't find areas of government sensitivity, if he then starts to search for things that are not there, one really has to assume that he can't find problems associated with the government and that he is merely going through the motions of trying to defeat it without having reasonable positions to take. I want, Mr. Speaker, to look at some of the main positions that have been taken by the Leader of the Opposition to see whether in fact they are areas of sensitivity on which he can hope to bring the government down or whether being completely bankrupt of government sensitivity areas, he is trying to create things which don't in fact exist.

What has he concentrated his efforts on - what are the main areas of government

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . sensitivity in the opinion of the Leader of the Opposition. One, Mr. Speaker, is he has picked on Lake Winnipeg regulation, here is a place that we can hit him. I really think that this is something almost pathological on the part of the Conservative Administration, that somehow they got hit hard on South Indian Lake, history will repeat itself, they will hit us hard on Lake Winnipeg regulation. That has been their entire psychology in dealing with this program and I want to take a few aspects of it to see, Mr. Speaker, and let the Member for Minnedosa, who is going to judge, not on political grounds but on grounds of efficiency and rationale, as to whether it's so.

First of all the Leader of the Opposition has continually referred to Lake Winnipeg regulation as "flooding the lake." Mr. Speaker, if we look at the last thirty years - and I say that that is a relevant period - it is true, and we have acknowledged it, that the average level of Lake Winnipeg, the average level will be increased by roughly three tenths of one foot - three tenths of one foot - but in exchange for that three tenths of one foot on the average, we are reducing the flood level by as much as two feet in many, many years. So in order then to make this a sensitive area, in order to make this a sensitive area, and I ask you to judge, the definition of a flood in the opinion of the Leader of the Opposition, the definition of a flood - and if we looked in his dictionary it would say "Flood:- reducing flood levels by two feet". That becomes a sensitive area of this government in the definition of the Leader of the Opposition.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, he has taken this program and I don't know where he gets the figures; all I can do is assure him that the cost of Lake Winnipeg regulation was estimated at roughly 50-60 million dollars, \$55 million, I can't give you the exact figure and these were only estimates. The initial contract came in at savings - they did not come in higher, they came in lower - the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition, because this must be a sensitive area in his view, continues to say that it is a \$100 million program. The Lake Winnipeg regulation is going to cost \$100 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that there are problems with the Lake Winnipeg regulation program. I think that I have indicated that. I think that it is a costly program. I think that if it's a bad program, Mr. Speaker, that \$50 million is a lot to waste on it; that if the honourable member could show that it was a bad program, then \$50 million is enough wasting; but in order to make it worse than it is, because he doesn't think it's a bad program, he insists on using the figure of \$100 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why does he use the figure of \$100 million? Because apparently he doesn't think \$50 million is enough of a waste. Well I want to assure him that if this program is a waste, it's a waste of \$50 million, and if he will make the point that it is a waste, that \$50 million is much more money than I would ever be associated with wasting. So if his point is correct, Mr. Speaker, then he can ignore the \$100 million because he has got a good point. If we are wasting \$50 million that's quite enough and he needn't go to \$100 million which only confuses his argument and merely indicates that he is prepared to engage in hyperbole rather than to deal with the question.

He has done the same thing, Mr. Speaker, in every aspect of this program. He has indicated that everybody who understands the program has spoken out against it. He says that Dr. Newberry has spoken out against it. Mr. Speaker, if Dr. Newberry has spoken out against the program, he has never said a word against the program to me. I have never heard him speak out against the program. I know that he never attended any of the Commission meetings where he would have a perfect right to come and speak out against the program. I have never heard him speak out against the program. But the Leader of the Opposition doesn't have a good enough point, so in order to make his point better, he says that Dr. Newberry has spoken out against the program, and everyone who understands it has spoken out against it.

Mr. Speaker, why does he say that? There are certain people who have spoken out against it, who I respect. The former Premier of Manitoba, Douglas Campbell has spoken out against the program, and I say that that's his opinion, against six other people on the board. Kris Kristjanson has spoken out against it, he was very much part of the high level program. But why should he then insult everybody who has accepted the program. Why does he say that everyone who understands it has spoken out against it. He knows that Dean Hoogstraten who is a member of the Manitoba Hydro Board has gone along with the Board on the program. Does he then attribute to Dean Hoogstraten, that here is a man who doesn't know anything about the program because he has indicated approval for it. Does he say, does he have to in order to make his case, does he have to say that the departed W. J. Parker, and I ask the Member for Rock Lake, ask the Member for Souris Killarney, the Member for Arthur, is he satisfied that

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . in order to make a case against South Indian Lake, that you have to say that W. J. Parker didn't understand what he was talking about? Is it necessary to say that Dean Hoogstraten doesn't know what he's talking about? Is it necessary to say that Tom Storey, the former manager of Hydro, doesn't know what he is talking about? And what is the definition in the Leader of the Opposition's dictionary: Person who doesn't know what he's talking about; it's listed there as a phrase, "a person who agrees with Lake Winnipeg regulations", that's his definition. That could be Dean Hoogstraten, that could be Tom Storey, that could be Cass Boeoy - that could be anybody, it could be anybody, anybody who understands it has come out against it.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has given us an interesting sidelight which I want to bring to the attention of the Member for Morris and the Member for Lakeside, who is not here, as to how he would handle Lake Winnipeg regulation or this type of program if he was the premier of the Province of Manitoba, and he aspires to be such. What he says, and he said it on television, he said that I would do whatever Dr. Newberry and Cass Boeoy told me to do, that if they recommended regulation at 716, it would be 716; that if they recommended that we do not go for a Churchill River Diversion it would be no Churchill River Diversion. The reason that he said that is he said that I was to be criticized because I would only accept the recommendations of the Water Commission as advice, that I would say that these are the technocrats who are advising; I will listen to their advice but in the last analysis, I am responsible to the people of Manitoba and I will make the decision, and that if Mr. Boeoy and Mr. Newberry and Mr. Uruski and the others on the Water Commission told me that you should regulate at 716 or 718, that I would not necessarily take that advice. That if Mr. Boeoy and Mr. Newberry told me that I am in no circumstances to divert water from the Churchill to the Nelson, I don't undertake in advance to take that advice, because it's me who has to go back to the people of the Province of Manitoba and not Cass Boeoy and not Dr. Newberry. But that man who aspires to be premier of the Province of Manitoba, he says that when I am premier I will do whatever these fellows tell me to do; that if they say regulate at 718, I will regulate at 718 and damn the people around Lake Winnipeg. That if they say no Churchill diversion, there will be no Churchill diversion; and if they say, Mr. Premier, regulate at 713, I will regulate at 713 even if that means spending \$200 million to get \$3,000 benefit. And if they say, Mr. Premier, jump in the lake, I will jump in Lake Winnipeg because that's what Dr. . . . When we were kids and came in all wet and my mother would say, "what did you do?" I'd say, "I was running through the pond," and she'd say, "well why did you do that?" And I said, "well Johnny told me to do it." And she said, "well if Johnny told you to jump in the lake would you jump in the lake?" And what the Leader of the Opposition says is that if Mr. Boeoy and Dr. Newberry told me to jump in the lake, I would jump in the lake, because they are the ones who I look to for telling me what to do with regard to Lake Winnipeg.

Well I concede, Mr. Speaker, I concede without any doubt whatsoever that I have not said that I will do whatever the technocrats tell me to do, and if people in Manitoba wish to choose a premier, who will then say that when I am the premier, I will give the responsibility for deciding these questions to people who are in no way responsible to the public of Manitoba, then they will choose the leader of the Opposition as premier. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the Province of Manitoba have more sense than to make that kind of decision. And if that's what he has to do in order to make us sensitive, Mr. Speaker, again I say that the opposition has not been able to find the areas of sensitivity.

Mr. Speaker, in order to make us sensitive, he gets up in the House -- and I ask again the Member from Minnedosa, judge these remarks on the basis of their rationale. Taxes have been increased to a punitive level. The Leader of the Opposition says that taxes have been increased to a punitive level. We have been in this House four sessions. In the first session we did not increase taxes. We shifted taxes from one form to another, and as a matter of fact collected less. We passed one bill dealing with tax increases - that's my recollection. That had to do with doubling the amount of royalties that we collect from mining companies. That reduced taxes for the taxpayer in Manitoba, because whatever we got increased from the mining company meant that there was less of a load that would have to be paid in other forms of taxation. But, Mr. Speaker, in order to try to make us sensitive, he says that taxes have been increased to a punitive level.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if taxes are at a punitive level -- and I say that people will always complain about taxes; I mean there is no way in which they will say that they are happy with the level -- but if taxes are at a punitive level, then those are the guys who did it, because we did

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . not increase taxes, not one mill in . . . . And in order then to make that remark in the least way sensible, what the Leader of the Opposition does is he says that when our rate went up to 42.5 which has not yet been enacted I guess but we've indicated that will have to be enacted with The Income Tax Act, he says here they are increasing taxes. Well, Mr. Speaker, most of the people in this room have children . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member has four minutes.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Most of them are taking fractions and if the Leader of the Opposition's child or my child came into the room and said, Daddy, 42.5 out of 142 is more than 39 out of 111, we would say, what are they teaching them in these schools? Mr. Speaker, it would give me an indication to look for a private school for my child. If my child came in and said that 39 out of 111 is -- that 42.5 out of 142 is more than 39 out of 111, and if the member of the opposition's child said that to him, he'd say go stand in the corner with a dunce cap on your head. But he says that to the people of the Province of Manitoba and instead of him wanting to have a dunce cap on his head he wants them to congratulate him by making him Premier of the Province of Manitoba, for saying that 39 out of 111 is less than 42.5 out of 142.

Mr. Speaker, what were the proposals? And I see that I'm running out of time and this will probably get me chastised by the Member for Morris for overgoing. But what are the propositions? Some of them are very good propositions. I would ask the people of Manitoba to really judge whether this kind of thing would be done by the Leader of the Opposition in view of his past timidity. He says that there is a chance for us to build a \$7 billion pipeline. He didn't say how it would be built. We know what the position of his party was on the last pipeline; they said that the only way private enterprise will build a pipeline is if the people of Canada guarantee 95 percent of the cost then they will be able to build it and sell their shares at enhanced values and I suppose that that's what he has in mind with regard to the \$7 billion, because he's not prepared to go on the covenant for the people of Manitoba for 7 billion themselves; he's only prepared to do it to make somebody else beat his chest and say, look what kind of rugged individualist I am. The Province of Manitoba covenants its \$7 billion and I'm building a pipeline and look at me. But the fact is that let's look at this \$7 billion proposal. Does anybody really know how much \$7 billion is? Mr. Speaker, let me try to put it in terms which we can try to begin to understand. It's 70 Churchill Forest Industries, 70 -- well 7 billion -- Churchill Forest Industries \$100 million, \$7,000 million; 70 Churchill Forest Industries. Mr. Chairman, using the proper figures, it's 140 Lake Winnipeg regulations, 140 schemes of that kind. It's 14 provincial budgets if the provincial budget was only \$500 million. But, Mr. Speaker, we had occasion a couple of weeks ago to say that we have in Manitoba, we have a product which is rather unique in the world, that that product has a future; we know that President Nixon has referred to caesium; in his State of Union Address he refers to the metal caesium. That we are saying that if we can be protected by the concentrate which is unique in Manitoba, and which people have already on their own invested roughly -- let us take a low figure, let's take \$7 million, without asking for a single public cent \$7 million has been put into that product by outsiders; that we said that if you will guarantee us that we will be protected by finished concentrate, we don't have to invest anything on speculation, but finished concentrate, that we would be willing to have the Province of Manitoba, because it feels that there is a future in a particularly Manitoban product, that we will put up \$1 million on the concentrate, warehouse receipts in our hands, that's how conservative we were -- I think that we were over conservative -- but if we could somehow make it more possible that that mine will have a future for Manitoba, and at the same time have an opportunity of becoming a Manitoba shareholder to the extent of 20 percent in that mine, Mr. Speaker, if we could do that we'd be prepared to invest \$1 million, and the Leader of the Opposition was not at all receptive to this. Risking \$1 million of Manitoba money on mining, the Leader of the Opposition endorsed the remarks that were made by the Leader of the Liberal Party that he said, my God we have to be worried about what they are doing with this \$1 million. Mr. Speaker, do you know what \$7 billion is? This man who says that he's going to go for \$7 billion on this type of pipeline practically shook in his boots when we were talking about \$1 million secured by concentrate. Do you know what \$7 billion is? It's 7,000 Tantalums.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret to inform the honourable member his time is up.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, do I have a few minutes just so I can conclude?

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed by the House? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I hope not to encroach on the courtesy which has been given to me. Mr. Speaker, 7,000 Tantalums, and not secured as well as Tantalum, but 7,000. Even saying 7,000 Tantalums doesn't really tell you what we are doing, what he is suggesting, and whether the people who saw how he behaved on Haslam would say that he has the courage to go ahead with a \$7 billion program. Seven thousand Tantalums means that every day, including Sunday; for the next eighteen years we were to announce a Tantalum mine deal, every day including Sundays for eighteen and a half years, and he says, Mr. Speaker, that he would be the one to move with this kind of program.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if there is, and I should think that the subject has merit; the First Minister has already indicated that it has merit; that if that kind of a thing has merit then it's not to be trusted in the hands of people who say that the only way it can be done -- and we know from their position in the pipeline debate and it hasn't been discounted by the Leader of the Opposition in his proposal -- that the only way it can be done is if we use your covenant, the best covenant in Manitoba, the covenant of the people of the province, and any banker will tell you that if you've got the Manitoba covenant you don't need any other security -- right; the Member from Minnedosa -- there isn't a better covenant unless it's the Government of Manitoba plus somebody else. But the fact is that the best covenant, the best covenant, that what he would do is he would use that covenant to guarantee, oh somebody like E. P. Taylor or somebody else who he has respect for his business initiative, and then E. P. Taylor would then be able to get the money and beat his chest and say, "look at how I am opening this country on the covenant of the people of the Province of Manitoba." So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that if that kind of project does make sense it makes sense for the people of the Province of Manitoba to entrust it to a government that indicates that it's prepared to use the covenant of the people of Manitoba to benefit the people of the Province of Manitoba and not to say that the people of Manitoba don't have the capacity to . . .

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to conclude my remarks; I know that I am entrenching on the time of others but I'm going to conclude and I hope I'll have just a few minutes left to talk about the Opposition generally.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that an opposition and an opposition that is hitting properly is one of the most essential features of a government program. I believe that a government operates in such a way as to wonder how its proposals are going to be handled when they come before the opposition and I believe that unless an opposition is strong that a government weakens. And in our case, Mr. Speaker, we have certainly numbers -- certainly numerically the opposition has had the strength to be able to deal with our programs, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that if anything, the . . . of Manitoba are suffering at the present time -- it's not a strong government, and with great respect, and I know this comes out as remarkably partisan but I've always been that way and I don't think I can change -- if anything we lack, we lack a strong opposition. That the biggest asset that this government has is its vitality, its direction and its program. The second biggest assets it has is the opposition because, Mr. Speaker, when a government thinks -- and the Honourable Member for Morris, and I'm glad you're back because I know that the Honourable Member for Morris would never undertake, and I know that the Member for Lakeside would never sit in a government and be a Minister of Mines if it was his direction that you are to do what Dr. Newberry and Cass Booye tell you; and the Member for Morris would not be part of a government who would say that whatever James Coyne tells us we will do, and he didn't do it, and I give him credit. That the government has to be administered by the people who are responsible to the people not by anybody else. But in any government, that one of the things they must do, and I assume that this government will do, they have to sit and talk about how they're going to be attacked and they'd say, sure in Ottawa they'd say, what will Diefenbaker say? Or what will Lewis say? In this government I'm sure they're going to have to say, what will Borowski say, what will Gonick say? Somebody will say, well what about Spivak? They'll say, don't worry about Spivak, he'll say that a flood is two feet higher than lowering water by two feet. Don't worry about him. He'll say that a flood is lowering water by two feet. Who's going to worry about that? But that's not, in a personal sense that's not the most serious objection that I have.

Mr. Speaker, I have a particular position which I subsequently came out with which has the peculiar effect of leaving me a back member of this government while the Member for St. Boniface who used to give us hell and who I was told not to associate with is a member of the government bench, we haven't had that type of issue. I had a personal problem with this issue.

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . My personal problem was that I tried to stay away from it, I told my members that I want to stay away from it, that anything I say is going to be looked upon as being some way a revival of the problems that existed in any leadership contest between myself and the First Minister, and I told my members that I would not become the spokesman for this. My God, there are so many people who are against it what do they need me for? And I waited and hoped against hope, Mr. Speaker, that somebody else in our group would take a firm position on this issue so that at least it would be argued, and that didn't happen. And then I waited and I hoped, Mr. Speaker, I am weak like anybody else and I admit that my position and people call it some kind of courage, I say that I did it because I'm a coward. These guys have got courage, the guys who have got courage are the guys who go to their electors and say that regardless of how I felt I voted to give public money to private schools. Those are the guys with courage. I can't do that. And I was hoping that there would be other cowards in the House like myself who would get up and make an issue of it, and it seems to me that on this kind of question, Mr. Speaker, that because of the leadership that has been given by the Leader of the Opposition -- and he can criticize us as much as he wants and we are subject to criticism, I don't think that we have chosen the right way of handling it and I blame myself as much as anybody else. But surely there should have been somebody to bail me out from the opposition. Surely somebody should have been saying that we are not going to let this happen. Surely the Member for Lakeside, when he indicated that we have somehow wound up on both sides of the fence on this, surely that even from a blatantly, what you call political point of view, that the opposition should have protected a majority of the people of the province on this issue.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they didn't and the fact is that if one -- you know I made the first joke of this kind I am sure. Ed Broadbent came to speak to Manitoba and he talked about the fortunes of the New Democratic Party, they were the opposition in British Columbia, they were the opposition in Saskatchewan, they were going to be the Government of Ontario, they were the Government of Manitoba, and I said that Mr. Broadbent is wrong, that he hasn't gotten far enough. In Manitoba not only are we the government but we are also the opposition and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, in this peculiar situation that if the people are to have a strong opposition, if the people of Manitoba are to have a strong opposition there is only one way of doing it, elect more government members because it's not coming from the other side.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize the next member I'd like to draw the attention of the House to the gallery where we have 45 pupils of Grade 10 standing of the Lac du Bonnet School. They are under the direction of Mr. L. . . and Miss B . . . This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here.

. . . . continued on next page



ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the honourable member will permit a question. In view of your statement with respect to the opposition I wonder if the honourable member can advise whether he'll encourage the Premier to call the Wolseley by-election?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Premier has been encouraged to call the Wolseley by-election.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not debate the merits of a pipeline or redundancy of some farms but, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can say that maybe there are no redundant farms in Manitoba but there are some that perhaps are not viable operations, and all we have to do on our last municipal committee is to talk to some of the farmers and accept the fact that there are some farms that are not productive and the people on these farms cannot make a living.

I was told in a couple of areas by a farmer, he said the government at one time told us to expand our operations to buy more land and he says this is what we have done. We have four sections of land, all the land is very stony and there is no way that even I can make my 150 cattle operation viable because the upkeep, the fencing just doesn't make it productive at all. So I say to the government that there are some farms that probably are not viable operations and we have to accept this fact.

The other point, on the pipeline I think it has great merit. I think it's a federal matter and the only way that the government can get involved in it in any way shape or form will have to be in conjunction with the provinces and the Federal Government. But I do believe that it has merit and sort of an exciting development.

Mr. Speaker, I would just draw one reference to what was said the other day by the Attorney-General and I was sort of surprised and almost disappointed that you get this kind of reaction from a man in his position. He was chastising the Opposition the other day and relating that we are protecting the rich in this province, and I've heard this so much from the members on this side of the government, the Opposition, all they do is protect the rich. I wonder who are those rich people that he's talking about, Mr. Speaker, because last year the Minister of Finance has told us that there is only one percent of the people of this province make more than \$20,000, one percent, and these are the people that the Attorney-General is kicking at, complaining about and saying that the Opposition is protecting them.

Now also, no wonder the First Minister is somewhat uneasy these days and touchy on many things and in fact, I'm sorry, he's not in his seat, but I would like to say that the First Minister has lost his poise, he's not the same that he used to be. Maybe it's not what we're saying on this side but I don't think maybe he's hearing the rattles at the back or from his own backbenchers. But I would like to say that he's not the same Minister that he used to be, he's not talking about issues, he's getting into personalities. The other day when my colleague from Portage la Prairie was speaking and he drew reference to the fleet of cars that the government has now, or has increased the fleet of cars, and the First Minister with the House Leader, both of them, reacted and said "it's a lie, it's a lie," that's the reaction that came from the two of these gentlemen. And then the First Minister got up and said well, there was a statement that I corrected that wasn't correct. Now if his ministers make wrong releases and perhaps the Minister doesn't want to see the Opposition jump on it and react to it, perhaps he should circularize us and tell us about what's going on, because I have a release here from the Tribune of February 2nd and it states that Public Works Minister Russell Doern said today, "The government now has one car for every four civil servants."

That's what it says. Mr. Doern said new programs particularly Autopac and northern development schemes increase the government motor vehicle requirements this year. The fleet now has 1800 cars. The Minister says he didn't say it, well that's fine. I will accept his statement. But I think it was proper for the First Minister to get up and say well I've made a correction instead of react the way he reacted and saying it's a lie. Because what we were talking about, we were talking about a statement that was released somewhere to the papers by the Minister responsible for the fleet of cars and that's what it says.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Well on a point of privilege, I would like to clarify the statement that was made and correct it because my honourable friend is persisting to say something that is not accurate. It is true that the government fleet is approximately 1,800 vehicles which includes some 1300 to 1400 cars and some 400 trucks. I did not divide the vehicles into the number of civil servants, I do not know the precise number of civil servants at this time. It is inaccurate to say that I said that one in four civil servants has a car; whether you use the old figures or the new figures, those statistics in that division is inaccurate. I did say there was a combined fleet of some 1800 vehicles.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I accept the Minister's statement but the point that I'm trying to make, I'm not debating how many cars there are, I'm debating that when my colleague was speaking the other day, he stated what was in fact stated as a news release by the Minister himself, and if it was incorrect, it was in order for him to get up and state so, but it's in here.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: When a point of privilege arises it should be raised. I look to people who are better versed on procedure than I am, but I thought it's only right at this stage to point out that according to Hansard Page 47 the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie made the statement that the government announced that one out of every four civil servants has a government car. Now that statement is not true and that is the statement which the honourable member seems to be repeating and attributing to government.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I can see the Honourable Minister of Finance is getting

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: . . . extremely touchy. If he would have listened to what I said, I said I'm quoting a news release. I don't know if the contents are correct or not but I'm stating what was in the paper and the paper stated that the Minister released the contents. So if it's incorrect he had the chance to rebuttal it and say it's not true. The figure was - I'll quote the figure again and say - "Government fleet of cars shows increase. Acting Minister, Mr. Russell Doern said in an interview the government has now one car for every four civil servants." --(Interjection)-- Well, I accept that, but I'm saying this is what the news release said. But I accept your statement, you say you haven't said it.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps there are other reasons that the First Minister is somewhat uneasy these days with statements that's emanating from some of the backbenchers, and I would just state the Member for St. Matthews when he states that we should have a confiscatory estate tax in this province, and no wonder. I know that he will say this is not true, but this is what he did say, it's in Hansard, and he was quoting - "I favour a far more progressive income tax than exists today. My position personally is that I would be in favour of confiscatory estate tax. Well no wonder, with that kind of an attitude, you know, it's pretty difficult for the Minister of Industry and Commerce and for the First Minister to attract any development to this province and have the kind of economic development that we would like to have.

Mr. Speaker, when one takes part in the debate on the Address it is customary and fitting that we pay respect to you as the guardian and protector of the rights of this House and the members who sit in it and I wish to do that now, to congratulate you for the way you're conducting the matters in this House and as well to congratulate the newly elected member to this House, the Member from Minnedosa, the appointment of the new Ministers and the mover and the seconder. We have looked to the Throne Speech, have studied it with great interest, the Speech delivered last Friday, a week now which all Manitobans watched with interest because it was a speech from a government now that has been in power for almost three years, has been in this House four times now. Myself and many others in the province have perhaps expected much more than was in that Throne Speech. But I think the big point here, I think the time has passed for cleaning up bits and pieces of legislation which the government is talking about. I think the government has a full majority and it can carry out its program or any program it has in its mind, because when the New Democratic Party were on this side they always had immediate solution for all our problems and the Minister of Labour, I recollect quite well that he was able to speak on any issue at any time and he says, we have policies for any situation that develop and I know that for the last few years, I have to prod him along about the Labour Code, some matters in labour. I know this is the third year, perhaps

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . it takes a little time but I think that the government would have done well to proceed with the implementation of a new labour legislation the first year in office instead of waiting this long.

I think the Throne Speech shakes the confidence in this government to lead Manitoba into an economic growth and to provide our citizens equality of access to recreational facilities, for cultural, economic and social facilities for which governments are responsible.

Mr. Speaker, I know that it's pretty difficult to cover much new ground at this late stage in taking part in the Throne Speech but I will cover a couple of specific areas, housing and a couple of matters that are of importance to me in the constituency.

The Throne Speech makes reference that the government also opted out for selective growth policy and I've heard the Minister of Industry and Commerce use this selective growth term last year on so many occasions and I would like to hear, and I'm still waiting from the Minister of Industry and Commerce, where has this selective growth taken place in Manitoba because I'm not too well aware where it has, because I don't believe it has. I know that many contractors that I know personally, some business people, even lawyers and some accountants have left this province. So I certainly do not see this growth taking place.

I know that all the members have received a letter from the Manitoba Association of Architects and I will just quote one paragraph and it states "the result of the survey of the construction industry tabulated as December 1, 1971 by the Manitoba Association of Architects indicates a continuing low level of in-province volume of construction for which architectural consultants are providing professional services." And it states "the great decline in construction from 1970 to '71 of \$127 million to 82 million reflected 54 percent decline in-province work." It also states the projection for the first half of 1972 would indicate an annual volume of \$108,800,000 or a 25 percent decrease from last year, 54 percent decrease in the last year. And it also states "for the first time since the Second World War, there has been in 1971 a decrease in the number of registered architects in this province." And this is from the Manitoba Association of Architects. So I also cannot see this great growth taking place in the province. --(Interjection)-- Well, I don't know if the First Minister was in or not but I'm just quoting from a letter from the Architects. This is their statistics what has taken place in the province last year, the reduction of work and again reduction this year. I agree there has been more concentration in the government sector of construction and I'll get to that a little later.

Mr. Speaker, this government promised to do very much for some of our less fortunate people and much thrust of the last three Throne Speeches were directed at human betterment. But I would like to know what are the facts. The facts are that Metropolitan Winnipeg has a serious poverty problem. A Social Service audit stated that 16 percent of the families in Metro area were earning less than \$3,000 annually. A more recent survey of the Planning Committee of the former Metro Corporation revealed that of 2,200 families living in the Notre Dame-CPR area, a cross section of families in this area of 1,465 had an income of less than \$3,000. So at least 50 percent of these people in this area are making less than \$3,000 which is below the minimum level. These studies indicate the proportion of the community's poor in one heavily populated area of the City increased during the times and during the years that our wages were increasing and at the present time according to our leading social workers, the same poor remain poor and their lot is getting worse. I'm concerned because the government has now had three years and I know the Minister will say well we've increased or removed the Medicare costs and so on, and I agree with them, but I'm saying let's look at the whole question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . Member permitted me to ask a question. When the member is reciting that litany of urban poverty, is he aware of the fact that other large cities in our country have the same problems and that in fact is he aware, that in Metropolitan Toronto there is a higher percentage of total population on welfare than in Metropolitan Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I agree with that statement and I appreciate those facts but what I'm saying is the government has not, and it has had time, to help a lot of these people. It has not done as much as it promised. It had ready made solutions when they were on this side of the House but it seems that these people are still unfortunate and I think they are unfortunate citizens of the province and of this city.

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . .

I think that there's two important factors. I think that they should have the opportunity to a standard of adequate level of living and a second point, these people, I feel they are also unable to contribute to the growth and development of their community and of our province. I think that this government has not given these people a better way of life; they still lack proper accommodation; they still lack decent housing; they still lack jobs, so --(Interjection)-- yes I am but I'll get to it. So I feel that after three years in office, the government did not do as much as it should have done, and in fact I think the government did very little. I hope the government will not require more studies in respect to these people because as far as I'm concerned there has been so many studies made and the volumes of material is only collecting dust and I think the government has to get on with the job and do something, because I re-collect very well when the Minister of Labour sat on this side, he was going to cure this problem very quickly and the government has not.

Mr. Chairman, there has been very much said about public housing by a few members and I would like to touch on it. I know that few of the members on the government side have talked about public housing. And I'm not against public housing, I am for public housing, I think that the government had very little choice, they had to proceed because we needed the accommodation. But I am concerned, and I think the government is going in the wrong direction by not allowing these people to be able to own their own homes, and they'll find out like they have found out in the other cities what has happened.

A study completed in 1967 found that Winnipeg will require 65,000 public housing by 1991. The government has since estimated that there are at least 82,000 households in Manitoba which are unsatisfactory. In '69 the only public housing in Manitoba was in Winnipeg itself and at that time we had 600 units divided between Burrows-Keewatin and Lord Selkirk area. By 1970, the public housing units rose to 1,300, by the end of 1971 to 3,500 and the target is 21,000 units by the end of 1975. But Mr. Speaker, numbers is not the criteria of a successful housing program - location, type, accessibility, services, compatibility with other developments are important measures and let's look at Burrows-Keewatin today, that's a public housing. There are many units that are empty in that place right now. I shouldn't say many, there are some units that are empty and they are not rented and there are people living in the Burrows-Keewatin that make as much salary as some of the members on this side of the House or more, that they could find accommodation anywhere else, that's available to them, but they're living in there. So there is something wrong with that public housing itself, there is something wrong.

Again I feel that the number of public housing should not be the criteria, it should be the location, the facilities, accessibility of services and so on. The federal government's report on housing recommended that this first existing housing be acquired for use by low income groups, rather than having subsidized homes for all low income groups.

I feel that consideration should also be given to a program of income supplements to permit low income families to rent or buy housing according to their needs in the private market. I am not saying that we didn't need the large development of public housing, my point is that we should make it possible for people to purchase these homes. The other provinces have already made a start in that direction, Ontario and B. C. I think that we should even make outright grants to people for a down payment to buy a house and, in fact, subsidize their mortgage interest rates, but I think we should make it available to these people to be able to purchase their own homes. I wonder how much thought has been given to the amount the taxpayer may ultimately be paying by way of rental subsidies when the housing programs are complete. The housing authorities in the United States are facing bankruptcy because incomes are not rising as fast as operating costs and they are making a change in their housing developments in the States. What I am saying, when we had the housing task force go to all the low rental housing people and ask them the questions - are they satisfied, are they happy? And they weren't, they still wanted to be able to buy their own homes; Ontario is doing it, B. C. is doing it. I cannot see, I would sooner see the government make an outright grant to allow some of the people to be able to purchase their own homes. In the long run it is going to be much cheaper than say building low rental, subsidized housing for all our low income people. I don't think this is the solution. I am saying this is exactly what has taken place in the States which they cannot cope with and you see a change of policy in across the line as well.

A study in the United States disclosed that the amount expended on 28,000 public housing

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . units would be sufficient to enable 42,000 families to compete in the private market with income supplement - with money left over for renovating of the property they occupy. So Mr. Speaker, I believe that wider range of experimental solutions must be tried, such as rent and income supplements, to enable families to seek their own accommodation such as public assistance for home ownership, renovation of older homes and change in a property tax structure. I feel that such programs would encourage independence amongst families needing housing accommodation, would provide much more of the incentive program than programs which involve housing subsidies only.

And I also feel that the requirement for citizen participation in such things as public housing should be a must and should be encouraged, so to make home ownership easier for many people, I will be presenting a couple of the resolutions later on in the session. One is to remove the education tax from our senior citizens, and the other one that we be allowed to deduct property tax and mortgage interest costs against taxable income, because in my opinion if we don't move in that direction and in fact, I feel that we should also remove the sales tax, federal and provincial on housing. We are coming very quickly and reaching the stage where very few people can afford to buy a private home, because when you look at statistics even in Manitoba, where you have some 67 percent of the wage earners making less than \$5,000 it's very difficult for these people to be able to buy a home when in the last few years, through governments themselves, provincial, federal and municipal allowed land speculation, allowed themselves to put in sales tax cost which increased the cost of home ownership and this in itself has made it very difficult for many of our people to be able to purchase homes and I am very concerned about our senior citizens, who in some instances are forced to sell their homes, because they cannot keep up the property tax.

On the other side I will agree that the government has done something and I feel it will be a great help but I don't think the government has moved into the right direction by saying we'll give you \$50.00 rebate because with the increase in assessment, the rebate will only cover the increase in tax that you get from year to year. I know that my taxes have gone up, so I assume that everybody else's property taxes went up, so this isn't the total solution. I would have sooner have seen the government said we will have total exemption of the first \$2,000 of assessment for everybody which would have done almost the same thing and \$5,000 of exemption for our senior citizens which I think would have made much better solution or would have been a much better solution than the present one, because all the \$50 will do is cover the increase of taxes that will take place in the next year or so.

Mr. Speaker, the other point, I think I would be right to congratulate the government for assisting some of the communities by giving grants for winter works program under the provincial employment program PEP 72. I don't know if listening to debates just a little while ago in the answer period or question period, if the money is directed properly to in every way and channelled in the right place but the places in the rural community of Manitoba where this money has gone to. I think it's a good program - many of the rural communities have been starved for recreational facilities, for community facilities, and this program I think, in many instances will certainly help to develop our - at least recreational facilities and develop our community facilities that are drastically needed in the rural parts of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I will not debate or fight the old war of Autopac, and I see the Minister is not in his seat so I will not make more reference to him, but I think it's the responsibility of this minister to tell the insurance agents where they stand at the present time, because I think many of them feel that their backs are against a wall, they don't know where they stand from sort of year to year. If it is not the intention of the government and the Minister to do away with the agents, I think the Minister should tell them so now, so that they can plan properly. Many of them will have to increase their --(Interjection)-- no, they'll have to increase their portfolio, what they have at the present time which would enable them to stay in the business; some will have to go out because there is not enough money for them. But at the present time I am somewhat concerned when you have the Motor Vehicle Branch running big advertisements in the paper or on the radio saying that "We are staying open tonight or you can get your Autopac renewal at the Motor Vehicle Branch" --(Interjection)-- Yes it is - It makes no reference to the agents - I would say the majority of the agents are very small entrepreneurs, that they have not the money to advertise like perhaps a few of the larger agents, and the Motor Vehicle Branch has all the resources that it needs to for that type of advertising, and I think it's unfair. I think if they are going to advertise that you can get your Autopac renewals at the Motor

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . Vehicle Branch, they should also state that they can get it at one of the agents or authorized Autopac agents, or the Motor Vehicle Branch, but if it's the intention of the government to do away with the agents completely I think it's the responsibility of the Minister to tell them now where they stand. I think it's most important.

Mr. Speaker, I would wish to touch a little bit on economic growth and northern development. I think it's very important for Manitoba because, not that we must create new jobs for the new people that are coming on the labour market, but just to keep our existing people working. With a million people we haven't enough consumers to create the kind of a large market for our local producers, so we have to export. I think we should encourage the growth of small towns and cities and perhaps ask ourselves why should 85 percent of the people live in Winnipeg by 1985 or 1990, as was stated by one of the ministers last year during the Unicity bill. I think that we have to develop our northern Manitoba and I think this is where the government has to provide services such as those in the cities and I'm talking of course about television, good radio reception, better roads, schools, loans for community centers and so on. Perhaps even equalization of food and freight rates, day care centers and so on, in order that we can keep our people up north and that you can develop. I think money spent on manpower and services in the northern community will be returned many-fold to this province. Mr. Speaker, we also have a great natural gift in northern Manitoba and I of course refer to the port --(Interjection)-- he's one of them - and of course I refer to the port of Churchill.

A MEMBER: I'm referring to the natural resources.

MR. PATRICK: I think this port is now used to a very small degree of its capacity and through this port at the present time we only have the one way traffic and I think it's unfortunate that the government has not proceeded to see that we have a two-way traffic in this port - that our traffic is on a two-way basis, with Europe, Asia and as well as the Atlantic seaboard. I think the government can do something about expanding the use of this port.

I believe that to develop our immense northern territory we also should consider incentives for residents to remain in the north over a period of time. My colleague from Portage la Prairie will be presenting a resolution to the legislature for increased minimum wage for our northern communities and we will also be presenting a resolution again for a university of the north and I want it stated clearly that if it is not feasible at this time to have a university of the north, perhaps it is a fact that we can have a faculty of northern studies perhaps in the north as a branch of the University of Manitoba or a branch of the University of Winnipeg and almost every university in Canada has agreed with this that there should be a faculty of northern studies up north somewhere. I don't think this is an idea that hasn't got any substance. I think it can be done if the university itself perhaps in the next couple of years is somewhat premature, then surely the government can move to establish a faculty of northern studies in one of the northern communities, Churchill or Thompson.

I think that this government should consider also with the federal government a program of training in cooperation with our mining companies to train our native people in such things as exploration, mine surveying, line cutting, and it is my information that many of the people in the north like this type of work and I think this should be encouraged where the native people can opt out to do this type of a job under their own administration and manage their own operations.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that we have to develop this province so that all areas will benefit and not have the majority of the people crowd in one city where you do have problems with traffic, with pollution, with all kinds of problems. There is no reason why a city like Brandon or a city of say Dauphin, cannot get more of the industry to that area and expand those places.

Mr. Speaker, the other point that I wish to raise and that concerns the long distance toll charges for the people in Headingley. Some years ago I presented a petition from the people of Headingley, I believe around 300 names, to the House, to have the long distance toll charge removed and I have continually raised this matter every year. This has not been done and this year again as you know, there has been some discussion on it with one of the government ministers, with some of the people in Headingley, and I feel that since Headingley is a part of Winnipeg, a part of Metropolitan Winnipeg - it's in the - now part of the Unicity --(Interjection)-- well, a member here says it was forced into part of the Unicity. These people are dependent upon the services of Metro for their municipal offices, for police, fire

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . department, hospital, schools and many of them work in Winnipeg and still they have not their phone number listed in the city directory. I think the majority of these people either work in Winnipeg or have businesses in Winnipeg which is very, very costly. I haven't got the figures here but I did have the cost, how much they pay for their telephone bills each month and some of them pay as much as \$50, \$75 - these are not business people, these are ordinary people that work in the city, live in Headingley and to me, it seems like a very, very, almost exorbitant amount to pay for a monthly phone bill of \$50 or \$60 for any one resident. So I would hope that the Minister would have been able to give us at least a little more information what he intends to do - will there be any consideration given to removing the long distance telephone to between Headingley and Winnipeg?

Mr. Chairman, there is just one other point that I wanted to cover and that was in connection with tourism - I did speak at some considerable length last year and I think that we must have a better program than we did before in respect to tourism. I think that most of the tourists that come to Manitoba spend in the neighbourhood of at least \$155 each for accommodation, for meals and transportation and shopping. Only 35 percent of them come to Winnipeg, the rest travel through the rest of the province of Manitoba. I think that much more can be done to expand our trade. I know last year that there was perhaps only \$1,000,000 spent on advertising and I think that the province in return received something like \$40,000,000 from the tourist trade which is a considerable amount of money and I think that this should be expanded a great deal, that we can promote this area not only that it would create a tremendous amount of new jobs because it's a job incentive type of an economic development but also it would create many jobs that our young students need during summer holidays when they're not in universities and high schools. I guess my time is right up. I do have a couple more things to mention but I will later on in the debates. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q. C. (St. James): . . . the honourable member will answer a question? In view of his interest in the development of more public housing, did he make any representations to his Liberal colleagues in Ottawa when they sharply reduced our allocation of mortgage monies for low-cost housing last year?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in government, the Minister is, and it's his responsibility and duty to do it and I hope he would have done it. But I wish the Attorney-General would have listened. I said that I appreciated that we needed public housing but I said the government I think is going in the wrong course. I think the government must also make it feasible and possible for many of these people that are living in low rental housing to be able to buy a home of their own. I said just look at Burrows-Keewatin project right now. You'll find there's empty units in there and you'll find there's people living in there that can afford to pay a very high rent because it wasn't planned properly. So I think that the government should undertake to do better planning when they proceed with public housing.

MR. MACKLING: I take it then, Mr. Speaker, do I take it from the honourable member then that he has been making representations to his colleagues in Ottawa to make it possible for the Manitoba Government to facilitate or subsidize low-cost public housing on a purchase basis?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the House and to you that I have; I'm very disappointed that the Attorney-General hasn't; I told him that somehow the other provinces were able to make an agreement with the Federal Government such as Ontario and B. C. that they have started a program like that and I'm very disappointed that this government or the Minister was not able to do this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would be inclined to call it 12:30? If not I can start but . . .

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed) I call the hour 12:30. I am leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 o'clock.