

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery where we have 20 students of Grade Nine standing of the Brooklands Junior High. These students are under the direction of Mr. W. Rae. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan.

We also have 25 students Grade Eleven standing of the West Kildonan Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. J. M. Klassen. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

We also have 30 students of Grade Eleven standing of Garden City Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. A. S. Jurowski. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

And we have a further 14 students of Grade Eleven standing of Steinbach Bible Institute. These students are under the direction of Mr. Henry P. Dyck. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

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

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I don't have what is in the nature of a ministerial statement that would be distributed but I would like to advise the House that we would tentatively like to set the date of March 19th at 10:00 a. m. as the first meeting of the Public Utilities Committee. Now I say that now so that there will be considerable notice in advance. We would like to get the date fixed more formally, but I would like to give the honourable members notice to that effect. Of course, the committees will have to be set up and agreed to before that date, but that's the date we're aiming for.

PRESENTING REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I have to lay on the table of the House copies of the Annual Report of the Manitoba Hydro Electric Board.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): I would also like to submit an Order for Return No. 2 on motion from the Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General and Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (St. James) introduced Bill No. 2, an Act to amend the Garage Keepers Act; and Bill No. 5, The Personal Property Security Act. Bill No. 5 recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson) introduced Bill No. 10 an Act to amend The Health Services Insurance Act. (Second reading Friday next)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate to this House whether the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was expressing government policy when he expressed the preference of direct expropriation of mineral assets in this province rather

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd). . . . than increasing taxes on the mineral companies' holdings?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, not being in a position to know whether the newspaper article in question was what the Minister of Mines in fact did say, not being in a position to know its accuracy I can't answer that question. I rather suspect that the interpretation of what the Honourable Minister said may be somewhat inaccurate.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate the make-up of the interdepartmental task force that will be studying Mr. Kierans' report?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I indicated at the time of the tabling of the report that the composition and time of the task force would be announced by the Minister of Mines and Resources in due course.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder if I can, another question to the First Minister, if he can indicate whether the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources will chair that session.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the composition of the task force will be announced in due course, it will be a departmental task force, interdepartmental.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines. I wonder if he could indicate whether or not an invitation will be extended to the former chairman of Manitoba Hydro to be present at the just announced meeting of the Public Utilities Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the practice has been that the committee decides who they will wish to hear or if they will hear anybody other than the chairman of Hydro, that has been the practice in the past.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet and since the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition studiously avoided putting his question to me, and for a good reason, Mr. Speaker - (Interjection) - well I think, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I speak on a point of privilege and I only do so because of the obvious intention of the Leader of the Opposition to studiously avoid putting the question to the Minister who is quoting, therefore I make a point of privilege on the news story that came out today. Apparently Mr. Speaker, the journalists didn't have anything exciting to write about insofar as what occurred yesterday so they spoke to me today, Mr. Speaker, I indicated to them, in response to a question as to whether I favored Mr. Asper's proposal of taxing the mining companies as much as the government wanted, that they could get as much money by taxing them, I said that to do so would be to tax them out of existence and the government would then have to operate the mines. I was then asked well isn't what Mr. Kierans is suggesting to tax them out of existence and do you agree with that? And I say that if that was being suggested, which I am certainly not certain, if what was intended was that there be subterfuge to take over the mining companies by taxing them out of existence, which is not what I was suggesting, I would prefer going through the front door and telling the mining companies that this is what we intended and to buy them out, but neither of those proposals was something which I suggested was a matter of government policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. The honourable member has imputed motives to me in suggesting that I studiously avoided the question to him. Mr. Speaker, there has been more than one occasion when the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has expressed opinions which are contrary to his First Minister and it's somewhat difficult for members on this side to know exactly what government policy really is. My question was directed to the First Minister so that there could be some clarification of what the government policy is and it would appear by his answer that at this point he has none.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Before we have a debate full scale as to who said what, whose intent on doing what, let's recall that this is the question period. I allowed the Honourable Minister of Mines an explanation because every member is entitled to explain when he has been misquoted or misrepresented. He may have been a little lengthy. I would suggest that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition possibly took imputation where there was none. It was an explanation as I saw it. I would also suggest that he does not impute when he's suggesting, that someone else hasn't made up their mind which also isn't necessary in this House. Let us carry on with the Oral Questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. I. H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Does the government have in its possession the report of the Corporate Manager on the operations of Churchill Forest Industry complex for the year ended December 31, 1972?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, not having received notice of the question I will take it as notice now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. I wonder if he could indicate to the House and to the people of Manitoba whether the government has made a final decision on whether they are going to proceed with the billion and a half dollar beltway or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there has been no change in the government's attitude and position on this question since the time of the last session of this legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. BOROWSKI: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Could the Premier indicate if land purchases are continuing for the beltway now?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the province is involved with the City of Winnipeg in land purchase for future land needs. It is not specifically connected with the possibility of future urban transportation corridors, whether they be beltways of a vehicular kind or rail.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if the Minister can indicate when the government will be proceeding with the construction of the Patterson Dam?

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Resources. In view of his remarks in relation to mining taxation, can we conclude from that that there will be no change this year in the mining taxation rate on Manitoba mining companies?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member can make whatever presumptions he wishes. On numerous occasions I said to the House and to the industry itself that the Manitoba government will try to keep its taxation rates competitive and that the Manitoba government would try to get the other provinces and the Canadian government to avoid giving concessions and depletion allowances to mining companies so that we could all collect more rather than righting with each other to get less.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. Will the government table in this House the financial audited statement prepared by Touche Ross & Company and which the government received last year on the operations of Churchill Forest Industry complex, for the year ended December 31, 1971?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it certainly goes without saying that any audit statement that is prepared by the office of the Provincial Auditor or on its behalf by another auditing firm with respect to the operation of any department or agency of the Crown directly or indirectly involved, will be made public.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party - supplementary?

MR. ASPER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that that financial audited statement has been in the hands of the government for nearly a year now, I wonder when we might expect it to be made public?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if the document in question has not already been filed

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). . . . with the Court to whom the receiver is reporting and responsible, and I'm assuming that the document will be available for tabling here, it's just a case of determining the earliest time that this can be made possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate to the House whether the government would support a City of Winnipeg request for a McGregor - Sherbrook overpass?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member phrased the question in the hypothetical and therefore I don't believe it deserves an answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the First Minister, and ask him can an individual collect a school tax rebate if his current taxes are in arrears?

MR. SPEAKER: The question is also hypothetical. Order, please. Taxes may not be hypothetical but if the question is put with an "If it should happen" therefore it's hypothetical. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Finance could indicate or clarify for the House the status of Stothert Engineering with respect to the complex at The Pas; mainly was Stothert Engineering relieved of its responsibilities or did it resign its responsibilities?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that question was directed to me, I believe it would be more appropriate to direct the question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, the utilization of Stothert Engineering Limited in the initial instance was to be in the capacity of a management consultant group to manage the complex. The intention always was to bring in permanent staff, or at least this is the receiver's intention and this has gradually happened and Mr. Stothert has completed his work with providing the receiver assistance in the retention of a permanent manager. The receiver has announced the appointment of a permanent manager. Stothert Engineering is still retained by the receiver for consulting purposes - consultation as required.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Did the government know then when they originally engaged Stothert Engineering, that Stothert had previously applied for a job with Churchill Forest Industries and had been refused?

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

MR. EVANS: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rephrase my question and ask the First Minister again. If I have a constituent - (Interjection) - all right. I have a constituent who is in arrears in taxes, is he entitled to the school tax rebate?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member has a specific case in mind he should forward the particulars. He is still asking the general question in the hypothetical sense.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

A MEMBER: How could he get a refund if he hasn't paid them?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs. Does the City of Winnipeg have to have the government's permission to expropriate land for the Inner Perimeter Beltway?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the latter part of the question.

MR. PATRICK: My question to the Minister of Urban Affairs is, does the City of Winnipeg have to have the government's permission to expropriate land for the Inner Perimeter beltway?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'll take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable First Minister. Have any welfare cheques destined for employable persons been stopped as a result of the government's work for welfare proposals?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is that the province is in process of formulating the guidelines of a program to carry out in co-operation with municipalities that will change the nature in which those who are in receipt of general assistance and who are not employed but who are employable, may enter into either work activity projects or in training. The details of that will be made known in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the question is for the Minister of Industry. Has the government received any explanation and will it make that explanation, if so, available to the House as to how or what circumstances caused CFI sales for the year just ended to be approximately 12 percent lower than the projection given to this House last year in view of the vastly increased sale price of the goods produced? Is there any explanation?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I should take the question as notice to look at the figures involved. All I can say is that we did prepare a report which was tabled in this House, a very detailed report on the operations for the year ending December 31, 1971, I believe and there will be one prepared and submitted to this House for the year ending December 31, 1972. Projections are based on a lot of factors including prices, and prices do fluctuate, but by and large the year '72 has indicated a rather significant increase in the output over '71.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister and he may refer to the appropriate Minister and that would be to the Minister who is involved in the advertising of the Education Tax Credit Plan. I wonder if he would accept a request from this side that he inform his Advertising and Information Branch to indicate to the people that taxes must be paid before they are going to be entitled to receive a credit under that plan?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the legislation of that plan was legislated last session. My honourable friend is aware of its provisions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Premier. In view of the fact that the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Resources and Hydro are being jointly sued by the South Indian Lake community and that the lawsuit calls for permanent injunction to stop the Churchill Diversion, my question is do all the contracts being let or that have been let by Hydro on this project, do they contain an escape clause in case the permanent injunction is granted?

MR. SPEAKER: I would say that that is a legal question, besides that as the honourable member indicated, there is something before the courts and if it pertains to this then it again becomes out of order. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie wish to rephrase it?

MR. GORDON JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to question your judgment but I'm asking about a contract, I'm not asking about the lawsuit I'm asking about the contracts that are being let, and surely that is a normal question that could be answered in this House. If the Minister wants notice I'm willing to wait, but surely it's a matter of a contract, it's not a matter of a legal question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I indicated the other day that Manitoba Hydro was proceeding normally and the normal law of contract applies. I think my honourable friend would agree that in certain circumstances it is not unknown for the Crown to be faced with litigation but in which the Crown proceeds with certain public works. The litigation may be of a serious nature, it may be of a less than serious nature, but in either case the advice received by Ministers of the Crown, a decision is taken - or by a Crown agency, Crown corporation - decision is taken to proceed normally and accordingly they proceed normally.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie have a supplementary?

MR. GORDON JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would the First Minister - is he then saying that there is no escape clause in the contracts?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting to my honourable friend that the contracts entered into are normal in the sense that they are similar in nature to contracts entered into by Manitoba Hydro in the past for the construction of certain works.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health and Social Development. I'd like to ask him whether the government is considering the permitting of direct Manitoba Medical Association representation on the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, the medical profession itself is well represented on the Board of the Manitoba Health Services Commission and I feel satisfied with that.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer a question posed to me yesterday by the Honourable Member for Thompson in regards to the recoveries on the fraud cases pertaining to welfare.

The 18 convictions of welfare fraud have resulted in recoveries of 13,959.74 to the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Minister of Health and Social Services whether the government is considering the direct representation of the MMA, elective representation from the MMA itself on the Manitoba Health Services Commission?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had answered the question but I guess not satisfactory to the member. The medical profession is in my humble opinion well represented. You have Dr. Thorlakson who is a past and very active member of the MMA and you have two other members of the medical profession as members of the Manitoba Health Services Commission and I feel satisfied of that fact. I don't consider recommending to my colleagues the appointment of a direct representative of the MMA no more than I would for a direct representative of the MARN.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Education. I wonder if he could advise the House as to the progress made on the construction of a school at Gypsumville.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, there is no school under construction at Gypsumville at the present time.

MR. GIRARD: I wonder if the Minister could elaborate on the plans with regards to the construction of a school at Gypsumville.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. There are discussions at the local level amongst the various school districts located in that general area as to what type of educational facility would best be suited for future purposes, but nothing has been finalized as of this date.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson - supplementary.

MR. GIRARD: I'd like to direct another question to the Honourable Minister of Education. I wonder if he now knows what the general foundation levy will be set at?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, as I had indicated previously this will be announced in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the Minister inform this House as to whether or not a definite decision has been made as to what is going to happen to the Sanatorium at Ninette?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is quite aware of the structure of the Board pertaining to the Sanatorium in Ninette and the Board itself is in consultation with

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd). . . . the Department of Health and Social Development with the Health Services Commission and with other departments of government to help solve the problem that they have pertaining to the facilities available there. I have made certain recommendations to them and they are being considered and the Department of Health and/or the Health Services Commission will do everything in their power to help them find a viable alternative to the facility.

MR. EINARSON: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister at liberty to indicate what those recommendations are?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, pertaining to the Department of Health and Social Development indirectly because it involves equally the Housing Corporation was the possibility of looking at the facility in light of the needs of senior citizens and training for individuals that are responsible to the Department of Health and Social Development.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have another question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. I'd like to ask him whether the decision to reorganize the Mount Carmel Clinic as a Health and Social Development center includes a decision to name Dr. Tulchinsky as its first director?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: No, Mr. Speaker.

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 wonder could the Minister indicate to the House have any PEP grants been withdrawn through misrepresentation on the application or mishandling of the funds?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, that is a very vague question, in fact there were various elements to it. I wonder if the honourable member could be more specific.

MR. McKENZIE: Well Mr. Speaker, I'll try to be more specific for the Honourable Minister. Have any PEP grants been withdrawn due to misrepresentation or misinformation on the application form?

MR. EVANS: Well offhand I don't have any knowledge of this but I'll take the question as notice.

MR. McKENZIE: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Have any PEP grants been withdrawn due to mishandling of the funds?

MR. SPEAKER: The question was taken as notice. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister by way of clarification or restating what I believe his answer was to the question my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie asked. Do I take it that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I do believe that if the honourable gentleman has a specific question it can be entertained. We do not wish interpretations of questions and then asking for an obvious answer. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, are the contracts that Hydro has let in respect of the South Indian Lake project of such a nature that should the court rule against the government, the Government of Manitoba and Hydro would face damages for breach of contract?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The honourable gentleman is aware it's hypothetical. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Highways. Due to the announcement in the Throne Speech that there is increased tourist traffic coming from the United States into Canada, is Highway 75 going to be made a four-lane highway?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I think that the Honourable Member for Rhineland has been in the House long enough to know that no information is given until the highway program is presented in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure who to direct this question to but I'll try the Minister of Urban Affairs. Not too long ago some certain grants were given to the City of Winnipeg concerning the purchase of buses manufactured in Manitoba. Have we any assurance from this government that other towns and cities will get the same consideration?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I believe, Mr. Chairman, that they have already.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me on my sixth time up. I would like to -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. TURNBULL: I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Has the Minister now learned how many surveys have been conducted by or on the authority of his department to determine the datum level of South Indian Lake?

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

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't know. If the honourable member wishes me to take the question as notice and find out I will do so.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the same Minister if he agrees that there has been more than one survey conducted.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many have been conducted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. In reply to a question yesterday he indicated that there were 300 homes at South Indian Lake. My recollection is that in 1969 there was generally listed as being 75 homes, or 75 families, and a report of 1968 lists 75 residents and if in fact there are 300 homes, has there been any research done on the escalation of the number of homes between 1969 and 1973 or 1972 wherever his figures are based on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Riel is now attempting to indicate that I specified the precise number of homes. I think I indicated that that was an upper limit. The population of the community is such that there would be something in the order of 100 or 150 homes I should think.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Will the interim report of the task force on education be tabled or be available to members?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any task force on education is scheduled to present an interim report.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary. It is mentioned in the Throne Speech and it has been referred to -- (Interjection) -- post-secondary, that's right.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as Acting Minister I'll take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Highways. Is it the intention of the Minister of Highways to return to proper and regular maintenance of provincial roads as requested by resolutions from the Union of Municipalities?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, the program that has been put into effect a couple or three years ago I think in all due respect has been very satisfactory and I have always indicated I think since the time I've been Minister of Highways that if at any time it has not been sufficient I have always instructed the district engineers to use their common sense.

MR. WATT: A supplementary question. Is this the answer that the Minister gave to the Union of Municipalities - their resolution?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, yes, I should say that is correct. As a matter of fact if the honourable member wants to check any of the roads that have been taken over by the

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd) province as PRs and you check the amounts of money spent on maintenance of roads since the government has taken over these roads as compared to the municipalities when they had them as market roads, has been substantially greater.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party -- One further supplementary by the Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Regardless of the money spent, I ask the Minister now, are the municipalities in the Province of Manitoba satisfied with the maintenance of the provincial roads under this government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I think that the municipalities are more than satisfied with our program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Highways, I presume. I guess about two years in view of the fact he had commissioned a study and report on the taxicab operation - your predecessor had commissioned that report - has that report on the taxicab operation in Winnipeg been received?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I heard something of a program this morning and I was expecting this question so it doesn't really come as a surprise. I might say that the report of the commission has been received, yes.

MR. ASPER: Could the Minister indicate when he might be tabling in the Legislature that report?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that this report has to be tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, I have a question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary? Order, please. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Will the Minister table the report?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I don't have any qualms about tabling the report. I think if the request is there I have no qualms about that at all.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. TURNBULL: . . . for the Minister of Highways. Does he intend to implement the misguided report recently received by his department to ban bicycles from main provincial highways and the Trans Canada Highway?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't aware the question was directed against me and I really didn't hear the question.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, I must say I was not directing the question against the Minister of Highways but rather to him. I'll rephrase the question. Is it the intention of the Minister of Highways to implement the misguided report recently received by his department to ban bicycles on major provincial highways and the Trans Canada Highway?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, really the report did not say that the bicycles ought to be banned from all highways. There are some highways that they recommend that perhaps the bicycle should be banned for safety purposes more than anything else. The report has been received, we're studying the report and I think that in due course we will come up with certain recommendations.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. It has to do with the work of the ag reps. Is it true that the ag reps in the province have to administer and supervise the PEP programs and the STEP programs in their areas?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Portage probably would recall that ag reps throughout history have been involved in the delivery of government services related to agriculture of all kinds that is, unrestricted. That is any new programs that are introduced are usually introduced through the offices of the ag rep for his region.

MR. GORDON JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The adding on of more work, is this affecting the true ag rep role in that he's not having as much time as

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. GORDON JOHNSTON cont'd).... formerly to advise farmers on their agricultural problems?

MR. USKIW: Well I think, Mr. Speaker, the member is attempting to project what may be in the estimates of the Department of Agriculture through his questions, and I simply want to indicate that we have made provision within the estimates for the overload.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Resources. A few moments ago he said that the government would not tax the mining companies out of existence for the purpose of taking them over. I wonder if he would extend that same courtesy to the rest of the taxpayers in this province?

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the policy of the Manitoba Government is to treat all of its citizens in a fair and equitable manner.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Resources. In view of the interest shown in the beautiful beaches of South Indian Lake, is the government going to be selling lakeside lots and building permits for anyone who wishes to build a cabin there?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the question is put in a facetious manner by the honourable member - (that's not a swear word Joe) - but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we are giving consideration to utilizing the community area in any event as possible tourist facility location.

MR. BOROWSKI: One final question. Has there been any requests up to this point from anyone in Manitoba requesting the purchase of some lots?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there are requests for the purchase of lots in various places. I don't think that the location that the honourable member is referring to is one of the more numerous requests. I can't remember any offhand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder since there's some doubt about the number of residents and homes at South Indian Lake because the statement yesterday is clearly spelled out in Hansard, seems to be at indifference to what the First Minister indicates today, if the government, he or one of his departments would undertake to supply ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister state his privilege?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. For the second time this afternoon the Honourable Member for Riel is attempting to misrepresent my remarks of yesterday with respect to the size of the community at Southern Indian Lake. I believe I've tried to clarify that to my honourable friend. It is my understanding that the community is something in the order of 600, 650 in population with a proportionate number of families and homes. I think we're all well aware of that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: I'd like to assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the First Minister, I was not trying to misrepresent him. It's just that yesterday he said that there - in Hansard - that there were 300 homes and it is approximately five times higher than the number of homes indicated in 1969, and could we get some exact figures on the population and homes?

MR. SCHREYER: I can advise my honourable friend now, we'd be happy to do that although I tell him in advance that the number I don't believe will deviate very much from earlier estimates - something in the order of 6 to 650 population with a proportionate number of homes which would be in the order of 100, 125 thereabouts.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Member for Thompson's interest ... - (Interjection) -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister on a matter of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes. My colleague has drawn my attention now very specifically to Pate 55 of Hansard, the words are very clear and I will quote them because it's obvious that I was doing so by way of comparison. I said, "Now if out of 300 homes, approximately, there

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). . . . are let us say 2 or 3 that will have problems of water level So it's by way of approximate ratios that we were discussing this yesterday, but I've indicated now what I believe to be the quite accurate estimate which is in the order of the magnitude that I have already related to my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: I think this is getting probably a little ridiculous but 125 homes is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Let me indicate that I have distributed annotations and comments and precedents in regards to questions. Citation 171 Beausnes, and Section (L) of that citation says: "No question may be asked that will seek for purpose of argument information on matter of past history." Let us cut it out.

The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Member for Thompson's interest in cottages at South Indian Lake, I was wondering if the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources would consider issuing a licence to the Member for Thompson to operate a gift shop up there?

ORDERS OF THE DAY - THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Last evening when we were on the debate in respect to the reply to the Throne Speech, the Honourable Member for St. George was on his feet, I was under the impression he was going to carry on, apparently he isn't and I believe inadvertently it was indicated on the Order Paper that it's adjourned by the Honourable Member for Rhineland. I would suggest in my opinion that the debate is actually open at the present time. The Honourable Member for Rhineland will have his opportunity shortly. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, firstly I would like to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that it was generally accepted that the Honourable Member for Rhineland would have the adjourned debate stand in his name. Now if he's prepared to have the honourable member proceed in advance that's fine, but my impression was, as I'm sure it is the general impression in the House, that the debate would stand in his name.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, by way of explanation. Since the Honourable Member for Virden has to leave shortly I will let him proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Let me clarify for the House that the other day although members may have assumed what they wish, I had not accepted the Honourable Member for Rhineland's motion for adjournment because there were other members ready to proceed, but I shall accept that if that is the wish of the House.

The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, firstly I would like to thank the Member for Rhineland for allowing me this privilege to exchange positions with him and it does show there is some spirit of Christianity around this Chamber.

Secondly, I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder, especially the mover first. Having spent some of my life in the north I think I followed his remarks and understood the points that he was putting across. Then also congratulate the seconder. He did boggle down in statistics and I generally get bogged down when the statistics come thick and fast but in any case I congratulate him.

And to you, Sir, it's nice to see you in your position. I guess you're the commander of this political ship of state and knowing all ships hit rough waters from time to time and sometimes a little ripple creates a tidal wave, I can only hope to start that little ripple in the months ahead and let come what may.

The next point of appreciation. If you recall in the Estimates last year under the Minister of Public Works, I made some reference if the acoustics weren't improved I would consider speaking more and listening less and I must say maybe I did get to him. In any case it's a much more bearable place to be with the new drapes, and it certainly did. I was up in the gallery yesterday and I'm sure the people up there now can have some hope of grasping what is going on down here.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd)

I would like to refer now to an area that was sort of left out of the Throne Speech, and that's the area of transportation. My constituency has a situation with the Assiniboine crossing on an angle through it, I have three branch lines with dead ends right within my constituency and I think if we're realistic we've got to be looking at some of these branch lines being abandoned when the freeze comes off in 1975. And I can't help but think if the First Minister doesn't call a June election and elects to go to October or Fall and something happens in Ottawa, he could very well be forced into going early next year - that being 74 - the abandonment coming up in 75 and in this particular area of Manitoba there has to be tremendous money spent to upgrade municipal roads as well as highways, and I would have liked to have seen the administration take a stand either in opposition to rail abandonment or allocating money that will have to be used to upgrade and help the areas that this abandonment may take place.

And also to follow up the honourable member's remarks last evening regarding the air service in western Manitoba and indeed in conjunction with the other prairie provinces, and I know that Transair's negotiating with Ottawa and I thought it would have been appropriate if this administration had given full weight behind these negotiations. They may have done but it didn't show in the Throne Speech. And also to tell the Honourable Member from Brandon West and Brandon East also they want to urge the Brandon Mayor and his staff that more than verbal support is needed because the rest of western Manitoba will contribute if Brandon shows that there's some economic support for this.

Regarding agriculture that I live in and know something about, I believe, I see signs of much good here, how far it goes as far as trying to utilize marginal land, and I know this to be a fact, there's much of this marginal land that is not utilized to the fullest it should be. If they go so far as to start land banking good productive land then I would question that because then we're really into the NDP manifesto working paper and I don't think I can agree at all with that full approach. Another area in agriculture. During the winters there's many programs, short courses in beef and hogs, and this is good. That in my area there was some last year and there is many young people, young sons who were operating farms were not considered and their parents come to me and I phoned the department and they expressed - well this person was only in the big operation a year and a half. I phoned a gentlemen from Lenore and I expressed what was going on and the gentleman at the Brandon office said, well his father would have been more qualified -- and his father is 78 years old. Well you can imagine my backwoods non-biblical answer to him on that occasion, and I urged him to in future years, advise his minister, these programs should be - it's all right, Mr. Speaker, for you to smile, if you're smiling with me, fine, if you're smiling at me -- but the fact is this, that we need much encouragement to get young people, not when they're middle aged changing their system, but get them when they're fresh, when they're forming ideas, at these courses. And the other encouraging sign was in the livestock program and this can -- there can't be too much done in this area, providing we are not restricting our interprovincial borders or international borders and we must protect because you could read into this huge auction monopolies and we must protect the little, smaller auction markets in all the areas of rural Manitoba -- and I can think of my own Virden auction market that does a much bigger business than some of the larger cities, and not being around this building so awfully much but in recent days, I can't help but appreciate a feeling that the morale of some of our top civil servants are greatly affected and I hope this to be right because I think if it isn't, all Manitoba will be hurt.

Regarding municipal boundaries, I understand that my Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs at the Annual Municipal Meeting became very popular with the municipal people for saying that as long as he was their Minister there would be no municipal boundaries changes, and I hope this to be right, but let us not forget in 1964 when the then administration almost got talked into this position. We went out to the country in a very hot July and listened to the people and we were told in very - in no uncertain terms they told us they had a reserve, they told us all of the many things - there wasn't many members of this House that were here then - there was four members of this Chamber that are here now that were named on that committee, but in my scrapbook it only indicates the Honourable Member from Rhineland and myself, and this was taken in the Dauphin-Swan River area; the other two members I'm sure were about their duties, one of which was the Honourable Member, the First Minister, then the Member from Brokenhead, and I'm sure he was doing - maybe he was aiming for Ottawa at that hour,

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. MCGREGOR Cont'd) . . . I don't know. I would like to leave with you, Mr. Speaker, my absolute faith in municipal administration. I think that's the closest to the people, and I think if more responsibility was given them all of us would have -- the peoples at least of Manitoba would have a better understanding of what administration is all about.

I should have at the beginning, possibly, congratulated the press -- there's some new faces up there, and I know possibly they are somewhat like the politicians, sometimes get blamed unfairly and can't always come back, but a remark was made to me in the last couple of days, he said, "Morris how come," and this was the exact question "Monorail Molly comes in and makes a bunch of exaggerated statements, gets full coverage, and where other ones are very sincere, get no coverage?" And my only comment was this, that the press are human, they may have bad days, but also they have an employer. They may make the right speech, the right write-ups and maybe their employer has a political idea that wants to protect somebody. And I don't know whether I was right but I do respect the press.

A MEMBER: You were dead on.

MR. MCGREGOR: I'm going to refer to some of the things I've said other years, and one last year, in conjunction with our late colleague, the Honourable Member from Churchill. I'm not sure if we've got the message to our Indian and Metis people, and in trying to look into this I was rather shocked to find the difference between the Metis and the Indian is almost as great as the difference of the white and the black in the United States. There seems to be an absolute barrier there. I think, while it would cost money, is it so wrong to have a member of this make the rules, change the act, that a member of this House could represent all the true Canadians of this province, and one likewise to represent all the Metis, the one that's truly representative of them, not one that's a doctor of something that doesn't really in my opinion represent the Indian people. -- (Interjection) --

And I would like to say something to my Honourable Member of Labour from his great oratory last night, and he made quite a few references over here, and he used the word of our simple speeches. Well you know the message I get from my constituents that if politicians would express themselves in more layman languages that they, the people in the further away, would appreciate it more.

And also in his reference to the things they are doing that we didn't do, and I couldn't help but think of the days when I used to sit over there, quite a number of years ago, when the administration of that day was doing great things in comparison to say the Doug Campbell administration days, but we didn't tell them how our budget went up from maybe 56 million into 180 million and I suppose this year we have reached, and we were real high in our last years over there, but it's probably reaching in the order of a half a billion, maybe more, and the things they are doing are fine but let us know the taxpayers are paying for this.

A MEMBER: Hoot mon, hoot mon!

MR. MCGREGOR: The Honourable Minister, the Member of Wolseley, the Leader of the Liberal Party, in a recent press release, made reference to the cabinet ministers and that they should disclose their holdings. I think this is very genuine but I would go further, I would say every member of the Legislature, and go five years before he steps in here, we might well see where some of our colleagues on either side of this House had great tax loans manipulated into a business may have been a brewery, may have been a hotel, and may it well have been a distiller, since sold out his rights at a large, maybe, I'm saying maybe, that large gains instead of the taxpayers being the benefit, his hip pocket was enriched, he or she. -- (Interjection) --

I don't usually try to barb any member, Mr. Speaker, and I think fair play, I've always said; I approach a thing from an honest and a Christian point. Well all right; -- (Interjections) -- and again I'm not trying to pick out, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour. I see in the Throne Speech there's consideration on upping the minimum wage, and I have no quarrel with that. And if the Minister is having hearings, or listening to the people, I think this is good. And I hope absolute fair consideration will be given to the fact, not the question of upping them but are we creating more unemployment, because this is also a very major problem at this time.

And again repeating something I said last year, and I appreciate the things that have been done in the welfare, the nursing homes, the medicare, for the senior citizen, and no one can quarrel with that because they made everything we have got and deprived themselves of

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. MCGREGOR Cont'd)... many of the things that we have today. And my old usual kick, my problems in welfare. I know it's tough, I feel for the Minister, and if I had any say, and obviously I won't even if we move over there -- not likely -- but I would have an . . . one so big and so tough he would have to be hated by every member of this Chamber. But there are things that no minister and I -- we had these problems when we were overthere, real big, real tough -- one so tough to straighten this thing out. And the thing that bugs me -- now I've tried to go through these individually, and I think the minister last year accused me of not going to him, and maybe I should go more often, but these are things that I believe I can straighten out myself if given some co-operation with the welfare staff. What happened to the one out of Virden a Mr. G. -- and I'm just using G as the starting of his name -- he got involved with Peter Warren and the Peter Warren show -- and I got dressed down pretty well from Peter through a letter, a couple of letters. I worked faithfully on this and all I got out of that was the worker out of Brandon went out and chewed the real toenails off this Mr. G. because he had went to Morris McGregor, and he had went to Peter Warren. And I sent a letter to the Brandon office, just pretty critical, I'm not trying to interfere with them, if they told me that individual shouldn't get welfare, spell the reasons, I will support them. And how many times have I said that to them? I was in this home; I know the need. These are the things, Mr. Speaker, if I had the hammer in my hand, this would be done, and I would be unpopular, I am sure of that, I would be hated in my own area.

Well I promised my Honourable Member from Rhineland I wouldn't be a very few minutes, and there's just one thing in my ten-plus years here, I've had a lot of thrills and a lot of fine things have happened, and I've got the devil a lot of times too, for which I had earned that right.

But today I would like to just put on the record a birthday, a hundredth birthday. It's far from the first, this Friday, a friend of my family, a Mrs. Adams, and it's tremendous, she's in real mental health. I've been at hundredth anniversaries when it isn't so. One week ago I was at my first seventieth anniversary. I don't know how many members -- (Interjection) seventieth wedding anniversary. I've been to many 65's, a Mrs. Townsend in Virden. So I just say to the Member from Rhineland thank you. I do have to take off on something today, and I don't know whether I got everything, but I just -- (Interjection) -- yeah, I want that one too. So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

. . . . continued on next page

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Thanks. Mr. Speaker, first of all let me congratulate you on still maintaining your office and doing a good job. Certainly this year I have not challenged you on any at any one time and I think we'll be able to get along quite well, so far.

Well I also wish to express my regrets and certainly condolences to the family of the late Mr. Beard, the Member for Churchill. He was a very close buddy of mine. We had lots in common and he will be sadly missed, not only by me but I'm sure by all the members of this House. I really appreciated the Honourable Member for Churchill and he really stood up for the north and was a very good member all around.

Then I too want to wish or congratulate those ministers who have been assuming new duties and some additional duties since we last met and this includes the First Minister, although he's not in his seat at the present time. I know there's other ministers who have assumed additional duties and here too I wish to congratulate them.

However, there's one ministry that I feel that in my opinion is much too large; I feel that the Department of Health and Social Services, which includes welfare, should be split and that we should have the two separated. I feel this is too big a department in my opinion and from the experience I have had I feel that there should be a separate and special minister for the social services such as welfare.

Now as far as the Throne Speech that was presented to us the other day, and here again before I forget, I want to congratulate the mover and seconder to the Speech from the Throne. I think both of them made a valuable contribution. While I do not agree with everything they said, nevertheless I wish to congratulate them on it.

The Throne Speech in my opinion contains a lot of unnecessary verbiage, especially on certain matters, on programs that have been going on for some time and which are just repeated.

On other areas I feel that the Throne Speech should be much more precise, let's take municipal assistance. What do we mean by municipal assistance? Is it going to be 50 cents on per capita, or are we speaking in terms of \$5.00 per capita increase, or is it going to take some other form of assistance? So Mr. Speaker, to give it wholesale approval one lot of areas are so vague this makes it very difficult. I don't know whether members on the other side of the House are fully aware of all their programs that they intend to bring in, so that they can vote for them. I've never been on their side or have never been in the caucus, so I couldn't say.

Then too, there are certainly areas that are left open to interpretation, and here again I have to reserve judgment as to the support of those items.

However, Mr. Speaker, there are a good number of items that I think we can support and I would briefly review some of them. This is not my normal practice of speaking on the Throne Speech because I generally just deal with the matters that I feel are either left out or need emphasis, or other matters that should be introduced at the time that we debate the Throne Speech. I feel on the matter of contributions to cost of nursing home care, we are introducing a new principle here not to diminish the accumulated savings or assets of the individual. I certainly endorse this particular principle and I feel that this principle should be carried further. In my opinion this principle should be extended to welfare in certain cases; because this was what was done in British Columbia where the Honourable Mr. Gagliardi at that time was made Minister -- (Interjection) -- yest, "flying Phil" -- and he's a great man.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. FROESE: He encouraged many people to carry on and do some work. What we are doing now with our program the people have to be impoverished to a certain level before they get any assistance. And this means that very often if they can only do little work, some are incapacitated to a certain degree, others have other defections, and therefore they cannot earn much toward making a living. But what we do by our present system is that we are bringing them down to the level of complete impoverishment so that they will get assistance. And I think this is the wrong principle and I would like to see that other principle that we are putting into this nursing care, that this same principle be introduced in the welfare system so that we would give them partial assistance. Let them earn and try and

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. FROESE: Cont'd) . . .make a living and where they fall short let's give them something, so that they will not lose courage of doing something on their own. And I feel that this should definitely be introduced, and I had hoped that this would be introduced by this government at this present session. But I fail to see it and I do hope that it will come about; maybe they will still change their mind and bring about some program of this type.

Another item in the Throne Speech has to do with home care for sick helping them so that they can be taken care of at home where feasible. I think this is a good thing because in this way we can effect savings. I know of one particular case in my own riding where the lady who would have been in hospital for at least five or six months was taken care of at home; she received some assistance and in this way the husband could take care of her. Had she been in hospital it would have cost us at least 40 or 50 dollars a day, that's a per diem rate. So in this way I think we can effect large savings and this is what we should look at and bring about. Not only would it do that but it would also be reduced to demand for new facilities, new and more facilities, because we have to expand the hospital facilities time and again. And I think this is one way of avoiding these additional capital costs. Not only that but the operations are all going up year by year and so that in that sense we would be making very large savings indeed.

When I look at the Throne Speech there's mention of school grants, there's mention of teacher retirement at an earlier voluntary age. This is one thing that I have mentioned in this House before that it should be brought in. I feel that a teacher should be entitled to retire at an earlier age if he so desires, maybe not at full pension, but I think the principle is good and I certainly, if the legislation as such is well drafted, I will certainly support it.

The Task Force on secondary education and I asked the Minister before whether the report would be tabled, he took the question as notice. I certainly would like to know what it contains and what the recommendations are so that we can properly discuss them when the Education Estimates come up.

The matter of telephones, this was already mentioned by the Member for Emerson yesterday, I feel that the rural people are being penalized under our present system. They first of all have to be on multi-party lines and do not have the privacy. Secondly, these rural people have fewer people that they can call on their local areas compared to the city people who can call probably half a million people for that matter without any long distance charges. Here I feel something should be done, and something must be done, to more equalize the costs. And I hope that this government feels and sees its way clear to bring about some changes.

On the matter of hydro power, and I am going over these very briefly. I don't want to go into this at length at this time, there will be other opportunities but I just want to say one thing and that is, that we in Manitoba with hydro power are very very vulnerable. Should we have a war all they need to do is destroy the lines, transmission lines, or bomb the plant and where would we be. Everything is dependent on hydro: our heating our homes in winter time. Take away hydro and where are you? -- we'd all be frozen to death -- and this is why I feel that while I endorse the type of power that we get from our hydro plants, I think we should at the same time keep in mind some of these other kinds of power where we can have local plants, and for that matter I would think we should have a Pembina Dam so that we could have a local plant right close in southern Manitoba. I know the First Minister has given some thought to this at one time or another, and this is not beyond the realm of impossibilities, so that while I am endorsing increasing our hydro facilities, I feel that we should also give thought to having some local plants spread throughout the province so that we would be not be quite as vulnerable; and if not, it need not be a war, it could be bad weather. We have had instances where we had our wires down and where, as a result of that, because of storms that we didn't have power. So I think as far as hydro is concerned that is all that I have to say at this particular time. I will have more to say on that matter at a future date.

I welcome the decision to provide more assistance to police service to the smaller centers. Here again we do not know at this time in what terms we are talking of and that is why I hesitate to give concurrence, or give endorsement, to certain proposals because of not knowing what it really means or what it's going to be. We have to wait till the actual legislation is coming forward. But in principle, in principle I certainly welcome it and

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. FROESE: Cont'd) endorse it.

There is mention made of assistance to farmers. This, too, in my opinion is very vague when it comes to the matter of the young farmers acquiring land; additional assistance apparently is going to be made available. I also know of some of the difficulties that young farmers experience when they were going to acquire some additional land a little farther away from home and that the Board overruled them, that they would not give them the loans or the assistance that they needed, when I thought, in my opinion, they were perfectly entitled to it because sometimes a young farmer who has acquired some land cannot buy in the immediate surrounding area and he has to move further out to acquire additional land to add on to his holdings and to make it an economic unit. And this was denied by the board that was overseeing the Agricultural Credit Corporation. So I hope that this change that they're talking of will include this matter.

The matter of sewer and water is also mentioned and that additional support will be forthcoming. Here again we don't know to what extent or just what is intended. I think the program as such as a whole is a good one but I think the support should be much greater.

The matter of regaining land for recreation: again, I just wonder how they are going to go about it. They don't say in what way this is going to be done and here again I guess we'll have to wait and see how this proposal is going to be put forth.

On the matter of litter and waste disposal, which is also mentioned in the Throne Speech, this really is a problem, and we have had a committee in past years sitting on it and had received recommendations. We even had a bill introduced by, I think, the Member for Brandon West at one time which was not proceeded with. This is a real problem, especially as far as glass bottles are concerned and when you travel and you see these in the roadside, ditches all over. Rain comes or falls and water comes into these bottles and they're frozen and they're cracked, or they're driven over, and glass is one item that doesn't rust or rot, it just stays there and you cut up your tires and it is a real problem. And I feel that we should pass legislation making it mandatory that higher charges are being made to bottles so that people will not generally just throw them away and that others will also have the tendency to collect them so that the problem can be eliminated to a large degree.

With the matter of litter I think we should also consider pollution. And here I feel that as far as pollution is concerned, we now have automobiles come out with new devices to eliminate pollution to a large degree. This is a considerable cost to the purchaser and in my opinion it's unnecessary. Not only is it a higher cost but it also uses much more gasoline and so that the cost continues. I think the only place where we should have such devices is on these big buses that are travelling the streets of Winnipeg and which give off a terrible fume. So that, in my opinion, we in Manitoba with our large areas of space I don't think we need these devices on our automobiles and that we should not be caused to buy them when we buy our new units.

Mr. Speaker, so far it sounds as though I'm just giving approval on the Throne Speech but I certainly have other items to bring out which are not to my liking, and when it comes to transportation I feel that here is an area -- last year the Highways' program mentioned that Highway 30 was going to be widened and receive considerable work on it. To date nothing has been done, and I feel that here is an area that we should be working at much greater speed, and when we introduce programs, so that they will be brought to fruition.

I already questioned the Minister earlier in the question period -- we're having a 30 per cent increase or influx from the tourists from United States to Canada and I feel that Highway 75 is one of the main arteries whereby the people come in to Manitoba and that the State of North Dakota has a four-lane highway almost as far as Grafton now. I do hope when they come to the Manitoba border that we'll be prepared to likewise construct a four-lane divided highway from the United States border to Winnipeg. I think this is essential and this is only in keeping with what they are trying to do. Not only that I think -- I feel that we need much better roads in rural Manitoba. Not only because some of them have deteriorated but they are a necessity and especially when we see what is happening today in the rail line abandonment and the grain rationalization program.

We have a map here, and this was in the Winnipeg Free Press weekly of September 23rd, 1972, which indicates that the intention is to reduce the number of delivery points for grain from 1900 down to 280 in western Canada. This is a drastic reduction. This means that

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. FROESE: Cont'd) in my riding where we have seven or eight receiving points today, seven or eight different towns and villages that have elevators that receive grain will be reduced to two, and that we'll only have two centers that will be accepting grain deliveries. And for the province they're going to reduce them very drastically as well. They have them categorized according to the A, B and C classifications and the A classification is the larger one, of which we will have 24 different points throughout western Canada. Four of these will be in Manitoba out of 24. Then we have the category B points of which there will be 67 points in western Canada; we will only have 5 out of 67 out of the three western provinces. And out of the C category a total of 189 points, we will have 34. So this, Mr. Speaker, is a very drastic reduction of delivery points for farmers that is supposed to be completed by 1990 if everything goes well. I would like to hear from the government whether this plan has been accepted by them, and whether they are in accord with it, because we know today that because of the grain companies amalgamating and being bought up that we are getting large monopolies, and that in many places the farmer no longer has a choice as far as the agents is concerned, and if the agent doesn't particularly like a farmer he may grade down his product and he has no alternative, no choice -- and especially once this program comes into effect, in my riding the only areas that will have elevators is Altona and Winkler. The points such as Plum Coulee, Horndean, Rosenfeld, Gretna, Letellier, St. Jean, they will all disappear, and I am sure that our people back home would be up in arms if they knew about this program and were made aware of it. This really came to discussion and was fully discussed at the Palliser's Wheat Growers Association's Conference in Regina earlier this year. This association is a very viable one and it certainly had a very full program the two days that it was in convention. And I for one certainly do not accept this type of program for Manitoba. What it means it will be reducing elevator space. I have in the last number of years brought in resolutions for inland terminals in Manitoba. The resolution was rejected time and again.

Had the government adopted it right now we would be making money heads over heels and the thing would have been paid in one year because when the Federal Government brought in the LIFT program, what happened? There was a reduction of the crops grown and now we find ourselves short; we cannot even supply the markets that are there today. Bangladesh and India would like to buy more wheat but we are unable to supply them, so had we gone ahead with inland storage we would have had, could have had, a large amount of wheat and supply which would really be an asset at this time.

The matter of the uni-trains was discussed along with this program, and they're also mentioned in here. This is a new thing whereby they have these new large tank cars for grains and now that they are used, they have some in operation, now they claim that most of the trackage is far too weak and won't carry these big cars, so that they will be able to be used on main lines only. So this will further aggravate the situation if we go into this type of program of reducing delivery points.

With this whole program there's also the matter of inland storage but the type of program that they envisage as far as inland storage is concerned is far from what I had envisaged at one time. Their idea is to eliminate a lot of the present elevators and have a few large terminal elevators inland. I feel that our elevators should be left intact in most cases so that farmers wouldn't have to take their grains for 60 or 80 miles to a delivery point, and that is what this plan means. It mentions 60 miles here but in my case if I wanted to take it to a terminal point it would be more than 80 miles, it would be around 100 miles. So this program, and I feel that it is already been implemented without getting any endorsement publicly in this House because what do we see? Because in the amalgamation and the takeover of the different elevator companies, we find that they are closing elevators left and right, they are dismantling them, taking them down, others are being closed down, the Horndean one was closed down, one is being demolished in my home town so you see this is happening right now and this reduces the storage space that is available to farmers for wheat; and this means that we will be more and more dependent on quotas from time to time in the future if we are not replacing them at the same time with some other storage. What it also means is that, are we prepared to build better roads if these elevators are demolished or are reduced; and a lot of rail lines are also due for abandonment. Is the government prepared to build new and bigger roads because this will mean that we will

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. FROESE: Cont'd) have to have bigger trucks on our roads, bigger bridges, and roads that can carry larger loads. And I would like to hear from this government because if they are going along with this what are their plans? Are you ready to spend that kind of money in Manitoba on roads and bridges? -- (Interjection) --

I think the federal legislation for car loadings by individuals is still on the books, that it can be done, but very few farmers can avail themselves of it because you've got to be a big producer in the first place, you've got to have the acreage; secondly, you've got to have the quota in order to ship in carload lot quantities. And now this presents a new problem because protein grading is coming in. This was another matter that was discussed very thoroughly at this conference, which I really enjoyed, and I find now they distributed maps of the western provinces, of the protein content of wheat in the various areas, and we in the Red River Valley are second lowest. It was also mentioned that there would be a penalty price-wise on the wheat that had a lower protein content so that according to the figures given there it would mean that we would have at least a penalty of 15, 16 cents a bushel right here in Manitoba because of lower protein wheat, and this could be quite considerably higher than that. This means that there's going to be a big loss to the Manitoba farmer if this program is carried on, and yet we hear nothing from the Minister of Agriculture on this. Nothing has been said and he will not even come out and explain it. Doesn't he know? I asked a question the other day, he took it as notice. Apparently they're not interested even in inquiring and finding out what is happening in the agricultural field and especially in this whole area. It's not just a federal matter, it's a provincial matter as well because our farmers are dependent on it and our economy in this province is dependent on it and our tax revenue no doubt will be dependent on it.

I also feel that because of the larger or higher prices received now for wheat that is being sold, and we were told at that conference that wheat had been selling the latter part of 72 for \$2.80 a bushel and that the sales in the last months of 72 were over the three dollar mark. If that is the price that we're getting now, why don't we get a higher initial payment?

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. FROESE: I notice that there is a small increase being given now -- it came out last week -- but it's a far cry from what it could be, and I feel that the Canadian Wheat Board is holding back too much of the farmers' money without due cause.

Another thing, I think we can only be -- we are very lucky, indeed that we don't have an international wheat agreement at this time because if we had one of those we would probably have to sell our wheat for half the price or two-thirds the price that we're getting now. That's why I've never liked the long-term agreements because they were made for five years; they were not made by the farmers, they were made by some other officials, bureaucrats, and they decided for the farmer how much he was going to get for his wheat five years in advance without having any idea as to what the farmer would have to pay for the commodities that he had to buy. And this has been going on for the last 25 years or so, and we are indeed very fortunate that we are not tied down to such an agreement at this particular time so that we can cash in on the new better prices that are available right now. In my opinion the government should have long ago have adopted the resolution that I put forward on inland storage -- certainly we could have made a lot of money on it. Secondly, this would have been, in my opinion, sufficient by now to completely pay for that; the storage is needed in addition to what we've got, and certainly the LIFT program in my opinion was a colossal error that should have never been made to come about in our fair country as long as we have hungry people in this world.

A MEMBER: Well said, Jake.

MR. FROESE: Now inland storage naturally would require money and here again we were told the other day in Economic Development Committee, that in Canada we were generating sufficient purchasing power, or investment capital, to suffice for all the development needed in Canada. This was said by one of the witnesses appearing before the committee. -- (Interjection) -- I see. The Member for Osborne said that it was said by all of them. I didn't attend one of the meetings, I'm not on the committee, but I do generally try and attend those meetings so that I'm informed as to what goes on. Now we in Social Credit feel that we have the machinery in Ottawa; we have the Bank of Canada which

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. FROESE: Cont'd) . . . can look after our needs, and which should be put to use, and I feel that this government should long already have asked the Federal Government to see to it that the Bank of Canada would make available money interest-free, or at low rates, to the people of Canada. Because what are we doing as far as other countries are concerned, and I have a list here of the countries that have made loans from the Bank of Canada interest-free for periods of 50 years or more. India at present has a loan of 265,333,000, no interest rate, 50 year period; Pakistan 123 million, no interest, 50 years; Tunisia 56 million, no interest 50 years; Nigeria 33 million, 3 per cent interest, 50 years . . .

A MEMBER: Under what program?

MR. FROESE: This is from the Bank of Canada; this is the Federal Government issuing credit to these nations . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member has five minutes. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): . . . Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would indicate whether this is under the World Development Fund through the Bank of Canada, or some other method?

MR. FROESE: Oh, Mr. Speaker, it's immaterial . . .

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. FROESE: . . . it's completely immaterial under what program it is: If the money can be made available to these countries interest-free for periods of that time -- and there is some more here: Ceylon 50 million at three-quarters of one per cent, 50 years; Algeria, a million six hundred, interest-free for 50 years; Jamaica 11 1/2 million, three-quarters of one per cent, 50 years; Ghana, 7 1/2 million, interest-free, 50 years; Colombia, 17,820,000 at one-half of one per cent, 50 years;

A MEMBER: You're running out of time, Jake.

MR. FROESE: Yes, I'm running out of time. There's some more here on this particular sheet listing those various countries that have received money through the Bank of Canada from our Federal Parliament, our Federal Government interest-free, and I say when we can do that for other countries we can do the same thing for our people here in Manitoba and in Canada. And this is what should be done in the way of building our institutions such as hospitals, schools, roads, the things that we need. Why do we have to pay for these over and over again in interest payments when the machinery is there for us to do this, and when we -- (Interjection) -- Well I understand the Social Creditors made an amendment, I think, a week ago and the government voted against it, and I think your party went along with the government in voting against it. I don't think that was very good of your colleagues there and I hope that you reprimand them for it.

We are in Manitoba, and according to the expenditures of last year, we are paying interest on our provincial debt of \$39 million. This is \$39.00 for every man, woman and child in this province.

A MEMBER: A day old.

MR. FROESE: Why -- yeah, a day old. Why can't we also use the Bank of Canada for the very purposes that these countries can do. Let's at least make an effort, let's make an application, let's go to the government and ask for this. -- (Interjection) -- Well I hope that -- the Minister says we have. Let them table the correspondence then and let us see it, because I think -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I wouldn't mind doing that. What could we do with \$39 million in Manitoba just the interest alone? We could increase the personal exemptions for the people in this province and I think we could also allow people who are now paying income tax, personal homeowners who are unable to deduct the interest on their mortgages as an expense, who are unable to deduct taxes on their homes as an expense, these items should be deductible under the Income Tax Act and this is what you people should be doing. You should be changing that to help our people in Manitoba in this way. We would find that the farmers are able to do it; we find that other business people who rent their quarters to live in are able to do it; why can't we make this same thing available to the general public in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I have a lot more to say, I'll have to wait to another time then if my time is up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, before I begin I would like to say to the House that along with many other members here I regret the passing of the Member for Churchill, Mr. Gordon Beard. I know that many members here did meet Mr. Beard and his wife when the Queen was here, and we had the opportunity of socializing on the Lord Selkirk. It's my only time that I met Mrs. Beard but I would like to extend my condolences to her in her bereavement. He was a man, I think, Mr. Speaker, that represented his constituency well and a man that I will miss, and I think many members here will miss, in this session of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the Member for Flin Flon for moving the Reply to the Speech from the Throne. He is an individual whose working class background, whose experience and sweat in the mines I think makes him speak with great feeling and conviction, especially, Sir, when he speaks of the differences between the working people and those who don't have to work for a living like the members opposite.

I would, too, Sir, like to thank the government whip, the Member for Radisson, for his contribution. As has been pointed out he did tend to get perhaps a little ruffled when he came to the statistical part of his speech but I think that his contribution was well meant and was appreciated by many even if only in humour.

And to you, Sir, I would like to offer my congratulations. I see that you occupy that seat with the same dignity that you are used to bestow on the House, and that you have this year a new decoration, perhaps awarded to you for service in the battles here in the Chamber but I'm sure, Sir, awarded to you for distinguished service in the army, the Canadian Army, during the Second World War, and I congratulate you, Sir, on your Speakership and on the decoration that you are now wearing.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the exercise of the Throne Speech debate is one which enables the opposing parties, who do represent ideas and ideologies in conflict, to bring their collected wisdom together to see if they can hack out a policy for the province of Manitoba which will be beneficial to most of its residents. This exercise has been going on now for some days. I think that yesterday's performance by the Leader of the Liberal Party was one that can be commented on only because of its ineffectiveness. If he did not have the full support of the Free Press I don't think, Sir, that his speech would have deserved the comments that it did receive. It was, despite his attendance here in the second session since he was elected, a rookie performance. It was hardly, it was hardly, Sir, if I may say, a speech the contents of which could even be compared with that presented to us by the Leader of the Official Opposition, whose speech I think was much more concrete, who at least stated where his party stood and represented to us the ideas of Conservatism and reaction in Canada.

I think, Sir, that I must give some advice to the members of the two opposing parties. I know, Sir, as you can see from what they have just said, they are unlikely to take it, and likely sir, they are satiated with advice. They have advice from the business community, advice from the investment community, advice from insurance company presidents, advice from the presidents of railways -- other than the CNR I hope -- they have advice from mining company presidents, they have advice from the rich, they have advice from those new entrepreneurs the medical profession, and they have advice, I am sure, from many other wealthy people who, Sir, can always speak for themselves, and I must say are always effective in getting their point of view across. Although I must confess, I must confess that the president of Monarch Life, Mr. Harold Thompson, although claiming that the government is inaccessible and indifferent to their point of view, Mr. Harold Thompson has never telephoned me, Sir, and I must say that I'm very deeply moved and very regretful of the fact that this company president hasn't seen fit to get in touch with me to see what I could do about getting whatever he wants for the business community in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I'm always accessible to company presidents as I am to members of my constituency. I have a listed number -- not an unlisted number -- in the telephone book and I would welcome his representation.

Mr. Speaker, I think I should tell the members opposite, even though they won't take my advice, that if really they want to criticize this government they should hit upon its weaknesses rather than its strength. They insist, Sir, on attacking for example, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources who quite single-handedly could withstand all

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. TURNBULL Cont'd) . . . the debate and all the arguments and all the logic of all the illogical people on the Opposition benches. They insist on attacking the Premier whose stature in the province is such that their criticisms are deflected. They insist on attacking that other strength, namely our fiscal policies within the province, which have benefitted perhaps more people, more people who need benefit, than any other fiscal policies introduced by any previous provincial administration. Why, Sir, they insist on attacking those men and that fiscal policy mystifies me completely. So, Sir, I shall tell them what I think the weaknesses of the government are.

There are weaknesses in this government, Mr. Speaker, and here's one, here's one of them -- namely, the urban policy that has, one could say I suppose, been adopted by the New Democratic Party government. Sir, as the Leader of the Opposition said in his speech, I don't see any urban policy and I wait with eager anticipation for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, or the now Minister responsible for Urban Affairs, to enter this debate and tell us what it is that the New Democratic Party government is going to do for the City of Winnipeg because I don't see anything that this government is going to do for the City of Winnipeg. All I have seen so far, Mr. Speaker, is the introduction of an Act which established what is commonly referred to as Unicity, and since the introduction and passage of that Act, as far as I can ascertain from the Minister who was previously responsible for Urban Affairs, the policy of the Provincial Government has been hands off.

Sir, as an urban member I have sat here and listened to the problems of the farmer and the problems of the north, and very few members have stood to speak on the problems of the urban member and the problems of the urban people in this province. What, Sir, has been the contribution of this government to urban policy other than the Unicity Act, which I think was a good Act, which I think was an Act that established a system of government that was at least rational in conceptualization. But you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Act to establish one city in Greater Winnipeg called initially for a mayor elected by the council, and that of course was amended in committee and the Act passed in such a way that the mayor is to be elected by the city at large. What we have now in the Unicity Council is a group of individuals who posed in the most hypocritical fashion as independents. They were elected, Sir, as representatives of a group called ICEC, or the Independent Election Committee or something -- what was the name of that? ICEC. Anyway, Sir, it is a name that I think will go down as the most infamous name in the history of the Province of Manitoba because what did the people of that group represent? They represented, Sir, the Liberal Party, the Conservative Party and the real estate interests in the City of Winnipeg, and that, Sir, seems to be all that we have down at City Council. Now Sir, there are some New Democratic members there, five or seven of them. They are not overly effective when you -- they are not overly effective, Sir, when faced with an overwhelming majority of those who come from the ICEC.

. . . . continued on next page

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd.) Now I don't mean, Sir, to condemn every member who represents the real estate interests or the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party in the Unicity Council. Indeed, I think there are some men there who, like all elected people, do their best to give what representation they can to their wards, to their electors, who try within the parameters of their reason and understanding to do what they think is best for the city, but I must say, Sir, that they have misled the people of Winnipeg. They ran as Independents and they are not Independents, they are Liberals and Conservatives, and I think that that kind of subterfuge, that kind of deception, really should not be tolerated by any urban member of this Legislature who feels that he represents someone other than the rich and the real estate interests in the province or the city of Manitoba. --(Interjection)-- I gather, Sir, that my remarks have struck home because the members opposite seem to be rising to criticize the ICEC as a group that I have designated as merely Liberals and Conservatives.

Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to try to direct the City Council in the consideration of those policies that I think they should enact for the benefit of the people of the City of Winnipeg, but I must point out to you, Sir, that recently there was a decision made by the City of Winnipeg Environment Committee which was definitely opposed to the expressed wishes of a number of residents. Now I don't wish to enter on to the side of the residents or of the councillors in this issue but merely to outline to you the situation as it developed. There has been apparently before City Council an application for re-zoning on Roslyn and Osborne for the construction of a Safeway Store. That store was opposed by residents in the neighbourhood. It was opposed at most of the meetings of the Fort Rouge Community Committee; there were hearings held; people made representations and the people, the residents of the area, felt that that project should not be proceeded with. The councillors . . . of the Fort Rouge Community Committee with the exception of one, decided that they would support Safeway.

Now why would they support Safeway, Mr. Speaker? Why do they want a new Safeway Store at Roslyn and Osborne? Will a new Safeway Store really make it any easier for the residents of that area to shop at Safeway? I don't think so. Will a larger parking lot ease the traffic problem at Roslyn and Osborne? I don't think so. What will be the benefit of a new Safeway Store at Roslyn and Osborne? Well, it obviously is going to benefit Safeway.

They surely wouldn't put it up if they couldn't get presumably some kind of fat concession, some kind of a write-off; they surely wouldn't put it up if they couldn't increase their profits from retail sales. That's who it will benefit. Even though the people have opposed that project, the councillors proceeded pig-headedly to introduce it.

Now, Sir, I cannot accept that some of those councillors on City Council derive some form of benefit from siding with the real estate developers in this city. It is a mystery to me, not being in the inner circle of real estate companies, insurance firms and other such institutions, it is a mystery to me why an elected person would fly in the face of public opinion that was decidedly, overwhelmingly opposed to such a development. They certainly did not, those councillors certainly did not have a mandate; they certainly did not campaign down here in Winnipeg south on a platform which included a plank, "Put a new Safeway on Roslyn and Osborne." That certainly wasn't their platform. You know what their platform was, Mr. Speaker? It was "Put People First". That's what it was. People first - and what the devil did they do? They turned around and refused to accept the position of the people, a rational exposition of why that Safeway store should not be put up there.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not speaking of a group of people - university professors or teachers - who know nothing about city planning, who know nothing about business. I am talking about men who own and operate very successful small businesses right in the vicinity. I am talking about architects who are practising architecture. I am talking about lawyers who are practising lawyers. I am talking about engineers who are practising engineers. These are the kinds of people that were opposed to that development, and what did the councillors say? "Well maybe, but I think these will support it. Maybe we'll oppose it, but I think we'll support it." That's what the councillors position was. And I find, Mr. Speaker, that the Unicity Act as it now stands - and I hope there will be some amendments to it - does not really seem to provide the kind of recourse for the citizens that it might. It is my understanding, Sir, that after such a re-zoning proposal passes second reading, the citizens have no further recourse. They can try to get an appeal before the Municipal Board, the Minister can refuse and I believe he did refuse. They can register an objection - I believe that was done. After that there is nothing

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd.) and they have to put up with a decision, a decision which will directly affect the area in which they live and they will have to do it, have to put up with this decision without being able to have recourse, as I understand the procedure, to the Provincial Government or to the Municipal Board. It is a fact accomplished now. I think Sir, I think Sir, that it is a development that will not enhance the attractiveness of living near Osborne on Roslyn Road. Sir - that area is likely one of -- Mr. Speaker do you . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the honourable member have a point of privilege or a point of order?

MRS. TRUEMAN: Would the member entertain a question?

MR. SPEAKER: That's not a point of privilege or a matter of order.

MR. TURNBULL: Not at the moment. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that area is likely one of the most attractive urban areas in the City of Winnipeg. It's close to downtown, within walking distance; you don't have to get into 5,000 pounds of car to move yourself downtown. It's close to small shops; it's an area of attractiveness to an urban person like myself. To a farmer it may have no attraction at all, but I don't speak for the farmers and I would prefer if they didn't speak for urban people.

Now, that I think, Sir, is one area which the members opposite, if they did not have a vested interest in insurance companies and real estate brokers and real estate companies, that they could attack, but they can't attack it, Sir, they can't attack that kind of development. Why not? Because they are tied to the money they get from insurance companies and they are tied to the money they get from real estate developers. That's why --(Interjection)--. They are, Sir, they are Sir, no more than lackeys. Lackeys --(Interjection)--. Ah, I hear the Member for Charleswood, Sir, saying that those guys (namely the real estate developers) have a few bucks in the bank, and that is his criteria, that is his criteria for success. Got a few bucks in the bank, you can do anything; if you've got a few bucks in the bank . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order.

MR. TURNBULL: If you've got a few bucks in the bank then you can do anything with the urban environment. According to the Member for Charleswood if you've got a few bucks in the bank, you can desecrate the city as long as you can make a buck - that's his motto!

A MEMBER: Better believe it.

MR. TURNBULL: Now I think, Sir, that there's another weakness of this government, which again the members in the opposite benches won't take up. They won't take it up, Sir, for much the same reasons as I've just elucidated - because they're tied to certain commercial and industrial interests and they can't free themselves from those interests, Sir. They don't want to free themselves from those interests. They like it. They like to suck up to the business community.

Now another area of weakness I think, Sir, lies within the whole area of ecology and environment. Not only the reasons that I have given you why the opposition members can't take up this cause and attack this weakness of the government, they don't even understand what ecology means - that's the main reason. Sir, there are things that this government is doing or hasn't done with regard to the ecology and the environment that I think could easily be attacked. And one of them is South Indian Lake. Now in 1969, I think - well perhaps I should just speak for myself - in 1969 I think that many members, myself included, ran on the assumption that the Conservatives, especially the Member for Lakeside, knew so little of what he was doing with regard to South Indian Lake that the government should be required to re-examine the whole development project. And I think from 1969 for about three years after that the whole development scheme of South Indian Lake was re-examined. Hydro officials re-examined it, I'm sure the Minister responsible for Mines and Natural Resources re-examined it along with the Premier and the Minister responsible for Finance. And the Hydro officials, Sir, included one of the most eminent engineers in the country, a man whose qualifications are such that most provincial administrations would be proud to have him on their staff. A man who was tough, and a man who was honest, and a man who knew what he was doing, and a man who could put any member over there, including the reputable engineer the Member for Riel, in their place with as much ease and as much dispatch as any man I have ever seen. And you notice, Sir, that the members are rising, as they are prone to do, like jackals and baying at the remarks I am making, and I assume, Sir, that it must be because I'm striking home, because they wouldn't give me credit for anything else, I'm sure.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. TURNBULL cont' d.)

I think, Sir, that the re-examination of the South Indian Lake project has led to a more rational use of the resources that are up there, a more rational use of the land and of the timber and of the mining resources that may yet be discovered there, but it's not a perfect decision, Mr. Speaker. Anything but. It's still a decision that will result in the flooding of a large area. It's still a decision that I find some difficulty living with because, Sir, one can't get all the facts. We can't even find out how many surveys have been conducted at South Indian Lake, but I am sure, Sir -- I can't find out from the Minister in the House, Sir, but I am sure that soon, soon, Sir, the Minister responsible for Mines and Natural Resources will tell me in this Chamber how many surveys have been conducted at South Indian Lake.

Another ecological question, Sir, is the one related to litter and waste control which I suppose I'm out of order from discussing them, Sir. I can't discuss them. The matter of solid waste disposal has been tossed around by this government since the day it took office and we are now being promised some programs to help in that disposal. And I hope, Sir, that these programs will mean something because I haven't seen yet programs that have meant a great deal coming out of this government with regard to matters concerned with the quality of the environment. We've heard a great deal about the quality of life but that somehow seems to have excluded the quality of the environment. I can't really see how they're detachable, separate. It seems that when I look at the environmental record of this government that that in fact is the case. They are not considered to be the same.

What environmental controls have now been imposed in this province that weren't in effect before our election in 1969? We have an Environmental Council now established and as far as I know it is headed up by a man called Lloyd Axworthy, and he is a Liberal and so I guess anything that that committee recommends will be regarded as somehow critical of the government for political reasons and therefore not worthwhile, and therefore not to be implemented, so I can't see how the Environmental Council has any real control or any real authority or any real impact or any real function in the Province of Manitoba. And I must conclude that one of the reasons that Mr. Axworthy became the leader or the Chairman of the Environmental Council was so the government could say "Well, that chairman there is opposing us for political reasons and therefore we don't have to do anything." Now that is a point that I'm sure some members opposite - some members opposite - could take and attack the government with. But they haven't. They haven't. And I don't suppose they will, and I think I've given the reasons why they won't use these two weaknesses in the government as a basis for an attack. What we have instead, Mr. Speaker, what we have instead of an effective and concentrated attack is a bunch of criticism of a deal that Manitobans have got from Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, I was incredulous yesterday afternoon sitting here listening to the rookie performance of the Leader of the Liberal Party. He is, you know, Mr. Speaker, a lawyer, a tax lawyer, a man used to making verbal presentations to people, and he has all the resources of the Liberal Party behind him, all the money, all the vested interests, all the connections with the insurance companies and the real estate developers and what not that I've already listed, and apparently, you know, it came forward into this mouse-like document and this ineffective criticism of the constitutional issues in the deal Manitoba was getting as a result of the constitution.

Mr. Speaker, to me it is a strange way in which to criticize this government. I can remember on the 7th of January, I think, '73 in the Winnipeg Tribune a most remarkable statement which relates to this criticism of the Liberal leader of the constitutional position of Manitoba and the other provinces. And Mr. Speaker, I found it really quite amusing. He seems to think that he as the Leader of a Rump of four members in this House, is going to have great influence on the Federal Government; it's going to be able to change the policy of the Federal Government and alter the constitution in such a way that Manitobans will get a better deal. And he symbolized this, Mr. Speaker, on January 7th, 1973 by saying that if he was with Riel he would join Riel in the trenches. I have the quote, Sir, in case anyone wishes me to table the document, that the Leader of the Liberal Party would join Riel in the trenches.

A MEMBER: Riel never was in the trenches.

MR. TURNBULL: That's the first point, Mr. Speaker. In 1867 there were no trenches

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd.) in Manitoba when Riel did his thing for Manitobans. That's the first thing. So one must assume that the Leader of the Opposition doesn't know anything about warfare to begin with. The Leader of the Liberal Party knows nothing about warfare to begin with. And secondly, Sir, one can hardly imagine this Leader of the Liberal Party joining a worker in the trenches because the Liberal Leader, Sir, is a tax lawyer. He makes his money by, you know, beating the tax structure set up by the Federal and Provincial Governments. He makes his money by making the rich richer; that's how he makes his money. And one can hardly imagine him joining Louis Riel. Louis Riel after all was a man of vision, a man of foresight and a man who did likely more to establish the Manitoba Act setting up this province's part of Canada than any other man in the Northwest Territories at that time.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, with Manitoba's place in Confederation is not the Constitution; the problem has arisen from the fact that the Liberal Party since 1896 has dominated the national life of this country and in dominating the national life of this country has sold out Canada to the United States and to other foreign companies. It has sold out western Canada to eastern Canada and in fact, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party of Canada has sold out westerners, period. That's what it's done. And I think, Sir, that if the Leader of the Liberal Party wants a better deal for Manitobans what he should do is quit, let the Liberal Party collapse, as it's likely to do at the next provincial election, and leave the field to the Conservatives and the New Democrats and we'll work out a better deal for Manitobans down in Ottawa. I don't think, Sir, that the Leader of the Liberal Party could join anyone in the trenches. I can hardly imagine him getting his fingernail dirty, Sir. (Never mind his fingernails, just one fingernail.) He hardly is the type of person that I can see getting down there in the dirt, you know, and really doing his thing for the working man. I can't see that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Ottawa had surely better give Manitobans a better deal; there's no question of that. And the best way you can do that is to throw the Liberals out. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Liberal Party in his incredible, you know, misconnection with Manitobans poses the question: what does the West want? And I have that clipping if anyone would like to see it. Perhaps members of the Liberal Party that are still left in the House, two out of four, it's 50 percent of them, maybe they would like to see the clipping. --(Interjection)-- They don't want to see that clipping. This Leader of the Liberal Party asks: what does the west want? Mr. Speaker, we should surely realize, as he should, that the west wants something that's very simple to achieve. The west want to get rid of the Liberals and it has, Sir, got rid of the Liberals in Manitoba, there being only four of them, in Saskatchewan, in Alberta and in British Columbia, and Sir, I think that since the Liberal Party has been decimated in western Canada we have seen evidence of these four western provinces getting or trying very hard to get a better deal for their respective provincial citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I think that one need not belabour the point. The Liberal Leader is searching around for an issue or a hobby horse, whatever, to ride and he thinks he's found it in this request, this request to Ottawa to get western Manitobans or western Canadians rather, Manitobans a better deal. Mr. Speaker, that man has no influence in Ottawa and I think that was evident some time ago I believe when he was here, his speech to the Liberal Party, his speech to the Liberal Party at one of their, you know, one of their little poor man's dinners at \$75.00 a plate in the Marlborough Hotel.

A MEMBER: I never pay my way.

MR. TURNBULL: When it was reported in the newspaper, Sir, that all the Liberal Leaders -- I don't know how many members that would be in the provincial legislatures; would that be eight or ten members in the four provincial legislatures? I'm sure the Liberal members here will get the correct figures when they reply. Let's say ten. These four leaders of the ten Liberals in provincial legislatures are going to meet with the Prime Minister of Canada to discuss a better deal for western Canadians. And what is this meeting to be, Mr. Speaker? It was billed, you know, and I mean let's face it, the Liberal Party has control of the Free Press or perhaps it's the other way around, perhaps the Free Press has control of the Liberal Party, but in any case, Sir, it was reported, you know, that this was to be a meeting, oh a very serious meeting for the discussion of weighty issues and we can just imagine the Liberal Leader here discussing these weighty issues with his Premiers. Yes. One can imagine him discussing them as a feudal slave would discuss the issues with his overlord.

But anyway, Sir, the meeting was billed as a very serious meeting and I read in the

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd.) paper that it was to last 30 minutes. Thirty minutes. Four leaders and the Prime Minister were to get 30 minutes together. Now if you divide the time up just roughly, Sir, that means that the Leader of the Liberal Party of Manitoba was going to have for the discussion of a better deal for Manitoba seven minutes or so with the Prime Minister of Canada. That, Sir, is the influence of the Liberal Leader on the Prime Minister of Canada and I think, you know, that that pretty well sums it up. --(Interjection)-- That's correct. I'm glad that that point was indicated to me. My figures are based on the assumption that the Prime Minister of Canada has nothing to say to this meeting. But Sir, if you'll notice, I said seven minutes, that's 28 minutes, that means the Prime Minister of Canada would be allowed two. And I'm serious, Sir, that the Prime Minister of Canada would be able to sum up what he would give to Manitoba in two minutes as well.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Liberal Party in this House that if they want a strong voice with Ottawa that what they had better do instead of having their Liberal Leader here meet with the Premier for seven minutes, what they should do is get themselves a female beauty queen and that she will have more time and more influence with the Prime Minister than their present leader.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will do the traditional things, Mr. Speaker, in the contribution that I choose to make in this Throne Speech, namely congratulate you of course, Mr. Speaker, for once again presiding over this Chamber. I too have noticed, Sir, the decorations that you wear and I automatically made the assumption that one of them no doubt, Sir, was a medal for bringing to your duties here a certain degree of dedication and devotion far above the call of duty - and I sometimes have probably added to the problems that you face in this Chamber - and so deserved.

I'd like to congratulate, of course, the Honourable Member from Flin Flon, the Honourable Member from Radisson, for their contributions in moving and seconding the Speech from the Throne --(Interjection)-- That's about all I can say today to the Honourable Member from Radisson, the Honourable Member from Flin Flon. I'd better quit while I'm ahead, or while you're ahead.

I'd like to also refer to one other person that is very much part of our club here, Mr. Speaker, and that of course is the position that our friend the Chief Clerk of the Chamber here now is occupying, Mr. Jack Reeves. I congratulate him on sitting on that position. In doing so I know that honourable members would want me to pay some tribute to the former person that occupied that Chair, Mr. Prud'homme, who for so many years, long before I arrived in this Chamber, brought a great deal of stability, a great deal of knowledge that he impartially imparted to all members at request and it very often helped particularly new members, green members, that came into this Chamber. When advice was sought, advice was often given. I think that we would want to recognize Mr. Prud'homme in this way and perhaps even more formally at some other occasion.

In saying this, Mr. Speaker, I can't help but note and I believe - I don't know to whom I should address myself to, perhaps through your office, Sir - but I have some concern about the fact that there is no assistant seated beside Mr. Reeves. We take for granted the very essential services that he provides to us, particularly the onerous load that he carries when the Estimates are on, when the bills get in the mill, and I would hate to think what would happen to the progress of this Chamber should he in fact fall ill, or should for some reason or other he not be able to be present in this Chamber, and I would trust that it is perhaps a matter of an oversight or perhaps something is in the works, I have no way of knowing, Mr. Speaker, but it's evident to us as we sit here and watch the workings of that desk that there should perhaps be some reinforcement, and this is perhaps the only call to the increase of the Civil Service that you'll hear from this side of the House, or at least from me in this session.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me address myself to the debate at hand, namely the Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and it's of course very difficult not to be deterred from one's original intent by previous speakers. One could, for instance, Mr. Speaker, take a great deal of time to try to reply or try to dissect the somewhat astonishing message that we heard yesterday from the Leader of the Liberal Party. I say astonishing, Mr. Speaker, because I would firstly want to disassociate myself from most of what the Honourable Member for Osborne

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . just had to say about the Leader of the Liberal Party. It's obvious from the Honourable Member for Osborne that his intention is, and obviously it is the intention of the New Democratic Party, to continue and probably to heighten that divisive class war which they revel in which sets Manitoban against Manitoban in a far more divisive way than race or religion ever can. When he suggests to us that there's nobody on this side or in the Conservative Party that has seen the day or the light of work, he knows that that is not correct. He knows that the Honourable Member from Pembina, the Honourable Member for Arthur, the Honourable Member for Gladstone, myself, all of us know the value of work and have worked in our various occupations, professions and what have you, to attain those things that we have and are proud to have at this particular stage of our life. --(Interjection)-- Well, we don't even make that charge. We also are aware that both of you have worked very hard for what you have attained in your life. But leave it be, Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of classic, you know, divisiveness, that the Socialists wish to create and carry on, and we can expect that to accelerate and obviously it's going to, Mr. Speaker. This is why, you know, I'd like to disassociate myself from those kind of remarks that were directed at the Leader of the Liberal Party by the Member for Osborne.

What I do want to address myself very briefly to and disassociate myself completely from the statements made yesterday by the Leader of the Liberal Party is the threatening posture that he accompanies his call for western position. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing that, leaving aside the other complicated matters having to do with the situation in Quebec, leaving aside the extremists, the bigots or the racists that get trapped with the French question or the bilingual question, something like that, the one thing that has bothered most moderate people about the extreme position emanating from Quebec from time to time has been that kind of strident call for separation "do or else" posturings that have come from that province. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't know who is giving advice to the Leader of the Liberal Party but I want to assure you that kind of a posture will find little sympathy in the prairies. If one thing we in the prairies pride ourselves in being is super patriots, super Canadians in many ways, and I certainly do. So this threatening posture in attempting to set us up in a do or die situation is one that I reject, the Conservative Party rejects, I know the people of Manitoba will reject. I appreciate the difficulty that the Leader of the Liberal Party has in finding a call, in finding a cause. Let him continue to search; he is searching in infertile grounds, I'm afraid.

Mr. Speaker, I could certainly take some time, you know, to try to reply to the lovely speech that we heard yesterday by the former House Leader, the Minister of Labour. I was about, if I recall, to leave the Chamber when his dulcet tones drew me back to my chair and I did in fact take the time and the interest to listen to that great contribution to the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. DOERN: With tears in your eyes.

MR. ENNS: I could, I really perhaps should, and I will on another occasion tell the Minister of Labour who now chooses to call us hypocrites. Why? Because we have seen correctly that this government has the capacity, has the capability of doing some worthwhile measures and in our supporting of those measures he calls that a hypocritical action. Mr. Speaker, I do not apologize to that Minister of Labour for the priorities that were set by the Roblin administration; I do not apologize for the Party that had to be . . . on our youth, to build the schools, to build the hospitals, to build the elderly care homes that we now can put some people in and now can help pay for their care. If he wants to shout hypocrisy, if he wants to shout hypocrisy to us, that man who stood up and voted against the necessary mechanism of tax collection, the five percent sales tax that had to be imposed on the people of Manitoba, he and all his cohorts stood up and voted against that measure but now there's no question, it's not hypocritical for them to watch the revenues roll in, watch the building revenues roll in from that taxation measure that we had to put in in order to see that we could build the necessary infrastructure, that we could build the necessary schools, that we could build the necessary hospitals, that we could build the necessary roads to get our old people into these facilities. Mr. Speaker, what was their hypocritical stance? What was their hypocritical --(Interjection) -- No, Mr. Speaker, I just finished telling you I would not make that speech because that speech has been made . . .

MR. PAULLEY: We'll debate it another day.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. ENNS: I just wanted to let the Honourable Minister and the Premier who is not in his chair, as well as half the Cabinet who is not in his chair, they have seen fit not to grace this Chamber most of the time of this short session. The Minister of Labour liked to make note of it ten times in his speech that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was not in his chair. He unfortunately was attending the business of a nomination meeting which undoubtedly even in the eyes of the Minister of Labour is a worthwhile meeting to attend in our democratic exercise, as I am sure the Premier has a worthwhile reason for keeping him away from this Chamber. But, Mr. Speaker, let's understand something. We're going to hear a lot of this. Every time one of us is away from our chairs there will be an attempt made by some members opposite to bring that to the attention, to put that into the public record so that he can wave that Hansard in the coming election. We're aware of that; we can expect it; this is the kind of approach that we can expect from honourable members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious even in this early state of the session that hydro development will continue, it will continue to occupy a major portion of the stage. Mr. Speaker, and why not? Because hydro is, no matter what the individual members feel, no matter what the press or the public at large feels about the issue, the fact of the matter is that it is the one issue before us where hundreds of millions of dollars are being talked about in very loose terms, commitments for additional hundreds of millions of dollars are being made, and this is now, this is present, and this is in the future and it rightly deserves to occupy that portion of center stage.

Mr. Speaker, let me then remind members opposite just how fluid that stage is - and I use that term literally. Let me remind, Mr. Speaker, what the positions, how fluid the positions have become on this issue and what was said just a few short years ago by members of this House, members no longer in this House, and in doing so hopefully bring, at least to the record, a degree of honesty and truthfulness to the situation that is being distorted more and more every day as we proceed along the path of this great development.

Mr. Speaker, of course - and I dismiss the Liberal Party's position in this matter with reminding them that their position has changed little from that of May 7, 1969, when the Winnipeg Tribune reported their position, "The Liberal Party abstains in the South Indian Lake Vote," Mr. Speaker. Seldom, seldom, Mr. Speaker, does it come about that a party or an individual member - it has happened occasionally when an individual member for some reason or other finds it necessary to abstain, but generally this posture of abstention is not a laudable one. Mr. Speaker, the people that put us into this Chamber have a right to know where their member, where their representative stands on any given issue at any time. To play the musical chairs of changing seats and abstaining is the typical no action attitude that the Liberal Party has displayed so long with one perhaps notable exception - and they're displaying it today - with one notable exception. That, of course, is their former Premier, Mr. D. L. Campbell, and that makes one wonder a little bit about some of the guidance or the acceptance that the Liberal Party has now taken on this vital question, Mr. Campbell, with whom I don't expect the present government to agree with on too many issues particularly ones of philosophical nature - we don't agree with him on many issues. This government, this Premier saw fit to recognize his particular area of expertise the field of Hydro development, this government, this Premier saw fit to appoint Mr. Campbell to the Manitoba Hydro Board, so that while my criticism of the Liberal Party is scathing I will say this much for Mr. Campbell, he, while taking that position in this House and then while having the opportunity to avail himself to all the information which he indicated at that time he didn't have, came to a decision and that decision is known to all and sundry in this province. And that decision happened to coincide with the decision essentially that I fought for in this House and my party fought for in this House. --(Interjection)-- Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker, so much for the Liberal Party's position with respect to the hydro development program in this Chamber.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I normally don't mind answering questions. I have very limited time; I'm sure the Honourable Member for Portage agrees, I'm not about to be detracted or turned off the track at this particular stage.

Mr. Speaker, let me suggest to you as arising out of this question, positions do change. I have here this statement by the now Chairman of Manitoba Hydro that the giant Kettle

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . Rapids power project is dependent on the proposed Southern Indian high level diversion. Hydro says Kettle plan in jeopardy. Mr. Len Bateman, the now Chairman of Manitoba Hydro. Now, Mr. Speaker, obviously there has been, after greater examination of fact, a change in position by Mr. Len Bateman the now Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, which this government accepts. Obviously, then why can't you accept the change in position of that of a Mr. Kris Kristjanson, or that of a Mr. Harry Enns, or that of the Conservative Party? And that, Mr. Speaker, is essentially of course what I am driving at in the course of my remarks right here. The position that the Conservative Party has and will enunciate and is enunciating right now very clearly, that from the information that we now possess which we didn't possess at that time, the optimum level or the optimum use of the resources at Southern Indian Lake and the diversion of the Churchill River call for middle, middle flooding. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a position that I believe is correct.

MR. GREEN: But it wasn't your position in 1969.

MR. ENNS: All right, we'll come to that, Mr. Speaker. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, I entitled this the changing of fluid positions that people have had in this whole question. Mr. Speaker, I find it of some interest, for instance, to see what the official Indian brotherhood had to say about the question of hydro development at that time. They for instance felt that the then government action was appalling. The phrase "might is right" policy was being applied. They suggested in the Winnipeg Free Press, February 11th, that perhaps the time to stop is now; the place to stop to make the last stand - somewhat dramatic language - was at Southern Indian Lake. Mr. Speaker, what were they asking for? "We want the complete written guarantee of the commitments of government. We won't settle for any more verbal agreements." They wanted this before any license was granted. Mr. Speaker, this Minister, this government has granted licenses to Hydro. . .

MR. GREEN: Right.

MR. ENNS: Have they made any written agreements with the Indian community involved?

A MEMBER: No.

MR. ENNS: Have they held any public hearings with respect to listening to the Indian people's concerns?

MR. JORGENSEN: No, no.

MR. ENNS: Has this Minister gone through any of the exercises that he so eloquently called for when I was faced with the position of bringing about a program of development in that particular area? Mr. Speaker, in this instance the Honourable Liberal Leader yesterday called for an examination and inquiry. It was scoffed at and laughed at by the now government who have scoffed and laughed at all suggestions of inquiries. And don't, Mr. Speaker, let the Minister of Mines and Resources refer me to the announcement that he just made this afternoon about the Public Utilities Committee Meeting. We know what kind of hearings we've had at those hearings for only the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro can be questioned. No experts -- oh, there is an exception, will allow him to be heard. But you see, Mr. Speaker, we weren't particularly interested in hearing from the mayor. We wanted to listen to some consultants; we wanted to hear some experts, the kind of experts that were available to the opposition when I was the Minister responsible for this development. Mr. Speaker, what did the honourable, the former House Leader, the Minister of Labour, have to say about the question in February 1969? "Hydro plan inquiry demanded. New Democratic Party Leader Russ Paulley wants a special hearing by the Legislature's bipartisan Public Utilities Committee on the Manitoba Hydro's entire Nelson River project. There is something odd going on about the whole thing, about the way things are changing recently." Mr. Speaker, we've had escalations of costs, fantastic escalations of costs; we've had changes in midstream of the chief architect, Mr. David Cass-Beggs; I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, there are indeed some strange things going on, and the question for a special inquiry that Mr. Paulley, the Honourable Minister of Labour, asked for, the Honourable Minister of Labour asked for should indeed take place, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let me refer just briefly to the comments made at that time by my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Resources. He presented a brief to the public meetings that I arranged for and if the original meeting place wasn't big enough, the auditorium, the Norquay, we rented the Winnipeg Auditorium and everybody and his dog had his chance to hiss and boo at a Minister if that was his desire -- and it was unfortunately some of their desires. But, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, what did the Honourable Member of Inkster, as he

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) then was, have to say about this arrangement? It was indicated to us that before a license would be granted a hearing would be held and the people concerned would have full opportunity of making their position known. It appeared at the time that these steps were reasonable under the circumstances and would result in fair treatment to the persons concerned. That was his general approach, or remarks with respect to the concept of the hearing. He then goes on, of course, to say, it should be apparent to all that the proceedings from that point on and he - this is the point where it was indicated that the licenses would be granted, that it should be apparent to all that the proceedings from this point on, no matter what the outcome, justice could not prevail. He goes on very eloquently, you say. He also says that historically societies have - I submit that the denial of justice to the people involved at South Indian Lake will result in the inevitable erosion of the rights of every citizen in Manitoba. If my constituents in Inkster constituency are to be protected then I must speak out against this type of government action which would deprive the rights of the citizens of South Indian Lake.

Now Mr. Speaker, what was the case? Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster knows why those meetings were called. The people -- and this is far more important -- of South Indian Lake know why those meetings were called. The public knew why those meetings were called but through a technicality, an error in the position that I took . . .

MR. GREEN: Right.

MR. ENNS: . . . through the calling of the meetings, by calling the meetings under a specific Act, did in fact enable the whole question of the project to be looked into and developed and that, Mr. Speaker, was essentially the kind of legalistic loophole that the Democratic, New Democratic Party at that time, the opposition generally at that time chose to pounce on in an effort to block what they now consider to be a most worthwhile and necessary development in this province. Mr. Speaker, let me just underline, and let me get back to the fact that the people at South Indian Lake were aware of the nature of those hearings. I have here the minutes of a meeting that was held at South Indian Lake April 22nd, just about a year before those hearings in Winnipeg were even called. Sixty members of the community in attendance, where we candid . . .

MR. CHERNIAK: April of what year?

MR. ENNS: April 22nd, 1968, 60 persons of the community in attendance. Were we candid with the people? The question was asked, "Will everything be flooded?" "Yes", the answer from Hydro, Mr. Overgaard, "Yes. Almost 100 percent would be affected, if not completely flooded." The question was raised from the community, what about personal concerns, what about graves? Would the graveyards be moved to higher grounds? Yes, this will be done. The question was asked, and throughout my purpose for reading or pointing these out, what is the smallest size of the settlement that the government will be willing to establish? Twenty-five people or 30 people? The point in me raising this is that there was no confusion in the minds of Southern Indian Lake as to what the purposes of those meetings were called for.

There was a further meeting, Mr. Speaker, there was a further meeting a week later, a further meeting a week later, 45 people in attendance. This time I sent Mr. Tom Webber to the community, because he as the agency, head of the agency, director of the agency, that was in fact going to give the license, informed them that the license would soon be submitted to our branch for consideration, and we wanted to have their feelings; and he also suggested at this meeting that we may have to go to public hearings, but regardless of the public hearings, we want to know your feelings, what your feelings are and what we would like you to do, so that we can assess these and decide what is the proper thing to do about making a transition for the people living in the area, assuring that compensation is paid to the people who are being affected. Charlie Dysart, a member who is still very active in that community, had this to say. "What concerns the people here most is they would like to know definitely how much compensation they are going to get when they are flooded. Hydro has made no definite promises as yet." The position was put again by Mr. Dysart but before the license is granted, would they be in a position to make these promises? Mr. Speaker, from that arose the desire to hold the meetings so that in public view, firm promises, firm guarantees -- Mr. Speaker, not only guarantees made by civil servants but we were prepared to enshrine it in legislation

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) that not simply a group of civil servants, not simply an in-house working group which was done in the case of the Grand Rapids development and criticised to some extent, but, Mr. Speaker we were prepared to ensure the fact that those things that the Indian Community at Southern Indian Lake was concerned about: move or replace equivalent structures; provide docking facilities in the new community site; replace or pay for the fish camps belonging to the residents of Southern Indian Lake; clear the area required for the New Southern Indian Lake townsite; pay the cost of moving people displaced by the raising of the water; make arrangements suitable to the residents of Southern Indian Lake to move and/or suitably mark existing graves; co-operate with other appropriate agencies in providing electrical services; share with other government agencies to the extent of \$60,000 cost of constructing a floating fish plant. Mr. Speaker, all this is what the people of Southern Indian Lake at that time wanted firmed up, guaranteed, told that this would be forthcoming, prior to the licenses being granted which would do irreparable, not damage, but change to that lake and cause considerable hardship, and considerably change the way of life of these people.

The Progressive Conservative government was prepared to give them those guarantees, prior to issuing the license. This government, this government has issued the license, is moving forward with the contracts and is denying all of this to the people of Southern Indian Lake; not that they are going to not give the people of Southern Indian Lake this but they are certainly leaving the people of Southern Indian Lake in no better position than the position that the Chemahawin Tribe was at Grand Rapids, and that had been established some time ago was not satisfactory to the native peoples.

You are saying to the native people trust the white man; we will set up an in-house committee; we will have some senior deputy ministers and directors make suitable arrangements that you will be looked after. That's quite a change, Mr. Speaker, quite a change from the requests that were, indeed, the demands that were made of us. Mr. Speaker, and now we have this game going on in the Chamber where our Member for Osborne sets up the individual ministers, or the First Minister, daily -- why? You know, on the question of South Indian Lake because the Member for Osborne, the Member for Crescentwood, the Member for -- all members, recognize that they're going in the election with the conscience of the flooding of South Indian Lake on their conscience, they now want to establish clearly, and in a distorted manner, some way of convincing their constituents that they have not compromised their principles. Mr. Speaker -- and this question of seven feet of flooding, 850 is what the license is applied for. It's no different if we asked for -- our position is 854 . . .

A MEMBER: 869.

MR. ENNS: All right. Our position's 869 if we added the clause, but hydro use as little of that as you can. We could have said we're going to flood the lake four feet. That's what you are saying right now with the questions that the Member for Osborne is saying. The license calls for 850, calls for ten feet with the provision that you use as much as you can. Mr. Speaker, that's beside the point. The question is that we have it from the authority on high, Mr. Cass-Beggs, that the first four or five feet of flooding ecologically speaking, wreaks 85, 90 percent of the damage. You recall the expert testimony of Mr. Malaher, former departmental head in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, that indicated that 99 percent of all the wildlife, the fur-bearing animals live in the first two, three feet of the shoreline on the rivers of the Burntwood and the Rat River. Mr. Speaker, there can be no denial of the fact that if you put two inches of water on this blue carpet, or four inches of water on this blue carpet, you do the same damage, and whether or not you want to now establish cutely, for political reasons whether or not how many people are going to have to move, like the water's up to their doorstep, the fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that all, all of the 75 residents and five outsiders -- that was the count by the way, Mr. Speaker, accurately in 1968 - it's not my figures, it's their figures.

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

The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Thursday afternoon.