

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Monday, March 10, 1975

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 60 students of Grade 5 standing of the Butterworth School. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan, the Deputy Speaker.

We also have 24 students of Grade 11 standing of the West Kildonan Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Klassen. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, the Minister of Urban Affairs.

And we have 40 members of the Women's Institute. These ladies are all from the Gladstone area. This is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Minister of Labour. Sorry, Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Development) (Inkster) on behalf of the Attorney-General introduced Bill No. 2, The Interprovincial Subpoena Act; and Bill No. 6, an Act to amend the Wills Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development) (St. Boniface) introduced Bill No. 5, an Act to amend the Vital Statistics Act; and Bill No. 8, an Act to amend the Child Welfare Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Questions.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. It relates to the Provincial Auditor's report which was tabled, I believe, on Friday. I wonder if the Premier could indicate to the House what organizational or other steps he proposes to take to deal with the Provincial Auditor's criticisms of the Department of Co-operative Development other than the replacing of the minister, which he's already done.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, changes in administration within any given department takes place from time to time. In connection with the particular reference made by the Leader of the Opposition, I can indicate that one, and possibly two, additional professional accounting and auditing services' personnel have been assigned to the task.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether the Management Committee has reviewed the Department of Co-operative Development, with respect to the Provincial Auditor's recommendations.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there has been a meeting with representatives from the Department of Finance and Co-operative Affairs and the Provincial Auditor's office in order to get more definition as to the nature kind of extra services that ought to be arranged for in order to deal with some of the problems of accounting service relating to northern resource development.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the -- a question of the First Minister -- whether the matter of the cash deficiencies of the Southern Indian Lake Co-op and the lack of accountability have been reviewed with the Department of Co-op Development and the Attorney-General's Department.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of meetings take place on that subject matter, in that problem area, during the course of the past several months and that's about all I can indicate in that respect at this time.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. To the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate whether the matter is to be referred to the RCMP.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if there is reason to do so, then that takes place as a matter of normal course. I am not aware that there is any particular reason to assume that that is necessary.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, again with reference to the Provincial Auditor's report -- (Interjection)-- This is not a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Another question to the First Minister with reference to the Provincial Auditor's report, dealing with his remarks with respect to the certifying the accounts of R and M, or auditing accounts of R and M Construction. I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether the Provincial Auditor filed with the government a certified statement, certifying the accounts of R and M.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I thought that the line of questioning had to do with the Department of Co-operatives. I take it we're on a different subject matter at this time. I'm not aware that there is any problem with respect to what my honourable friend has raised. I'll take the question as notice and give him a definitive reply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Development. I would like to ask him whether in view of the seriousness of the current dispute between nurses and hospital administrations, it's the intention of the Minister to intervene in the negotiations in an attempt to head off a crisis.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: No it isn't, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question but to the Minister of Labour, if I may. Could the Minister of Labour report to the House on the current state of the dispute.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Yes, Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the Labour Relations Act and the responsibilities of the parties concerned negotiations are continuing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK, (Riel): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Government House Leader. I wonder, in view of the tabling of the report of the Provincial Auditor, if he can advise how soon the Public Accounts Committee will be called.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we're waiting for the names of committee members from all parties. I am not aware that we have received a list from the Opposition Party as yet. As soon as the names are called the committees are formed. We will have the committee meetings as quickly as possible, one following the other, each having maximum priority.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could undertake to make public accounts one of the first priorities.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the honourable member that it will be amongst the first of priorities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, last week I was questioned in this House and I took the question as notice, and I'm ready to answer them now. On March 6th, a question by the Member from Assiniboia, who wanted to know how many of the beds at the extended treatment at St. Boniface Hospital were open. The answer is, approximately 160. And why weren't the other beds open, or when will they be open? This will be, well at the end of the month and, of course, there was the recruiting of nurses, and they must receive special training in geriatrics after they are hired, and they should graduate at the end of the month.

Now there was a question also, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge on March 5th. His first question was: can the Minister tell us whether the Provincial Department of Welfare is making provision for suitable accommodation for the family of Mrs. Angela Courchene and her ten children, who are presently living in two rooms in a main street hotel. This is the answer: a five-bedroom house at 520-1/2 Alexander Avenue has been found for Mrs. Courchene; and has been inspected and found to be acceptable and clean. It is being painted today, moving will begin tomorrow, and Mrs. Courchene will take up residence

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . on Wednesday. The \$150 a month rent has been paid and assistance in moving will be given.

Second question: Has the department investigated a charge made by the North-End Community Organization that the Provincial Department of Welfare has intimidated Mrs. Courchene because of her association with the North-End Community Tenants Association. Well we have checked this matter with the North-End Community Organization, who has assured us that they've never made this charge, so this might be a figment of my honourable friend's mind.

Question No. 3: Is the department planning to provide for any special program for emergency housing for welfare recipients who are evicted from housing because of City of Winnipeg building by-laws closing down decrepit older homes in which welfare recipients are now compelled to live. The answer is no. However, since 1969 the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation has provided 9,000 low income and elderly persons housing units. We are intending to double that figure within the next three or four years.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege. I would just like to ask the question of whether or not it would be more advisable that answers to questions which were not available at the time they be given, be submitted rather than using up the time in the question period in detailed answers when we are on a specific 40-minute limit on the question period.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The honourable member asked for a matter in respect to procedure. He knows very well there is a procedural committee. If he wishes to suggest that to them, they can make a recommendation. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Acting Attorney-General of the House -- and he'd maybe want to take the question under advisement -- that in the Annual Report of the Auditor, I refer to the Gardenhill Craft Co-op where there's an inventory of \$29,250 is missing. The question is, I wonder if the matter's been referred to the RCMP for investigation, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the honourable member's advice and take the question under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Can the Minister inform the House whether he is preparing to present to this House a report on the lake level situation on Lake Winnipeg in anticipation of the spring runoff?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the matter is now being considered by the Lake Winnipeg Management Board. I've had certain verbal predictions, but I would think it would be safer to wait until I have their definite report before giving the information to the House. I will do so as soon as I get that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister confirm whether it is in fact true that the freezing level of Lake Winnipeg this year is a foot and three-quarters higher than it was at the same time last year, and would this indicate more serious problems of flooding in this coming spring?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I had intended not to rely on the verbal suggestions but now that my honourable friend has raised an obvious scare by suggesting that we could be a foot and a half higher than we were last year; the verbal predictions are that we will be a foot lower than we were last year at the maximum. However, the honourable member should well know that if the spring runoff is greater, then that will cause problems; if the spring runoff is lower, that that will mean lower levels. It is also possible that some of the Hydro channel improvements will be working by this fall, which will again reduce water levels from what occurred last year.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a supplementary on the last point raised by the Minister. Has the Minister dealt, or conducted any negotiations with Manitoba

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . Hydro in terms of establishing a regulatory program for the channels, and could you tell us to what degree the construction is in place so those regulations could be implemented?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, when Lake Winnipeg regulation was agreed to one of the conditions was that the regulation program would be supervised by a management board which is inter-disciplinary in nature. That board is in existence and the regulation program would be pursued through the Lake Winnipeg Management Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. I note by a recent Order-in-Council passed on the 5th of March that he was authorized to withdraw a sum of some \$21,000 from the special trust fund set up by the Horned Cattle Fund for purposes of advertising and promotion. Could the Minister indicate to me and to the House more specifically what kind of advertising, what kind of promotion he intends to do with this \$21,000?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, we have had many representations on the part of livestock people with respect to the need for greater information to the public of Manitoba on the plight and conditions of the cattle industry, and we have been prepared to meet that kind of obligation through that fund and we have invited people representative of the industry to bring forward some suggestions as to how that money might be spent, or the methodology that would be used.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Maybe not necessary, but am I to understand that organizations such as the Cattlemen's Association of Canada or the Beef Growers, or indeed the newly formed organization of the Cow-Calf groups, these are among the groups that the Minister would be prepared to consult with in the kind of promotion or kind of programs that he would envisage.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, since the money really is the property of Manitoba cattlemen in essence, I don't think that I would want to consult the Canadian Cattlemen Association as to the disposition of those funds but rather the respective organizations within the Province of Manitoba.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a number of copies of the request of the Cattle Producers and my reply, which was requested during a question period in this House last week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. I'd like to ask him whether he's planning this session to introduce legislation calling for first agreement arbitration in bargaining procedures?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest, despite what happened over the weekend with the Conservative Convention, the answer to my honourable friend's question will be, in due course he will be aware of suggested legislative changes respecting the Labour Relations Act.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask the Honourable Minister of Labour if he is sweating out the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I indicate to my honourable friend I don't sweat out any proposition that comes from the Opposition. We, on this side of the House, have definitive plans of what we are going to do in respect of labour legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my question either to the First Minister, or the Minister of Mines who answered the last question to do with the auditor's comments, or report rather, and ask him when he's taking the advisement of the other co-op under consideration would he also take the Crane River Co-op under advisement also and report back to us of what steps they're taking to recover the \$40,000 worth of cattle that seems to be missing out of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think I get the gist of the question. The other co-ops my honourable friend refers to in passing, being the Gardenhill Co-op, I believe that there is some involvement and obligation on the part of the Department of Indian Affairs of Canada,

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . and with respect to the Crane River Co-op all I can say, since I've not received notice of the question, is that I believe that the Co-op Credit Society of Manitoba has indicated that it may have to take action to protect its security on the loan, but that's about all the detail I can give at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I guess I picked the wrong day for my questions, I have a question for the Minister of Northern Affairs, I'll direct it to the Acting Minister of Northern Affairs, Mr. Speaker, or the First Minister. I wonder if one of the government Ministers advise the House, what percentage of roads or the number of miles of road are constructed in the north by the government, the winter roads, and the percentage or the miles that are constructed by private contractors.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think that the honourable member should submit an Order for Return, but if his curiosity simply cannot wait, I can give him a very very rough estimate that perhaps in the order of 40 to 50 percent would be constructed. Well now, I'd better revise that, Mr. Speaker. The greater part of the road mileage is done by way of contract out.

MR. McKENZIE: A second question, to the Honourable the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Are these private contractors compensated by the government for the roads that they construct?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there is a standing policy on that. There is some mileage of road, however, which as of the current calendar year is being paid for on a 50-50 cost-sharing basis as between Canada and the Province of Manitoba. That would apply to about 350 miles of road, leaving about another 300 miles, plus or minus, that would be paid by the Province of Manitoba on its own.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural . . .

MR. SCHREYER: I am sorry but there is a further caveat that has to be put on that, that is to say the payment by the Crown, Canada and Manitoba, would be with respect a designated network of winter roads. That is not to say that there may not be 5, 10, 20 miles of road built casually by someone for a very ad hoc purpose which is outside the designated network and which the Crown may not be paying, I'm not aware.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, a further question, Mr. Speaker, and more for clarification, If I referred to the road from Oxford House to Ilford and the road from Ilford to Split Lake, or if I referred to the road from Ilford to Shamattawa, are those contractors who built those roads compensated for the construction of the winter roads?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I should think so with respect to Ilford-Split Lake, I should think so; with respect to Ilford-Shamattawa, I would guess so; with respect to Ilford-Oxford House, the answer is no, since it is not part of a designated network, having been replaced by a road Cross Lake to Oxford House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I notice where the government has approved a further million and a half loan to Saunders. Can the Minister indicate to the House if any ceiling has been established by the government at the present time, on the public funds, any ceiling that has been established that the government is committed to provide public funds for Saunders Aircraft.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Government will continue to fund that enterprise as long as in the judgment of the Manitoba Government it's in the interest of the province, and the people of the province, to do so.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Can the Minister indicate to the House what is the total funds now approved directly by Cabinet and not by MDC?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am now going to work on my memory and I hope the honourable member will accept it as such. It is my recollection that \$18 million was approved

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . by the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Development Corporation, that the \$18 million was approved by that corporation starting from the time that they agreed to finance Saunders Aircraft, that after approving \$18 million, the existing board which I think I should indicate was not the same board that originally, or to a great extent membership of the board is changed from time to time, but the new board at the figure of \$18 million indicated that the risk involved was such that it wanted the government to accept responsibility for further advances. So the advances by the MDC Board as a board, \$18 million, the balance, which brings us up to approximately 26, 5, by the Cabinet of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate from what department are the funds taken for Saunders?

MR. GREEN: The Manitoba Development Corporation appropriation of capital funds.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition,

MR. SPIVAK: My question is to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and in relation to the answer that he's just given. Could he indicate whether the board at the time that they indicated that the risk was too high for the board to make the decision on their own, that wanted government involvement, did they have projections of estimated amounts of money that would be required to keep the operation going until there was approval and possible sale of some of the planes?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure as to the thrust of my honourable friend's question, but I gather that he has said outside of the House that at that time we could have wound up this company with a total loss of half a million dollars. If that is so, Mr. Speaker, then we have been showing huge losses in the Manitoba Development Corporation as a means of demonstrating losses rather than as a means of really showing the true situation, because several million dollars of losses in the Manitoba Development Corporation are reserves in the Saunders Aircraft account. If it could be wound up for \$500,000, we have been doing an injustice to ourselves with the statement of the Manitoba Development Corporation.

MR. SPIVAK: Really on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, that was not an answer to the question I put. And, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There is no matter of privilege in regard to answers. I'm sure the honourable gentleman knows that. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the information supplied by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is false. The representations that he just made are not the representations that I made outside this House. I'm quite prepared at an appropriate time to debate it, and I'm quite prepared to be able to document what I said.

I now ask the Minister, at the time the decision was made by the board that they would not grant any additional moneys to Saunders because of the high risk involved, at which point the matter then was placed in the hands of the Cabinet, did they have projections of the amount of money that would be required to keep Saunders on stream until both FAA approval and the possibility of sales of the plant?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there were projections given at the time that they made their advance from 15 million to 18 million dollars. I think that there were projections given of various different amounts of money. I'm not prepared to deal with those at this time, but there were projections made as to the amount that would be necessary to keep the corporation on track, yes.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, to the Minister of Mines. Then now can he confirm to the House that the refusal of the Board to advance further money at the 18 million-dollar was based on the projected information that they had?

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that. That's a very simplistic position, vis-a-vis the board's position. I also want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that the board did not say, or did not recommend, that the government not advance moneys. The board issued a joint statement with the Minister at the time that the 18 million dollar figure was reached, indicating that it could not be done strictly on the board's responsibility. But the Board of Directors never recommended to the Government of Manitoba that it ceased to advance moneys to the Saunders Aircraft, it merely indicated that as a Board proposition, it no longer felt that it could accept responsibility for the advances.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources can indicate to the House whether the Board in arriving at its decisions to advance money to Saunders Aircraft ever considered that it had a political decision-making part in the decision of advancing money to that project.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Development Corporation in guidelines confirmed between myself and it, and in the practice that was adopted previously, as indicated to the honourable member by Mr. Parsons, never took political considerations into account, have been instructed not to take political considerations into account when determining whether they should advance or not to advance money. A clear difference, Mr. Speaker, from the policies that were adopted prior to this government taking office.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he can indicate whether the minutes of the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Development Corporation indicate directly that political considerations were involved.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have answered the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the - I'm not sure if I have his title right, but I believe it's the Minister of Corrections.

A MEMBER: And Rehabilitation.

MR. ENNS: And Rehabilitation. Okay. Corrections and Rehabilitation. A short while ago prior to the session opening, he indicated some empathy for a position shown or taken by the courts, and in fact other people of the legal profession, expressing a concern or worry about additional space or facilities . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. ENNS: . . . for the mentally and highly emotionally disturbed prisoners, as to whether or not some security . . .

SOME MEMBERS: Question.

MR. ENNS: . . . places of confinement, of confinement could be found for them other than Stoney Mountain or Headingley Jail. Has the Minister been able to do anything about this, at the Selkirk institution; is he intending to do anything about it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Corrections.

HON. J. R. (BUD) BOYCE (Minister of Corrections and Rehabilitation)(Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I just want my colleagues in the House to know I didn't plant that question, but I have been sitting here and this is my first question. I was sitting with bated breath that I would be able to rise in my place and give a very profound answer. But the announcements of course that we will be making I'm sorry will have to wait for our estimates, Mr. Speaker. Hopefully my colleagues will give me the money necessary to make some modest advancements.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in response to a previous question with regard to Saunders Aircraft, I indicated a Board position as at the time that they stopped advancing money at \$18 million. It was a previous Board position at the approximately 15 million dollar level, where a particular request for an advance was refused, and then a process of finalizing that was not concluded, and I don't wish to have any misunderstanding as to what I said with regard to the Board's recommendation, that they have never made a recommendation at the time of the refusal after \$18 million that we not advance money to Saunders Aircraft. At that time they issued a joint statement indicating their position which the honourable member can read.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if the Minister could tell the House if there are any lands that have reverted to the Crown because of default of payment through the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, that have been offered for sale to the private sector.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think I'd have to take that question as notice, or the Member could file an Order for Return, whichever he prefers.

MR. WATT: A supplementary question. I ask the Minister then, is the Minister of Agriculture and the government using the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation as a vehicle for land acquisition where the government would become ownership of the property

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. WATT cont'd) . . . rather than offering it for sale to the private sector?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation is a very flexible organization that may or may not do things that are in the best interests of their client and the people of Manitoba.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Thompson, and the amendment thereto by the Leader of the Opposition, and the amendment thereto by the Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I took the adjournment on behalf of the Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, may I preface my remarks with the usual sort of congratulations to yourself, and best wishes and good luck in undertaking your responsibilities in this second session, and also for making the comments in reference to the Throne Speech. There have been other changes that have taken place since we last sat.

May I first of all congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech debate in their work in getting the session under way, but also note with a degree of concern that we appear to have reverted, Mr. Speaker, back to some of the more hectic parts of other sessions we've had in this Chamber, and it usually takes us several weeks to get to that stage, Mr. Speaker, but we seem to manage to graduate to it in the first day. So I trust, Mr. Speaker, that we can have some good parts to the session as well as those parts.

I'd like to welcome back to the Chamber the Member for St. Boniface and I trust that he feels more comfortable now than he did at other times in this House since 1969, having come back under his new colours.

Mr. Speaker, while mentioning that, I'd also like to say that the former Member of St. Boniface who sat with us for only one session will be missed in this Chamber because I think on all sides of the House Mr. Marion was very highly regarded. (Applause) His work was well prepared; he spoke in an articulate manner; he obviously represented the many issues of his constituency very well, and as I say I think all of us here had a very high regard for his contribution in this Chamber. That's all part of the political ball game, Mr. Speaker, and we trust that we can hear as good a performance from the new Member for St. Boniface who sits on the government front benches.

Mr. Speaker, while we talk of the government front benches, it can't go without notice, particularly when you're sitting on this side of the House, that we now have a government that is made almost up entirely or two-thirds of its entirety as far as the benches are concerned, with Cabinet Ministers. We have on the two front benches only one person now who is not a Cabinet Minister, which leaves few in number, Mr. Speaker, and very little room left on the back benches, where we find the numbers less than half of the total of the government caucus. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the characteristics of this government I think that has to be noted, is that they have graduated to the stage where more than half their caucus is considered front bench and in the Cabinet. --(Interjection)--

Mr. Speaker, I think what should be of greater concern to the Minister of Labour is the cost to the taxpayers of financing and supporting the multitude of government departments that have been created by this government. I think it's a well known fact that every time a department is created you create a bureaucratic structure that is an extremely high cost to the taxpayers. Even if you take the same department and split it, you don't split in half the size of the bureaucracy, you create a new bureaucracy that develops a new department. Mr. Speaker, I think that it should be with a degree of concern that we note that there are 17 front benchers on the government side as opposed to the perhaps 12 or 13 that have been more traditional in Manitoba governments.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to deal with the Throne Speech directly, and perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I could go through very briefly and maybe talk about what I think is some of the good news and what I think is some of the bad news in the Throne Speech.

First of all it's not a substantial document this year; we have had much more substantive documents from the government in the way of announcing their policies and the directions

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . which they intend to take. It's not unusual and it appears to be a grab bag of comments from all the departments of government.

I will note, first of all, that I think that one of the major things that is missing is any thrust or message for the consumer. We have had one of the worst years in Canadian history for inflation in Canada, and we have a government Department of Consumer Affairs, Mr. Speaker, that has been isolated as a department by this government but there is very little, if anything, in the Throne Speech that would give any message to the consumer. Well, Mr. Speaker, that goes for all the past year's activity. Despite all the problems faced by the consumers of Manitoba, there has been very little, if any, noteworthy comments or efforts that have come to public attention by the Department of Consumer Affairs, and I think this is one of the things that has to be probed and looked at more extensively in this session as to what is the role of this Department of Consumer Affairs.

The good news, Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech that I find, and I have some hesitation, as all of us are going to have hesitation, in endorsing and proposing extensive programs for government because we know that the government is in a difficult financial position. But two of the items that I think are noteworthy and laudable, given that there's room in the economy of Manitoba to handle them, one is the reference to Child Development Services, which is not new but is important that it be given further guidance in providing for that very great necessity in the Public School System for helping the underprivileged child. This is one of the things that has been under question and certainly under pressure by the interest groups to see developed for many years, and we trust that we can get more information on Child Development Services.

The other major topic that I think is a welcome one from the government is its reference to the whole topic of day care centres, and it's rolled into one in the Throne Speech by reference to the rights of women that are going to be recognized more extensively in 1975 by the government in view of the fact that it is the Year of the Women on an international scale. And I wish, Mr. Speaker, to make direct reference to this topic here. I think, first of all, that day care facilities have in the past, although they have been a formal program of the government, they have referred particularly to pre-school requirements for children. Mr. Speaker, there is the whole question of the school care for school-age children in the lunch and after-school-type programs that have been operated by the volunteer groups of the province, and which have been supported to some extent by the government by way of pilot projects. I don't think that you can divorce day-care from this type of a program, the need is as great in one area as it is in the other. I think all of this of course ties in to the modern day concern of the rights of women which many people regard with a rather jaundiced viewpoint, I would assume from the general comments that are received in the community, but it's not an issue I don't think that lends itself to either the politics of the right or the politics of the left, or the politics of the centre. It is in fact pure and simply a modern day concern that provisions be made so that those people who are caught victim of the historical recognized rights of women now turn and recognize that something substantial has to be done, and of course the day-care program more than anything fits into this.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to recognize that the people who are caught victims as a result of there not being extensive programs in this area are primarily women; they're caught because most of them are the victims of either being a widowed woman or an abandoned housewife with children, or at least someone who is caught in the position that their only alternative is to become a welfare recipient and therefore find themselves in many cases of having to live at home to ostensibly look after a family but along the way many of whom develop very serious health problems because of the onus of responsibility that is thrust on them and the deprivation that they undergo by not being able to undertake meaningful work. So, Mr. Speaker, that in many cases the day-care program and the lunch and after school program are a case of allowing a person, and primarily a woman, to become a productive person in society. In the long run I'm sure that if one wanted to look at it strictly from a cost-benefit point of view, he would probably find that the benefits from it of allowing a person to become a productive person to fulfill an employment role or professional role, however you want to categorize it, will offset the costs which one would see directly in the financing and support of day-care and lunch and after school programs.

So, Mr. Speaker, these two items in the Throne Speech I think I would recognize as being welcome items. They're ones that are of concern in my constituency, and have been

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . for several years, and I think that without getting into large expenditures and making room for cuts in some other areas, which we know the government can make in their budget, that we can bring about a very healthy development in this area of government action.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also ask the government here in their suggestion in the Throne Speech that they're going to look at the law of property, that I would ask them to review the position they took two or three years ago when they brought in the Gift Tax Act and the Succession Duty Act. Mr. Speaker, I think it must be well known to many members of this Chamber that a significant hardship is worked again primarily on the women, the female half of the household, that in gift tax laws the woman is deprived of legally sharing her husband's income on a fully legal 50-50 basis, or any other, with the laws that are the laws of this province. I don't believe that the laws that were passed with regard to the Gift Tax Act in particular have brought any significant revenue to the Province of Manitoba but they have worked a significant hardship to many people who wish on their income to split it the way they might wish to split it. More importantly on the Succession Duty Act there is a real hardship for a great many and many of these are in, I would say, perhaps the majority are in the agricultural community where attempts are made to shift property from one person to the other in the family, and particularly the husband to wife shift is now more broad than that from the father to the son as the case may go in the transfer of property in agriculture.

But in the other areas where you have in this day and age a 150,000-dollar limit in total value of an estate, you can very easily reach that limit for people who are not necessarily with an agricultural background and have a property value built up, but many people through an estate built out of life insurance and even homes in cities and other areas, it's not fair that the government should be sitting in judgment and attempting to derive money, Mr. Speaker, when that transfer takes place from particularly the husband to the wife, because invariably the husband is the person who ends up with most of the estate in the family and there are numerous repetitive cases of this happening. I think if the government is going to pay more than lip-service to the rights of the women in 1975 that they have an obligation to consider as well the legislation which they brought in a year or two ago in respect to gift taxes and succession duties.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer now more to the economic matters and to the other issues that are contained in the Throne Speech.

It is with some concern that we note that this year that the government has overspent its budget substantially. The total overspending by special warrants in this year that's just finished, Mr. Speaker, amounts now, as the session opens, to around \$40 million, 38 to 40 million dollars. Mr. Speaker, 38 to 40 million dollars is a record of overspending over budget. Mr. Speaker, what it says is that the budgets that we are being presented with are not very meaningful. \$40 million, Mr. Speaker, if you had a balanced budget and you were to meet it through taxation, would probably mean the raising of the sales tax to probably 7 or 8 percent. So, Mr. Speaker, although in no way does this suggest that the sales tax should be raised, what it does suggest is that the government's going to have to cut its cloth according to what it is telling us it's going to do if it intends to not have these over runs on budget. \$40 million, Mr. Speaker, this year added to the total brings for this government since they took office actual spending over their estimates of \$110 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's not fair to tell the people of Manitoba that you're going to give them a budget and make a great issue over the tabling of a provincial budget, if in fact you have no intention of holding to that budget. And that's exactly what happened. And this year is the worst of all years since this government came into power, and, if we understand correctly, we understand that the budget that is coming in is going to be a predicted deficit budget, which adds to the trouble. In the last few years the government has brought forth under the guise of a balanced budget an actual deficit budget, and last year's budget is in deficit when you take the special warrants, Mr. Speaker, it was a deficit budget of about \$38 million. So, Mr. Speaker, we ask the government to estimate its spending more accurately so that the people of Manitoba know exactly where they do stand.

Mr. Speaker, it has also become almost impossible to predict what the actual debt of Manitoba is. We have so many different ways now of projecting and telling Manitobans what their debt is, it has become virtually impossible for them to know where they do stand. What

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . we can tell very effectively at this point though is that the government is vastly overspending its projected expenditures in every given year and this year is the worst year so far.

Mr. Speaker, I want to note that in the Throne Speech as well that the government has indicated that they will go to an Energy Conference in Ottawa in April of this year and at that point Manitoba will put forth its position with regard to energy in Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, I also noted with interest, and a degree of concern, that the First Minister's reply to the questions that have gone to him regarding Manitoba's energy position is that Manitoba has such a vested interest in Hydro in Manitoba that it really can't look at anything else. Now, Mr. Speaker, that's not stretching it very far, essentially the answer to every question that is put, and unfortunately I feel that the people of Manitoba may be lulled into really thinking that's the case because they have thought for the last five decades that Hydro was the answer to their energy supply. But, Mr. Speaker, we had recently documented the first report of the Manitoba Energy Council - this is the first report that the Energy Council has put out - and in their report it must become clearly evident to the people of Manitoba that 50 percent of their energy requirements is oil and to shift much of that 50 percent to electricity is a very major job and, Mr. Speaker, it also recognizes in here that it will not be possible to make shifts to electricity that are going to have a very large and significant effect on our total energy consumption, or the types of energy consumption we have in Manitoba.

So when we say to the government, what is your policy with regard to getting involved in the Syncrude project in Alberta, Mr. Speaker, it's not enough of an answer saying that our assets are entirely tied up in Hydro. Mr. Speaker, the energy supplied from the likes of the Syncrude project in Alberta will probably always for the next generation, the energy requirements from the likes of that project, or from other oil sources, will probably always in all our lifetimes here exceed what we can get from Hydro, and other nuclear forms of energy that we might embark on that has been announced by the government. So it's not good enough to answer that we can solve our energy problems by depending wholly on Hydro. I don't think the government really believe that, I think what they're doing is that they haven't really looked at it.

We've asked them, what is their position and what have they done to ensure that the Arctic Islands gas pipeline comes through Manitoba? Well, Mr. Speaker, we have not yet had an answer to that. We have seen the Province of Quebec attempt to buy a share of Panarctic Oils, they were only headed off by the Federal Government from buying into it. We have seen the Province of Quebec offer money to the study which is going to bring the pipeline down from the Arctic Islands with very much the intended interest in seeing that it takes a route across into Quebec, a route, Mr. Speaker, which makes no sense at all but nevertheless with the expenditure of excessive amounts of money it could be seen that it go into Quebec, whereas the logical route comes down through Northern Manitoba. The gas supplies themselves lay directly north of the Province of Manitoba in the Arctic Islands. The logical route, the geography, the geology, the entire system says that the line comes down through Manitoba and we've asked the government on several occasions, beginning with resolutions as much as two years ago in this House, to get moving on the environmental studies in this respect, and then by letter to ask them, what are they doing in view of the moves being made by the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario, what are they doing to see that a Manitoba input is being made at this stage of development. Well, Mr. Speaker, the government may be doing something but they have refused so far to demonstrate and even in this report, which is only last fall, they refused to demonstrate that they are doing anything in that regard. They refuse to acknowledge in this report that was produced last fall that Manitoba now has a natural gas shortage, that for the next two years there are no new hook-ups allowed to natural gas in Manitoba. That all the interruptible supply in Winnipeg, and I presume in all of Manitoba, has actually been cut off this winter, and all those plants that were on interruptible supply have either had to shut or turn over to another source of energy, not even recognized in this report. No comment, no acknowledgement that we in fact have a deep-rooted vested interest in where future energy supplies come from in addition to hydro, Mr. Speaker; a complete divorcement from any concern about natural gas supplies or potential developments in oil in Western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, this government has talked for the last two years about developing with the

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . other western provinces an economic industrial strategy. There has been conferences in Alberta, there have been joint committees set up called West-Track; there has been other committees set up, premiers conferences and all the rest. And the first opportunity that came along to really put some muscle into a western economic position was to at least examine whether Manitoba should in some way become involved in the Syncrude project. And they and they alone know the financial position of Manitoba and know whether we have substantial resources to get into that type of involvement. But, Mr. Speaker, the answer again in that case was, we're committed to Hydro, and Hydro, Mr. Speaker, can never produce us with any more than half of our required energy requirements in the province of Manitoba. They are deficient, absolutely deficient, in demonstrating that they have any grasp at all on the planning for the future of the energy requirements of Manitoba.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the honourable member would permit a question.

MR. CRAIK: I prefer till I'm finished, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would mind waiting.

Mr. Speaker, we'll come back to this issue again I'm sure and there are others in the Throne Speech that I want to make reference. I notice that we're going to be dealing with the Mines Act and I expect that this will be the redrafted version of Bill 82 which was in the House last year and that we will perhaps be dealing with it fairly shortly. Mr. Speaker, without commenting on it directly, since we will be getting it in the way of legislation, there is one other aspect to the whole mineral industry that I want to remark on. This is the changes brought about in the regulations for mining.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say first of all that I think we don't realize the very substantive policy change that was made by the government in the regulations that were announced by the government in the last couple of months. These regulations have a very drastic impact on a great number of people in the mining, mineral industry. And when I say that, Mr. Speaker, I don't refer to the mining companies per se. I'm referring in particular to all those that are involved in prospecting, whether it's the individual prospector or those prospectors working for companies. And, of course, the individual prospectors by far outnumber those working directly for the mining companies, if the figures which we have available are any good indication.

Mr. Speaker, the substantive changes were, one, to increase substantially the fees for people who want to do prospecting. The fees to do their prospecting, the fees to hold on to their land, the fees that are associated with the amount of work they have to do on their claims and the restrictions that are put on them in holding and developing those claims. That is one aspect of it.

The second aspect of it is that the government has taken the option that if a claim or a lease develops at some point, at a point, the government has the option to move in and say if you are going to develop this further, this shows promise, we the government have the option to take 50 percent of equity in your development. Mr. Speaker, that also incurs 50 percent of the costs being involved by the government. They have to pay for 50 percent of the costs. What they've essentially said -- Prospector you go out for a fee, do your work, if it starts to shape up, after you've spent \$10 thousand then we have an option to come in and say we want to take half, Mr. Speaker, we want half of the action in that project.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to try and elaborate any further about the impact of this, but let me read to you, very briefly, the comments made by the President of the Manitoba Prospectors and Developers Association. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that these people, prospectors and developers, are a breed of people that are traditional to all of Western Canada from the day of its pioneering development. They're a breed of people who have come about as individuals who live for that pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, are driven by the profit motive and go out as individuals to try and find these claims that hopefully one day they can develop. Most of them, Mr. Speaker, the majority don't find that, but nevertheless, they are driven by it and they search for it. And they're the collection of individuals in this province who have banded together to try and bring to the attention of government their concerns. Let me read their major comments:

1. The regulations fail to recognize that prospecting and exploration is an extremely high-risk business and the rewards should be commensurate with the risks involved.
2. We question the right of the minister to demand a 50 percent interest in selective

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . projects. I can compare that with the man who walks around a poker table and after seeing all the hands, picks the winner and demands 70 percent of the pot.

3. We question the justice in changing the rules in the middle of the game. This refers to the people that already have long existing claims. Mr. Speaker, the rules have been changed for the mining companies but not for the small prospector because they don't have as much political clout as the mining companies.

4. We find the increase in fees completely unnecessary. The additional revenue derived from such increases is a drop in the bucket and will not help the public treasury. In fact, the extra paper work involved as a result of the new regulations will exceed substantially any extra revenue resulting from the increased fee. These increases will undoubtedly place considerable hardship on a majority of the prospectors.

Mr. Speaker, it goes on into the financial arrangements, but let me say in conclusion. We have come to the conclusion that the end result of these regulations will be the complete elimination of prospectors and small companies, leaving the field to the giant corporations, most of whom will be foreign controlled. This is contrary to the government's stated policy of favouring domestic control of our industry. It is also contrary to the government's stated policy of championing the cause of the underdog. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about it that the new mining regulations are going to have a severe impact on those people who would be in the category of the small prospectors in Manitoba. There is no doubt at all. Even now we have seen the results of these regulations in the amount of prospecting that is being done in the province of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, we wait till we get the Mines Act. But this is separate from it. It has an impact on the prospectors. The Mines Act, of course, goes after those foreign controlled corporations that are referred to in this letter and whom the Minister of Mines and Resources has shown such an affinity for in attempting to get into the equity action in their companies as well. So, this is going to be a year, Mr. Speaker, when I'm sure in this session we are going to see a great deal more of discussion and topic about the principles involved in the takeover of the mining industry in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to refer to a topic that I'm sure will be discussed again in this House, and that is the topic dealing with Churchill Forest Industries. Mr. Speaker, I can't help in introducing this topic but be triggered to a sense of indignation by the remarks of the new Leader of the Liberal Party when he first received his election as head of the Liberal Party. His remarks, I think, are very critical, can't help but lead one to question a number of things that have happened in the CFI case, of the CFI Inquiry Commission and so on. I want to say that our hope for Mr. Huband that he would make a fresh positive contribution to the political scene in his role as the leader of the Manitoba Liberal Party was pretty short-lived.

On his first appearance on TV after his election he abused that occasion by the suggestion that some politicians who were demonstrated to be dishonest by the CFI Inquiry were still politically active. In using this broad anonymous public smear, specifying none, and accusing all, he used the tactic that reveals his own fitness or otherwise to serve in public office. Mr. Huband has not been given full credit for his own role in the CFI scandal. Premier Schreyer recently expressed that his greatest regret, arrived at with the benefit of hindsight, was that the government did not take over the CFI project much earlier. When asked why not, Premier Schreyer replied that it was because he relied on legal advice. It was the Huband legal group who supplied that legal advice, Mr. Speaker, that cost the people of Manitoba millions of dollars in wasted taxpayer money, in addition to the substantial legal fees they charged for this privilege.

Mr. Speaker, when the Inquiry Commission was set up to look into Churchill Forest Industries all of the political parties, Mr. Speaker, were advised that they could be represented by legal counsel at those hearings. The Conservative Party, who to a very large extent were the group that were put on trial by the hearings, Mr. Speaker, were represented by Mr. Meighen from Brandon to the extent that we could afford to have representation. The Liberal Party I think was represented by Mr. Turner, and the NDP Party was represented by Mr. Wright, from Mr. Huband's group. Mr. Speaker, I think that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I do not think that the New Democratic Party was represented by counsel at the hearing, and that Mr. Wright did not

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . represent the New Democratic Party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, he represented the government, the New Democratic Party, the other was a counterpart of Mr. Meighen and Mr. Turner for the other parties. Mr. Speaker, we know that we had to pay for our legal counsel; we'd like to know who pays Mr. Wright. Was he paid for entirely by the government or was he paid for by the NDP? We've filed an Order of Return in this connection and we'd like to find out.

Mr. Speaker, let me go on with the incestuous relationship that has gone on here. When the present Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, Mr. Green, left the cabinet to fight the separate school issue, it is my understanding that he went to join the Huband legal group. Mr. Speaker, he may have done no more than hang his hat there until his return after the separate school fight was over. His pre-1969 law firm was no longer existent, I presume because his major partner at that time was none other than Mr. Mitchell, who sat as one of the three commissioners investigating the entire CFI matter.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me go one further. When Mr. Mackling left the cabinet, was defeated in the 1973 election, he went to the Huband legal group as well. Mr. Mackling also, at the CFI Inquiry Commission when he was a witness, said that his involvement in the CFI issue as Attorney-General was minimal because he didn't know much about corporation law. Well now that the smoke has all cleared and CFI has been replaced in name by the Manitoba Forestry Resources Company, none other than the legal counsel is Mr. Mackling. And Mr. Mackling also is still, I gather, a member of the Huband legal group. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you that if one is looking for an example of intellectual honesty at least, you could hardly pick this example. This incestuous relationship, this half-way house that has been created in the Huband legal firm for NDP cabinet ministers who may come and go on a temporary basis, or on a permanent basis, and stand like a paragon of virtue and preach to us about the CFI case.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The minister have a point of order?

MR. GREEN: I permit the honourable member to carry on but I now rise on a point of privilege. Because, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member implied, or expressly stated, that when I resigned from the cabinet I hung my hat at the firm of Richardson and Company. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make it perfectly plain that I was hired as a consultant by Richardson and Company as well as by a firm who I believe predominantly are run by Conservative lawyers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel, has three minutes.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the honourable minister then is saying that his role in that law firm was somewhat like the contract civil servants that the government now hires to work for the government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I do not deal with this matter flipantly. I hired my services out, I was paid, which I have a right to do. I did work for it. I always believed, like most others, that I got paid less than what I deserved, but I certainly gave full value for what I got paid for, to all those who employed me, including the City of Winnipeg, including a Conservative law firm, including Richardson and Company --(Interjection)--

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

MR. GREEN: . . . and I resent that

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel, --(Interjection)-- The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I say that it's political incest, political incest at its utmost. What is probably one of the most clear cases of political incest in the whole field, the legal field, the whole field of so-called justice, whatever you want to call it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, then I ask you to rule. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I was properly employed, that I was properly paid, that the firm involved has Conservative lawyers in it, Liberal lawyers, that I worked for that firm, that I worked for other people, that I had no gainful employment at the time as a member of the government, that I had a right to work and earn a living and that that firm was willing to employ me. I also spoke to other firms who were willing to employ me, and I suggest that any suggestion that I did not have the

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . propriety, that it was improper, by political incest or otherwise, for me to accept this employment, is improper and should be withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I do believe that it is parliamentary practice for members not to cast reflection upon other members in the Chamber. I would ask the honourable member to reconsider what he has said. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, at no point have I suggested that anything he did was illegal. I said it was a prime case. I said it was a prime case of political incest.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to finish if I have a few minutes left. -- (interjection) -- No, Mr. Speaker, there is no way that I am withdrawing a statement. There is no way that I am withdrawing a statement that this is a prime case of political incest. If he wants to somehow extricate himself by description from the involvement, that's fine. I said there was nothing illegal about it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I, again, implore the honourable member to reconsider what he has said. He has made some charges against another member of this House. -- (interjections) -- Order please. Let me suggest that the honourable member did name the Honourable Member for Inkster and did allege that this is what took place, that the honourable member was involved in an incestuous political relationship and that he had hung his hat there. Now I think that is a straight matter of alleging something to a member. I believe that is not parliamentary and I would hope the honourable member would withdraw it. It's that simple. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was watering down the thing by saying that he at least hung his hat there. I did not -- (Interjection) -- well, Mr. Speaker, it's the Minister himself that said that he accepted salary from them. well, Mr. Speaker, that's fine, I wasn't prepared to say it again. I knew, and it's been alleged that that is where he went in that interim period. That's fine. So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Hansard--that you, Sir, will want to review the Hansard before deciding whether this is a matter that should be reconsidered.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable member's time is up. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member wishes to compound, compound his -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I'm speaking on the same point of privilege. He is now suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the acceptance of salary makes the situation worse. I indicated to the honourable members that I worked for Richardson and Company, that if it is necessary to do so, I will produce the work that I did for Richardson and Company. I'm prepared to submit it to the Law Society to see whether that work was value for what was -- (Interjection) -- That is splitting hairs? You, gentlemen, on that side know that I am right, and all your member has to do is indicate that he withdraws the suggestion that there was something unsavoury about my working for Richardson and Company when I was not a member of this Cabinet, and I will accept it. If he will not withdraw it, Mr. Speaker, I will not pursue the point further, I will take it that he is not a gentleman and go on with the proceedings.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on the same matter of privilege. If the Honourable Member for Riel considers whether he should withdraw or not, I would think he would be gentlemanly enough to repeat the remarks he made about my leader outside this House where he has no parliamentary immunity.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I shall allow the honourable member one minute to complete his remarks.

MR. CRAIK: well, Mr. Speaker, -- (interjection) -- I'll be happy to say it outside the House, Mr. Speaker. I have no hesitation and say, I think that this points up a whole problem that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and perhaps many legal firms get into that they think that they can convince the public that they can close this door, open that door, put black here and put white in there, and that there's no involvement, and that's a lot of nonsense. This firm in this case stands accused of the comings and goings that have gone on in this whole CFI case, and how the Minister of Mines and Resources can sit there and act lily-white pure and appoint his former partner with all his immunity as a member of the CFI Inquiry Commission to investigate him -- Mr. Speaker, you may convince somebody from a theoretical point of view that this is all well and good but you're not going to convince anybody else and you're not going to convince the people of Manitoba.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . Mr. Speaker, I have other remarks and I want to finish but . . . I've used up my time or my time has been used up . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I indicated to the honourable member he had three minutes left -- (Interjection) -- Order please. At 3:43 -- (Interjection) -- Order please. If the honourable gentlemen wish to have a conversation would they take it someplace else. I indicated to the Honourable Member for Riel he had three minutes - it was at that time 3:42. If you look at the clock now I think I gave him ample opportunity to catch up his three minutes. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I had intended in this Throne Speech Debate to address my remarks primarily to issues of policy and substance that were raised. However, with great misfortune and with some real regret I find that once again the members to my right, my far right, have attempted to divert the attention of this House, again for matters of substance and policy, attempt to play their peculiar type of personality assassination politics which they, growing tired of playing it amongst themselves, they now must begin playing it with other people. This is the second time within 48 hours that members of that group have attempted to divert attention from the particular issues that should be raised in this province, to divert attention from their own internal squabbles and their own internal backbiting and their own internal knife-stabbing to try and point sort of the finger of accusation at other political people in this province who happen to have an intention to direct their interest and their energy towards discussions of issues and ideas. Now that's the kind of game that they want to play. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how we get rid of it except by the ballot box, and I hope to God the next time the people of Manitoba have the opportunity that they will look squarely at the record of this group of people and realize that the only thing they are able to do is to sort of attack other people. That is the only contribution that they make and while it may be a contribution at times, it simply no longer has any place in the politics of this province. I would just simply wish that they would come to their senses at some point and begin to apply themselves to the discussion of the critical issues of this province instead of to the critical characteristics.

Now let me just deal with this issue, just let me deal with this issue that my friend from Riel, who up to this point I had a great deal of regard for in terms of his willingness at times to discuss . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. AXWORTHY: . . . seems to be following in the footsteps of his leader and is no longer devoting his attention to what should really be the matters of this House but begin to use the area of libel and innuendo to try to sort of calculate that there is something incestuous, to use his words, going on the . . .

First I would simply point out that in this province the fact that Richardson and Company happens to be one of the better law firms, and is called upon to act for many people, simply shouldn't be a matter that's brought in . . . Mr. Charles Huband happens to be one of the finest litigant lawyers in this province, generally acknowledged, and is used by government and private firms alike to pursue their interests, then that should simply be put to his credit, not to his discredit, and I think that the Member from Riel should simply realize that you can read two things . . . if you're reading into them poisonous . . . then that's the way it's going to come out.

Now let me point out another fact that he raises about this whole question of who is responsible and where. The fact of the matter is that if we were to really at some time get down to a serious examination in this House, and I regret that we haven't, about who is really involved and responsible for the total mismanagement and ineptness, then I think that the statement made by Charles Huband is perfectly true that there are active politicians, and I saw their names in the paper, sort of walking the floors at the Conservative Convention this weekend who were actively involved in the development of . . . and mismanagement of CFI and they should be so named. And I think, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the only way, the only way that they can prove their innocence is in a court of law, which is where they should be brought. -- (Interjection) -- That happens to be the fact of the matter. The fact of the matter, the charging is a question of government policy. We are simply suggesting it's about time, as the Member for Lakeside should well recognize, that it is the responsibility of the Attorney-General, and this party has asked repeatedly that the government and the Attorney-General bring those parties

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . to the bar of justice so that they can either prove their innocence or their guilt as the question may be . . .

Nor, Mr. Speaker, I would simply say for matters of the media and for other members of this House, there are charges being made by this member and by others that---unfortunately Mr. Huband is not in this House to answer for himself, and I regret that I'm not in possession of the facts, that I can answer directly for him. I would simply say -- (Interjection) -- Pardon me. This is what you fully expect from these people that all they can do is sort of bazoom away and that's their style and quality, and we're quite used to it and we accept it because it's exactly as it is that the moment that this group starts offering to this House sort of reasonable, creative suggestions as to how to run the province, then they'll find out that their political positions will change rather than standing sort of on the one track that it has been for a long, long time.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like, if I may, simply to---perhaps we can lay that member to rest. We know exactly how the Conservatives approach politics and if it may not be incestuous, it just uses forms of assassination, and I'm not so sure which on the scale of values, which is worse. I would suggest that the Member for Riel really look at his code of ethics to find out whether assassination is any worse than the incest that he is charging.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to, if I may, with that slight diversion sort of taking away from the real thrust and the real purpose of this debate to spend a moment dealing with what I think is one of the major issues in the Throne Speech. It has been called by many as a quiet, passive document, and I think in many ways it is. But there is a commitment made by this government which I think deserves a great deal of attention by members of this House, and that attention really is on its commitment to begin to attack the problems of downtown core renewal and housing. And let me just simply say at the outset so there will be no mistake, that members of this caucus applaud very strongly the objectives that are set forward by the government in its Throne Speech, that we think that as we have spoken many times in the past that the attention that the City of Winnipeg requires and deserves has long been overdue and we must begin to really seriously look at the kinds of solutions and the kinds of assistance that can come from the provincial level to the city to begin to attack the kinds of problems and difficulties engaged and met by every modern city as it deals with a very difficult age in a very difficult time.

well let me point out to this House, Mr. Speaker, that while we applaud and agree with the objectives, we must take serious concern with the means that they propose, that we have had experience in North America, I suppose since before the Second world war, about different kinds of efforts to renew downtown core areas to deal with the problems of the inner city, to begin to attack the real difficulties engaged by residents of those areas. The thing that comes through clear time after time is that any effort or attempt to try to renew or rejuvenate the inner city simply through the provision of public housing and public works is bound to failure for the residents of that area. Now it may serve some useful purpose for the Province of Manitoba to build a new Autopac building or environmental laboratory, or to raise three or four hundred units of public housing, but the real equation and calculation that has to be raised is, what does it do for the residents of the area? Is the bricks and mortar, the building, the physical construction that seems to be the major thrust and approach put forward by this government, is that really going to benefit the residents of this area?

Let me just use for example, Mr. Speaker, if you think historically about efforts that have been made in the city. Since about 1958 with the first construction of the Lord Selkirk public housing and renewal project on the north side of the CPR tracks, by rough estimate I would indicate that close to \$200 million of public money has been spent in various efforts at renewal or renaissance or rejuvenation and yet I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the quality and standards of life of the thousands of people who live in the downtown core has not improved one whit by that major public expenditure. Other people have benefited, other groups have acquired some advantage, but for the large numbers of people who occupy the downtown core, there has been not much improvement at all through that vast expenditure in money. It simply comes down to the fact that the bricks and mortar approach is really an outmoded sort of approach that no longer has, because it is approach that doesn't really tackle the problems of that area, that it is sort of directed at the wrong target using the wrong means. I think that that is the basic thrust of concern of this caucus, that we think that the considered estimate of

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . expenditure of 45 to 50 million dollars could be much better applied in more effective ways to really tackle the difficulties and issues faced by the residents of the inner city of Winnipeg. And we would simply point out, Mr. Speaker, that if you look and try to assess what is the difficulties of the inner city', well, to begin with, Mr. Speaker, the major problem for the people in the inner city is that simply in the scale of population they are the poorest, the least employed, most under-employed and the most disadvantaged in the economic and social sense. You can't tackle that problem by putting up buildings. What you have to tackle is through a variety of means in terms of developing new manpower programs, new job opportunity programs; tackling the provision of social services and the delivery of those services in the downtown area, providing in that area the capacity for people who for centuries or for generations have been denied any responsibility for their own welfare to provide them with a sense of confidence and a sense of self-responsibility, and sense of being able to solve the problem for themselves. And that is not done by some level of government or by somebody from the outside doing something for them. They must be given the opportunity and the capacity to do for themselves, be given the means and the wherewithal to provide for the solution to their own difficulties. That is the way to break the cycle of poverty. That's the way to break down the walls of slums and ghettos. That's the way you tackle the major problem of the 18 to 25,000 native people who have migrated to the city and find themselves at the lower bottom scale of the social and economic ladder simply because they can't get decent employment, because they don't have the training or the education capacity to do so. And the concern of this caucus is that the amount of money and the kind of myriad of little programs they're skipping around are simply spits in a barrel compared to the real need of providing for the economic rejuvenation of the inner City, not the physical but the economic rejuvenation, and we think the money that has been committed would be misspent and misplaced if it doesn't really seriously tackle that major cause of the problems of the inner City which is economic and social in context, not physical.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we also believe that even if we take the intention of the government to try and use this commitment of money to begin solving some of the problems of housing and accommodation, that again it is a problem that is much wider in scope and much wider in range than simply sort of locating a set number of public housing units on a site in downtown Winnipeg; that the problem faced of the housing market in this City is really reaching the proportions of crisis stage, I would ask the members of the House to consider for a moment some of the statistics that we're looking at: That last year in the City we built less than 1,000 units of apartment blocks and multiple family units, when the requirement under a normal year is close to 2,500 to 3,000, in other words half the number. That we built less than almost virtually no public housing or low income accommodation for families at all. And while the government in its Throne Speech tended to applaud itself and pat itself on the back for its achievements, those are achievements of 1971 and '72; they were certainly not achievements in 1974, because virtually no low cost housing was built in the City of Winnipeg for families. Now that, Mr. Speaker, is a serious problem.

It's also a serious problem when we look at what it does in terms of the other kinds of factors that figure into the housing problem; that the increase in property taxes and public utilities have gone up close to 30 percent, and therefore most people who live in the downtown area of Winnipeg are facing a rental increase of close to 25 to 30 percent last spring and will have to face exactly the same kind of rent increase in the coming spring, because in a consultation with builders and developers and financial agencies in this City, which have just recently been completed, indicates to me that less than 500 units of multiple family units are being planned for this building season this spring. Now that is close to 2,000 short of what we need. And with that kind of shortage, Mr. Speaker, the end result will be simply a tremendous and extreme pressure upon the housing market to the point where we have less than a one percent vacancy today in the City of Winnipeg and it will become almost close to a zero percent; and when it happens there is no longer a market in housing, it is simply a matter of survival, and at that point the prices simply go right off the top and there is no ceiling.

Now that, Mr. Speaker, constitutes not just for a small group of people but for literally thousands of people, and as a member of a constituency which has within it probably the highest density of apartment population of this City and which represents many of the people of the downtown area, I can only say that the lack of attention of that problem constitutes one of

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . the most serious omissions of the Throne Speech and one of the most serious omissions in government policy that I have witnessed in a long long time; that they are simply sort of denigrating and denying the economic survival and acceptance of a large number of people of this City, and therefore that kind of commitment of money of 45 or 50 million dollars must be looked at in terms of how could it be used to help the large numbers of people who are going to face a very serious and severe housing shortage, and serious and severe rise in the cost of housing in the next three or four months. And we would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing that we can see indicated thus far, certainly not in that commitment that was made, that would any way go to try to deal with the problems of inner City housing in its widest and largest application.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we believe that it is important to this House to begin to look at alternative ways of spending that money. Are there other ways of taking the same objective and the same commitment, and the same resources, but applying it in a different way to get better public results, to get more benefits for the same amount of dollars spent? And in this case, Mr. Speaker, unlike our friends to the right, we take the words of caution that was put forward in the Throne Speech Address by the Member from St. John's, who said okay, give us your alternatives and we'll listen. Well, Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to offer alternatives if the government is prepared to listen, and on behalf of this caucus, Mr. Speaker, I would like to present to them and to this House other alternatives based upon the same equation of money to see how and if our proposals might have a wider application and a more creative application of that same amount of money to the problems of the inner City. And so for the consideration of this House, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to present what we would call a three-point program of inner City housing and renewal.

And the first part of that program is to concentrate on the areas of jobs and training, that we think that particularly when you consider that while the unemployment rate in the City of Winnipeg or in the Province of Manitoba is now close to four percent, the unemployment rate for people between the age of 14 and 30, in other words the younger workers, I think is close to seven or eight percent. And if you add on to that that group of people who are native in origin in the inner City, you'd probably find the rate closer to 15 to 20 percent. And it is that hard core of unemployed or even those who are working which receive a very poor return for their employment, which constitute one of the major social problems and economic problems of our City. And therefore we would recommend to this House the following kinds of programs:

First, to provide a tax incentive to private employers for the hiring and training of new unskilled workers; that the job program in the United States rather than having a government-sponsored training program but utilizing the number of private firms existing in the City and giving them tax credits when they hire an unskilled or unemployed person and put them to work, provide a major attractive new opportunity for that kind of group of people to put them to work.

Secondly, we would like to see this government establish what we would call a community employment program. Now a community employment program, as we see it, would be based in part upon some of the same principles of a temporary employment program, such as STEP and PEP. But we would like to see it in a longer term way that would produce continuing support for jobs in new areas such as home repair and construction, health and social service delivery, recreation educational activity in the provision of services to senior citizens.

Let me give you an example, Mr. Speaker, of how we could see that being used. Some of you may have listened to a program on the CBC this morning on the Alice Poyser show talking about the serious need for a new range of services being provided to senior citizens in order to allow them to stay in their own homes rather than moving to a personal care home or to a senior citizen public housing unit. And the proposal brief put forward is that if only senior citizens could get certain kinds of shopping services, home maintenance services and transportation services and certain kinds of health delivery care, they would be able to retain accommodation in their older homes. We're proposing a program whereby that kind of service could be applied.

We also suggest that in a field of home repair that there are literally close to 50 to 60,000 older homes in need of various kinds of repair in this City. The problem is where do you get a work force to do it. In my own experience working with a job training program where we took unskilled young men sort of off the streets, many with very serious prison records, and put them to work in the area of home repair and have had a very successful

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . rate of skill and training and new employment, would suggest to me that there's a tremendous opportunity for new job creation as long as there was some support in the initial phase to allow it to happen. Now it's not the kind of thing in the initial phase that the private market itself can provide for, there simply isn't enough of return on the investment, but it is a worthwhile activity in the home repair field, it would provide the job opportunities for the unskilled worker, combined with the training, and would provide again the incentive for that person to become part of a working community and acquire a fair income in return.

A MEMBER: How about . . . ?

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that that would be a detail we could work out, but in our first area they feel that a year to 18 months is a first beginning and then they actually go out and do repair work for which there is a certain amount of return on profit which goes back to the company itself, so that in a sense it becomes a self-supporting type of operation over a period of time. I think that there is enough details which I think I'll come to indicate how that might be done.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, in this same area of jobs and training, we'd like to see a much more substantial aid and assistance for job training and education for the public school system in the City of Winnipeg. Last Friday, I asked the Minister of Education if the government was prepared to offer to the school systems which must provide additional training for inner City and Core children, whether there'd be additional assistance forthcoming, and I'm afraid to say the answer was somewhat vague or generalized. We would suggest that again part of that 45 to 50 million dollars could go into the educational training programs, programs like the R. B. Russell School which I think is providing a very successful program, but it's simply not enough nor does it accommodate the need. And there are many opportunities, both innovative, to provide for a combination work-study program for sort of young, inner City youth, which would again sort of save them from ending up in Headingley or Stony Mountain, which is where many of them are destined to go.

Fourth, Mr. Speaker, we would like to see the organization of a manpower and work council for the City of Winnipeg. Now there are a multitude of federal and provincial agencies and municipal bodies and social agencies, all chipping away at small points or parts of the work Manpower area, but no one bringing it together to try and get a combined comprehensive program to try to bring all the programs together, to rationalize them, to coordinate them, to combine them in a total attack. Well, Mr. Speaker, the reason is that no one has yet taken initiative, as far as we can understand, to bring it together as a working council. We would suggest that the Provincial Government take that initiative and bring them all together so that the amount of federal and provincial and municipal money and the social services would be utilized and applied to that major attack upon again that hard core economic problem of the inner City.

Fifthly, Mr. Speaker, we would like to see the province again use that money to help establish special programs of work and training for native people in the inner City, particularly in the areas of providing sort of new task forces for native people to work in police protection, in Health and Social Service delivery and in government works. One of the real problems being faced by this City is a growing feel of resentment and alienation of native people from the white society that they live in; and one of the reasons is that the street bureaucrats, the street level civil servants are not of that kind or of that culture, and we would like to see some of that money being used to bring them in as part of the work program, similar as was suggested in the conference on Law and the Native People that occurred in Edmonton a month and a half ago, where they suggested that certain native people be brought into the RCMP and into the correctional institutions so that they would provide a capacity of rapport and understanding between the two groups of people.

Mr. Speaker, we have close to 25 to 30,000 native people in the core of our City and they occupy close to 50 percent of the people in our jails; they occupy a large part of those people on our welfare and social services. And those problems are not of their own doing, that they are in many cases society's problems and we don't think society in the community is really doing what it should be doing to respond to that problem, and we suggest this would be a way of bringing sort of native people in the city into part of the organizations that we belong to.

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd.) . . . That, Mr. Speaker, is one point in the program that we would offer as an alternative for inner City renewal. The second point is what we really would like to call community economic renewal. And that is providing major incentives for inner City residents themselves to assume responsibility for their own renewal and to provide financial assistance for upgrading programs that cover a much wider range of activities throughout the City that that envisioned by that put forward by the government.

First, we would like to see the province enact what we would call a community economic development corporation legislation. Under such legislation funding would be provided to non-profit corporations established in local communities to initiate the development of new housing, to start new businesses, undertake the repair of older commercial areas and to provide the basis of setting up economically self-sufficient operations and units in the inner City and in fact in other parts of the City as well.

That there is now working in the United States a program called the Community Development Corporation. It's funded to the size of about \$30 million. That program is now working in something like 80 cities in the United States, and it provides one important ingredient that has been missing so far in most programs applied in this province. That is, it transfers the design and implementation of the program to those people who are actually going to have to live in its effects. It's not something being done by the outside for somebody, it's allowing people to do things for themselves. I think that the record that we have seen so far in the operation of the Community Development Corporation in American cities would give us good evidence to demonstrate that it's worthwhile to try it in this City. If it is in fact something that the Province of Manitoba wants to have new buildings in the downtown area, then let them contract with one of the Community Development Corporations to provide such space; but in so doing they are actually providing the development of a new company, a new economic enterprise, a new capacity for people to do for themselves, rather than having MHRC do for them. That again, Mr. Speaker, we think is a very important principle and we think a principle which tends to separate some Liberals who are interested in social problems and socialists who are interested in the same problems but tend to try to do it through government management or through state management. We think that our philosophy and our approach is to allow people, to enable them to do it themselves through the facilitation and enabling of government, not for government to do it for them. Therefore we think the enactment of a community development legislation would go a long way to provide for that self responsibility which is one of the important ingredients in breaking through the cycle really of non-confidence and lack of confidence of many people in the inner City.

Secondly, we would see as part of that operation, Mr. Speaker, the establishment of an urban development bank, with the Province of Manitoba working on very similar principles to those, say, operated by foreign aid agencies or to the agencies working in the Maritimes, would provide a range of soft to hard loans and some grants to these community enterprises to help them get started, and as well offer loans and grants to the City of Winnipeg and to the local Community Committees for the upgrading of local services; for streets, for lighting, for new facilities, so that they would again provide—because the province has a greater capacity for funding and financing through its control of the growth revenue, that they would therefore be able to provide that kind of revenue back into the City to provide upgrading, not just in the Core area, not just in the neighborhood improvement area, but in areas of Elmwood and Fort Rouge and the west end of Winnipeg, in the Wolseley area, many areas represented by members opposite me, which also have old housing and deteriorating neighborhoods and neighborhoods which are not being touched by any public program or any public assistance whatsoever at all; and it's only when you begin spreading that kind of money out and providing that kind of incentive that we can begin not simply to tackle the worst problem but to provide preventive medicine for those areas which are beginning to deteriorate, and that is a very important consideration.

Thirdly, and I think my colleague from Assiniboia will offer as a Private Member's Resolution, a proposal on home repair program, so again we can provide some financial assistance which are not covered by the federal program for those people who want to maintain their older homes. Let me just stop for a minute, or digress for a minute, Mr. Speaker. There is some very interesting work being done on how you improve neighborhoods. One of the most important facets of that is that a neighborhood turns around, a neighborhood begins

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. AXW ORTHY cont'd) . . . to rejuvenate itself when the rate of home ownership goes above 50 percent. Now if you look at many of the older neighborhoods in the City of Winnipeg, most of them are occupied by absentee landlords, most of the people who occupy those residences are tenants, and if the other thesis is true, as being determined in some programs in other cities, that the way you rejuvenate them is by giving people a stake in their community, by giving them some concept of ownership, then that kind of thing must be encouraged and enhanced, because it will become the incentive for the redevelopment, you don't need a mass of government programming, you don't need public works, it's people through their own efforts, because they have a stake in that community that they're prepared to stay in an older neighborhood and put their own effort and their own sweat into its rejuvenation rather than letting someone do it for them.

So again we suggest, Mr. Speaker, that one of the major thrusts of this government, one of the major thrusts of this province in the utilization of its money should be to apply it to giving an incentive for people to own their own homes in the older neighborhoods, to allow young families to buy them and to repair them and to fix them up. And we would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that would be a far more effective stimulant for rejuvenation and renaissance than any major public works program. -- (Interjection) -- Perhaps at the end of my talk if the Minister would allow.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, in terms of our program we'd like to concentrate on the area of housing, that we think that serious attention must be made to stimulating new construction in the City of Winnipeg and to enlist the private market in supplying low-income housing needs. Let me suggest first, that we would like to see the province again use part of that 45 to 50 million dollars - and I'll come down to how they can divide the figures up later - for a capital loan program where they would provide mortgages at a rate of about 8 percent and offer loans to private developers to build low-cost housing for low-income individuals on the basis that there would be a set guarantee of return on that investment, and we would suggest in the range of 10 percent. In exchange for such a subsidized interest rate for the building of lower and moderate income homes such private developers would also have to agree as part of the trade-off that they would provide a set percentage of those units built for the provision of low-income families - we suggest probably in the range of 25 percent. That would be part of the trade-off to the return of that kind of mortgage assistance. We feel that again you would be enlisting private capital, bringing it into the market, you are providing a solution to a much wider housing problem, and that is the general shortage of apartments and multiple family accommodation throughout the whole city, and at the same time providing a real stimulant for the creation of low-cost housing and one that would eliminate many of the present problems faced by public housing.

I know that the Minister has spoken, and in fact I have his article, where he says that he can't build public housing because citizens object to it and because the province, rightly so in my mind, is subject to the same rules that any other private developer is subject to in getting a zoning variance or getting a building plan agreed to, under the municipal by-laws, that they say they can't build. Well we don't have the facts. We don't know how many applications are in but let's take the Minister at his word, for if that's the case we would suggest that one of the ways around the problem is not simply to get mad and rail against individuals in the community because they won't go along with public housing, the way to solve the problem is to find an alternative. To find more creative alternatives. And we're suggesting that by allowing sort of private developments to go up and then leasing or using a proportion of those private units that are built for low income needs, that would eliminate the stigmas that are built for low income needs that would eliminate the stigmas that are attached to public housing and the reaction and rejection that is faced in many neighbourhoods. Because the fact of the matter is that you must build housing for people. You can argue ideologies, and you can argue theories, and you can argue philosophies, but the fact of the matter is that while that argument is going on and while the province says to the city they're not doing enough, and the city says to the province you're not doing enough, there's close to 2,025 people on the MHRC list waiting for some kind of accommodation. And so frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is time that we moved, and if we can't move through the public housing format, let's move through other formats.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . .

We would go on to suggest in the housing field, Mr. Speaker, that the province join immediately in the federal offer of cost-sharing for rent supplements in non-profit and co-op housing units. That's an offer that was made just recently by the Minister of Housing at the Federal level, and we suggest that it would help a great deal if our Minister of Housing indicated right away that he was also prepared to join in that, so that this would again provide a major incentive to the non-profit field, which again is an alternative in the low-cost housing, to begin building. Winnipeg and Manitoba has one of the poorest records in the non-profit field, mainly because it receives virtually no assistance from the Provincial Government for trying to aid and assist the non-profit housing companies to begin building accommodation. We would suggest the supply or availability of a rent supplement system cost-shared by the Federal Government would enable non-profit corporations to provide housing at an economic grant and then again make it available for the lowest income families in this city.

Truly we would like to see, and this would be a major costing area, that the province begin to provide major funding for the servicing of land in the city. Now there was a great debate, and it's raised at the convention of our friends to the right, they don't like land banking. I think land banking has some utility at certain times and certain places. But land banking as it is now being applied around the City of Winnipeg has very little use for current housing needs because the requirement now is serviced lots to put housing units on. And one way of strongly affecting the cost of housing would be to provide for public funding of the servicing of land, the provision of major storm sewers and roads and capacities. It's been estimated that if there was public funding of serviced land you could cut the cost of a \$35,000 house by \$5,000. And what that would simply do, Mr. Speaker, is this, that under the Assistance Home Ownership program offered by the Federal Government, it sets a ceiling of \$30,000 for those who can apply under the AHOP program. That eliminates many families in this city from using the AHOP program. If we were able to reduce the cost of construction by \$5,000 that would open a much wider segment of the population to make use of the AHOP funding, and perhaps the most direct way of doing that would be to provide direct funding to the City of Winnipeg so that they could service more lots and make that land available. So you would solve the problem in two ways. First, you would bring far more units on to the market than are now available; and secondly, you would provide those houses at a cost structure that would become eligible under the Assistance Home Ownership Program. Well, Mr. Speaker, those are simply a range of alternatives.

In the area of jobs, manpower and training, in the area of community development and economic renewal, in the area of housing, we would suggest that the total cost of those three programs combined would add up to about \$45 million over a period of time. We would suggest that the results of such programs first, would provide a much wider range of benefits to a wider range of people, that they would attack the problem of downtown core development in a much more effective way by attacking the human problem and the social and economic problem rather than just the physical deterioration problem. We would suggest that the benefits accruing to the wider community would be no different. You would still acquire, as you do under the government proposal, a number of units of low cost housing; you could still provide new space and facilities for offices, and even if you can't I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the priorities that would be raised, the priority between having a new Autopac building and having a major regeneration of the individuals who live in the downtown area, that the second priority is far more important than having more space for an environmental laboratories or a new office building, or whatever is being provided. And fourthly, we think, Mr. Speaker, that this province could take real leadership and show real creative initiative by indicating that the way to tackle poverty and the way to tackle a slum problem is not further generalization, not further massing people of low income all together in one place, but providing the wherewithal and the means for them to provide solution to their own problems, and of trying to upgrade that area through the transfer of responsibility back to their own hands.

Now there are some risks involved, and we recognize the risks, but we think that certainly you are trying to provide that assistance to people who have never been given the opportunity before to do for themselves. And that means simply that you're going to have

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . to provide a certain amount of technical assistance, and a certain amount of managerial assistance, and a certain amount of cushioning along the way. And you're going to have some failures in doing it. But the point is that it would strike out of the cycle of poverty and strike out of the circle, whereas I don't believe that the present proposal will make any more difference than was made in the development of the Cultural Centre, or the Convention Centre, or the Lord Selkirk project, or all the rest of the major investments of public works that have gone in to downtown in the past 15 years have not affected the people who really lived there one whit. So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the government take a look at this kind of alternative.

We will be presenting resolutions on more specifics along the way. We would hope that we could find some common ground because we frankly feel that this issue is much too important to try to make debating points on, to play the game of partisan politics that has been played thus far as we listen to the contributions, or whatever name you want to give those that are being offered by the Leader of the Opposition. We feel that this kind of issue really requires the combined energy and intellect and imagination of all political people in this province, both provincial and municipal, and we think that that kind of combined approach might begin to find some solutions rather than simply sort of using a lot of funds and getting a lot of good press releases, but five years from now sort of saying, oh my goodness, we have to try some other form. We've been through too many public relations renaissances of the downtown area in the last 15 years. We're suggesting that we now approach the problem in a much more realistic and direct way. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood):

Mr. Speaker, I just had a question that I wanted to ask of the previous speaker. He made the point, and I just wanted to ask him to comment briefly on it, he said that he did not believe that public works projects helped the people who lived in the specific area in which they were built, and he cited examples of the Centennial Concert Hall and the government plan to put a number of projects on the periphery of the core area, and I think that's subject to debate. I don't want to debate that, but that is what he said. I would ask him, though, whether he would admit or agree that the construction of public works projects, the ones he mentioned already existing and the ones that the government has announced they intend to build, would benefit the city as a whole or the province as a whole.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker . . .

DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable member has three minutes.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will try to stay within those limits. The question itself requires an answer that certainly should go beyond three minutes. But I would certainly admit that most public works projects of whatever degree of effort benefit somebody, and I would certainly agree that in the past public works projects, such as the Centennial Hall, have benefitted a great many Manitobans, and I happen to be one of them and I use that building with great frequency and I enjoy my use of it. The point I was trying to raise is that if the objective is to build public works then let's say so, if the objective is to renew the downtown core and the inner city, then let's say so, because sometimes it is two very different objectives, and what we're suggesting is if the objective is to apply public money to the regeneration of the downtown inner city area of Winnipeg, then we would say that the building of public works is a relatively limited way of achieving that.

Now I think, Mr. Speaker, that there are ways that if the government does intend to go ahead, there are ways that they could make that public works building somewhat more applicable, and that would be to ensure that any contracts that are let for the construction of public buildings in the downtown core would require the employment and training of many of the unskilled unemployed workers and people who reside in the inner city, which by the way is a contract condition that is now employed by the Housing and Urban Development Corporation in the United States: that if they are using projects designed for urban renewal or downtown development, then that must also include a job training, job employment component for the unskilled. So in fact, if they go ahead, we would suggest that they at least take the project that far. Now that takes some very serious difficulties, as we well know,

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . with the unions and tradecraft unions in this province, but we think it's time that we also began negotiating with the trade unions to begin seeing how we can bring them in to begin supplying some of their own organizational skills through the inclusion of many of the unskilled, unorganized, ununionized people in this province, that they also have a chance to gain the benefits.

So I simply repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I admit, of course, that public works are of benefit, but I think that if the objective is to help and aid in the inner city, we think there are certainly other ways of doing it that would more directly affect and benefit those who happen to reside in the inner city.

. . . continued on next page

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP M. PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all to congratulate you as Deputy Speaker, and the Speaker himself - which I will do privately - for continuing on in the post to which you have been named and for conducting yourself capably and well, and I hope that we may have the benefits of your services and those of the Speaker for a long time. I would also, while I'm passing around compliments, thank the Member for Fort Rouge, who has just completed his address, for his very temperate, instructive and constructive presentation, in very sharp contrast to what we were subjected to just prior to his rising to speak. I think we definitely would go much farther if we had more of the same rather than of the other.

I would hardly dare to suggest flowers or compliments to the Official Opposition for fear of being misunderstood or misrepresented. Anything that is said on this side seems always, or so often, to be misinterpreted, given the wrong twist, and then it is used to bolster up their particular position. They seem all to be sitting very precariously. They're like nervous pigeons sitting on an unsteady and uncertain perch and not knowing from where or when a gust of wind may blow up and blow them off and away. It may be a wind that they themselves will eventually engender, and it will not be a matter of our doing but a matter of their doing. I am a little bit at a loss to know whether I should wish them well or ill, because what words could I properly utter? There's a little verse that I think of that I might recite, and it says, "Although I am full of music as choirs of singing birds, I cannot sing the old songs and I do not know the words." I have no words that I could use properly and appropriately within this Chamber to address myself to them as they justly deserve.

But the Leader of the Opposition is never at a loss for words nor is he at a loss for a tune. He sings the same tune over and over and he repeats the same words in a monotonous repetition of vituperation, name-calling, and - if he doesn't then his fellows do - slander. We hear them in the Chamber, we read them in the newspapers. They are broadcast over the radio and the television, and it's always the same. There is a sameness to the lyrics that are set to a monotonous tune, which leads me to recite another verse in which I would say, "They sing to us the old songs, the songs we've heard before, the old and oft-repeated songs that they have sung of yore, the old familiar melodies, the plaints we know so well, the same lamenting . . . , the same old stories tell. The tears may roll from their bloodshot eyes, their wails rise loud and strong, but still they are the same old cries and still the same old songs." With my compliments I dedicate this to the Opposition. And it isn't much wonder that the choir that the honourable leader across the way leads has grown weary and has finally decided that the time has come for a new choir leader.

But I would wish just to substantiate the fact that the same words are being used over and over. I would like to recite some of these repetitious statements. We are already weary of them, but let me just add a little bit to your weariness. You might be happier to adjourn from here and go off to some good dinner, I don't know where. The first one that I picked up here is the headline in the newspaper that "Spivak Wants More Power for the Auditor," and whatever virtue that that request may have, it has been repeated over and over again. This isn't the first time that it's been used and it will not be the last. We've heard it as far back as when we first came into the Legislature and the question of auditor began to be discussed, and we are still hearing it, as the paper is dated, March 6, 1975. It re-echoes now as from a vacuum and from an empty barrel, and that doesn't mean that I am referring directly to the Leader of the Opposition.

Then in another headline we read: "The Throne Speech Omissions Disappoint Spivak." What else did we expect that it would do? I don't know that this is a particularly earth-shaking bit of information. He expected to be disappointed and we are happy that his expectations have been fulfilled. And further on in the same article he says: "It's probably the most unimpressive and barren speech that I have ever listened to." That would seem to me to indicate that he seldom listens to his own, although he might, with some benefit, try to on occasion.

Again, he loves superlatives. They come pouring from his lips like a never-ending stream. He speaks here of "Colossal Mismanagement - Spivak," And then, on in the article, there are such things mentioned as "loss" - "he estimated that there would be an eventual loss," "A colossal mismanagement of public money," "An insult and an affront to the people of the province," "A gigantic fraud," "The government bungled and covered up," "The government has to get out of business," "Just another artifice," "Another dangerous

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd) experiment born in frustration and despair over mounting financial losses and public embarrassment." "A desperate deceiving of the public," and so on and so on. "Very risky and unsound enterprises."--(Interjection)--That's right, it would apply. It would apply very well. But he makes all these criticisms and through the whole article, which covers a good portion of the page, there is not a single positive proposal. He knows how to pour out these words that have not been uttered for the first time in this particular article. We've heard them all before.

And then in another article it says, "The Opposition seeks action. Mr. Spivak said the government refused to recognize the problem of inflation. Mr. Spivak said the government now was trying to camouflage the dismal failures of the Crown lending agency. All in all, Mr. Spivak said, the Throne Speech was a testimony of the malaise they, the Provincial Government, are living under. Mr. Spivak suggested a reduction in Manitoba's income tax, removal of the provincial sales tax on clothing, building materials and energy equipment, as well as programs to deal with the whole range of problems." We could well set this aside and save it until next year and it could be published again, word for word, without having to send the reporter down to record the gems of pearls dropped from the Honourable Leader's lips.

A MEMBER: He may not be around then.

MR. PETURSSON: He may not be around then is right.

And then again: "Spivak urges expansion of Provincial Auditor's role." That's the second time I mentioned that but it comes in a different paper. "Spivak said, Wednesday, the responsibilities of the provincial auditor should be expanded to include audits of all firms receiving loans from the Manitoba Development Corporation," and so on and so on, and the thought struck me that perhaps the Leader of the Opposition would like to have the auditor's responsibilities expanded to include the records of the provincial Conservative Party, particularly where election income and expenses are concerned. There seems to be some kind of a problem in making the proper reports, and if we extend the duties of the auditor, then that might be a good direction in which to extend them.

And then there's another headline: "Spivak raps MDC loans." And why not? Why shouldn't he? It's a part of the ritual. If he did otherwise, these walls would probably crumble.

Then there's a charge that the Speech from the Throne was bland and barren. "The Conservative Party leader, Sidney Spivak, told a news conference the speech was unimpressive and barren." And what else did we expect him to say? He's just following the customary line. "Mr. Spivak said the speech did not deal with the real problems facing Manitobans." --(Interjection)--Oh yes. Somebody has spoken to the reporter who is writing this up. In these lines he didn't suggest what the real problems were. He says the Speech from the Throne did not deal with the real problems. The only thing he indicated as possibly being a problem was inflation. He named that one and that one alone, and that was it, and there was nothing new otherwise.

He criticized the government's intention to increase the lending powers of the Manitoba Development Corporation. Now if the government had proposed the reverse, the comment also would have been the reverse. If the Speech from the Throne had said that the government was going to reduce the lending powers, then he would have said, why not increase them?

There is one item here from an interview with Mr. Huband, who said - and I'll quote him, not in the same context as the Leader of the Opposition, but simply as himself and as the leader of the third party: "Mr. Huband said the government incorporated two Liberal Party suggestions in the speech: a dental care program for children, and studying the possibility of substituting nuclear energy for Hydro development in Northern Manitoba." And in reply to that I would simply say, good for us. We hope that his Party votes in favour of these things, these measures, when they are introduced and brought forward into the House.

But there's one thing that the Liberal trio does far better than the Official Opposition. They're far better than the singing group that the Leader of the Opposition leads and which his group does not want to have recognized as a qualified choir. He made some off-key noises in that direction but he insists that they are not qualified by legislation--he's speaking about the Liberals, I'm sorry. The Leader of the Opposition does not want to have the Liberal group recognized as a qualified party in the House. I was referring to them as a choir; I'm referring to the Opposition as a choir. They sometimes sing discordantly and off-key, and the

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd) Leader of the Opposition made some of these off-key noises in that direction. He insists that the Liberal group is not qualified by legislation to sit as a party. But, be that as it may, one thing about that trio is that at least it manages to harmonize. There are far fewer discords from their direction than from the direction of the Official Opposition. They may still sing the old songs but they sing in some kind of harmony - under difficulty, of course, with their choir leader sitting in the gallery trying to direct from there.

But now, having said these things, I'm in a bit of a dilemma, somewhat in the same position as a certain minister in preaching his sermons was. As he stepped into the pulpit each Sunday to deliver his sermon, he divided his sermons into five parts. The first part he announced his text; the second part he elaborated on his text; the third part he drew parallels to his text; the fourth part he departed from his text; and in the fifth he failed completely ever to return to his text. Now if I had been taking the Opposition as the subject of my text, I am now leaving it and have no expectation or hope of returning to it. They may rest in peace.

I wish to change the pace of my remarks a little bit and say a few words about centennials, centennial celebrations, and most particularly about that one referred to in the Speech from the Throne where the words are as follows. It says certain things that the government proposes to do and so on, and among these, among proposals that the government has in mind is to complement the celebrations denoting the 100th anniversary of the arrival of the Icelandic settlers in Manitoba, when Hecla Provincial Park will be officially opened during this present year.--(Interjections)--You know, I can use an expression that somebody down in Texas used at one time, when he said if the people living in the flood-prone areas down there can draw in as well as they can blow, then they would never have a flood.

In Manitoba - so that I get on to the other subject - there are many ethnic groups, as we're well aware of, and they all have representation, or many of them have representation here in the Legislature. These ethnic groups pioneered this land. Their children and their children's children are the citizens of today. Our parents or our grandparents came to this country at an early time, and among these early pioneers are people that came from Iceland.--(Interjection)--I hear noises from a man who lives among Icelanders and knows them well.

A MEMBER: He loves them all.

MR. PETURSSON: Whether they love him or not, I don't know.

Canada recently celebrated its Centennial, Manitoba its Centennial in 1970, Winnipeg its Centennial last year, 1974, and other groups will be doing the same as the years go on, but this year, 1975, happens to be the year of the Icelanders who settled in Manitoba in 1875, the largest self-contained settlement that the Icelanders have made and the first permanent settlement that they made on this continent. There had been some who arrived earlier, in 1873 and 1874. Some tried Nova Scotia, others tried Ontario, some went down into the States; but none of these settlements were permanent ones, and finally, in 1875, they came to Manitoba and, by arrangement with the Federal Government, they settled on a tract of land along Lake Winnipeg, 12 miles in width and 36 miles along the shoreline, a tract of land that was then a part of the district of Keewatin. Manitoba at that time was a postage stamp province, and the northern boundary of the province reached only as far north as Boundary Creek--that's just immediately north of Winnipeg Beach--and the arrangement with the Federal Government was that this settlement of Icelandic people should be a self-governing colony. On some maps it's referred to as the Icelandic Reserve, but it was a self-governing, Icelandic colony, and that took the burden of responsibility off the shoulders of the Federal Government and left the people to themselves. They were given some assistance but mainly through their own endeavours they managed to survive.

They landed in Winnipeg on flat boats, barges, drawn from a place known as Fisher's Landing on the upper Red River in Minnesota. They had travelled to that point by train, and they travelled by flat boat up to Winnipeg, 285 people, they disembarked here, and then, when arrangements were made, proceeded on to Gimli to this tract of land that had been selected for them, and landed there at what was known as Willow Point on the 21st of October--this was in 1875, winter was setting in, and it was a cold winter that year, and they were, in a sense, cast adrift on the shores of Lake Winnipeg without shelter, without buildings, and without many other necessities of life.

They set to work immediately, men who had come from a country where trees are not known, and they had to learn to use the axe to chop trees and to build log cabins out of them.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd)

They set to immediately, and before the winter was over they had managed to build 30 cabins. As a matter of fact, 50 of those 285 people remained in Winnipeg but 235 people went on to Gimli and they were housed in these 30 cabins that they managed to build during that winter period, in the meantime doubling up in some while others were being completed. The determining factor, as far as the number of cabins was concerned, was the number of stoves that they came with. They had 30 stoves and they saw no point in building more cabins than what they had stoves to use in them, so they limited themselves to these 30 cabins.

Immediately the next year they began to improve the buildings and import more stoves in preparation for another large group of people that came in 1876. I don't remember exactly, but there were over a thousand and probably close to two thousand people that descended on the settlement in the year 1876. Among those people was my grandmother as a young girl with her parents, and she lived through the trials and tribulations that these pioneers experienced, through a smallpox epidemic, through the cold of difficult winters with primitive shelters and so on, and through a smallpox epidemic that broke out in the fall of 1876 and continued on into the spring of 1877. In the second summer that they were there, they were visited by the Governor-General of Canada who was then Lord Dufferin. He paid them a visit in the summer of 1877. He served as Governor-General during the years 1872 to '78. He had visited Iceland in the year 1856 and, as a result of that visit, he wrote a book called "Letters from High Latitudes" in which he had many words of praise for the Icelandic people for their industry and other good features. His visit to Gimli was a reaffirmation of his high regard for these people as he had found them to be in his visit to their homeland at that earlier period. And--it seems to me I have a little time--no, I don't have it with me. I was going to read a statement that he made at that time, at the time of his visit to Gimli. He went into many homes, visited many people, and according to his statements he enjoyed the visit greatly.

I mentioned the necessity of building homes from scratch in the depths of cold winter; of the men having to learn to dig through the ice; living through a smallpox epidemic. It was during that epidemic that 100-plus people died, adults and children. They were quarantined. They were not allowed to come out of the settlement. They weren't allowed to go farther south than to Netley Creek. That was where food supplies were brought and they had to come from Gimli to pick these things up. Later on, towards the end of the seventies and early eighties, there were floods. Many people lost their homes and they lost their livestock. We talk about floods and compensation and things of that sort these days, but in those days there were no such things as compensation or flood assistance. They had to take it as it came and do the best to survive.

Less than two years after these people came, and in spite of all their problems, being a literate people fond of books and fond of reading--there is no illiteracy in Iceland at the present time and there hasn't been for many years--within the first two years, a printing press was set up at Riverton and a paper was published, a newspaper, which was circulated throughout the community. It wasn't able to carry itself. Eventually it fell on evil days and had to discontinue, but other efforts were made to provide means of communication between people in the settlements back and forth, up and down the lake shore, and then finally in Winnipeg a weekly paper was published. It was organized, a printing plant set up, equipment, in September 1886, and that was 11 years after the people had settled in Manitoba. The name of that paper was Heimskringla, and I mention it at the risk of confusing the girls down in the Hansard room. It's Heimskringla - very easy to pronounce; Heimskringla. And two years later, in January 1888, another paper was established and that one was called Logberg.

A MEMBER: How do you spell that?

MR. PETURSSON: That's Logberg. The first one, the Heimskringla, represents--it would be the equivalent of a paper named The Globe, or some such thing, or The World; and the other one would be the Tribune, can you imagine? They continued on rather an unhealthy sort of situation, but they continued to publish regularly every week until finally, in the Fifties, they found that things were beginning to get beyond their ability to maintain, and so they decided that the best thing to do would be to merge. In spite of the fact that they represented opposite polls politically, they decided that they would be able to get along together. The Heimskringla was a Conservative paper and the Logberg was a Liberal paper. In 1959 they became one - it was a marriage of convenience - and they have continued since to publish and

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd) to distribute the paper and, strange as it may seem, while it appears that the Icelandic language is being spoken less and less, the subscription list continues, if not to grow, at least to hold its own. As people fall by the way, then others come in to take their place. It has a wide circulation. The one combined paper has now a circulation in almost, I think every place where there are any Icelandic people.

In due course, along with other things, the people, being a progressive and an aggressive race, began to build sawmills, mainly on Hecla Island where a number of people had settled and set up farms and used the Island as their headquarters for the fishing ventures, and the sawmills that were set up there turned out lumber and from that lumber many homes were built, both on the Island and on the mainland. It was a thriving industry for many years. It wouldn't surprise me if there were some homes, or some buildings, at least, on Hecla Island and perhaps in Riverton, that still have boards that came from these particular sawmills, not dating back for a hundred years but dating back perhaps 50 or even 75 years.

And then besides building these sawmills, they had an interest in schools and they had an interest in churches, so they built schools for the children where the children could become educated, and they built churches for their spiritual needs.

Later, many people moved from the Gimli area to Winnipeg. They moved to North Dakota, they moved to Lake Manitoba District, they moved to Argyle, in Rock Lake area, and some people then moved to Vancouver. They practically covered the continent. There are Icelandic organizations in Calgary and in Edmonton, in Ontario and Vancouver, Seattle, name it; they're all over the place. The children of these immigrants have taken their place in the business life of the community, in the medical field. There are many Icelandic doctors, there are many Icelandic lawyers, there are many teachers, university professors, and believe it or not, some have turned to politics. Over the years, beginning in 1906, there have been 20 Icelandic men - Icelandic men - there was one woman at one time--Salome Haldorson. There have been 20 MLAs of Icelandic descent, Icelandic background. There have been poets, there have been writers, there have been artists, and many other lines that they have followed, including farming, and in general they have become successful in whatever venture they have decided to devote themselves to.

Among other things that the Icelanders are particularly proud is the Chair in Icelandic at the University of Manitoba, which was established in 1951, and that Icelandic Chair at the university here compares well with the Icelandic Chair or the Icelandic Department at the Johns Hopkins University or Cornell University, or the Chicago University and perhaps other universities on the North American continent, as well as the university in Leeds in England and in other places. The library, the Icelandic Library here, is one of the largest and one of the best in any university where Icelandic is taught. It isn't just for the sake of Icelandic itself that the language is being taught here, but rather it is recognized as one of the base languages of the English language. It is basic to English. For the study of Old English, a study of Icelandic is also a requirement.

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

MR. PETURSSON: I'm just about finished. It plays an important part in any study of the Germanic languages, and is recognized as having a place in the linguistic areas in the educational institutions on this continent and in many other places.

The Icelandic people have much to be proud of, and this coming season they will have much to celebrate. This year is the 100th year of their settlement in Manitoba and I felt it incumbent on me to make mention of it at this time and in this place. The members here will have a better idea of what the occasion is and they will know something of the significance of the Hecla Provincial Park when it is officially opened. The Icelandic pioneers settled there, they built their homes there, and they lived out their lives there. Hecla Island, almost more than any one area of settlement, stands as a memorial to the rugged character of these people, their initiative, and their ability to overcome what to many might have seemed insuperable obstacles. And so, I salute their memory and I salute the memory of every man and every woman of whatever origin who have had a hand in building this nation by coming here in the early days and making this place their home. Thank you very much.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I know there's 15 minutes left before we adjourn for supper and in that period of time, sir, I want to make a few comments in general and after

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) supper deal more specifically with some of the things which I consider to be of major importance in the province of Manitoba today.

I want to commend you, sir, for again assuming the responsibility for the orderly decorum of this House, and I assure you, sir, that I will offer you my utmost efforts to abide by your requests and your rulings in this Chamber. I also at this time want to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the speech in reply, and also to say a word of welcome to the two new cabinet ministers who have come into this Chamber since we last were here in the first session. I notice only one of them is in the House at the present time--oh, pardon me, he's not in his seat but . . . The Member for St. Boniface will no doubt be the heavyweight that is needed in the health field, and these are very good words from the Member for St. Boniface. And also, like the Member from Riel, I want to say with some regret, or note with some regret the absence of the former Member for St. Boniface, who I also felt had made a very worthwhile contribution in this Chamber. (Applause)

Sir, the treasury benches are rapidly filling up, and it is of some concern to all of us, but we also know, sir, that there are a couple of by-elections coming up some time. There's still two vacancies, and I don't know just what Cabinet positions will be offered to those that run in those by-elections. I do suspect, though, that if they are successful, that they would in all probability receive some position of that nature. Sir, I think that must cause some concern to the few backbenchers that are left, those that have served well and may or may not be recognized for their services other than perhaps a Premier's Executive Assistant or a Water Supply Board appointment or a Telephone Board appointment, and things of that nature.

But, sir, our expenditures and also our incomes in this province are expanding. Inflation is hitting our people equally as hard as other parts of the country, and in those times government revenue increases dramatically, government expenditure, which in most cases is the prime cause of inflation, just completes the circle and tightens the spiral a little bit more. I was listening with great interest to the comments of the Member for Fort Rouge who sits somewhat to the left of me . . .

A MEMBER: Somewhat?

MR. GRAHAM: . . . and, sir, I was quite interested in his comments. He mentioned something about a Community Development Corporation which had been in existence in some other jurisdiction, and I think we have one in this province too but I don't think it has been used in the context to which he was referring. Sir, I respect his judgment and his knowledge. He has had tremendous experience in the urban development field and it is only quite natural that he should talk only about urban affairs.

A MEMBER: . . . never mentioned the country.

MR. GRAHAM: The question of the community development corporation, though . . .

MR. SHERMAN: . . . rides back and forth . . .

MR. GRAHAM: . . . does intrigue me. He also talked about community employment programs.

MR. SHERMAN: You've never been in the country, have you, Lloyd?

MR. GRAHAM: And he referred to them as programs somewhat similar to the present PEP and STEP programs that exist in Manitoba. And if this program is going to be similar, I would sincerely hope that in his constructive suggestions that he's putting forward to government, that he would also put forward some constructive suggestions on how to eliminate the inequities and abuses that occur in those programs; and I was waiting, and waiting patiently, for some words from him on how he was going to eliminate those abuses. Unfortunately, sir, those comments did not come from him so I can only assume from his remarks that he is quite willing to proceed with inequities and abuses.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge on a point of order.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well I'd just ask if the honourable member will submit to a question.

MR. GRAHAM: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. AXWORTHY: I wonder if the honourable member would provide us with a list of those abuses that he has, so that we might find some corrective means for them, and would he please supply them so we can take those actions.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I know the Member for Fort Rouge is very busy reading reports on urban development, but we do have reports tabled in this Legislature and I would refer him to the report of the provincial auditor. He might find some very interesting reading

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) there, and I would heartily recommend it to him as almost necessary reading in this Chamber.

Sir, in the past year, we in this Chamber don't know what has occurred in government spending. In the coming session we will be asked to deal with the proposed spending for next year, and we will also, while in committee, study the past spending of previous years, but the only avenue that we have open to us in this Chamber for studying the current present spending program of the government is through the question period. And this, I think, is the basic difference between what happens in business and what happens in government. While business is always concerned about the future and their programs for the future, they are naturally concerned about what has happened in the past, but their greatest concern is what is happening to date: what we are doing today, what we are going to do tomorrow, where Joe is going to be working tomorrow, what program and so forth. But we in this Chamber, sir, differ greatly from business. We talk at great lengths about what happened a year ago, we talk at great lengths about what is going to happen next year when we consider the estimates, but we have no avenue open to us to deal with what is happening today, and what is happening today is the most important thing we should be dealing with. I don't know how we can overcome this, sir, as long as we deal with the affairs of government in the manner that we do. I think it would have to take quite a drastic change in our legislative process, which would enable members of this Legislature to deal with the day to day operations on a current basis.

MR. SHERMAN: Something like overthrowing the government, Harry.

MR. GRAHAM: So when members from the opposite side, such as the previous speaker, raise numerous quotations from various papers--and I have none with me here. I have no poems, I have no newspaper clips--when he talks about we on this side of the House being repetitious and dealing with things that have happened in the past, it is really, sir, the very nature of the Legislature which dictates that this is the manner in which we handle them. We have a report that was tabled in this Legislature on Friday, sir, which outlines, not completely, but outlines some of the avenues of examination, some of the fields of examination, that were reviewed, not today, not even last year, but for the year before that that ended on March 31st, 1974. So some of the things that he is talking about in this report can be 21, 22, 23 months old, and that's a particularly long period for a member of the Legislature to be dealing with when people are asking him everyday questions about what is happening in government and you start talking about what happened 22, 23 months ago. But we only received the report on Friday.

But having received it, sir, and having quickly scanned through it and then taking a second look at it, one can only assume that every charge we made in this House last year, every criticism we made of government in this House last year, was valid, very valid, sir, and the suggestions that we made in most cases have been procedures that should have been followed a year ago. So when the Member for Wellington suggests we're repetitious - or other members for that matter - maybe by being repetitious we can finally point out, if not to the government, then to the public and to the press, that what we are saying is in fact correct and that something must be done about it.

Sir, after the hour of adjournment I want to take the remainder of my time and deal with the report of the Provincial Auditor, not in great detail because that great detail can only come from the Provincial Auditor when he appears before the Public Accounts Committee, and sir, we have no authority over the calling of the Public Accounts Committee. We are at the whim of the government. We have been assured by the House Leader that it will be one of the priorities in the calling of committees so we can only wait in eager anticipation. When that time comes, we will have the opportunity then to get to the more detailed examination that is necessary of the accounts of this province, of the abuses of financial authority that have existed in this province and have been repeated, and also an examination of the actions of this government in the somewhat arrogant manner, as you can well recall, sir, when they last year refused to have judicial inquiries, said there was insufficient evidence, refused to listen to the suggestions that were put forward by this side of the House. But one year later, sir, we are now finding the things that should have been done might have saved the people of Manitoba many dollars if they had been done when we suggested.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, I am now leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m.