

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, April 10, 1972

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney. The honourable member has 15 minutes.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking at 5:30 I was talking on Autopac, and I'm sorry the Minister isn't in the House, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, because I was discussing many features of Autopac and their failure to deal with the problems of insurance. Mr. Speaker, we have the honourable members across the way, some of them who are the Board of Directors for the Automobile Insurance Company and I would like to say at this time at the Automobile Cabinet meeting they had on March 20th, they dealt with a certain problem of insurance, and I know many of them have the experience of dealing with insurance because they all have a background, they all know what's good for people. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say at this time that I have in my hand here a regulation No. 4172, the regulation under Section 29 (1) of the Automobile Insurance Act which was filed March 20th, 1972, which deals with a feature of automobile insurance.

And after the honourable members get finished discussing their problems, I'd like to comment on this particular problem. The honourable member's mentioned all during the discussion on automobile insurance that they would deal with every one with the same consideration, Mr. Speaker, with the same consideration. So what happens, Mr. Speaker, on March 20th 1972, which is exactly three weeks ago, you know what happened, Mr. Speaker? --(Interjection)-- They had a Cabinet meeting. They had a Cabinet meeting, and I'm sorry the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs isn't here because I was wanting to speak to him at 8:00 o'clock. I don't know -- he's out speaking to automobile insurance agents for Autopac, or the insurance agents for Manitoba. But no matter where he is, I hope that these comments get to him.

Socialism is a philosophy that you're supposed to treat everybody equal, and I mean equal. And the First Minister who came into this Legislature the same time as I did, and I was sitting back with the Honourable Member for ...

A MEMBER: And you learned something and he didn't.

MR. McKELLAR: Johannson anyway. And the First Minister was sitting back here in equal position with me and he's where he is, and I'm where I am, and I'm not - well I spent 11 years over on that side trying to ... the public that I did what's best for them. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, I don't have the answer to that because I'm still here. And that's a lot more than a lot of the ones that were there at that time, but the Honourable Minister of Labour was sitting here while all the time he was giving out the word, when I was sitting there. And he always said he would treat everybody equal when he got over there. I never thought he would make it but he did. But lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, you know what happened, you know what happened. On March 20th because some honourable members of the Winnipeg City Council they put on a campaign to put the squeeze on the Cabinet, not on the Board of Directors of Autopac, not on the Board of Directors of Autopac, but on the Cabinet and they are the Board of Directors of Autopac as far as I'm concerned, because they make the decisions. The Board of Directors of Autopac ... and you know what happened, Mr. Speaker, not only did they cut it in half, they cut it in less than half, and you know what they cut it down to, 120,000 from 255,000. Yes, Sir. Now is that the way we react to public pressure? I don't think you would ever accuse the Conservative Party of ever acting to public pressure. But lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, they acted to public pressure and what did happen right under Autopac? The common man's enterprise. The common man's enterprise. So, Mr. Speaker, it relates it right out - \$120,000. That's all they got to pay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the law of the land is going to be looked after, or the government of the day are going to see the laws, -- or treat equally ... everyone. I would like to tell the government of the day what right did you have to change the rules of Autopac. What right did you have to change the rules of Autopac? --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, we're not on this side of the House wanting Order-in-Councils to be passed every day to change the rules of the game for some farmers, for some pensioners, for some under-privileged individual who needs this help. The City of Winnipeg don't need this help any more than the people of Killarney, the people of Souris, the people of Boissevain. And this is the point I'm making. If the Town Council of the Town of Souris come in here, do you think you'd change the rules of the game? --(Interjection)-- Never, never would you change the rules of the game. Never, because they don't hold enough weight, and I'm forever going to hold this over your head, Mr. First Minister,

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) because you gave in, you gave in to that group of people, you gave in to them. Do you think Wawanesa Mutual would have gave into the city of Winnipeg? Not on your life, not on your life. Do you think the Portage Mutual Insurance Company would have given in to the City of Winnipeg? Not on your life, not on your life. I tell you they are men of principle. They are men of principle and they wouldn't give in. Mr. Speaker, if you ever heard of an injustice that's the best one that was ever made right there in this Order-in-Council.

But, Mr. Speaker, I've got another injustice now. I've got another injustice, another injustice and it was written to me on the 24th of May, of 1972. --(Interjection)-- 1972 - it's from the Transitional Assistance Board, the Transitional Assistance Board, --(Interjection)-- March 24, 1972, pardon me. If the Minister of Labour would listen to me. He's been so busy over the past 15 years speaking from his chair that he doesn't want to listen to this chair. I want to record this on the Hansard of the Manitoba Legislature. "You are hereby informed", and this is written to me and I'll table it. It's no good to me. It's no good to me - "You are hereby informed that as you have failed to file the prescribed application form for Transitional cash assistance, and have not replied to previous notices, the Transitional Assistance Board at a meeting on March 20, 1972 resolved that your file would be closed".

Mr. Speaker, I want to relate and give you the background. I was an insurance agent. I paid my \$15.00 license every May 31st. I was told that I did not qualify for Autopac --(Interjection)-- and when I . . . the Directors of Autopac right there. The Member for Roblin received a letter on the same day. We were told by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs that I did not qualify along with the Member for Roblin. In the Act which details the requirements under the Transitional Assistance Board it says that every agent has the right up until September '72 to file for assistance under the Transitional Assistance Board but regardless of the fact that I was busy, and the Member for Roblin was busy, because we have other duties other than to fool around with . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I am trying to hear the honourable member. The Honourable Member for Souris Killarney has five minutes.

MR. McKELLAR: We were told on March 24th by a letter from the Transitional Assistance Board that our files were closed. Now I tell you that if the government want to break the law, that's one thing. If I break the law, that's another thing, but I know that I'm not breaking the law, and I want to file this letter, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the page boy to pick it up and I want to give this letter to the page girl here. This is a wonderful thing, I have only bought licenses for about 23 or 24 years, or 25, I don't know, it's somewhere in that - it's so long since I -- and I've never been challenged by the Superintendent of Insurance in all the years I did my duties as an agent for the public, but when I'm told by the government of the day that I am finished without any payment, that's just about all I have to say --(Interjection)-- Discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, I have a number of things to say also and I am sorry the Minister of Health isn't here because he is disturbing us in Western Manitoba. He's disturbing us. In the month of September in 1972 in the Ninette Sanitorium the doctor, Dr. Payne is retired, and the public at large in that area, and the staff, would like to know what the thinking of the government is going to be in Ninette, because it not only affects the community of Ninette, it affects the community surrounding Ninette to about a 30 mile radius. And when I asked a question the other day to the Honourable Minister, he took the question and refused to answer and this question has been asked by the people out there, by the committee who have been appointed to look into this problem and they want to know, they want to know, they want to know from you, Sir, they want to know from you, what you are going to do to the community . . . --(Interjection)-- No, no, Sir, don't say it's six years. The Honourable Member can talk all he wants but if he wants to make a speech he can get up after me and contradict me, contradict me. Mr. Speaker, the people of the community of Ninette and the people of southwestern Manitoba want to know what's going to become of Ninette Sanitorium in September 72. So that's all I'm asking, you don't have to contradict me or anything. I'm just asking you a simple question. The Minister here of Higher Education, the Minister of Health and Social Development, all we want is an answer, then we'll have something to say.

Mr. Speaker, I think the right -- I wouldn't agree to send the Minister of Agriculture to the Senate, because he might socialize the Senate at Ottawa. Do you think that's right? Mr. Speaker, I've only got about two minutes left and all I want to say to the people of Manitoba: Do we want free enterprise or do we want socialism? Do we want --(Interjection)-- and you can

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) talk social democratic, which the Minister of Finance said in his Budget Address, or the Member for . . . back there, back in the back row, who is talking about Communism - what are we going to have? Mr. Speaker, is there any difference between Socialism or Communism? --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, this is a choice what the people of Manitoba got and I'm asking them, which choice do you want? The choice is freedom of . . . , socialism there. It's the simple fact of life, simple fact of life, and I put it to the people of Manitoba - give us free enterprise.

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

MR. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Would the Member for Souris-Killarney answer a question for clarification? This afternoon when the Member for Souris-Killarney was speaking on the Budget, he told us that the farmers would be paying income tax on the amount of grants as outlined in the Budget. Would he explain how you pay income tax on a tax credit?

MR. McKELLAR: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's quite simple, very simple. For those who aren't farmers it's very difficult, but for those who are farmers, it's very simple. Very simple.

If you charge your taxes, land property taxes up on your income tax as an expense, if you get a credit, it's classed as income. It's very simple. For the city people who don't charge their property taxes up on income tax they spent, you don't have to put the credits in.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take part in this debate but since I didn't take part in the Throne Speech Debate, I would like to begin by congratulating you on your re-appointment as Speaker of the House. You have a very difficult job, and I realize it. You won't be getting the most of your trouble from me I'm sure but I really sympathize with the position you have and I am glad it's you that has it and not me.

I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech. I didn't agree with everything they said, but they are entitled to their opinion. I would also like to congratulate the other members that have been shifted around in the Cabinet over there. I think probably, well they got shifted . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the honourable members could all co-operate so that I could hear what is being said. I know the acoustics are bad in here but nevertheless if the undertones would stop warring with the overtones, I could possibly hear. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: This is an important speech. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But while I'm congratulating people I don't want to forget about the Member from Minnedosa and I think it shows that he is held with a great deal of respect in that area and I also think it shows that the Conservative Party is on the march in Manitoba and I think that is very good.

Now I'm not going to take part in the part of the debate where you get down to talking about the millions one way or another, but I think if a lot of those people over there had enough sense to look after their dollars and cents, they wouldn't make such a mess with the millions. And regardless of how they are going to juggle or shift, or shaft, or whatever you want to say, it's \$60 million more we've got to raise for expenses, not to mention the capital expense. This is costing an awful lot of money. This is taxpayers' money and it's going to be worse. I'm not one of those who say there couldn't be a small rise because we realize things are going up, but that sort of an increase as well as the capital expenditures that we are going into, is just too much.

Now I would like to speak a little bit about agriculture because in this last number of years, regardless of what the Minister of Agriculture has been saying, things have been getting worse for the farm people.

We have heard this talk about the two price system of grain that was supposed to be such a big thing but really it wasn't because it amounted to about \$300 for each farmer in Manitoba and our expenses per farmer is going up faster than that. Even though we got a small increase we're still losing money, so things aren't really going good for the farmer. Hog prices have been poor; egg prices have been poor; there's only been the one bright light, as you could say or the one industry that's been doing fairly well and that's cattle --(Interjection)-- I noticed in the Throne Speech that whoever wrote that thought that the Hog Marketing Commission was responsible for the increase in the price of hogs since January. Now I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture didn't have anything to do with writing that because I am sure that he is more knowledgeable than that, but I am just wondering who did put those words in there, because the Minister of Agriculture knows and so does everybody that's in the farming business that Manitoba

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) doesn't produce one percent of the hogs that are consumed in North America -- not one percent. --(Interjection)-- Did you have a question? They don't raise one percent of the hogs in North America. In fact Manitoba could have no hogs and it would make very little difference to the market in North America. --(Interjections)-- So I don't believe that the Minister of Agriculture really would have something like that doing that --(Interjections)-- Our prices -- you fellows are having a lot of fun but it really isn't fun for the farm people --(Interjections)--

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order, the Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am aware, Sir, of the ruling which you handed down the other day which was to the effect that a member's comments made while seated in his Chair do not make up part of the record, the proceedings of this House -- but it is not clear to me, Sir, whether those same utterances that are made by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, even though he was seated, will appear in Hansard, in which case there should be an opportunity to simply point out that he is definitely misquoting me. At no time did I say that the existence of the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board would influence the price of hogs in Omaha, or anywhere else on the continent.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to indicate that --(Interjection)-- the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Hansard will attest to the fact that I have been singularly silent in the last few moments. --(Interjections)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ENNS: That's how you've got me on this . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Would the Honourable Member for Lakeside like to . . . I should like to indicate the ruling that the Honourable First Minister referred to also had in it that all actions whether uttered or whether recorded were still the responsibility and faced the consequences of the procedures of this Chamber and I want all honourable members to remember that. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Just to keep the records straight -- so some people say it's in Manitoba, and some say it's in Omaha, I'd like to read what it says in here: "Members of the Assembly will have their attention drawn to the operation of the recently established Hog Marketing Board and will be interested to note that hog prices have shown marked improvement. Additional support will also be given . . ." Oh, this is where it goes on. --(Interjection)-- Okay, I'll read the rest if you want me to. I could read the rest but it really doesn't concern this. --(Interjection)-- This is the Speech from the Throne that was read. Yes. --(Interjection)--

Well at any rate regardless of what anybody says our prices are tied to the prices in United States, in livestock and in beef, and there's no use of anybody trying to say they can do any more than maybe take a few of the little curves out of it but that's all that can happen. If there's a surplus in the States it's going to be -- if there's a surplus there it'll depress our prices and if there happens to be a scarcity there we'll have a better price. You could also look at it another way is that by all hogs going under the Hog Marketing Commission that each farmer is also losing a certain amount more per hog. --(Interjection)--

We hear about Hog Marketing Boards these days and marketing boards of all types, type of supply management as you could call it and I would like to read a little bit I have here. "The people who run marketing boards," --(Interjection)-- This? Right here -- some of my notes. Is that all right? --(Interjection)-- I haven't much faith in marketing boards and the people that get put on them because it isn't too long till they seem to think they got a pretty easy job and get pretty complacent and they lose markets. We've seen this happen with the Canadian Wheat Boards. I also haven't too much respect for an awful lot of the experts that come out and tell us what to do. Not long ago the University of Manitoba sent a farm specialist out into southern Manitoba who heavily influenced the thinking of the farmers in that area. At a time when prices were the highest in the history of our area he urged the farmers to buy more land -- just prior to near crop failures due to inclement weather. He urged cash rental of land and committed the farmer to have large payments when he had little or no crop. At a time when grain prices were going down and cattle prices were about to go up, he advocated the farmers go out of cattle because they weren't making money in this and that they go into raising hogs. He was wrong on all counts, and some of the fruits of his advice can be seen in bankrupt ledgers in the courts of this province. --(Interjection)-- This is true.

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd)

And here you can think of the little joke about the specialist or the economist that went out to the farmers and were trying to tell them what to do and when they lost money on their hogs one year, he told them to go out of hogs and to go into cattle. He went into cattle. It wasn't long till he lost money in cattle and then he put them into chickens and at last the farmer said: "Do you know if I keep listening to you I'm going to go broke, sure as heck." And you know that he was on the right track because if you do follow the advice of those fellows this is just what will happen to you. They seem to guess it wrong all the time.

I don't think it's fair to blame the provincial government though for all the troubles we have with agriculture but I noticed that they're very willing to try to take credit for anything else that happens just like on the hogs. But I don't believe that it's fair that farm people should have to sell their produce on what you call the open and free market at a time when other industries are protected by labour unions, import duties and tariffs. All these work to the detriment of the farmer and he is supposed to sell his produce on an open market. And you know, I don't care what anybody says, I think it's only a matter of time till the farmers will have to be subsidized on the growing of the grain because it's done in all other countries.

Now, I'd like to speak again a certain amount about the minimum wage because this group on that side are supposed to be trying to do something to help the farmer and we're the biggest industry in Manitoba but they're talking about increasing the minimum wage and I can't see how this can help farm people. I really can't. We have no way of passing the extra cost on to anybody. We are having to sell at the world market. We can't pass it on. Our local implement dealers and garagers cannot compete with Winnipeg labour or if they do they have to pay those type of wages and then they have try to pass them on to the farmers and when the farmers are short of cash - it's pretty near impossible.

So I really don't see how an increase in the minimum wage can help farm people at all. In fact I think it's worse and you know I feel that labour unions are becoming too strong and they're becoming detrimental to the whole country. You know that we have a cheap food policy in this country and a labouring person regardless of how he complains, he never bought more food for an hour's work than he's doing today and I'm sure you people are aware of that. A labouring person never bought more food for an hour's work than he's doing today. They've got a -- (Interjection)-- Pardon? --(Interjection)-- I wish you would also take the trouble to try to tell me how an increase in the minimum wage is going to help them.

And then we have our farm boys who are growing up on the farm and they're needed on the farm but because their father can't begin to pay them what they might be able to earn in the city they leave their father on the farm and come into the city where they can get more wages. They're not always unemployed when they come in here. Often these farm boys get the work and the city people are out of work. So I don't know how this works to the benefit of the farm people -- I wish somebody would tell me that.

These labour unions are becoming so strong and going on strikes like they do and they don't care about the farm people. When I asked that question the other day the Minister of Labour got up and spoke about the trouble they have in the railways and the snow slides and all this. Well, if one thing's wrong that doesn't say that another's got to be wrong and we didn't cause the weather to be that way - the snow slides. --(Interjection)-- I can understand on the other hand and I must say that you can't blame the people in the city who are working on the minimum wage when they see their people next door to them who are on welfare or who are on unemployment insurance that are getting more than them. I'm just not so sure that they're doing the right thing though, that maybe the correcting should be done on the other side. -- (Interjection)-- We've got to export and if we keep increasing our prices I think we're going to price ourselves out of the markets.

And now I'd like to speak about fertilizer because our Minister of Agriculture hasn't done anything about it --(Interjection)-- and I feel it must be over two weeks since I've brought it up in the House and I thought possibly he would have got something done about it when I drew it to his attention. You know what we have going on with fertilizer. We have the plants like Simplot at Brandon, they're selling fertilizer across the line to dealers and these dealers are offering it to people on this side at \$20.00 a ton, \$20.00 a ton less than what the people on this side are trying to charge for it. --(Interjection)-- I asked our . . .

A MEMBER: Are they paying that \$20.00 to the NDP Party?

MR. HENDERSON: No, just the ones who are getting the pork barrels. No, but this --

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) (Interjection) -- this is serious really, because I phoned up a dealer and I said, "What is it? How much profit have you fellows got on a ton of fertilizer?" I said: "How can they sell at \$20.00 a ton less?" "Well", he said, "all I know is", he said, "we're guaranteed eight to handle it, but", he said, "I don't know how they can sell it for 20."

On top of that these industries are getting subsidized through government grants and different plans. And they're actually taking money out of the farmer in an indirect way because he's paying taxes. They're taking money out of the farmer. --(Interjection)-- You fellows just hold on and you can have your turn later on. And I think since the Minister of Agriculture is always trying to run outside the province every once in awhile to see if he can do something for Manitoba, this is probably -- has to do with the Federal Government but I think he should be getting the word in.

And by the way while we're talking about the Federal Government and so forth I'm not pleased with the Attorney-General and the way he handled this here . . .

A MEMBER: Nobody else is pleased with him either, not even the government.

MR. HENDERSON: No, he said in connection with -- he done nothing to try and stop the Liberal government from removing the words RCMP off those police cars and so forth. And it was said down there that these people didn't recognize RCMP or know what it stands for. The next time they're jumping in trying to interfere with Ottawa all the time, they're jumping in trying to interfere with Ottawa and saying that we've got to have it this way and here's something that belongs to western Manitoba, it's something that's very unique and they're doing nothing about it. But then this is the government, this is the government that says old customs and dogmas and styles must go, we gotta change regardless of whether it's for the better or not - we'll have a change, we'll take --(Interjections)--

I'd like to make some remarks about the Highway Department and the construction program. I'm really looking forward to it very much but it says there will be the same level of highway works in the south and central regions as in most previous years. Well what are they talking about - in most previous years? If they're talking about since they came into power there hasn't been anything done in the south and it's very disappointing. It's very disappointing because you all know that the bulk of the highway went up north and that there wasn't anything done in the south and we have a lot of roads down there that need repairing and they should be kept up or it's going to cost more to put them in shape again.

And I'd like to say now that as I'm in contact with people you don't hear them complaining about the money that's spent on the Highway Department. You don't hear them complaining about that. They're always glad when there's a good road and you don't hear people talking about it. Money spent on a road so you daren't going over a rough road shaking your car to pieces or having gravel stones that are hitting your windshield and knocking out your headlights. The people in the city here probably aren't much aware of this because they probably don't drive those kind of roads. But those are all costs to the farm people. --(Interjection)-- Well anyway it's very -- I for one and I think all farm members and that the people I hear feel that money spent on a road is well invested and that it helps to save people money which is the main thing.

If you want to hear the things you hear them complaining about is some of the programs that you have for youth hostels and fellows like Nick Ternette and others like that --(Interjections) -- you should hear them talk about your education program --(Interjection)-- Yes, and you should hear them talk about the Welfare Department. That's number one. That's number one. I see that they're talking about having a one-man commission to look into the abuses in welfare and such like. Well, I'm pleased to see that there's somebody going to look into it but I hope it's somebody that's out to try and cut costs and to try and keep people from getting on relief or getting them to work rather than getting more people on because it seems that programs that have been carried on in this last year or so has just been out to try and get more people on. Every article you're picking up you can read about youths between 18 and 24 that are refusing work and don't take work and they're still getting welfare. There's got to be a stricter program on this. There's got to be some communication between the employment office and manpower and unemployed and welfare people. Able-bodied people shouldn't be getting relief like this, --(Interjection)--

On the tourism. It's a department to my way of thinking that can have more spent on it because nowadays there's so many in the labouring force that work such short weeks that they have a lot of time to spend somewhere and I think if they had some of the tourist industries developed that they could spend their money in Manitoba. And I think also that there'd be people

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) come from outside the province which would spend money here and I think this would be very good. So these two departments - I'm in favour really of more being spent on them because they're money invested and it isn't really like money lost.

There is talk about prison reform and rehabilitation. Well this is very good and I'm all for the program of rehabilitation and trying to keep these people gainfully employed but don't let anybody get the idea that I am in favour of going - bending over backward all the time to the repeat fellows that are coming in there all the time and getting into trouble all the time, and I think while you are talking about being more lenient to the people that are in there on their first offence; the people that are in for their first or second offence I believe that they should be treated different and so as they can get out with possibly a trade, or else work while they are in there. --(Interjection)-- You're a joke out in the country, you're a joke. We talk to the farmers and they say, "Well that man don't know anything about the cattle business. He don't know what they're worth." They say, "wonder what he would think if he lost a few cattle." And then the other man from St. George, he seemed to think when they were talking about something here the other day that we had hobby farmers and corporation farmers and that was the bulk of the things in the country. You fellows over there on that side are all mixed up.

But now I want to come to the thing that really bothers me - it bothers me more even than what welfare used to, and that's plenty, and that's the way that Manitoba Hydro's been handled. I am very disappointed in that and while I think sometime you should be blasted about it, and called names, and insulted, or something, I feel at times that I would be very happy to use the other approach if it would make any difference and help to make you change your mind, because there is nothing wrong with anybody being a little wrong sometimes but they should take a good look at where they are going. It takes a big man to see when he's maybe on the wrong track and to retrace --(Interjection)-- That's right. That's right. But if you people in the Manitoba Hydro go ahead and spend in the neighbourhood of 75 million in the regulating of Lake Winnipeg, it certainly isn't going to do any good for Hydro purposes, because I want somebody to show me where it produces more than a million and one half dollars worth of power.

Think of the interest on this every year. Do you know what that costs for each Indian up at South Indian Lake? I figured that out because I was told if they went to the middle height of the dam it would be around 25 to 30 families of Indians that would have to move and that was all because we know the Conservatives set the higher level and that did involve more Indians but at the middle diversion, this was about the number of families, about 300 Indians. Now take your 75 million and divide it by the 30 and you'll find out how much it's costing you -- where's my sheet on that?

Those Indians, those are costly people. Yes if you divide that it would be costing \$252,000 for every man, woman and child, Indian over there. And that's not to mention the interest that you would be paying on this \$100,000 or 75,000, million, not thousand, million that would be there.

And you know, when I think about how we talk about tax shifts and how we can raise money I keep thinking, here's a wonderful way to raise money for Manitoba. Here's a wonderful way to raise money for Manitoba, if we went ahead with the flooding of South Indian Lake at the middle level. In two years' time we'd have it all paid for and we would be selling power and be in the clear. We would be making money every year, and then if we needed more power, we could put on more generating plants and we could sell more and more power, possibly as much as 75 million in a year. The figures I have is that it's 15 million that they could sell now.

And then if there's more power used, then they could put on these more generating plants. We'd have no pollution problem. We'd have a renewable resource, and we wouldn't have to be thinking about an increase in hydro, because if we go ahead with this here regulating of Lake Winnipeg, and the people out there don't seem to want it regulated, because I've been listening to the hearings, in fact, they are quite disturbed about it, they don't want you regulating Lake Winnipeg. They don't seem to think you are going to do anything good for it. You're not going to get no hydro power out of it. If you went ahead with the other program, then it might never be necessary to do Lake Winnipeg -- that's what it said in one of the reports, possibly up to the year 2000, and how do you know what we'll have then. You might - we may never need it in this province. So this to me is the poorest piece of business that any government could do. What is going to be lost up at Churchill Forest Industry is really only going to be peanuts to what is going to be lost there. It's really only going to be peanuts to what's going to be lost there.

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd)

Now there's a lot of you over there that I don't look on as really businessmen but there's somebody that's the czar and I don't see why. I just don't see why you don't change your mind on there. After all, it is a kind of a compromise, the Conservatives were saying the high level, you were saying the low. We'd let the Liberals get in on there and be the winner, but there's only three of them. Why don't we compromise on it? You know the way I feel about it if that side over there doesn't take a better look at what they are doing in Manitoba Hydro, I surely hope we can go to the people before it happens. I really hope we can go to the people before it happens so that we can defeat them, and so that we'll save Manitoba all that money.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BLTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, my first words would be words of sympathy to you and the behaviour that I've been witnessing for the last two or three days. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the odd jest will create merriment in the House, and the caustic remark will, of course, create anger, but it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that honourable members on all sides of the House seem to be carrying this feeling of argument across the floor, much of it unnecessary. It seems to me that this Chamber and all it stands for requires that common courtesy should be extended to any honourable member that has the floor and that there should be no words thrown across with the sole intent of endeavouring to throw him off what he wants to say, for the use of a better word of explanation, but rather extend to him the courtesies that are his right in this House and I am sure that the House will be better for it.

Mr. Speaker, the matter of the budget - I must say that the Minister in his Budget Address went to considerable pains to give the impression that the economy of the province was in a reasonably sound condition. He admitted, Mr. Speaker, that the biggest problem was unemployment. He forecast that it would possibly continue for some 18 months and that his purpose was to accommodate it to some degree by massive public spending.

Mr. Speaker, to do this he proposes massive borrowing. He justifies this by indicating that the income in some parts of the economy is on the increase. This I suggest, Mr. Speaker, at this point could possibly be wishful thinking. I trust he is right in his forecast, who wouldn't? At the same time, Mr. Speaker, he gave us no alternative plan should the forecast become an empty dream. The right of the public, and it is only right that the public should be informed what is happening to their Canada Pension Plan dollars; since the fund became law the people of Canada have contributed millions of dollars annually. Think of this, Mr. Speaker, what these millions of dollars would do if put to work provincially in the private sector, toward the establishment and continuance of the basic economic foundation of the province, which after all is its life blood. No, Mr. Speaker, the procedure now is for governments to borrow up to the annual provincial contribution, thus the Minister tells us that he expects to call for \$56 million from this fund this year.

He is no different, Mr. Speaker, to previous finance ministers both here and elsewhere. I believe that every penny paid since the fund's inception has been borrowed by this province, all of which, Mr. Speaker, must be paid back, and paid back with interest. Possibly this exceeds in the excess of public debt to some \$150 million. It's true, Mr. Speaker, that this sort of financing may be better than borrowing on the open market. What I am endeavouring to say, Mr. Speaker, is why lull the people into a false feeling of security and, worse still, mortgage the future, the future generations that are unborn to satisfy the financial problems of today. Would it not be better, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would cut the cloth according to our ability to pay, at least to some degree?

The Estimates, Mr. Speaker, before the House suggest that increases are in every direction to the extent of \$575 million. This in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is public spending out of control. In spite of the several sources of revenue, including \$50 million from Central Mortgage and Housing, and the provision of a further \$15 million from the Federal Government for winter works, the Minister tells us, Mr. Speaker, that he proposes to borrow \$260 million. He comments that the people gave his government the mandate to develop budget policies, to promote equality of human conditions in Manitoba. I believe, Mr. Speaker, since the inception of this province, one hundred years ago, succeeding governments have been assigned that same responsibility. It is reasonable to say that they have done a pretty good job over the last 97 years. I would remind the Minister of Finance that his sentiments while placing his party's socialistic ideals above common sense dictates in my opinion, that it will be disastrous in due course towards our province.

(MR. BILTON cont'd)

I would also remind him of his grave responsibility when he proposes that his government intends to spend \$575 on every man, woman and child in this province. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't take too much imagination to realize that the present and the immediate future of this province is in a shaky financial condition, particularly when possibly less than half of the people throughout this province are contributing through income tax.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed spending of \$44 million in salaries for an inflated civil service is not the answer; nor is the every increasing welfare input the answer; nor is the centralization of financial power in education, particularly at our elementary level. I have said it before, Mr. Speaker, and I will say it again, that education and the quality of social life cannot be measured in dollars and cents, and I say that there are dollars being squandered in that direction this day that should be arrested.

In my own area, Mr. Speaker, there is a proposal to close down the Kendall school, ten miles south of Swan River. Two hundred and ninety-five people who signed the petition objecting to the procedure were told that the decision was made some years ago. What nonsense! These hardy people got the brushoff, Mr. Speaker, by the school executive and its officials. They have appealed to the Minister, and I trust he will reverse the so-called decision created by a brain trust that gives the appearance, Mr. Speaker, of having no concern with the human environment, the children themselves, to say nothing of the cost factor involved, so long as their ivory tower of authority continues to grow and grow and to hell with the public expense.

I would hope that the seven school teachers, Mr. Speaker, and the three university professors on the government side of the House who must know of the rising resentment of dictatorial treatment in education matters towards local people, will assert themselves in an endeavour to establish harmony and better understanding all round. It will, I can assure them, be an effort worthwhile.

Mr. Speaker, it is the right of all people to have some say in their destiny, and it must be understood and preserved. The present budget must be a cause of concern, Mr. Speaker, to local municipal bodies for with rare exception they are presently carrying enormous debts. Our people in Swan River are just now coming out of a ten-year debt toward the installation of a water and sewer system. This, Mr. Speaker, without a provincial grant I am proud to say.

Further improvements over the years have caused the debt to remain high. This with an annual uncontrollable education budget that has taken property taxes to a level, Sir, that people are questioning, questioning the thought as to whether or not it is a privilege to own one's home any more. This can be said, Sir, in Minitonas, Benito, Birch River and Bowden. Mr. Speaker, must all our senior citizens through crushing taxes drying up their life savings in a short period of time, be delegated to institutional living, oft times against their wishes. I am told, Sir, that 35 percent of prescription drugs are retailed to people over 65 years of age. People of this group, Mr. Speaker, tell me that they have monthly bills for drugs in the neighbourhood of \$20, \$30 and oft times \$60 a month. How can they manage, Mr. Speaker, with their small incomes?

Nowhere, Mr. Speaker, nowhere at all do I hear of any relief for these people whose earning years for the most part, is over. All the Minister can offer is an exemption of sales tax on used clothing. What gives - what gives I say? Where is the so-called human touch that he trumpeted the other night when he brought in his Budget?

In the field of nursing care, Mr. Speaker, for our ailing senior citizens, here is an injustice being heaped upon the thrifty. Locally we have 12 beds set aside in our hospital for extended care to the elderly. The last word I have is that it costs \$460 -- \$460, Mr. Speaker, to occupy one of those beds per month. I am told that they are all occupied with only two persons paying their way. The remainder is being absorbed by the Health Department. The Minister of Health repeatedly has told us that if and when the Federal Government provides half of the \$5 million necessary for the scheme, it will be incorporated into the health system. This, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, is poor comfort for the life partner that is ultimately left penniless and destitute through the life savings of both being dissipated through an extended illness of want. The budget says nothing to eliminate this dilemma, Mr. Speaker, that thousands of our pioneers are finding themselves in. This, Sir, this and witnessing the spending of millions upon millions of dollars in schemes and plans and open bucket spending and projects is causing these good people no doubt to worry and despair of the future and needless to say their own well-being in the few days or months or possibly few years that is left to them.

The Minister spoke of a mandate to better human conditions of Manitobans. I suggest to

(MR. BILTON cont'd) him that here is a field where human approach is justifiable, reasonable and proper as opposed to some of the schemes presently in the Estimates that might be eliminated. We hear of the proposed input of dollars, Mr. Speaker, into the north. Well and good, for that's where Manitoba's economic future lies. The basic problem, Mr. Speaker, is transportation costs. This must be grappled with and a solution found. The people in northern Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, as I've said before pay a premium to live in that country. For two years now I've been needling the Minister concerned to look in and head off the possible abandonment of rail lines between Dauphin, Swan River, the Hudson Bay junction. The other day he told me that we will fight it, fight it, he says, but I'm asking him now, Mr. Speaker, when will he start to fight? Before the fact or after the fact. Because it is serious. I'm not going to labour the point with this correspondence that I have but CNR employees in Dauphin, Mr. Speaker, are concerned. They're going to have to move their families if this comes about and they're worried about it - they can see it coming. Two of the main trains are being taken off as of April 30 and a year ago, a year ago I put it squarely to the Minister concerned -- and nothing, nothing. He tells me the other day - we'll fight it. If he doesn't get fighting it soon there won't be any railway to fight about and that is important. That railway, Mr. Speaker, is more than important to the development of northern Manitoba not only now but in the days that lie ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, representation has been made to me as House Leader that there seems to be agreement that after this heavy day today on the Budget Speech that there is an inclination that rather than go into Private Members' Resolutions this evening that with unanimous consent we may adjourn proceedings for today and in view of the fact that that representation has been made to me, Sir, I wonder whether or not this would be agreeable to the member of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: The arrangement is agreeable to the members of the Official Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes, I'm in perfect agreement if that's what the wishes are of the other people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, having unanimous agreement of the members of the Assembly, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Finance that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Tuesday.