



Third Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

28 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



VOL. XXVII No. 5

2:30 P.M. February 21, 1979

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

February 21, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed with the business of the day, I've been asked to announce to all members that the members' dining room will be open this evening for the convenience of members who may find it more convenient to eat downstairs than to have to go home.

I should also like to bring to the attention of the members that we have 18 members of the 184th Winnipeg Brownie Pack. These Brownies are under the direction of Brown Owl Betty Davies. This group is from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, Minister of Tourism and Cultural Affairs.

We also have 10 students of Grade 9 standing from River Heights Junior High, under the direction of Mrs. Lockwood. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River Heights, Minister of Government Services.

On behalf of all the members we welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the Report of the Ombudsman for the year ending December 31st, 1978.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Attorney-General)(Osborne) introduced Bill No. 7, An Act to amend The Jury Act and Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The Mental Health Act.

MR. DAVID BLAKE(Minnedosa) on behalf of MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake) introduced Bill No. 19, An Act respecting the Glenboro Hospital District No. 16B and The Rural Municipality of South Cypress.

MR. SPEAKER: Does it meet with the approval of the House that the motion is made by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa rather than the Minister of Agriculture?

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN(Government House Leader) (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I don't think we want to take that as a precedent. In my view bills or resolutions that are going to be introduced by private members should be introduced by private members. But on this particular occasion if there is no objection we'll just let it . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that my honourable friend's observation is correct. Why doesn't one of the private members introduce the bill?

MR. SPEAKER: Does it meet with the approval of the House then that the bill be introduced by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa in . . . You've heard the motion then. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? (Agreed) I declare the motion carried.

MR. WARREN STEEN(Crescentwood) by leave introduced Bill No. 10, An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Les Reverends Peres Oblats in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Before questions, the Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON(Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have the permission of the House to make a small announcement concerning House Proceedings tomorrow?

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I should rather have said "brief", rather than "small". Tomorrow we will be receiving their Excellencies and their party as they arrive at the Legislative Building for the Governor-General's first formal visit to the Province of Manitoba. The schedule is that the Vice-Regal party will arrive at the Chamber at 2:30 at our regular opening time. You, Sir, Mr. Speaker, I understand will be reading an address of welcome to which a response will be made by His Excellency, the Governor-General and thereafter on the departure of His Excellency we will render our usual robust version of God Save The Queen, and then will move in to the regular business of the House. I would hope that that announcement would meet with the general approval of all members of the House.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my quiet question is to the First Minister in the absence of the Minister of Finance. Has the Department of Finance done any studies in order to give us some indication as to the results of the stimulation to the economy by the temporary sales tax reduction of this past fiscal year?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I would be quite pleased to take that question as notice for the Minister of Finance.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, as well I would like the First Minister to indicate — he may wish to take this as notice as well.

In view of the fact that the government claims to be such good managers of the economy, if he can explain why Manitoba this past year, had the lowest growth rate in department store sales, 3.4, and a rate which is half the inflation rate.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend has picked out a selective statistic, the age of which I'm not entirely sure of, but based upon some of the rather aged statistics he was using the other day, I would I think in the interests of accuracy prefer to take that alleged statistic, take a look at it, and give him a factual response as soon as possible.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, possibly the First Minister would like to take another aged selective statistic, and that is to provide advice insofar as retail sales are concerned, 3.9 this past year, again the lowest in Canada, half the rate of inflation — an explanation for this occurrence.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to also take that question and that alleged statistic as notice. Might I inquire of my honourable friend the source from which he derives his statistics and the date thereof.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll be providing the First Minister with the sources and the bases for that material from Statistics Canada.

A further question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. The Minister may wish to take this question as notice or may be prepared to respond to it now. Is the Minister of Health and Social Development prepared to advise us as to whether or not there has been any decrease, any decrease in the standard of either quantity or quality of meals provided to those in our mental institutes or at the school for retardates during the past year, insofar as the meals are concerned?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure my honourable friend that my personal observation of the situation would persuade me to respond in the negative, and most assuredly, but I'm prepared to investigate the situation further on the grounds that he obviously is asking a well-intentioned question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to that, the Minister of Health and Social Development refers to his personal observations, has the minister personally visited and examined the meals that are being provided presently in our mental institutes to the patients?

MR. SHERMAN: In the general sense, in the universal sense, yes, Mr. Speaker. I haven't sat down with the residents of our mental institutions for a great number of meals, but I certainly have visited all our mental institutions and I have eaten meals at several of them. I have made it a point to check kitchen facilities and staff when I've been there, so, in a general sense the answer is "yes", but there may be some aberrations that require checking.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before we proceed, may I have the indulgence of the House to welcome 20 students from the Mennonite Collegiate Institute under the direction of Mr. Peter Voth. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. On behalf of all members we welcome you here this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable, the Minister of Health and Social Development who this afternoon fortuitously used the word "universal sense". Would the Minister object in strong grounds to Ottawa for introducing a means test into the provision of Family Allowances, which is the direct factor in causing money, intended to bring up children, to be attachable for payment of arrears in rent which may have been accrued many years ago; whereas the provisions for the children, food and housing and any other needs are needed today, with the moneys that are advanced as Family Allowances to which all of us were entitled equally prior to this change, and which change has resulted in the deprivation to lower income families in Greater Winnipeg.

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

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by my colleagues that if this question came forward to answer the Honourable Members Opposite as it does refer to housing which comes under my portfolio. I would like to say that yesterday afternoon my Department was in touch with Mr. O'Malley, who is the Manager of the Winnipeg Housing Authority — he would be the Chairman of the Board or Secretary of the Board of MHRC — met with him, and the situation is briefly this, that the Manitoba Housing Authority is funded 75 percent by the Federal Government, 12-½ by the Provincial Government, and 12-½ by the City of Winnipeg. There is appointments made to that Board, and I don't want you to confuse the Winnipeg Housing Authority with the Winnipeg Regional Housing Authority which is MHRC. There are appointments made to that Board which are suggested by the three parties that fund it and the Mayor of Winnipeg suggested some names which CMHC and ourselves agreed to. The names of that Board are Harry Munroe Gordon Lucas, Ken Wong, Slaw Rebchuck and Olga Fuga. Now, we have taken note of the fact that that Board may have made a decision to do something that is not legal' and the manager has assured me that he has got all of the aspects and the Acts and everything that would refer to the decision he had made. He will be taking it back to his Board and I assure you that the three parties that fund the Winnipeg Housing Authority are going to be watched very closely that they do not break the law in their request to try and correct rents that are in arrears. Certainly we don't want to see that happen, but certainly rents that are in arrears have to be collected. I assure you that we will be in very close touch with the situation, and I hope that's a satisfactory answer to the Honourable Member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a supplementary.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's always dangerous to have an answer prepared to a question that was not asked. I made no reference to the Housing Authority or to the validity or invalidity of what they are doing, they may feel that it is entirely right. I ask whether you would object, in

the strongest terms, to the root cause of this problem, which is not the Housing Authority but the Federal Government's decision to separate Canadians into class — those who have made it and those who have not made it — with respect to the provision of family allowances. Does this government intend to object to that? — (Interjection) — No, you do.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Inkster with a final supplementary.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, it's not a supplementary question. I believe that the Minister was pulling on his desk in readiness to answer, and I wonder whether there is an answer to that question. Whether they do intend to object or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the question is slightly, if not very hypothetical as to whether we intend to object or not object to what is happening. I assure you that the answer that I gave you was the factual answer to a situation as it presently exists, and the Honourable Member can laugh all he likes, I don't intend to get into a debate on what the Federal Government is doing or not doing in this respect.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce an easier question, one which he is more familiar with. I wonder if the Minister of Industry and Commerce can do anything about the fact that we are having problems with our goldfish. My daughter has some goldfish and there have been two fatalities. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that my daughter, Sharon, in paying the sales tax, has to pay for bird investigations, is it not fair that she has some help with the problems that she has been having with her goldfish? **MR. SPEAR:** Orders of the day. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. JOHNSTON: My answer to the Honourable Member that his daughter is a citizen of Manitoba and we take very seriously any request from a citizen of Manitoba who is interested in investing their money in this province, whether it be goldfish, birds or anything else. His daughter is welcome.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs, and ask him whether he has any concern about some of the ominous signs and the deplorable conditions about to be faced by the residents of the City of Winnipeg described by various councillors because of a deficiency of funding and support from the Province, indications that the streets are going to be dirtier; that we're going to have skating rinks closed; playgrounds and athletic fields are going to have less maintenance and less supervision. Is the Minister concerned about that state of affairs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in meeting with the city earlier this year when we discussed the \$30 million bloc-funding grant this year with the City of Winnipeg, in fact the very opposite view was expressed at that time that the \$30 million bloc-funding grant for 1979 was more than ample. A number of areas had been increased and they indicated that there will be a very slight, if any, mill rate increase in the city; and I would point out again to the Member for Elmwood, the City of Winnipeg — as many people who have visited the city have pointed out — has, for example, the best snow cleaning operation in the City of Winnipeg, and that has been maintained.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister — he seems to be referring to immediate responses to the \$30 million — I would like to know whether he has not heard that there has been some concern on Council that another \$5 million is required and that I believe the Mayor and the official delegation is going to approach the Minister for additional bloc-funding or for withdrawing certain provisions of the bloc-funding and having cost-sharing. Is he not fully familiar with that?

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. At the last meeting with the city, in fact we agreed at that time that we would review the provision that we had made in the bloc-funding grant with the city during

the course of the year and that we would be reasonable, as we had been in the past, with the City of Winnipeg and we expect to meet with the city often during this coming year to review any problems that they might have.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a final supplementary.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would then ask the Minister, on what basis he refused the city the right to levy new taxes to find new sources of revenue?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, that has not been refused.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: My question is to the Minister of Health and Social Services. Will the Minister and his government be considering these Family Allowance rebates to be considered as income for the purpose of welfare recipients' declarations? I note that this would cause a diminution of welfare benefits in the months that such rebates were received and I would ask him whether or not that would be the case?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, all I could tell my honourable friend is that no decision has been made on that yet. That question is in the hands of my colleague, the Honourable, the Minister of Finance.

MR. CORRIN: I would ask the honourable minister whether he is now or has been in receipt of a letter from his federal ministerial counterpart, Monique Begin, with respect to this matter and whether or not it is true that Ms. Begin has asked him and his government not to consider such rebates as being income for the purpose of the calculation of welfare benefits in this province?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, that's correct, Mr. Speaker. Madame Begin issued that kind of message or that kind of request to health ministers right across the country some months ago. I'm not sure that all, by any means, have responded or made their decisions yet, I know that some have.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Labour — and I gave him notice in respect to this fatality — can he inform the House whether he has had a comprehensive report on and whether he's had an investigation of the matter, and whether sufficient safety precautions were taken during that fatality that occurred?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the Member for Kildonan for the courtesy of making me aware of the fact that he was concerned with this particular situation and that the question would be raised today.

A thorough investigation of the fatality has taken place and I would have to leave it at that at this particular moment except to say to you, hoping you understand that we have turned the findings of that investigation over to the Attorney-General's office.

MR. FOX: I would like to ask then, the Attorney-General, whether he is proceeding with charges in this particular case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'll accept that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he can advise the Assembly as to the status of quotas on imports of meat products into Canada at

the moment, and if he isn't able to answer that at the moment, whether he would take that as notice?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY(Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I believe the quota at the present time is approximately 150 odd million pounds at this particular time but I can take the question as notice and get that specific answer for him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. Can the Minister confirm that the MONA local executive representing nurses at the Misericordia Hospital have recently written to the administrator of the Misericordia to express their concern that patient care was being adversely affected by poor climate control that was coming about as a result of refusal of the hospital board to negotiate with the operating engineers on strike at that facility?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of that situation. I'm also aware of or have been apprised of the fact that that situation is a temperature-control situation that predates the strike — the operating engineers' strike — that it is a seasonal thing that has afflicted that particular facility in the past; that the management of the hospital now claims to have the situation and the condition under control and the return of the engineers — although much to be desired — has no bearing on that particular situation.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary to the Minister. Can the Minister confirm that stationary engineers who are being used to strike-break at the hospital, are currently working 12-hour shifts?

MR. SHERMAN: No, I can't, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill with a final supplementary. .

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll address this question to the Minister of Labour with the hopes that the Minister responsible for Health will undertake to investigate that allegation. Can the Minister of Labour undertake himself to investigate any possible infractions of provincial legislation that may be occurring as a result of the use of strike-breakers in this labour dispute?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: At this particular moment, Mr. Speaker, to the Member for Churchill, I am aware that there's a great deal of activity taking place between the unions that are having the problem and the employers, if you wish. That was my major concern that they carry on their discussions.

It has not been brought to my attention that there is any adverse conditions in existence because of that particular work stoppage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health, partly based on his reaction yesterday. Does the Minister and the government believe in the principle of flexible billing?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, that whole principle is under discussion at the present time between the government and the Manitoba Medical Association and anything I said would jeopardize the friendly nature of those discussions.

MR. DOERN: Can the Minister then explain why yesterday he claimed he was misquoted and the President of the MMA indicated to one of the newspapers that he had expressed the belief that he did in fact believe in the principle of flexible billing?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to, for clarification, just advise my honourable friend that I did not claim I was misquoted by the media. In fact I think the occasions on which I've made that claim have been very very minimal, in fact they perhaps don't exist at all. I claimed I had been misquoted by my honourable friend in his remarks in the House yesterday.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, then I would ask the Minister the following: Is he saying, based on his first answer today, that there is in fact a real possibility that flexible billing will be implemented in Manitoba by his government because it is still under review and under discussion?

MR. SHERMAN: No, I'm not saying that, Mr. Speaker. But I'm not saying the opposite to that either.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, a question to the same Minister. I wonder if the Minister has anything to report to the House on the construction of the badly needed correctional institute at The Pas.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Not at this juncture, Mr. Speaker. My colleague, the Honourable the Minister of Government Services and I are burning the midnight oil on that one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas with a supplementary.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could indicate when they will have burned the midnight oil long enough, or when after a year and a half of consideration they will end their procrastination and dilly-dallying around on this issue and make a decision as government.

MR. SHERMAN: As soon as we can, Mr. Speaker. We are working at it with all conscience and with all diligence with an eye on the need in that particular area and an eye on the provincial treasury.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in reply to a question yesterday from the Member for Wellington as to whether or not an inquest would take place with respect to the unfortunate death of an individual at the Portage School, I can advise him that an inquest is slated but no date has yet been set.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I would thank the Attorney-General for that information.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Health and Social Services. I would ask the Minister whether he has yet had the opportunity and occasion to investigate and re-evaluate safety procedures respecting the movement of residents at the Portage Home in the aftermath of the recent tragic death at that institution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I think that it's certainly called for, Mr. Speaker, and that has been my feeling since that tragic event. I've asked for a tightening-up and an improvement of those procedures insofar as is humanly possible to prevent tragedies in totality from ever occurring.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington with a supplementary.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Honourable Minister indicate to the Assembly what directives he has issued on an interim basis with respect to security and surveillance procedures

at the home? He indicated that he has a concern and that things are being tightened up. Could he specify as to how they're being tightened up in this regard?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I will do, Mr. Speaker, but I'd ask my honourable friend to permit me to take that question as notice as what has been done has been in the form of discussions between my office and the relevant officials and I would have to seek out the specifics.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington with a final supplementary.

MR. CORRIN: No, Mr. Speaker, this is a question for the Honourable Attorney-General. Could the Attorney-General tell us whether it is true that himself, or the department on his direction, suspended usual procedures relative to the execution of an arrest warrant issued against one, Mr. Allan Spraggett, with respect to two counts of gross indecency laid against him yesterday by the minister's department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the charges having been laid. I will inquire into the matter referred to by the member.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to draw the Honourable Members attention to the loge on my left where we have a former member for Rhineland, Mr. Jake Froese and a former member from Pembina, Mr. George Henderson, visiting. We welcome you here this afternoon.

The Honourable Member for Wellington with a fourth question.

MR. CORRIN: No, Mr. Speaker, this would be the first supplementary question to the Honourable Attorney-General. Could the Honourable Attorney-General when he's making his inquiries as to whether there has been any deviation from the usual procedures in this respect, indicate to the House, and inform himself, of course, why Mr. Spraggett was not arrested in Ontario and brought into custody — and I'm advised, Mr. Speaker, that his whereabouts were determined and he was visited by Ontario police officials — and could he also indicate whether this will become a common practice with respect to the detention, or the lack of detention, of accused persons resident in other provinces but accused of criminal acts in our province.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to direct a question to the Minister of Government Services on The Pas Correctional. Can he report on the status of the lawsuit that has been brought against the government by the contractor due to the 18-month delay?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, . . . the Honourable Member knows that a Statement of Claim has been issued and to my knowledge, a Statement of Defence has been filed or will be filed.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I then ask the Minister if he could indicate some of the cutbacks that he has under consideration. He apparently said that he was delighted that there was an opportunity to delay the project because the government is considering modifications to the building. I wonder if he could describe the nature of those modifications; whether he's considering thinner walls or lower ceilings, two in a bed, just what is the nature of that proposal?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Before we proceed, may I suggest that the Honourable Member for Elmwood, if he wants detailed information of that nature, perhaps he'd better file an Order for Return.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, for the record, I made no such statement.

MR. DOERN: Then I would ask the Minister whether he is, at this point, considering any modifications to the original design of the New Democrats, or is he going with the same design?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of no design by the New Democrats.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health and Community Services. I believe it was Friday last, he indicated that the reason the government discontinued the special allowance to elderly, a small group of people in our community, that it was an anomaly that they should receive more money than someone who hasn't yet achieved the age of 65, and that in order to eliminate that anomaly they had decided to cut down the social allowances by about \$114.00 a month. I wonder if that indicates or signals a new approach by the government opposite?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health. **MR. SHERMAN:** Well, I'm not sure what lies behind the question posed by my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker. I would say there are many new approaches planned and under way by this government. There is nothing in the way of a new approach that is hidden. There is nothing devious about the announcement and the decision made with respect to those social allowance qualification rules for the elderly, but in general, I would say, yes, we are embarked on a number of new approaches.

MR. MILLER: Well if this is a new approach, I'm wondering whether, to be consistent, we can now look forward to the government opposite to discontinue the very selective and unfair property tax credit to those with very high incomes who are over 65 in age and denying it to those who are under 65. To be consistent, Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the Minister of Health can show a consistency on the part of his government.

MR. SHERMAN: Well Mr. Speaker, all I can tell my honourable friend is that my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Finance, has in front of him the whole spectrum of income transfer programs as they exist in the Province of Manitoba, their impact, their effectiveness. Those are being measured and assessed and we are hoping to ensure that resulting programs put the money where it is needed most.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks with a final supplementary.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister now saying that people who are getting this special allowance, a very small group, because in order to qualify they have to have very little means, are they saying that they were getting an inordinate amount of money, an unfair amount of money, and that this rationalization, the review that is now being undertaken, will, in fact, correct the anomaly of paying those with the greatest incomes and the largest homes the greatest benefits out of the tax credit system?

MR. SHERMAN: No, I'm not saying that, Mr. Speaker. I'm saying what I said — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks is saying that — I'm saying what I said, that we are looking at the effectiveness of programs. The Minister of Finance is studying that whole field, that whole range. The specific case of elderly welfare recipients, pensioners who are on welfare, was one specific instance that fell under the aegis of my department that we dealt with in an effort to remove inequities existing between elderly persons who were beyond age 65 and immediately short of age 65.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks with a fourth question.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister now saying that he is, in his capacity as Minister of his department, is prepared to eliminate inequities but he has no control of the inequities perpetuated or used by the Minister of Finance?

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, but we're working on those inequities, we're working on them. I hope that I will continue to be one-fifteenth or one-thirty-third of that process.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member of Seven Oaks with a fifth.

MR. MILLER: No final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Minister, in saying that he is now reviewing in order to remove inequities, I'm wondering before the review, since the review is not yet complete, the rationalization has not yet been looked at, I'm wondering whether he'd consider reversing the decision he's made so that these people can continue to receive that special allowance which they were deemed to require until such time as that study that they are talking about has indeed been completed, so that we may indeed have, in Manitoba, a fair and equitable, based on actual need and not on the spirit that moves the Minister of Health.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't need to restore anything because nothing was taken away. I don't know how many times the point has to be made that those receiving that additional benefit continue to receive it. They will continue to receive it. The rest of us, like my honourable friend and I coming up to age 65, when he and I go down the street on our 65th birthday and apply for Welfare, we'll have to qualify under the same rules as my honourable friend, the Minister of Government Services, who is one year younger than I am.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I point out to the Honourable Members, all members of the Chamber, that the question period is for the purpose of eliciting information and I would hope that it does not degenerate into an argumentative debate. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't dream of debating during the question period with the Minister of Health. I don't as a rule do that and I'm not trying to debate now, so I thank you for your admonition.

Mr. Speaker, since the purpose of the action undertaken by the Minister of Health is to assure equitability, fairness, then I again, perhaps not to the Minister of Health, perhaps to the First Minister, I have to now ask the question. If the action taken by the Minister of Health is indeed equitable, so that in the future all elderly will be treated the same way, can the First Minister now assure the House that to continue that fairness, that justice, that same approach, even-handed approach, that no special consideration will be given to those with the largest homes and the highest incomes if they are over 65 years of age? That is the situation which prevails today, since the last session of this Legislature.

ORDERS OF THE DAY — THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. On the adjourned debate, the fourth day of debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Springfield and the amendment proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Minister responsible for Manitoba Insurance and Manitoba Telephones.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL(Brandon West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and may I take this, my first opportunity in this session, to note and congratulate you on the continuing responsibility which you have in your position as Speaker of this House. We will support you, Mr. Speaker, in the exacting duties which you are required to carry out, and hope that you will continue to be the person who will retain and maintain the order and decorum that is so important to the carrying out of the responsibilities of the Members in this Chamber.

I would like also, Mr. Speaker, to recognize and congratulate the Member for Springfield, who was chosen to move the adoption of the Speech from the Throne, and for the manner in which he discharged that duty, and to the Member for Radisson whose rather unique approach to his contribution and to his ringing declaration that the conclusion, "je suis bilingual." I think, Mr. Speaker, that will depend upon the passage of time to determine how well that may be sustained, but we do congratulate him on the action he is taking in the study he is undertaking to obtain that kind of ability which we all would like to have in this Assembly. I would also, Mr. Speaker, like to congratulate the Member for Selkirk on his having been selected by his colleagues as the Leader of the Opposition. I recall the words that were spoken by the First Minister in that respect, when he offered the wish that perhaps you would be able to continue in that office as Leader of the Opposition for many, many years to come.

I hope the First Minister will understand that I can't perhaps support him fully in that wish. I would be willing to go for two to two and a half years, but, Mr. Speaker, it might be considered as unsolicited advice to the electors of Selkirk if I were to suggest that you might continue for many years thereafter.

Mr. Speaker, the announcement today, before the Orders of the Day, by the First Minister, on the visit of the Governor-General of Canada and his party to our Legislative Assembly tomorrow reminds us of the honour that's been conferred upon the Province of Manitoba and its people by that appointment, and we look forward with pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to receiving the former Leader of the Opposition in his new role as Governor-General of Canada.

I would like to, at this stage, thank on behalf of the people of western Manitoba and particularly the Brandon community, for the support that was demonstrated last evening by Members from both sides of this House who journeyed in such numbers to be present at a ceremony to thank the thousands of volunteers involved in the Jeux Canada Games that are now in progress at Brandon. The people who attended last night in such numbers were most grateful for that demonstration of support, and I am sure they would wish me at this stage to thank the Members for demonstrating to the people of Manitoba how very much they are interested and concerned with the large responsibility which this Province and particularly the Wesman community has undertaken in staging the Games in Manitoba.

I think, Mr. Speaker, you might permit me a note of local pride in extending our good wishes to the president of the Jeux Canada Games Council in Brandon, Mr. Alex Matheson, and through him to the volunteers and workers which are numbered in the thousands, who have at this point been receiving from all sides congratulations and words of good will from all across Canada. Not only from those who were able to attend the opening ceremonies a week ago Monday, but also those who were able to view them on television, and I'm told that there was a great emotional feeling from those who witnessed the pageantry and the magnificent way in which all the Provinces and Territories of Canada were represented by the hundreds of athletes who are taking part in these Games.

It is a matter of, I think, pride to all of Manitoba, and particularly to the small community of Brandon, that such success has been achieved in staging the Games, and I am sure you would want me to record, Mr. Speaker, this success and the good wishes of all concerned. The values that relate to the kind of programming and the kind of preparation that has gone on for several years in the Province is very difficult to measure in real terms, but I would suggest that the real benefit perhaps, and the lasting benefits are not those in monetary terms, but rather those which will accrue to the community itself in terms of the strength and the confidence that will come from having accepted this big responsibility, having planned for it over the years and now having it come to fruition in the manner in which it has.

I suppose it's natural, Mr. Speaker, for Members and for governments to point with pride when such accomplishments are achieved in our Province. It's also, I am sure, traditional for Oppositions to view with alarm when they are responding to the first intimation of the kind of programs which the government of the day is intending to adopt. The Leader of the Opposition, in his response, used such words as "irrelevant and innocuous document, a lack of openness and a heartlessness of the government" and he used these statistics —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, during this rather sombre evaluation of the program of government, the words were heard to come from somewhere opposite we didn't know it was that bad, and really some of the terms that were used were perhaps traditional in viewing with alarm but certainly not based upon any statistical evidence that would bear out what kinds of events are likely to occur as a result of the programs which are being undertaken.

I noted too, Mr. Speaker, that during the presentation of the Leader of the Opposition there was a very quiet and sombre group of his colleagues, who were seldom moved to any noticeable enthusiasm by the recording of these views by the Leader. Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to quote the statistical evidence which indicates the declining situation in our Province which the Leader of the Opposition has projected and predicted. It's simply not borne out by the Statistics Canada evidence, the latest of which cover the period the first eight months of 1978. From the kinds of questions that the Leader of the Opposition was asking today in this House, one would almost think that he had received new information from this source, but until that is available, the evidence as we have it now indicates quite clearly that 1978 showed a substantial gain over that last great period of 1977, when the full flower of public sector spending and deficit financing was brought to bear upon the economy of our Province. Since that was put aside, Mr. Speaker, the evidence of real growth, while it is still much below that which we hoped to achieve in the future, shows a doubling of the record for 1977.

Mr. Speaker, what really comes out of the Speech from the Throne, and what revelation it may have for us as to the firm policies of the Leader of the Opposition and his party, I find somewhat difficult to evaluate. During some interviews which the Leader of the Opposition gave to members of the press, he intimated that had he been elected and had his party been elected to government in 1977, they might, and they would have adopted a program of restraint. Mr. Speaker, the only difference that the Leader of the Opposition would suggest that he would have perhaps put the

emphasis more on restraining certain physical programs of government, and providing somewhat different amounts for social governments. But, in the main, Mr. Speaker, he indicated that he was in favour of a program of restraint in the Province. We now have the evidence in his reply, in his criticism of the objectives of this government, that public sector spending in his view is critically important to the economy of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I cannot reconcile that with his public statements with respect to restraint and his feeling that that would have been the program and the action of a New Democratic party government, had it been elected in 1977.

What adds to the uncertainty, Mr. Speaker, as to the real position of the Leader of the Opposition, in respect to policy in financial matters is or certain of the appointments which he has made to his shadow cabinet. I was interested particularly in the appointment as critic to the Minister of Finance, the Member for Brandon East. Mr. Speaker, here again, the Member for Brandon East is perhaps noted more for his ability to dispose of public revenues, of the contributions of the taxpayers of Manitoba, than he is for his policies with respect to the raising of public revenues. So Mr. Speaker, we have as critic of the Department of Finance, one of a diminishing number of big public spenders, and I wonder whether his selection of the Member for Brandon East would indicate that the Leader of the Opposition is still one of those small band of economists who say that the way to extricate the economy from the present problems is to increase the amount of public sector spending. I think Mr. Speaker, that that confusion needs to be cleared in the minds, not only of this administration, but certainly of his colleagues opposite, whether in fact the government, the opposition today, is one that does support the restraint programs of this government, or whether they are still saying that were they in government, they would adopt a program of increased public sector spending, of deficit financing, of using the revenues they hope to acquire in future years to meet present needs as they see them.

Mr. Speaker, there is a tendency among Socialists, not only here in Manitoba but throughout the world, to greet every initiative of a government with the charge that it is somehow a plot, veiled in secrecy and designed to destroy what the Socialists would feel are the true values in our economy.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to a sell-out. I presume he meant that he foresaw a plot to sell out Manitoba to the private sector, and the Member for Elmwood was concerned about tinkering, and tampering with the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, and, liquoring, the tinkering and tampering with MPIC and liquor.

Mr. Speaker, before dealing with his charges with respect to the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, I find the logic associated with the question of the retailing of liquor in our province, and its relation to the drinking age as somewhat obscure. I'm wondering if the Member for Elmwood was intending to suggest, as indeed was the Member for Fort Rouge perhaps, that to change the retailing of liquor in our province from a public sector-private sector combination to one in which there might be some additional involvement of the private sector is somehow related to the alcoholism in our province. If that is indeed the point that they are trying to make, Mr. Speaker, I would question whether it would not be equally effective to pursue that, to simply reduce the hours of the retail sale of alcohol and somehow reduce the prevalence of alcoholism in our society. Certainly it appears that this did not happen during the interruption of the retailing of alcohol and all its forms through the government stores during the recent months. When that interruption occurred I'm not aware that anyone was able to relate any substantial drop in the health problems relating to the use of the products.

With respect to the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you Sir that the entire field of automobile insurance is one that has been given careful attention and consideration since this government took office. We have now had an opportunity to listen to many of the people and the viewpoints of those who are either involved in the provision of these services or in the reception of the products of the insurance corporation. We've had an opportunity to hear from many of the citizens of the province who are the customers of Autopac. I'd like to make it very clear Sir, that I am appreciative of the efficient, and dedicated manner in which the General Manager of the Manitoba Public Auto Insurance Corporation, and his staff, have managed the operations of Autopac. Certainly in any large organization serving the public there are going to be complaints, and some of these of course will be justified. But I am confident that every reasonable effort has been made to satisfy the needs of the public within the limitations of the system employed, and certainly often there have been very trying conditions in our province, as we all are aware of the experience under extreme weather conditions that occurred during the month of January and into the month of February, where the rate of claims greatly exceeded any experience in the history of the corporation.

I believe Sir, that the limited no-fault aspect of Autopac is one that has presently gained public acceptance and a further extension of this principle may certainly be warranted in the area of property damage as well as its present application in the personal injury field. In this connection

we have looked with some interest at the recent automobile insurance legislation in Quebec, and we will make a careful examination of all of the aspects of the automobile insurance industry to determine what improvements might be made in the public interest. I can say Mr. Speaker that whatever path is chosen, as a result of the review that will be made, I am sure that all elements of the industry and the society will not be totally satisfied, but we are determined to implement a comprehensive review that will certainly have the best chance of successfully leading to the successful implementation of whatever legislation may be necessary to serve the public in this important matter

We are naturally looking for ways in which the service we are now providing through Autopac can be improved, and to that end we will review with great care all of the developments that have occurred in the industry since the original public insurance procedure was adopted in our province.

I would like to say Sir, a few words on cable television in Manitoba. September the 18th, last year was an important day in the communications field because the day marked the culmination of years of effort of both the federal and provincial personnel to give residents outside the city of Winnipeg improved entertainment services. It was on that date that I was able to accompany representatives of the MTS and the Department of Communications in Ottawa to officiate at a ceremony that marked both the opening of the Westman media and the completion of the first step of the intercity broadband network between Winnipeg and Brandon. This was the first major link of a coaxial Broadband Network designed to join 30 communities in southern Manitoba with two-way interactive programming.

It was a formidable task, Mr. Speaker, yet it was the farsightedness and courage of a few individuals that piloted this project to its finish. I would certainly wish to commend the cablevision licensees in the rural parts of Manitoba for their singleness of purpose in the belief that they could assist in making this service possible and join with the telephone system in accomplishing this extension.

Cable television is a major entertainment source; it was first introduced to Manitoba in 1963, and in Thompson and in Pinawa. But it wasn't until 1967, under the previous provincial Conservative government that cable came into its own as a medium for telecommunications. Within the city of Winnipeg MTS and the licensed cable companies would each own components of the coaxial cable distribution network. There were questions in the House at that time as to the viability of the telephone company being in the television signal transport business, and of their providing a monopoly service to the two Winnipeg cable companies. But, Sir, if one were to examine the past record of MTS, this Crown corporation has a tradition of being a common carrier.

The then Minister of Communication, the Honourable Stewart MacLean answered, and I quote from the April 13th Hansard of 1967, "No exclusive contract has been granted", and leaving out a few irrelevant words, "The Manitoba Telephone System stands ready of course to do business with any other company on the same terms and conditions as has already been offered to the two companies in question." He was of course speaking of the two Winnipeg companies, Metro Videon Limited and Greater Winnipeg Cablevision.

Mr. Speaker, the statement which he made then certainly holds true today. News Services on the cable facility could only benefit us, the people of Manitoba. The cable is in place, and as yet it's not filled to capacity. To duplicate the network would be economically and socially prohibited.

From 1967 this agreement between MTS and the Winnipeg cable companies, which was unique in Canadian cable history, has stood the test of time and was in fact renewed in 1978 for a further five years. In terms of cable television subscriber acceptance, in Winnipeg an estimated 82 percent of residential dwellings are hooked up. It must be noted that the original rate of \$5.00 per subscriber hookup has not changed dramatically in the past 11 years.

The company on the eastern side of the Red River, Greater Winnipeg Cablevision saw fit to raise its rates 50 cents per subscriber in 1976, but even this price compares favourably with that of other companies of its size and quality in Canada.

Cable television in Winnipeg was a success, but the dilemma of providing the same quality of entertainment to those living in rural areas was very real. Neither the initiative nor the money was available to overcome this barrier until very recently. For awhile it even seemed that federal regulation would prohibit the extension of cable television outside of Winnipeg.

It was not until 1976 that the Canadian Radio Television Communication, the CRTC saw fit to call for cable television licence applications outside the Winnipeg area. To the CRTC Manitoba presented a unique case, in that whereas the cable companies in other provinces held various partial lease agreements with their "tel-cos" and/ or owned the distribution plant. In Manitoba a Crown corporation was part owner of the cable network.

As a result of numerous hearings and basing their decision on the policies and practices already

established in the province concerning hardware ownership, licences were granted to four rural cable operators in the hope that service would commence in the now licensed 29 rural communities as soon as possible. But the CRTC had dropped the condition of hardware ownership from the rural cable operators licences. It was appropriate that the telephone company build and operate the local broadband network as well as the system to be used to carry signals from community to community. After careful evaluation of the alternatives, it was decided that a coaxial cable network would be the best possible system for intra-community use. feed

To this end a new and more powerful type of forward amplifier was developed at the instigation of the technical staff of MTS. There are four communities presently linked on the ICBN and these are Brandon, Carberry, Portage and Selkirk.

In Brandon community about 50 percent of the residential community is now subscribing to cable television. In Carberry the level is up to 35 percent and in Portage 32 percent. I believe Selkirk is now in the neighbourhood of 20 percent participation. But the ICBN is not being used exclusively to transport television signals. Rather it has also been used for special events such as the Lions' Telethon and the Brandon Winter Games.

The quality of signal transmission is assured, and no doubt the quantity of signals transported will increase in the future. A local cable company in Brandon, Westman Media, will commence local regional programming soon, and there will be testing of the ICBN in the forthcoming year for future telecommunication services.

It was shortly after the last provincial election that brought this Conservative government to power, that I had the opportunity to meet the Federal Minister of Communications, Madame Sauve, and to review with her the objectives we were trying to achieve. I was pleased to note that our desire to see the extension of cable service was mutual.

At this point it may have occurred to you that out of 30 communities licensed in Manitoba for cable television, only five actually have service. The problem is the question of cost-sharing arrangements that has to be decided among the association of cable operators in Manitoba. The idea of cost-sharing and cost-sharing of the delivery of signals was originally proposed, Mr. Speaker, in 1974 by the Winnipeg cable operators. At that time they proposed a rate of \$1.00 to be fixed on the Winnipeg cable subscriber for the extension of service to rural areas. Even the CRTC stipulated a cost-sharing arrangement, so that the smaller centres would enjoy cable television.

It was in their August 8th, 1977 public announcement that CRTC stated, "The Commission will require the establishment of a consortium in order that all licencees may develop methods of cost-sharing which they consider most appropriate to permit the distribution of the approved cable signals, the approved television signals to the various licensed systems."

The consortium has been in existence over a year and still has not come to a decision. Across Canada, Mr. Speaker, there are various methods in use today for the sharing of such intercity delivery facilities, for example, in Alberta the cable companies lease all their intercity facilities from the Alberta Government telephones.

The rates are set by AGT and in the Maritime provinces a consortium of cable operators was formed and developed a sharing formula based on a maximum charge of \$1.75 per subscriber per month, applicable to any community having at least 1,500 potential households.

Following a discussion with Madame Sauve in December, 1977, it was decided that to prevent any charges against MTS of arbitrary rate-setting. All rates would be adjudicated by an independent body, the Public Utilities Board. Yet, even with this action nothing was done to break the deadlock over cost-sharing.

Personally I find it difficult to estimate the immense value of the communications systems in this province. These services which we take for granted here in the city should be extended to the rural areas.

There is some question as to when the remaining 25 communities will receive cable television. MTS, as a responsible public utility, cannot commit funds to the further construction of the ICBN until revenues from such a system can be assured. I can only refer rural people to the various ACOM members. I have tried on numerous occasions to bring this stalemate to the federal authorities' attention, both the Department of Communications and the CRTC, but both parties have expressed an unwillingness to interfere.

In 1978 it is my hope that these problems will be resolved. I think all members of the Assembly will agree that we would like to see it possible to extend the programming and the other services that can be provided by a cable system to as many parts of the province as possible and we trust that these difficulties that are now being experienced will be overcome in the very near future.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have digressed at some length because I wanted to place on the record some of the responses which were elicited and were perhaps required in connection with many reports and comments that have been made over the past six months, by various media systems.

I trust that the difficulties we are now encountering will be of a temporary nature and that the licensed members of the Association of Cable Television Operators in Manitoba, will be able to resolve these problems in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, I would close, merely, by again reminding the Leader of the Opposition that I find his positions somewhat of a paradox in respect to his interviews with the press and his announced positions relative to restraint in the administration of the affairs of our province. And he now, Mr. Speaker, seems to indicate that he feels that much greater public sector spending is that which is required to provide the stimulus to our economy.

We again remind him of the example that was placed on the record for all of us to note and that, in 1977 when deficit spending under the NDP administration achieved major proportions, the real growth of our economy was the lowest since prior to World War II. I think it would be incumbent upon the Leader of the Opposition to explain what really is his position in respect to the policies of this government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it's always a privilege to follow such an impassioned, spirited address such as the kind that we usually receive from the Honourable Member for Brandon West, and I say that somewhat facetiously, but I hope that the honourable member will take it kindly because I have tremendous respect for him and for the manner in which he serves the people of the Province of Manitoba.

And despite the fact that he would have somewhat less flamboyance than some other members in the House, I would never criticize the substance of his remarks. And I say again, only facetiously, that it's a pleasure to follow such a spirited and impassioned address.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to begin my remarks by expressing some degree of appreciation for some of the gratuitous comments that have been made over the past three months by members of the opposition, which I have read about in the newspapers, some of which have been made personally to me, some of which have come third and secondhand, to the effect that I am their first choice for the leadership, Mr. Speaker, of the New Democratic Party. —(Interjection)—

And, Mr. Speaker, we know very well that the Conservative "kiss of death" is intended to be just that and we take it in that light. It rather, Mr. Speaker, reminds me of the story of two competing salesmen who met in a railway station in Minneapolis — and this is an old story, that's why I talk about a railway station — and these people competed all over the United States and always wanted to know what the other fellow was doing, and they always lied to each other. And one fellow said to the other quite innocently, "Where are you going?" And the other fellow said, "I am going to Chicago." So the first fellow said, "Thank you very much," and he went back and he figured out every angle of the other fellow's business and he was determined, and came to the absolute conclusion, that his competitor was going to Chicago, besides which he knew that the fellow had a ticket to go to Chicago, which made it a certainty that he was on his way to Chicago. So he walked up to the other fellow and he said, "Look, when you tell me you're going to Chicago, it must always be because you are going somewhere else. I happen to know that you are going to Chicago, so why are you lying to me?"

So, Mr. Speaker, let these statements and the interpretation of these statements reflect the fact that the Conservatives are not entire fools and that they know, Mr. Speaker, the history of the New Democratic Party. There have been some criticisms, Mr. Speaker, of the strength of the opposition. I think last year that the opposition in this party did a commendable, Mr. Speaker — I go much further — they did a very strong job. I don't know if in the first year of opposition, any party has been so successful in undermining the recent vote of confidence that was given to a new government, as successfully as we did in the last session of the Legislature — and I, Mr. Speaker, have no fear whatsoever about the ability of the opposition. Furthermore, there are people in this House who have a little bit longer memories and they remember, Mr. Speaker, when the New Democratic Party started to hurt the Conservative Government and it was between, Mr. Speaker, 1966 and 1969. It wasn't in moderate terms, Mr. Speaker. The party in those years and in this Legislature fought on the firm propositions, Mr. Speaker, that we would eliminate Medicare, which was considered to be a very radical and dangerous program . . .

A MEMBER: Medicare premiums.

MR. GREEN: . . . Medicare premiums, excuse me. A radical and dangerous program, now accepted by most governments in this country, Conservative as well.

We said, Mr. Speaker, that the public of Manitoba will underwrite their own automobile insurance, a radical and dangerous program, Mr. Speaker, but one which was fought for by the people in

this Legislature.

We said, Mr. Speaker, that we would reorganize greater Winnipeg, something that no other party was willing to make a commitment on, although the Leader of the Liberal Party — which doesn't seem to be around — said that he would do it and then faced with the opposition, immediately crumpled, something that we did not do.

All of those suggestions, Mr. Speaker, were radical; they were said to be dangerous; they did not involve the expenditure of money; but they were firm, clear commitments which built up confidence in the New Democratic Party opposition and gave them, Mr. Speaker, a mandate to form a government.

And, Mr. Speaker, without reflections on anybody who participated in this party — and there have been many people — those Conservatives who have a good memory know why they were defeated. And, Mr. Speaker, I say this because it is important that it be said: That the leader of the party at that time was someone who, fortuitously, happened to have the name of "Paulley", and I say that, not with great deference to my colleague from Selkirk, I say it in deference to everybody who served in the New Democratic Party and made it possible for us to overtake the government benches. And when it is suggested by honourable friends opposite — and it has been their chief stock in trade over the last eight years — that some form of moving away from conviction is necessary in order to give this party credibility, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that we are not going to be misled by that kind of suggestion; we are not going to be induced by it; we are not going to be intimidated by it, either by members of the press or members of the opposition; we are going to pursue those things which make each one of us say that we want to be New Democrats; because if it was good enough for us — and we are discerning people — then it must be good enough for many people throughout this province who have the same, or better, intelligence than we have.

And that is the way this party was founded; that is the way it grew, and that is the way it will grow in the future. And those people who want to make fun of us as an opposition — because somehow there has been a change in personnel — I say, Mr. Speaker, they may do it — I'm not weakened by the opposition — and as a last resort, Mr. Speaker, if the opposition is terribly weak on this side of the House, at least we have Spivak, and I say that, Mr. Speaker, with really not the facetiousness which I referred to from the Member for Brandon West, because, Mr. Speaker, what Minister does not know that when a memo is written, that that memo is somehow going to find its way to the media?

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many desks that memo was left on until somehow it got to the press. And I would say that the only reason for the delay was that somehow, somebody was trying to avoid this opposition that came — and the strongest words of opposition, Mr. Speaker, but they confirm many of the things that we have said — that the protracted restraint would better be known as a pretended restraint and that there on the other side are the great pretenders. And that is what we have had and that is what we will have, Mr. Speaker, because we keep getting these people talking about spenders on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, we are infants as compared to the Conservatives. They are giants when it comes to spending. Who introduced Manitoba to spending? Do you know that in 1966, immediately prior to an election, the Conservative Premier of this province announced — someone help me — was it a 2 billion dollar Nelson River Development Program? Was it one million at that time? One billion, Mr. Speaker, a billion dollar Nelson River Development Program to bring hydro electricity to northern Manitoba so that we could sell it to the States. And, Mr. Speaker, that's an interesting thing, because nobody has conducted an inquiry as to how much waste was involved in that billion dollar program. Mr. Speaker, I tell you that I offer to be the Commissioner of Inquiry to determine the validity of that program, and I will serve without fee. And I'm sure that you will all regard this as a great service on my part to the people of the Province of Manitoba. A billion dollar Nelson River Development Program and a hundred million dollar program to build a pulp mill in The Pas.

If we translated that, Mr. Speaker, into an announcement that had to be the equivalent today, we would have to announce a three billion dollar hydro program, because that's what's happened to money since 1966, and a 300 million dollar program to build some type of industrial establishment in The Pas. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in what you call the wildest socialist dream, has there ever been that kind of spending with respect to the Province of Manitoba. It happened previously under a Conservative administration and, Mr. Speaker, I say to you, with all due respect and with the greatest of conviction, that it will be the Conservatives again to bail out a bankrupt ideology, who will again become the spenders, and we find the germs of that in the Throne Speech.

We are going to, during the Budget Debate, really examine this restraint. I don't know how one — the pretended restraint — how one gets to restraint when they have spent more money and planned for a bigger operational deficit than was in the immediate previous year. I say that, Mr.

Speaker, knowing that the total deficit included operation and capital in the previous year, but their operating deficit was planned for on a much larger scale than the operational deficit of the previous New Democratic Party. And we're going to, Mr. Speaker, we're going to, during this session. We were warned by the Prime Minister last year that, as the session unfolds, there will be horror stories. — (Interjection) — Yes, the First Minister. This year we are going to be Edgar Allan Poe.

As the session unfolds, Mr. Speaker, there will be horror stories, if not one a day, I say one a week, as to what is going on within this administration, its performance as compared with its protestations and its suggested moods. Mr. Speaker, I think that that will unfold as Mr. Trudeau has said, as it should.

Now Mr. Speaker, what about this Throne Speech? I've looked at the Throne Speech and, in some respects it has some of the frailties and the difficulties which I would accept as criticism of our own Throne Speech. Somehow a Throne Speech has come to be a document where every department sends in what it is doing and then it is written down into the Throne Speech. So we have a whole bunch of administrative measures or statements by Deputy Ministers as to what their department hopes to achieve, and I can tell my honourable friends, so that they will not be disturbed that for the most part my arguments with this Throne Speech, insofar as administrative matters are concerned, are very simply arguments that I could have as a Member of a Cabinet of a New Democratic Party government; that in many respects they are administrative, even, Mr. Speaker, with respect to saying that there are going to be reviews. The results of the reviews will be much different, but reviews are something that I would argue about in Cabinet, and I would not really make an argument on a philosophical position as to whether the reviewer should or should not be coming. Mr. Speaker, I have

As a matter of fact, said and I believe that one of these reviews is a total smoke screen, that the review of the capacity of the public to underwrite their own insurance program is not going to result in any material changes in the Autopac program. Unless, Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are far more stupid than I give them credit for. Because the Premier of Saskatchewan was there, and he was an arch-Conservative, a philosophical Conservative, and when the insurance industry came to him and said would they change the socialist Autopac program, his words were — this is Ross Thatcher: "I may not be a socialist, neither am I a fool". Now the Conservatives, if they're going to the review and say we are not socialists, on the other hand we are fools, then they will change the Autopac program. But I don't think that they are going to do that type of thing.

Because, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that they are going to say that the public of this province isn't operating one of the most successful, efficient and fairest underwriting of automobile insurance programs in the country. And if they do, then my learned friend and my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, who said that they had better have short-term leases, and quoted me as saying so, and I repeat what I said last year, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sorry the Minister of Highways is not in the House, that the people from Toronto, if they think they're going to take over the insurance industry of this province, they had better double their expense accounts for the cost of doing it, because the road from Toronto to Winnipeg is also the road from Winnipeg to Toronto, and I urge the Minister of Highways to keep that road in good shape if that is what he is intending with respect to automobile insurance.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are three items. I have indicated that they are for the most part the kind of discussion that could take place as between — different arguments in this Throne Speech could take place within a political party. The ones that really distinguish the Conservatives from the New Democrats as I have always perceived it, and what made me go to become a New Democrat, are relatively few but relatively important.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the difference between members on that side of the House and Members on this side of the House? Members on that side of the House believe that society should be so governed that certain people with strengths, initiative, imagination should create — should follow their aspirations, create wealth for themselves and in doing so, have this wealth accrued to the benefit of all members of society. And that the government should keep its hands off, make sure that these people are not disturbed and that they are given every opportunity to use their imagination in that direction. Have I been unfair to the views of the Members of the opposite side of the House? I don't think so, Mr. Speaker.

The Members on this side of the House, for the most part, say that the elected representatives of the people, acting as an instrument of the people's aspirations and needs and social and economic desires, are able to collectively do things for all of the people of the Province of Manitoba, much more capably in many more areas than are presently being done by people collectively. And those are the issues, Mr. Speaker, upon which we differ, and in this particular Throne Speech, I have identified three areas where I think the government is saying that it is going to abandon to the private sector things which are presently being done by the people of the Province of Manitoba collectively. And I'll identify, if I can, what I think those things are.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I say the government has demonstrated a profound doubt and insecurity about its own ideological commitment by undertaking to commit \$118 million of taxpayers' money to provide social welfare assistance to private business. And it's in the Speech, Mr. Speaker. It's relatively obscure but it's in the Speech. This government that said it's not going to use public money for business has really told the people of the Province of Manitoba not that it won't use taxpayers' money for business, but that it won't use it for public business. Because somehow Conservatives are saying, and it really is not Conservative philosophy, it's some type of bastardization of the ideology, that it's okay for the public to give grants and donations to private enterprise which on its own cannot be successful, but it is not proper for the government to invest the same amount of money in trying to develop public programs where the private programs have proved to be a failure. And here it is, Mr. Speaker. They are intended to stimulate development in the private sector in various areas of industry, tourism, agriculture, northern Manitoba, energy and water resources, all in the private sector. To the tune, Mr. Speaker, of \$100 million

Now, do the Honourable Members know that that amount of money is more than any five year accumulated deficit of the Manitoba Development Corporation? There has been no five years running in which \$100 million was lost by the Manitoba Development Corporation. And even then, those moneys were advanced on the possibility that they would realize a return. In this case, there is no losses envisaged, because, Mr. Speaker, according to the accounting practices of these brilliant businessmen over on the other side, and I think that the Member for Minnedosa would blush, if you give the money and you do not set up a receivable you do not have to charge interest and you have no losses. If there are receivables, there are no losses. And in this case, Mr. Speaker, there are no receivables, and therefore no losses with which to embarrass the government.

And similarly, Mr. Speaker, on page 4, the creation of new processing, manufacturing and job opportunities, and I'm reading from page 4, in that regard I am informed that Canada and Manitoba recently signed an 18.5 million general development subsidiary agreement with emphasis on value added crop production which will allow for the cost-sharing of programs directly aimed at meeting that objective.

So we are talking, Mr. Speaker, of \$118 million of taxpayers' money. It's true. It's not all Manitoba money; a healthy share of it will be public moneys that we receive from the Federal Government. But Mr. Speaker, isn't it ideologically contrary to the Conservative position that \$118 million is going to be advanced as grants, as donations to the private sector so that if, Mr. Speaker, they are a success, the private sector — and my honourable friends will praise them for it, will run around saying, "Look, ma, I'm a rugged individualist". And if it's a failure there are no losses. There are no losses, because there has been no receivable set up for the money, and that is the first story, Mr. Speaker.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the government has indicated that it intends to dispossess an overwhelming majority of the people of the Province of Manitoba of property which belongs to the people of the Province of Manitoba, by alienating public lands to private individuals. These private individuals will then have control of this property to the exclusion of all other Manitobans, and will also realize the appreciating value of this property which rightfully belongs to all Manitobans. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask the businessmen in this House: is it good business in a period of inflation to dispossess yourself of lands and whose lands are being dispossessed? The land presently belonging to all of the people of the Province of Manitoba. And it's going to be sold, presumably, to private individuals. It all sounds great, Mr. Speaker. There will be private ownership in land, but let's take that to its logical conclusion. If everybody in the province owned property, wouldn't that be the Conservative dream? That everybody is the owner of property. And if that is the Conservative dream, do not they realize that every time they take a piece of public property and turn it over to a private individual, they reduce the opportunity of everybody owning property?

It's the same, Mr. Speaker, as what Mr. Bennett has done. Mr. Bennett has an industry that belongs to all the people of British Columbia. He says if he gives everybody a share, they become private owners. Do any of you believe that? They were owners before. What will happen is that those shares, now in the hands of private individuals, will be bartered for between those individuals until a few own it and the many do not own it, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact is, that that is what is going to happen.

I want to remind the honourable members that when the Wildlife Federation was complaining about the fact that they could not hunt on a private farmer's land I defended the right of the private farmer to say that he does not have to let a hunter go on his land. But I also said — so that the citizens of Manitoba will not be possessed — we will not alienate property now belonging to all of us and give it to one of us, and that's what the Conservatives are determined to do.

We are not talking — nobody has ever in the years of New Democratic Party government except in terms of acquiring land for definite purposes — not a single farmer in the Province of Manitoba had his land expropriated or taken compulsorily by the government, merely in order that the

will have more land. The expropriation practices were the same as under the previous government. What we did say is, that we will not alienate any more public lands. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that that is the second area.

The third area: The government has promulgated a declaration of dependence in favour of the private mining companies for the development of our natural resources and has thereby declared that the public generally will not receive a fair share of the wealth which will be created from the exploitation of these resources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this probably is the one that's closest to me because when I was a member of the administration I was involved in programs whereby the public of this province started to engage in an exploration and development program with respect to our natural resources. And the fact is, that that program resulted in an increased level of exploration activity in the Province of Manitoba, not a decreased level but an increased level.

It has also resulted in the finding of a mining property which I am advised will more than pay for every penny that went into that exploration program — and that's what's so embarrassing, Mr. Speaker, to the Tories — they're going to have this property; they're going to figure out some way to get rid of it so it will not be demonstrated that the public's exploration program was a success. And the reason they are doing it, Mr. Speaker, is that they consider it somehow unholy for the public to be successful in any of its activities. And in that regard, Mr. Speaker, they are prepared — even at the expense of any reasonable ideological thesis — to say that there will be public aid to private everything.

And, Mr. Speaker, that is directly consistent with their program with regard to schools. It's public aid to private schools; it's public aid to private business; it's public aid to private mining companies; it's public aid to private . . . ; it's public aid to anything except what the public already owns and that has to be interdicted without any question, Mr. Speaker.

And my Leader, the Member for Selkirk, the Leader of the Opposition, he drew somewhat of a chuckle from some of the members of the opposition when he said that they believe in government by a social and economic elite. Well, Mr. Speaker, isn't that abundantly true? Isn't that without question what they do believe in? When they came into power who did they go to in order to formulate their task force? Did they go to the average person? Did they go to the labour movement? They went, Mr. Speaker, to the Great-West Life and to the Chamber of Commerce and they said, "We want you to govern our province." —(Interjection)— Pardon me? Mr. Speaker, I have enough confidence in the people of the Province of Manitoba that I don't need your request. The request and the mandate will come, as inevitably as I am standing here and you are sitting there, and at that time, Mr. Speaker, it will be used, as it has been in this province, in other provinces in this country and in other countries in the world, where the same kind of thing that we are talking about occurs in every political form which is discernible.

But isn't it true, Mr. Speaker, if somebody wanted to find out or to deal with medical practice in the Province of Manitoba, would they go to the Minister of Health or would they go to the Manitoba Clinic? If somebody wanted to find out what is going to happen with regard to mining exploration and development in the Province of Manitoba, would they go to the Minister of Mines or would they go to the President of INCO? Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, some by mistake may go to the Minister of Mines but when they get there he will take them to the President of INCO. He will take them out of his office to the President of INCO because he won't be able to tell them what is the future of mining development in the Province of Manitoba; and he will say, "In order to give you that information I have to take you to the government," and the government is the President of INCO, and the President of Sherritt and the President of the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Corporation. Isn't that a fact? Can the Minister, from his seat, tell us what is going to happen with regard to the mining development?

And, Mr. Speaker, if somebody went to the Minister of Labour last year, and I now even say this year, and asked him what is going to be the future labour developments and labour initiatives in the Province of Manitoba, where would he go? Would he go to the Minister of Labour? No, Mr. Speaker, he would go to Mr. Atkins of the Builders' Exchange and he'd go to the labour section of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce; and if he didn't go there the Minister would take him there and say that this is the area, this is the place where we get this type of information.

Mr. Speaker, if somebody wanted to know what the future taxation programs of the province of Manitoba was going to be, would he go to the Minister of Finance or would he go to the Great-West Life? Would he go to Investors' Syndicate or would he go to the Manitoba Club? Well, Mr. Speaker, by accident he might walk into the office of the Minister of Finance but the Minister of Finance would arrange a luncheon meeting with him at the Manitoba Club where he would meet the President of Investors' Syndicate and the President of Great-West Life and the President of the other firm that I have referred to, or the Royal Bank of Canada, whoever it may be.

So when we are discussing this let's put our cards on the table. You may say that that's where

the government should be. You may say that those people are much more competent than the elected representatives of the people, but at least there should be no pretense about what is happening. And that, really, Mr. Speaker, is the difference. The difference is that this party says that the people are capable of governing; and the other party says, in those articulate words, "He who governs least, governs best. That if we only leave these rich geniuses alone they will put a chicken in every pot and they will put food in every stomach and they will put a roof over every head."

Well, Mr. Speaker, for those people who do not have chickens in every pot, who do not have roofs over every head — substantial shelter — I say, don't stand on one foot waiting for these geniuses to do the job because they will not do the job; and that it will be recognized that the public needs somebody to do it and to do it effectively.

And, Mr. Speaker, eventually the Conservative Party, this government, will move to that type of program. They will move to Robinism. They will agree that there has to be public initiative because it cannot be turned off; because we cannot permit the problem to stagnate.

The Attorney-General the other day, he didn't try to deal with the problem. He looked for someone to blame. We have figures, Mr. Speaker, which indicate that in the last year of New Democratic Party government there were 177 foreclosures. That in the first full year of Conservative Government there are 444 foreclosures. Now, these are things that you can grasp. The person who knows that his house is being sold because he cannot make the payments, cannot be told, Mr. Speaker, that, "Yes, but you're living in a wonderful capitalist society and you are free of Socialism." He cannot be told that.

Now, those figures are pretty frightening. They are not nearly as difficult as the ones that I gave first, Mr. Speaker, and I want to indicate that the Registrar of the Land Titles Office is incorrect; that when I went in there I asked him what could be obtained which we obtained last year, and it's he who thought it was notices of sale, but the figures that he gave did not have to be compiled, nobody has to pay for them and one wonders why an MLA stands in a worse position to the public to get those figures; and those figures showed, Mr. Speaker, 444 foreclosures over 270 in 1977 and 176 in 1976.

Now what did the Attorney-General say about those figures? Don't they bother you at all? If they bother you, Mr. Speaker, don't worry because he found the answer. He said, "What about the Hydro rates? It must be people whose Hydro rates have gone up and therefore cannot make the payments." Well, Mr. Speaker, that's not going to wash, you know, because the previous year when there were anything like 444 was in 1965 and at that time there were 455 foreclosures. And in the intervening years they went down in 1968 to 252 and 1969 to 207, and 1976 to 172, and they say — somewhere near those figures, I don't have them all exactly — but the previous high was 455. And at that time Mr. Cass-Beggs had never been to the Province of Manitoba.

There was only one thing, one straight line between 1965 and 1978. What was the same in both of those years? Can anybody tell me? What was the same in 1965 and in 1978? Does anybody know? No, Mr. Speaker. They are both years with Conservative governments. Those two things were the same. And there was no Hydro program to blame it on; and there were no Hydro rates to blame it on. And, Mr. Speaker, the other figures which are going to be dealt with as the year goes by, with respect to the sins of omission and commission on the part of the Conservative administration, are going to follow during the session.

The big problem with their program is that it is both bad business and bad economics. There is no economic expert and my friend, I hope the bank manager will confirm it, no economic expert who says that the way of dealing with things is to have public money poured into private hands. There are some who say that public moneys should be used as investment capital, and they are Socialist. There are some who say that private people should use their initiative, and those are capitalists. But only idiots say that the public should finance private investments, and that's where you were in 1966 and that's where you'll wind up again when things start to stagnate.

So it is bad economics, Mr. Speaker. And Mr. Speaker, it is bad business. These people who suggest that they are a businesslike government, you show me, Mr. Speaker, one mining executive who has a certificate insane or who has not been certified as being insane, who will say that if he owned mining property that he would deal with it in the way in which our Minister of Mines is dealing with mining property belonging to the people of the Province of Manitoba, namely, that he will give other mining companies the right to exploit that property without paying any royalties if there are no profits — just take the ore out of the ground and if you can show a balance sheet with no profit you can have it for free — and who says that in order for there to be activity he has to induce other mining companies to come in and develop his property. And if you will find one business mining executive who will say that that is a sane policy, Mr. Speaker, with his property — he will say it's a sane policy with regard to the public property — but if he will say it's a sane policy with regard to his property, I will apologize to this Administration. But, Mr. Speaker, don't

stand on one leg waiting for the apology. I'll conclude, Mr. Speaker, with two or three sentences.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Member's time has expired.

MR. GREEN: I'll conclude, Mr. Speaker, with two or three sentences. I won't prevail on my honourable friend's time. I do say, Mr. Speaker, that the main features of the Conservative administration policy will collapse, firstly because there is no economics, political science upon which it is based and it will fail; and secondly, because it happens to be the most reprehensible type of business practice. Mr. Speaker, I look to my authority at a Premier, who has indicated that he is going to do the following in the next year:

He is going to spend, Mr. Speaker, \$200 million annually, that's one-eighth of our entire budget on low interest mortgages; he's going to spend help municipalities \$300 million and he's going to spend \$500 thousand each year for an expanded program to help handicapped citizens. Mr. Speaker, do you know that that's more than a third of the entire budget of the Province of Manitoba? And who is engaged in this wild spending program? Premier Lougheed of the Province of Alberta, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. DON ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like at this moment, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate you on your ongoing duties as the overall authority in this Chamber, and wish you success.

I'd like to, although neither are present, I'd like to certainly go on the record as congratulating both the Mover and the Seconder of the Throne Speech on Friday of last week. They both did very excellent jobs.

I'd like also to, well, if he's still here, to congratulate the interim Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Selkirk. I think the party has made a formidable choice in their choice of the Member for Selkirk as their interim leader. And after listening to his reply to the Throne Speech on Monday I can only wish him every success in his endeavor to become, not the interim leader, but the true Leader of the Opposition over the next few months. And I think it definitely would be of a benefit to all Manitobans should he become the Leader of the Opposition, and I am confident that he could well serve the Province of Manitoba over the next several of years as Leader of the Opposition.

I noted in following the preceding speaker, the Honourable Member for Inkster, I noticed a certain attitude of defeatism which I've never heard in any of his speeches before, and it has come as some shock to me when he mentioned during 1969 through 1966, that the Opposition then was led by a man by the name of Paulley. I can only draw one conclusion from that since that particular Paulley never became Premier of the Province, I can only follow from his remarks that he doesn't expect this Pawley to become Premier of the Province either, and I have never heard such defeatism from the Member for Inkster before in my life.

Now, also I noted with a certain amount of interest that the Member from Inkster indicates that this province does not have any restraint programme, and I think if I recall correctly, on Monday the interim Leader of the Opposition indicated that there was a restraint programme, and that it was harmful to the province, etc, etc. Once again, I think it's only symbolic that the Member for Inkster is at odds with the majority of his party in terms of opinions put forth, and, what is that saying, the more things change, the more things they remain the same. And I trust that that is remaining the same. I also noted an interesting reference to the \$118 million that our government, as a free enterprise government, is putting forth in aid to private companies. I note, with a great deal of interest, that that particular source of moneys is via the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion in Ottawa, and he made the comparison between our particular programme and their efforts through MDC where in no five-year period running did MDC total up the amount of moneys that we're planning to expend in the next five years. And, once again, the Member for Inkster is using his parliamentary debating skills to thoroughly cloud the issue, because he fails to point out during a certain number of years when he was in government, DREE in fact did put a lot of money into the economy of Manitoba, into the private firms and you know, that I suppose in a lot of ways demonstrates to the public of Manitoba, the change in attitude of government that has taken place now that we've taken over.

No longer, will we as a Government of Manitoba allow DREE, a Federal Department, to pump money in without our say so. Instead, we are now developing a DREE programme in co-operation with our Economic Development Minister, to make sure the funds are used properly in Manitoba. That is something that is totally foreign obviously to the NDP government of the previous years

because the money came in without so much as a say so. But nevertheless, I always note with interest the Member for Inkster's speech, and I certainly hope that defeatism doesn't continue.

On Monday, when the interim leader made a reference to the out-migration of people from Manitoba, I certainly hope that he was not referring to the most recent out-migration of people from Manitoba of a family of considerable note in the province, that being the former Premier of this province and his family, who have now moved to Ottawa to become our country's representative of the Queen. I hope he doesn't, with the same broad brush, paint that as being a negative out-migration of people from Manitoba, because I'm sure that all Manitobans will agree with me that that is possibly the best out-migration of personnel that we have ever had in the past number of years in Manitoba, and I don't think that even the Honourable Member for The Pas would disagree with that as being very, very . excellent out-migration of people from Manitoba.

The interim leader started out his speech very interestingly the other day. He started it out as a stand-up comedian and he had quite a few very laughable parts in there, a few jokes. But unfortunately he ended it up as a fall-down critic. What took nine pages of Hansard to record could have been put probably in a page and a half. And if he indicates and criticizes our Throne Speech as being vague, and not positive, certainly he would have to classify his own reply to the Throne Speech as rather vague and not positive. His whole speech lacked a lot of positive points in it. He did, however, make one positive point, and the one positive that the interim leader made in his speech was the reference to the insurance companies. Now that we have invited them back to the insurance field in Manitoba, I believe he said, he would show them the road back down to Toronto. That was the one positive aspect and unfortunately he didn't speak it with the same forcefulness and constitutional fortitude that the Member from Inkster said it originally one year ago, and again today, and maybe that is an indicator of how positive positive can be from the interim leader.

In his speech he dwelt on criticisms of our government as being inefficient managers and driving businesses out of the province, driving people out of the Province, and that in fact is contained in his first amendment. Well, in terms of inefficient managers, Mr. Speaker, I have to disagree with the interim leader. I think we've been most efficient managers of the Manitoba economy, and I point to the \$83 million tax reduction that we implemented in the last fiscal year. That certainly is not the efforts of an inefficient government. We reduced the deficit of the previous NDP administration by 40 percent. That doesn't seem like an inefficient operation of government. Reducing taxes by \$83 million and deficit by 40 percent, that doesn't seem like inefficient government. We increased government spending by a level of 3 percent, which was the lowest increase of any government in Canada in the last fiscal year. That doesn't seem like an inefficient government. That seems like a rather efficient government. We reduced the Civil Service by some 1,800 positions. Once again, I think a lot of Manitobans would agree that that was rather an efficient job done.

if that is a Socialist's concept of inefficiency in government, then I have but one question that hasn't been answered either by the interim leader, the Member for Inkster, or anyone else over there. I just want one simple answer. What is your suggestion to replace these inefficiencies with your Socialist efficiencies? Are we going to see, as we have in the past eight years, that the taxes are going to go up instead of down? Is that your answer to inefficiency, to raise taxes? Are we going to see an NDP regime increase government spending? Is that your idea of efficiency? Are we going to see an NDP regime hire more Civil Servants? Is that their idea of efficiency? I think maybe the gentlemen opposite should begin talking to some people in Manitoba and find out which they would consider to be the efficient way to operate a government, whether the people of Manitoba would consider lowering taxes, lowering deficit, lowering the level of increase in government spending, lowering the number of Civil Service, is inefficient, and that their method of raising taxes, increasing the deficit, hiring more people, is an example of efficiency. I think they'd get the answer pretty quickly. They got the answer in October of 77, and they would get it again should they present that kind of efficiency to the people of Manitoba.

Now, another aspect that these inefficient managers, as we are being called over here, have done to negate what they're saying about us being inefficient managers, is the fact that as of today this government is right on target with its spending estimates. Now, how do we know that we're right on target with our spending estimates? Well, I think all gentlemen in this House received this. It's called the Quarterly Financial Report, issued by the Honourable Minister of Finance for the nine months, April to December, 1978. Now I realize that the NDP members opposite don't know what that is, because such a document didn't exist under their regime. As a matter of fact, quarterly reporting of financial situations of the Province was one of the efficient moves that this government

has already put into place.

Now, does that really mean that much? What does it mean that the fact now that there are Quarterly Financial Reports under a Conservative administration, and there wasn't under the NDP administration? And what does it mean to the average Manitoban? Well, probably the average Manitoban won't take too much interest in this. He probably won't take too much interest in the fact that there will be an interim year-end report issued sometime in June, showing the projected financial position of the Province, and it was accurate last year within \$300 thousand. Well, what will be very interesting to the voting people of Manitoba, by having these kind of reports available to them will be the kind of deceit that the government of 1977 perpetrated upon the voters of Manitoba in going and saying that their deficit for this year, for that particular year, was only going to be \$25 million when in fact at September 30, 1977 it was over \$10 million. That kind of deceit will not be able to be done because quarterly financial reports will be here and available. That kind of thing won't be used by would-be government seeking re-election. That kind of misinformation is long gone and let us hope that the people of Manitoba never again have a Socialist Government in here, who, the first thing no doubt that they will do, is junk the quarterly financial report because they don't want to remain accountability for the finance of the province. But let's watch with care, if, in the even this province is so disadvantaged to ever get another Socialist Government, see how quickly that goes. See what happens to the finances of the province.

It is interesting to listen, not only to Throne Speech Debates, but the Member for Brandon East made some very interesting comments in the media over the past several days and the nub of it all was that we were running an inefficient government. We were doing a terrible job of managing the economy — on and on and on. Well, you know, ladies and gentlemen of the Assembly, I think criticism from the Member for Brandon East is most important to consider at this point in time, considering his impeccable record of financial control within the departments that he administered during his term on the front bench of this government when he was in government.

Last year, during the estimates of Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, I would like to point out one small thing that appeared in Hansard and I thought was very interesting to bring to you gentlemen opposite as an example when you're criticizing us for inefficiency, as an example of how the Member for Brandon East handled his department. The discussion last year and this was on Tuesday, May 30th, 1978, was on ten public housing units that were approved in Russell, Manitoba. Now the conversation is between Mr. Evans and Mr. Johnston. Now, Mr. Evans is saying here: "Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know what formula was used to decide on the construction of those particular units. As a matter of fact, I wasn't really aware that they were really going up until I guess they were going up". Now, Mr. Johnston says: "I beg your pardon?" Mr. Evans goes on to say: "I wasn't aware that those particular family units were going up, you know, until you know, the process was in operation." Now, there's the kind of financial efficiency that the Member for Brandon East in 1976 had going for him in his department and he's sitting on his hind legs and criticizing us for inefficiencies in government? Boy, I wouldn't let that cat back in the canary cage.

There's another area too that the Member for Brandon East, al whilst he was Minister responsible for Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, had as one of his socialist fantasies a housing project in the Town The Pas and there were some fifty some odd units that were built by taxpayers' money in the Province of Manitoba, and bear in mind, that this is built by a Minister who is criticizing us for inefficiency. But that particular Minister, the Member for Brandon East, Mr. Evans, had constructed over 50 units of public housing with the intent of selling them to the various people of Manitoba. While I was up in The Pas, approximately nine months ago, and at that point in time there wasn't one single unit that was sold and they were all ready for occupancy at that time for about 8 or 9 months. There wasn't one single unit sold. They were begging people to move in at reduced rents and they still had no people. Now, why him and his efficient ways, built those fifty some odd housing units? Well, only the Mickey Mouse economics of the Member for Brandon East could tell us, but at any rate they're there, and now as a result of that socialist scheme we've dropped almost \$300,000 net loss to the taxpayers of Manitoba in disposing of those 50 some odd housing units.

That is some of the socialist efficiencies that we, the voting public of Manitoba, are supposed to re-elect them on because they are so efficient and such good keepers of the public purse. Those are two only small examples, but it just strikes me wrong, — "Well, Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, I wasn't really aware that they were going up until I guess they were going up". That's the Minister responsible for the department saying that. That's the kind of financial control that was obvious in the previous administration.

Now the second point that the Interim Leader mentioned was that we were driving out businesses from the Province of Manitoba and the press ss has echoed this. We've heard this in the press now. We have an editorial writer in The Dufferin Leader, The Valley Leader, who's echoing

socialist statistics, and it just strikes me dumb as to how the out-migration of business has become so prominent in the last year, when it happened for 8 years under the socialists and nobody knew about it; nobody said a word about it and they would say: "Well, it didn't happen", but it did happen. It happened every day. There wasn't a hue and cry about it and I wonder why. I wonder where our responsible press was then. It was said in here. Members of the Conservative Opposition were pointing it out to you but it fell on deaf ears.

Now as an example of these driving businesses out of the province, I believe there is a move afoot for Versatile to move more of their office functions back to Winnipeg, that they moved part of it down to, where was that — some better place in the United States and they moved down there under the socialist regime. They moved down there under the former socialist regime and now they're coming back and that's strange to me. They must think that we have more to offer.

Just this December there was an expanded plant out here in downtown Winnipeg. It was Gemini Fashions. They expanded their garment wear manufacturing plant and they are going to employ considerably more people and it's of interest to note that one of the owners of that particular plant said that had the government not changed in 1977, we wouldn't be here. Now that's an example of business coming in the province, not leaving the province. But the Interim Leader doesn't really want to hear about those kind of stories.

Now I'd like to draw out to the Members of the Opposition, because they don't very often get out of the city, and I'd like to point out some of the things that are happening in Pembina Constituency over the past twelve months or so. I think you will be very pleased to hear this. I know I'm very proud of it and I'd just like to point out to you that Morden, for instance, is the largest urban centre I have in my Constituency. Morden is growing at a very rapid rate. Housing is going like hotcakes. There has been several new developments, residential developments that are primarily sold out. There are several more coming on.

The Cannery, Morden Fine Foods is operating very, very well. They have an advertising program which is second to none and I would suspect that the advertising campaign is so good, that judging by some of the waistlines over there, you must be using some of their products — their tremendously good products. —(Interjection)— You bet that's under good management now. But there has been over the past four or five years a steadily rising value of the building permits in the Town of Morden and in the rural municipality of Stanley, and that's much to the credit of the area, because Morden is a community that thrives; that can grow; that can develop; that can create the jobs to keep their people there. It's a growing town. There is no out-migration of people from Morden that we hear the Interim Leader talking about. There's people coming into Morden, because the businessmen there, the entrepreneurs there, have decided that they are going to invest in job creation in Morden. They're doing it and thank you very much, Morden is doing quite well.

A notable project in Morden, currently, is the Tupperware plant. Tupperware plant, a division of Dart Industries, is locating a major manufacturing plant in Morden. It is interesting to note, and I pointed this out to the members opposite last year, that Tupperware was in the process of making the decision as to whether to locate in Manitoba or Alberta, and that decision was to be coming in in the summer of 1977, but no decision was made pending the election. The election was won by the Conservative Government and within two months, within three months, Tupperware had announced its plans to locate in Manitoba. I fully submit to Members Opposite that had they been re-elected that Alberta would have had another industry and not Manitoba and the residents of Morden are very, very pleased and very proud of the new industry that's coming in and the employment is going to be substantial. and that incidentally, for the Member for Inkster's benefit, did not receive a DREE grant. Sixty thousand dollars of government funds went in. Taxpayers' money for a plant which will invest approximately two million dollars — not a bad buy. I mean, we could compare that to 40 million dollars spent on Saunders Aircraft to produce 50 or so planes. Where's the better value? Where's the better value, Member for Inkster?

Other notables in Morden right now that are going on, Farm King, a local farm machinery manufacturing firm is adding to the plant, increasing its capacity to employ more people — that's not people moving out of Manitoba — that's people moving into Manitoba. Beachcomber Industries, a recreation vehicle manufacturer — they're adding to their plant capacity to employ more people. That's strange. We listen to the Interim Leader and members opposite and nothing's happening in Manitoba. Well, Morden Motor Inn — adding a disco floor and a steak pit —(Interjection)— Let's boogie in Morden is right. Taber Home has proposed expansion; there are two 18-suite apartment blocks about to be constructed in the Town of Morden; a development group are proposing a new housing development. That same group are proposing a major new office complex. This is all private enterprise. I'm glad to affirm that for the Member from Minnedosa. So that's private enterprise working in the Town of Morden.

In Miami — and I can't miss out on my local Miami— Natura Health Foods is a plant which

is located in Miami. They are currently entering into sales contracts with continental Europe on nature foods. It's going to improve the economic climate of the farmers in the area and employment in the plant. There is a new fertilizer complex going up at Miami, which will employ a number of people. These are all areas of growth that the socialists, because they stay in the city, never see.

The Town of Carman is also steadily growing, has been for the last several years. It's fast becoming the special crop centre of Manitoba. There is a number of contracting firms who have moved into the Carman area with their offices for Manitoba, to establish the special crop contacts in the province. That's much to the boon of the Town of Carman. Two organizations in the last year have spent several millions of dollars directly in the agricultural field. Stow Seed Processors at Graysville have added a processing plant with a capability to export grain; export special crops. Seedex, a corporation with similar duties, has built a very efficient, very good plant at Carman. All of those are investments that are taking place by private enterprise in Pembina Constituency to create employment for the people of Pembina, quite to the contrary of the picture that our doom-and-gloom socialists opposite would like to paint out.

Now the out-migration of people, that the Interim Leader mentioned yesterday, is also a very, very interesting statistic. He's using his statistics that these people are leaving in hordes and bounds and that Manitoba is soon going to be left with only the unskilled people in the province. Well, I think to a large degree that's an insult to the people of Manitoba that are staying here to build and develop Manitoba, but it's the kind of insult that I would expect from the Interim Leader.

The out-migration of people is not a new thing. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I knew of more people leaving the Province of Manitoba under the eight years of socialist regime than I ever have per year to date. —(Interjection)— That is true. The Interim Leader's statistics on out-migration of people are clouded by the fact that during the eight years of socialist rule in Manitoba they elected to keep the figures buoyed up quite well by importing all kinds of people from Saskatchewan. Unfortunately all the flow was in the reverse and temporarily it probably will look a little rough on the Province of Manitoba that we have a number of people, maybe formerly from Saskatchewan, now leaving and going back there for some strange political reason. I think it is kind of unusual that they would attempt to buoy up their dismal record of job creation by importing people into the Civil Service and using those kind of buoyed-up statistics, but the job creation that we have gone into in Manitoba over the past years is of very much interest to the interim leader over there. Perchance he should read the statistics. We created thirteen thousand new jobs in the Province of Manitoba in the past year. The best you did, with all your civil service hiring in your last year was 4,000. Now, if that's inefficient government, if that's government that isn't working, then you gentlemen have a different concept of that than most Manitobans do.

As a matter of fact, for every one hundred people entering the work force in the last year of NDP government, the economy created 29 jobs for them. Last year, our economy created 64 jobs for every one hundred people entering the labour force, more than double what you had been able to achieve after eight years of your reins on the economy, where you should have had a plan that did a better job of creating jobs, meaningful jobs for people. But you didn't. And that's obviously why you're sitting over there.

The interim leader referred also to that classic, to that classic socialist program they called the stay option, and he went on to a certain length that that was the greatest program. It stopped the out-migration of people from rural Manitoba to the urban centres. It was the "saving glory" of rural Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, that just is not so, and you know he should realize that by now. The stay option is a socialist program. It did not keep people in rural Manitoba. What kept people in rural Manitoba was the ability to make a dollar, and that happened in 1973, with the bubble in the beef market. Cattle prices were good in '73. Then, starting in the fall of '73 and going through to the fall of '76, the grain prices were very good. That's what kept people in rural Manitoba, that's what kept people on the farm. That's what brought new people back to the farming in Manitoba, not the stay option as our socialist friends would have us believe, but nine-dollar rapeseed, eleven-dollar flax, five-dollar wheat, three-dollar barley, that brought people to the farm and kept them there. The stay option - no way. And what ended up giving us those incredible prices in grain was that free enterprise open-market system, selling grain for what it was worth. And we'd have our friends over there destroy that market because last year we debated a bill on the commodity exchange in which the former Minister for Agriculture wanted to ruin and destroy the commodity exchange, and that's what gave us, in a small part, the increased prices because it reflected directly the market demands. What they want to develop doesn't.

It was interesting to listen over the past little while — and I'm sorry he's not here to listen to some of the comments that the lone Liberal has made in reference to a lot of the things that he has suggested for the Province of Manitoba . . .

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest to all Members that they extend courtesy to each speaker and allow him the opportunity to make his presentation to the Chamber.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I used to mentally think of the Member for Fort Rouge as the fairy godfather of the Manitoba Liberal Party, but that has changed in a recent editorial in one of the daily newspapers. They refer to him as Lloyd Don Vito Corleone Axworthy, because he was making offers that couldn't be refused. He had got grants for this and grants for that, and his latest attempt was very interesting to me. He said that he was going to have the Federal Government take a serious look at rail line relocation because it affected so many people and so many communities. Well, you know, that's a question which is very near and dear to my heart right now because, as a current issue and parallel with that, is the Federal Government's current efforts at rail line abandonment.

And you know, the Prime Minister, in Brandon, indicated that he would prefer rail line relocation because it didn't disturb the communities. And yet on the other hand, he's taking and pulling up the steel in a number of communities in Manitoba and I have a few quick statistics that I'd like to lay out on you. He claims he's concerned about the communities involved in the CPR yard relocation, and at the same time on two, four, six, seven rail lines in Manitoba, he's going to pull up the steel that will affect some four thousand permit holders who deliver grain on those particular rail lines. Where is his concern for those people?

He's pulling up the steel from some 65 or 70 communities, whole communities, not part of a greater Winnipeg community, but whole communities. Where is his concern for them? And if you multiply the number of people affected by those four thousand permit holders you're going to get a multiple of probably five for the people directly affected, counting the people who live in towns, counting the people who are dependents of the permit holder. You're probably talking some five times four, 20,000 people. Where is his concern for those people in those communities? I wish the Godfather of Fort Rouge would turn his attentions towards rail line abandonment, which is a very real issue affecting all Manitobans.

Now, we've got quite a few pieces of information to chew on the Throne Speech debate, and I won't continue on too much more. But I do have to tell you that I have been under considerable criticism in my constituency by actions of our government, and these criticisms are specifically directed, Mr. Speaker, at the Highways Department.

This summer there was a rash, an absolute rash of accidents, people driving down 23 Highway were running into piles of gravel. And the phone line was hot, and they were phoning me up and saying, "You know, what's going on here? Here's a rash of accidents. I wrecked my car today on this pile of gravel in the middle of the road," and I said, "Well, did you obey the construction signs, the road's being re-done." And the answer was, "Construction signs? What do they mean? We haven't seen those in eight years. We don't know what road construction is. And you know, it was quite heartening to find out that my constituents were having accidents because we were spending money on roads. Quite heartening.

I hope that we continue as a government in creating new jobs in Manitoba at the rate that we have in the past year. I think we'll better last year's job creation of thirteen thousand. And that, incidentally, does compare with four thousand jobs you created in the last full year. I hope we better the record of creating more than 64 jobs per 100 people entering the work force. I would hope that some construction will take place in the City of Winnipeg and, God willing and the unions not on strike, that may well happen this year. I hope that we continue to assist the development of small businesses, which we will do by removal of the red tape that they've been under some eight years of socialism in Manitoba and similar in Ottawa.

We're going to help the small businesses by showing them a genuine concern that we truly want them to be representative of the Manitoba job creation in the Manitoba economy. We're going to continue to strive for competitive tax structure to make the businesses in Manitoba able to compete with others. I hope that we continue in our job creation for the youth in providing meaningful jobs such as we did to 4,900 students last year. And all told, I'm pleased with our programs over the past eighteen months. I think our record is very, very excellent, considering the fact that we inherited less than ideal circumstances to govern. And I hope the Opposition will see fit to continue their harsh criticism of our government and continue to offer the Manitoba voters their alternatives to our style of government, the NDP alternatives being more civil service hiring, more government spending, more made-work projects, more public works spending. Maybe we need another garage. In other words, I hope that the Opposition continues to push for all of those programs which put them in the Opposition in the first place and will keep them in the Opposition for years to come.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there is a gentleman from our side that wishes to speak, but I wonder if we could call it 5:30? —(Interjection)— Well, except if he takes adjournment we're finished. Just call it 5:30 and we'll come back at 8 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Have we got agreement from the House to call it 5:30? (Agreed) The hour being 5:30, I'm leaving the chair to return at 8:00.