

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Tuesday, 26 February 1980

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions, . . .

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

MR. CLERK (Mr. Jack Reeves): The petition of John Edward Harrison and others praying for the passing of An Act to Incorporate the Brandon General Hospital Foundation.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees, . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. WARNER J. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table the report of the Public Utilities Board for the year ending December 31, 1979, and I might add, Mr. Speaker, as honourable members can see, this report is a rather voluminous one and it is at the printers now being reproduced for distribution to honourable members, and as soon as it is received from the Queen's Printer, honourable members will be receiving copies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, as the Minister reporting for Manitoba Telephone System, I'd like to table with the House the Annual Report for the year 1978/79 for the Manitoba Telephone System. As has been the custom in the past, the members have received their copies of it by mail.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I should like to table the report of The Trade Practices Enquiry Act for the year ending December 31, 1979.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I have a brief Ministerial Statement I would like to make and I have copies here for distribution.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a brief statement on a meeting held yesterday in Edmonton by the prairie Ministers of Agriculture, a meeting which I had requested last fall to discuss matters of mutual interest and concern to the agricultural industry. We received a report from the Canola Crushers Association of Western Canada outlining some of their concerns as it relates to the Federal Freight Assistance Program, to the availability of hopper cars to that particular industry, and a basis for setting the minimum compensatory rates for that particular industry was discussed.

These are important issues affecting the Province of Manitoba, with our goal of encouraging the expansion of our further processing of agricultural products here in the Province of Manitoba, and will be raised with the federal government as soon as possible.

The direction of the Prairie Agriculture Machinery Institute was also discussed and endorsed and the ministers committed continuing support to that particular organization and recognize that PAMI, which it is known as, may play an important role in meeting the energy efficiency needs of the agricultural industry.

On behalf of the Province of Manitoba, I presented the meeting with the recommendations of the Dr. Clay Gilson Report on Hog Marketing in Manitoba, a recommendation of the report that the ministers would have to meet to discuss the issues as relating to the exporting of pork products and also respecting the export organization which was established for coordinating of those efforts.

On behalf of the three prairie provinces, the three prairie Ministers of Agriculture, I will be requesting a meeting with the new Federal Ministers of Agriculture and Transportation as soon as possible to obtain an outline of federal direction on policy issues of urgent and critical importance to the grain handling and transportation system and to other western agriculture matters.

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

MR. SAM USKIW: Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the Minister making the information available to the members of the House. I would rather have hoped, though, that the Minister would have been in a position to give us some substance as to the position of the Government of Manitoba on the issues of concern that were dealt with at this particular meeting, and that will be the issues that will be conveyed to the Government of Canada. So far as I understand the position of this government, we have no clear understanding as to where they sit on the whole question of grain transportation and related matters as far as Western Canada is concerned. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that it was time we had some enunciation of policy.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we go to the Oral Question Period, I would like to at this time introduce to the members nineteen students of Grade IV standing from Miami Elementary School, under the direction of Ms. Brenda Whitehead. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Transportation.

We also have thirty students of Grade V and VI standing from Balmoral Hall School under the direction of Mrs. Audino. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

We also have forty visitors from the Steinbach New Horizons Club. These people come from the constituency of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Recently it has been reported that the Minister of Municipal Affairs, in a meeting in Swan River, disassociated himself from the position adopted by the Minister of Agriculture, and from the position of the provincial government in respect to Crow rate - Crow Rate Benefit Program - in that it was his view that the present policy by the present Minister of Agriculture only left the impression that the Government of Manitoba would be subsidizing the farmers of Canada.

I ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs whether this remains his position, and whether he continues to disassociate himself from the position taken by his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At no time have I ever disassociated myself with the Minister of Agriculture. I did express some of my own personal views to the people of the Swan Valley area; however, as I mentioned earlier, I don't regard that as having dissociated in any way with the views of the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, just a simple question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Does he agree or disagree with the views expressed by his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, pertaining to Crow Rate Benefit Program?

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I think that there's some confusion as to the definition of the Crow benefit and the Crowsnest rate, and I would ask you to further clarify just what you are asking me on that point.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs indicated he had some disagreement. I would now ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs what it is that he does disagree with in respect to the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: My supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture: Can the Minister of Agriculture advise whether the policy which he enounced pertaining to Crow rate benefit some months ago, remains the policy of the government of the Province of Manitoba, or has it been co-opted by a new policy being presented by the Minister of Municipal Affairs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as I understand the question from the Leader of the Opposition, he refers to the Crow benefit program which not only is the policy of the Minister of Agriculture but the majority of farmers across western Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Yes, I would ask the Minister of Agriculture whether or not he supports the Crow rate as it now stands.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is we support the benefits of the Crow rate as they accrue to the farmers of western Canada and we do not want to see that changed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that the American interest rates have been raised by one whole percentage point on February 15, so that their prime rate is now 16-1/2 percent, will the Manitoba government strongly urge the newly elected federal Liberal government to abandon the ridiculous policy pursued by the recently ousted national Conservative government of increasing Canadian interest rates even more than the Americans increased theirs since this policy of slavishly pursuing American interest rates hurts farmers, fishermen, and small businessmen in Manitoba?

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

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Member for Transcona's question, the actions of the federal government will be taken, I suppose, in light of their decisions they're faced with in the immediate future. We would have no hesitation in advising them that higher interest rates are going to cause problems for all sectors of our community. They already are causing problems for all sectors of our community, and higher rates will cause nothing but further grievance in all sectors of our community. And I can tell the Member for Transcona that only a degree of immunity, as he is well aware, can be maintained from our neighbours to the south.

So it's unrealistic for us to stand and postulate what we would do or not do when we're in opposition. Of course, the members opposite have no problem with that. They don't have the concern of having to form a government at some point in time. But the speculation is that

the rates in the United States, on a long term basis, at this point in time, the most recent speculation is that there ought to be controls brought in in the United States of a governmental nature, and without those controls that we're likely to see the long term interest rate, which of course is of direct concern and interest to the Province of Manitoba, go to the rate of perhaps 15 to 16 percent on a long term basis.

That, of course, is of direct, serious concern to us, and that is what is being faced in the United States. If that happens, I presume that the prime rate referred to by the Member for Transcona in the United States will go to a level beyond that, which, since it's always higher - or in recent times, in recent years it's been higher than the long term lending rate in the United States. If that occurs, Mr. Speaker, we're looking at prime rates in the United States of 17 percent plus, and you can see why some in the U.S. are advocating that there have to be controls brought in.

How long Canada - any government in Canada - can insulate itself from that is open to some question. The previous Conservative government referred to by the Member for Transcona - and I know that they don't really understand what is going on - took at least the Canadian prime to a level below the American prime; and that was not the case with the previous federal government in Ottawa prior to last May.

So Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the federal government may well have to raise it, and that it will be no surprise.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to all members to temper their questions in such a manner that we get a relatively simple, short answer. And I also suggest to the ministers that they try and answer the question as briefly as possible.

The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister, since he didn't answer my question, whether in fact the government will urge the newly elected federal government to try and develop a policy of interest rates which is made in Canada and not set by the Americans. Can he, in fact, inform me whether the government will be doing that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, we have no hesitation in reminding him of that. We had the opportunity, thanks to the efforts of the First Minister in Manitoba, about three months ago to meet with the Governor of the Bank of Canada, brought forward at a First Ministers' meeting the request that the provinces be consulted on these matters. And for the first time that I can recall, the Governor of the Bank of Canada made a sojourn across the country and consulted with the provinces.

At the time, the Governor of the Bank of Canada, who is the key person involved in making the recommendations to the government of Canada, was advised that interest rates at current levels in Manitoba were seriously hurting the regional economies, particularly those that were subject more to an economy dependent on small business and farmers where you were on short term rates at the banks, rather than large businesses who are generally on long term.

That point was made as loudly and as strongly as possible. The Governor of the Bank of Canada has been made aware of that. We have no hesitation in advising the current government in Ottawa of exactly the same matter.

MR. PARASIUK: Given the facts that soon after the Manitoba Government supposedly advised Governor Bouey of their position, the bank rate was in fact increased in Canada, and that secondly the Federal Conservative Government reappointed Mr. Bouey for a seven-year term - which was in fact in contradiction to their electoral promise that they would in fact reduce Canadian interest rates - could the Manitoba Government table the correspondence that they had with the Federal Conservative Government with respect to the matter of trying to lower interest rates in Canada so that small business and farmers wouldnt be hurt.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that if he wants correspondence tabled, he should file an Address for Papers.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Health. In view of the unique work being done by the Klinik Community Health Centre and the serious overcrowding which pertains there, of which I am sure the Minister is aware, can we expect a statement from the Minister concerning a modest budget for renovations which will enable Klinik to continue at maximum possible efficiency?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I cannot assure the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge - who has just addressed her first question as a member of the Legislature to my ministry, and I take the occasion to welcome her to the House - I cannot assure her that a statement of the type that she is requesting will be forthcoming. There will certainly be provision for Klinik and the other community clinics operating in Manitoba in the 1980/81 Budget of the Department of Health and the Manitoba Health Services Commission, but it will deal with specific and ongoing operating costs.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: M. l'orateur, je pose cette question au chef du gouvernement. L'ancien département de Santé et de Services communautaires vient d'être divisé entre deux départements, c'est-à-dire le département de Santé et le département de Services communautaires. J'aimerais avoir une division détaillée de ces deux départements si le Ministre voudrait bien énumérer les responsabilités de chaque nouveau département comme ils apparaissent dans la liste des Estimés que nous avons l'an passé.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Member for Inkster, we will have to wait on his translation of the question.

MR. DESJARDINS: M. l'orateur, ma question était posée au chef du gouvernement.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether he agrees with the theory or the proposition that interest rates in the United States and in Canada are largely related to the inflation rate. And following that, would he agree then that there is some room for differentiating in the interest rates as between Canada and the United States, given the fact that the Canadian inflation rate is substantially below that of the United States.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable members that their questions are getting into the argumentative and it is more of a debate than a question. Would the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet care to rephrase his question?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know from the Minister of Finance whether he agrees with the theory that interest rates, from time to time, in fact almost always, reflect the inflation factors in the economy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think the questions are in fact germane to the general public concern at the moment and with good reason. There is some relationship, although not a relationship that is perhaps as closely tied between Canada and the U.S. with regards to inflation as there is the relationship between the ability of Canada to borrow money, to finance in large measure the deficit that is faced by the federal government at the present time, where they are in the market for money approximately \$1.5 billion every six weeks at the present time, and having to borrow some of that, or a large part of it, in the United States, and that current rates in Canada, they maintain the argument that they have some difficulty in attracting the American capital.

So the traditional arguments that have been put forth are more closely related to the ability of Canada to attract the outside capital than to the influences of the inflation rates in the two countries.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet with a supplementary.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister to clarify, because it's my understanding that the government of Canada finances its operations largely from within the country, and that moneys borrowed outside of Canada are not for the purposes of deficit control or something related to that, but rather for specific development projects.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the government of Canada borrows outside of Canada as well, and also in addition to the government of Canada, the provinces borrow outside of Canada. The province of Quebec, for example, is in the market for some \$2 billion this year. They attempted a \$300 million issue in the United States two weeks ago, reduced it to \$200 million and raised, I gather, the last I heard, something about 1/3 of their original goal. And that, of course, when they are faced with financing their hydro projects and other projects in Canada with American money, are faced with serious difficulties. And as a result, the Canadian rate is always influenced by the American; nothing to do, in that case, with the inflation rate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet with a final supplementary.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps then the Minister would like to undertake this as a question of notice, and that is to find out precisely what portion of the Canadian deficit is financed through moneys from outside of this country. I would like to know precisely, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think that may come out as information in due course. I can't take as notice something that is federal government information. If he was in the House of Commons, his question would be quite legitimate.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister reporting for Manitoba Hydro. I would like to ask him whether the new Chief Executive Officer with Manitoba Hydro has signed an employment contract with Manitoba Hydro.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I presume he has. I'll take the question as notice.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the event that such a contract exists, would the member consider tabling it in the House?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, it will be a contract between the utility and the chief executive officer they have engaged and I think it would not be normal procedure for those contracts to be tabled. Let me first of all find out whether there has, in fact, been a contract finalized. I presume there has, and that the overall general conditions of it would be made known.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Economic Development. Can he, in regard to Flyer Industries Limited, confirm the Attorney-General's statement of yesterday that they are now operating at full capacity, and if so, is there any consideration being given to an expansion of the plant?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

HON. ROBERT "Bob" BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'm charged with the responsibility of administering the Manitoba Development Corporation so I would reply to that question. Let me at least say to the Member for Elmwood that at current production levels we are faced with having our orders booked for the whole of 1980 and into 1981, so that at present our order book looks very good and we are not in a position to go out and work at

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

all kinds of different other prospective orders because we are going to have to do everything we can to fill the orders that we have at present.

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

MR. DOERN: Would the Minister then indicate whether there is any procedure by which local requirements will be met by the firm - for example, orders placed by the City of Winnipeg - or will they have to wait in line or place their orders elsewhere?

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member having been active as Minister of Public Works dealing with tendering realizes that there are certain performance requirements when one is tendering on buses or tendering on any commodity. Flyer Industries has certain deadlines to meet with the orders that they have in place now, some from the States, some from other Canadian cities, and in order to make sure that we try and meet those deadlines without being subject to any penalties, we will have to see that we get those buses out. As I mentioned before, it's going to be a good tight job to try and get the orders out that we have, and I could not see at present that we could be fitting any orders in because we would be looking at penalties on some of the others.

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

MR. DOERN: Is Flyer Industries for sale at this time?

MR. BANMAN: As the previous government, Mr. Speaker, also is looking for some partnership or some sale of that particular company, this government is also concerned about the future viability of the company, and anything to enhance the employment opportunities in that industry in Manitoba, we will definitely be looking at.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. Johns): In the absence of the First Minister, I would direct my question to the Minister for Economic Affairs, or the Minister of Mines, or the Finance Minister, whichever wants to pick it up, to ask whether this government or any of its agencies has been in communication with the Alberta government or any of its agencies in connection with a possibility of the Alberta government, through a corporate structure owned by it, would become involved in equity shareholdings in exploration of mines and minerals in this province, as apparently has been done by Alberta in Nova Scotia?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, not that I'm aware of.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable Minister of Finance to undertake to investigate and report back to this House as to whether or not there is any foundation or any negotiations or discussions such as I have described?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite sure that if they were under discussion or negotiation I would be aware of them at this point in time. I think it's the sort of question I can give the member the assurance that since I'm not aware of it, I'm sure they are not taking place. For further investigation he may wish to refer to the Estimates Review, at which time we can go into it in some depth if he feels that there is something there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RON McBRIDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation. The Minister has received a detailed and well documented proposal from

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

The Pas Handi-Van Service for this important community project, and I wonder if he has given any final approval to that submission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, since this proposal met all the criteria set out, I'm assuming that the Minister will be taking it to Cabinet very soon. I'd like to give this Minister this little button to wear with him to Cabinet, which says "I support The Pas Handi-Van."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN : Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour and Manpower. In light of statements made by the Minister last September that workers at the closing Swift's Plant would be gobbled up by other industries, can the Minister confirm that a telephone survey conducted on January 15 and 16 of this year indicated that out of the 243 ex-Swift employees contacted, 156 were still unemployed, still without work; 16 telephones had been disconnected - I can only assume they've joined the great migration west; 19 employees had full-time jobs; 4 employees were working part-time; 4 thought that they might have good employment prospects; 4 employees were on training courses; and 2 had no intentions of seeking employment. Can the Minister confirm those figures?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that the facts as presented today are not the same as the facts that have been just presented by the Member for Churchill, which is reasonably typical of the kind of thing that he brings forward to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If anyone is being reasonably typical it is the Minister of Labour and his arrogant non-answers, but it is something we have come to expect and so I'll continue with a supplementary to the Minister, hoping that he will address himself more fully to the question than to argumentation.

Can the Minister further confirm, according to Canada Employment Centre files that have been coupled with Swift information from their personnel department files and coupled with the telephone survey, that 167 Swift employees were working out of the 400 to 600 that were laid off, and when you add to that figure the 19 who were discovered by the telephone survey, that this would indicate a maximum of 186 full-time employees out of the 400 to 600 that were forced out of the workforce by that closure, and that well over half of Swift's workers have either been forced to migrate out of this province or have been gobbled up by the unemployment lines.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The statement made by the Member for Churchill cannot really be considered to be a question.

The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. R. G. (Bob) WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport. In light of Canada's weak hockey showing at the Winter Olympics, would the Minister consider a major examination of our Winnipeg hockey development system, and an audit of the fees paid by the hockey participants so that minor hockey in Manitoba does not become a rich man's game?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sports.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the member's question, the development of amateur sports in the Province of Manitoba as undertaken by the different sports-governing

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

bodies - in this particular instance the responsibility rests with the Manitoba Amateur Hockey Association, who are, of course, affiliated with the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association. The department that I am in charge of is concerned about the different levels of coaching and has instituted several programs which will see better training for coaches throughout the province through different levels I, II and III, and we will be also monitoring the other requirements. But for the development of sport in the province at this time, I think the member has to realize that there are many people who are involved in that particular athletic endeavour and that is left up to the sports-governing body.

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

MR. WILSON: Well, in light of that answer, I wonder, could the Minister consider grants so that the participation fees, I guess they call them, or the pay-to-play fees for tier hockey are paid from lottery funds. It would thus make hockey development available to kids of all economic structures, whether they have talents, and broaden the development program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Province of Manitoba does not directly run any sports' facilities or any recreation facilities. We have in the past, as the previous government, encouraged the development of these facilities by certain particular grants, but the operation of recreation facilities lies within the jurisdictions of the municipalities and I have always been a firm believer that either at the federal or provincial level that jurisdiction is best left up to the local municipal governments. Further to the development of a team, such as Team Canada, it has been this government's policy, and I believe the previous government's policy, that the development of the elite athlete, the national athlete, is the responsibility of the Federal Government, and programs to that end will have to be arrived at and worked out with the Federal Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the answers provided to us by the Minister of Municipal Affairs pertaining to the Crow rate, my question is to the Acting Premier, the Minister of Finance. Would he undertake to canvass his Cabinet colleagues in order to ascertain how many of his Cabinet colleagues enjoy personal views pertaining to the Crow Rate Benefit Program as proposed by the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, personal views are par for the course in this government. We have an open government, and if a member in his own constituency wishes to tell his constituents what he feels about any particular issue, whether he is in the Cabinet or out, that it is sometimes known to happen.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Co-operative Development and ask the Honourable Minister whether he can advise the House whether he or the government or his staff are still in the process of discussions or negotiations with Bohmer Baux Limited of Ontario respecting the takeover of McKenzie Steele Briggs of Brandon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, we have mentioned several times, and the Chairman of the Board has mentioned several times, that we are anxious to see that operation stay in Brandon and be a viable operation in Brandon, and that the way to possibly accomplish that is through an equity arrangement with another company, which has marketing experience and marketing techniques which can enhance employment and the future viability of that company. That is an ongoing process and we will continue to monitor that.

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, specifically I would like to ask the Minister if he would answer my question - is the government or is his department still in discussion or negotiations with Bohmer Box Limited of Ontario with respect to McKenzie Steele Briggs Limited in Brandon?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, we haven't ruled out any possibilities. That is one of the companies that has expressed interest and we have not ruled that out at all.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise whether Bohmer Box Limited of Ontario was one of the five companies which bid to purchase McKenzie Seeds last summer and whose bid was rejected.

MR. BANMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, they were one of the companies who expressed interest at that time and have expressed interest since then.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sports and is prompted by a statement made by the Member for Wolseley that was unanswered. Because of this non-answer, should we take it that the Minister agrees with the Member for Wolseley that you judge the ability or the success of a program only by the standing, where the team finished in the standing, or in the case of Canada - who I think were an example on and off the ice, although they did finish sixth - does the Minister feel that this program is not a success, that it is a failure?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, as the Member for St. Boniface will appreciate, the government of the day whatever political stripe - and I guess we get into the Olympic boycott a little bit - is the good showing or non-showing of a particular country seems to have a reflection on the political people of that time. But I know the thing that the member is getting at. It becomes a very difficult thing to answer. When a person is enjoying the particular sport they are in and it is serving very many amateur athletes within the community, it becomes very hard to really measure the success that the program has had. I think I am still one of these people that believes that the participation and the enjoyment that our youngsters get and that our amateur athletes get from competing at whatever level is something that cannot be measured by international success.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, my question . . . I think the statement referred to Team Canada in this instance, and the Minister then replied that it was a failure and I don't consider that. This is why I asked the question. I think that they did quite well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you. I have a question for the Minister in charge of the Environment. Is the Minister aware of any federal or provincial environmental impact studies which have been undertaken or contemplated with respect to Indian Bay or Shoal Lake in the vicinity of Indian Reservation Nos. 39A or 40, and if so, would he tell us what the current status of such study or studies might be?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, that assessment will be undertaken jointly by Environmental Canada and the Environmental Protection Agency in the Province of Manitoba. I can't give the honourable member any further details as to when that impact study will begin.

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Have there been any negotiations undertaken with respect to the building of a highway from Highway No. 1 into Indian Bay, and if so, are those negotiations currently ongoing?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of such negotiations. Perhaps the Minister of Transportation may be able to give my honourable friend the answer to that question.

MR. SCHROEDER: A further supplementary then to the Minister of Transportation. Could the Minister of Transportation tell the House whether there have been any negotiations begun and if so, are they still continuing with respect to the building of a highway from Highway No. 1 to Indian Bay?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, not that I'm aware of, but if the member would prefer, I can inquire of the department to see if negotiations or discussions have been undertaken.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN (Wellington): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought you'd never notice. My question is for the Minister of Urban Affairs. We would ask whether the Minister can advise of his government's position on the pending closure of the DASH Transit System in the city of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, the operation of the transit service in the city of Winnipeg is the responsibility of city council.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, in view of that answer and in view of the fact that DASH has been able to substantially reduce energy consumption and has been very popular with the small business community of downtown Winnipeg, will the government consider provision of extra grant funds to the city in order to assure the continuation of that particular program?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the province has considered the financial position of the city of Winnipeg, and as I indicated on Friday in overall grants, has increased grants close to 12 percent for this fiscal year for the city of Winnipeg.

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

MR. CORRIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would ask, in view of that response, whether the government would directly cost-share and subsidize the DASH service as part of its announced commitment made in the Throne Speech to improving support services for small businesses and will the government refer this proposal as a high priority energy conservation opportunity measure to the soon-to-be restructured Manitoba Energy Council?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, as indicated in the Throne Speech, the Manitoba Energy Authority and various energy matters under the responsibility of the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Mines and Resources will be considering a number of energy conservation matters, and I can't answer for him whether any special steps will be taken in this particular field. I'm certain they will be given serious consideration.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to the Minister for Urban Affairs who spoke of a 12 percent increase, would he indicate to the House whether the amounts he is speaking of, the block grants and the 12 percent increase, include the amounts which, by

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

legislation, belong to the municipalities as portions of income tax, both personal and corporate?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the Member for St. Johns read Hansard from Friday when I attempted to give a detailed answer to a similar question for which you admonished me, Mr. Speaker. I'm prepared to give the Member for St. Johns as much detailed information as he requires, but perhaps if he read over that information first, he might have a more specific announcement. Or if you wish, Mr. Speaker, I can go through it again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Question Period having expired, we will proceed with the Orders of the Day.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River Heights, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto, that the motion be amended by adding the following:

That this House regrets that this government,

- (1) has shown its incompetence in managing the economy of Manitoba, causing an exodus of business and people from our province and depressing economic growth rate to the lowest in Canada;
- (2) has shifted funding and taxation resulting in increased user fees, post secondary tuition fees, and a heavier burden of property taxation;
- (3) and has permitted the deterioration in comprehensive health care for Manitobans while at the same time increasing user fees for nursing homes and Pharmacare.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have always enjoyed participating in the Throne Speech - I believe it's the 16th time for me, or some such number, and I have always appreciated the formalities that this particular debate allows us to indulge in, and that of course, is to congratulate you, Sir, once again on assuming your particular responsibilities, and to welcome the new members in the Chamber. We have three new members in the Chamber, the Honourable Member for Rossmere, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with whom I spend a great deal of time in hotel rooms, and the Honourable Member for River Heights, whom I'm sure will follow, and has already demonstrated the kind of reputation for bringing into this House members who particularly excel and who achieve, both in this Chamber and for their constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, I think I should also take note that there has indeed been an additional change since last we met, and that is in the House leadership on either side of the Chamber. I congratulate my deskmate, the Attorney-General and the Honourable Member for Kildonan in assuming those responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was kind enough to express some concerns about the Cabinet changes that took place. I want to assure him that I am very happy with the responsibilities that I have as Minister reporting for Telephones, for Autopac, for Manitoba Data Services and Government Services. I thought perhaps he might have noted that I was taking my responsibility as Minister of Government Services more seriously than perhaps that somewhat flippant remark that I made some time ago about doing it in several hours on a Friday afternoon. Surely he has noticed the new carpet that I provided in the Chamber, the new refurbishings, and that I have attacked my job with zeal, very obviously.

However, Mr. Speaker, he was correct in some way. There is no question that I have been censured by my colleagues. You know, Mr. Speaker, over the years, I have had some difficulty from time to time in my debating style. I have been known to sometimes become somewhat rambunctious, even to the point of disturbing the decorum of this Chamber. What isn't known, Mr. Speaker, though, is that in most of these instances it was the Honourable Member for Morris who was responsible. He constantly goaded me into taking these kinds of positions that egged me on when perhaps moderation should have prevailed. My colleagues recognized this, and so they distanced us as far as possible.

Not being alone, however, Mr. Speaker, was part of the problem. I can recall, Sir - you weren't in the Chair, but the Speaker was in the Chair, when on a particular occasion during an agricultural debate, my debating style got me to counting dead chickens somewhere in the

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

middle of the Chamber here, and that's one of the freedoms that you have when you enjoy an aisle seat. I think the Honourable Member for St. Boniface will appreciate some of the advantages of an aisle seat.

So you see, Sir, that too was of concern to my colleagues, so they flanked Harry with "Wary Gerry" and "Steady Ed", and they hope in this way to somewhat bring, you know, a greater degree of control on the particular speaking style and debating style of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to contain myself in my debates in this Session with those obvious censure motions that my colleagues have imposed upon me and attempt to nonetheless speak boldly and speak without fear or favour on those particular items and those particular matters that concern me.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose that it is entirely understandable that many of us will have a passing comment as to the last election, referring to the Federal Election of course, and I suppose there will be understandable and predictable interpretations of that particular election. But, Mr. Speaker, allow me to give my impressions of that election in this particular form. If I had spent as much time as some of the honourable members opposite had, labouring for and on behalf of the New Democratic Party - in other words, if I had been a longstanding New Democrat and worked as hard for that party as I enjoy working for the Conservative Party, I would have had to be extremely disappointed on election night. Extremely disappointed on election night. Mr. Speaker, it is doubtful if the New Democratic Party ever had a better opportunity to make substantial gains.

Mr. Speaker, there is no deal or no reason for particularly hiding the situation that there was a degree of disenchantment in the general public with both of the leaders of the other parties. After all it was only six months ago that the Canadian public rejected the Prime Minister Elect, the Leader of the Liberal Party. And, Mr. Speaker, it is not - although, Sir, let me say with a great deal of pride, that in watching the present Prime Minister, the Leader of my party, the Honourable Joe Clark, learn, develop himself as the campaign wore on, as his short six months of government wore on, was a source of pride to me as a member, and, Sir, on election night I think all Canadians were pretty proud of their Prime Minister accepting a democratic decision by the people in the way and the manner in which he accepted that decision.

Mr. Speaker, nonetheless that left the New Democrats surely in a position to make substantial gains. Now, Mr. Speaker, they had rehearsed their act very well. They had put their leader into a pin-striped suit. They had gotten away from some of the radical fringes of their department. Some time ago, they had dampened down the wafflers in that party, and of course, Mr. Speaker, now fighting for the second time on what you would call even par financially speaking in terms of the public access to money that all the major parties had.

So, Mr. Speaker, in two elections fighting on the kind of bread and butter issues which, you know, I think us as practising politicians can so easily recognize. I mean, when you can knock on a door and say, "Look, do you want to spend 18¢ more for gas or don't you?" You know, that is a pretty difficult position to attack from the point of a government and a pretty lucrative one from a point of opposition.

Mr. Speaker, with all that going for them, with all that going for them, the goal of every party, that is to achieve majority government, is as distant as ever, is as distant as ever, and that really is the true hard facts.

Mr. Coldwell several decades ago had that many seats, and he had them without the advantages of the slick financing that now we all engage in, including the New Democrats. And, Mr. Speaker, he had them without the kind of made-to-measure issues which eleven, sixteen years of irresponsible Liberal rule had saddled this country with, and that a responsible and honest government had to answer to. They had to answer to it in a way with some pretty harsh medicine, with a pretty hard budget, a pretty attackable budget politically speaking.

So with all that going for them, with all that riding with them, the pin-striped suit and the cigar; the New Democrats today have to be seriously disappointed in respect to their efforts on February 18th. Blanked out as they are in the Maritimes; blanked out as they are in Quebec; losses in Ontario; and a few gains in the west.

Mr. Speaker, in case there is any concern or doubt that what will happen in two years hence when the gasoline prices and energy prices will inevitably rise - and they will rise because of their national confederates. They will rise because of the support of the New Democrats who said it wasn't necessary. And I look forward to it. I look forward to it two years from now, Mr. Speaker, in campaigning the width and breadth of the Province of

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

Manitoba, and then asking the same voters of Manitoba, who for their own reasons, not in Manitoba but across this country, rejected an honest government attempt to provide the kind of leadership that this country needs, whether or not they will not have second thoughts about it. I am satisfied that as far as Manitobans are concerned they will.

Mr. Speaker, I do have some comments to make about what has now become the kind of vogue thing to do, not just here but I suppose in all parts of the country. And I must apologize because I do not wish to appear to be in any way apologetic about something that I refer to. You see, I can't help but remember in the latter Sixties, the mid-Sixties, the tremendous movement that was growing and pressuring governments to halt this growth for growth's sake. I can't forget that my then colleague, very energetic Minister of Industry and Commerce, the Member for River Heights, was severely criticized in this Chamber for beating the drums to beat seventy, for his enthusiasm to bring about economic development in this province. Mr. Speaker, I am not relating this simply to Manitoba, but, Sir, that was a genuine feeling that was expressed not just here in Canada, but indeed in many parts of the world, particularly the western world.

How quickly things kind of change. Now all of a sudden from some of the very sources that at that time looked askance at economic development, that were concerned about the quality of life, and said, "Who needs that factory? Who needs that polluting industry in our province?" Those are the kind of criticisms that the then Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the then Conservative administration faced in the latter Sixties. And now we hear nothing but a parading of facts and figures, a slavish addiction to every stats figure that comes out and a kneeling down at the altar of development for economic development sake. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplication as the Honourable Minister of Health indicates.

Mr. Speaker, surely what we want in Manitoba - a reasonable growth - Mr. Speaker, we want to provide for our young people as many job opportunities as we can. We want to provide for a common sense approach to the resource developments of this project when they are economically viable, when they can be done in concert with greater environmental problems. And, Mr. Speaker, those are the kind of things that this government is prepared to address itself and this government is prepared to carry out.

Mr. Speaker, I just couldn't help but note how in the short passage of times - a decade I suppose - that there has been, and particularly I think with some irony coming from the left, who very often were in the vanguard at that time, or spearheaded that concept, that feeling that could be described as the anti-growth people, that talked about zero population. There were whole organizations around in the mid-sixties that held up zero population as the ultimate, the desirable. Now we shake and quiver at every stats report as to whether or not a few people came or left.

Mr. Speaker, I just point out how values change and how particularly values change when you are sitting in the opposition and when you think that you can drum up a degree of hysteria or support on a particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, we believe - and we believe that this Throne Speech sets out the foundation, coming as it does mid-term in our period of office of the first term, and I know that at about the same time in the second term of our office we will be able to build on the blocks that we are building today. And by the time I make this speech in the latter part of third term of this government in office, we will have accomplished and we will have demonstrated our ability for the people of Manitoba in providing the kind of services, the kind of life that they require and they want here in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, this Throne Speech is a very progressive, a very forward-looking document. Mr. Speaker, in this Throne Speech we now begin to demonstrate, and we can demonstrate, that without the irresponsibility of simply spending more and more and more money, we can provide the kind of services that the people in Manitoba deserve. Well, certainly we are spending more money, Mr. Speaker, and the revenues are beginning to come in in the same way. Mr. Speaker, this Throne Speech allows us for addressing and directing those additional moneys to where they ought to have been directed to many years ago, Mr. Speaker. And the Honourable Leader of the Opposition should blush with embarrassment that it took this government and this Minister of Health to move into his constituency in his home town of Selkirk and finally promise those people to build a new hospital, a new health facility, a new hospital facility, that for eight years, despite its sagging, despite its literally falling down on his ears for eight years, was not touched, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it was this government, it was this Minister of Health, that allowed, that is finally addressing itself with real dollars to the redevelopment of the Health Science Centre,

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

the biggest facility of its kind in western Canada. For eight years you studied the matter. For eight years you walked around the matter. But this Minister of Health and this government is addressing itself to it.

And, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the strategy of the honourable members opposite. But it is wrong, it is untruthful, for them to suggest as they have, and they will continue to suggest, that somehow this government's dedication to health services is somewhat less than when they were in office is simply not true, Mr. Speaker. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is a lie. It is a lie. This government is dedicating more of its resources to health than they ever did in eight years and I'm speaking in percentage terms - in terms of money that is available to this government or was available to them. The Minister of Health will make that abundantly clear in this debate, and certainly throughout the discussion of his Estimates.

But that simple truism, it doesn't matter; you can debate legitimately as to whether or not the priorities are always right or you're in agreement with them. You can debate as to whether or not this particular program of health should be supported in larger amounts or less amounts, and you can support about whether the funding from Ottawa is being applied in this manner or that manner. But what you cannot deny is that the Conservative administration is spending more of its ready resources on health than any NDP administration has ever spent in the eight years of their life as government.

And that is the truth, that is a truth, and anything else in percentage terms of moneys available to you as government, in percentage terms as money available to us as government and in real dollars, either way - and in real dollars. Well the truth is the truth. Yes, in percentage terms I am saying that if this administration is spending X number of percentage terms of its total revenues on health, that it is a higher figure than when you were in office, or when you were the Minister. You could not convince, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface could not convince his colleagues to get more money from the harem scarem basketweaving programs that they otherwise were engaged in for health services. My Minister, this Minister, could and this Minister is, and this Minister does.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not the Minister of Health. The Minister of Health will do a much clearer and definitive job on this. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you - and we have to obviously say to it, and we'll have to say it often because this is a grand strategy on the part of the members opposite, and it's a proven strategy that regrettably, Mr. Speaker, sometimes works. If you repeat a lie often enough, no matter how big the lie, if you repeat it often enough, people start believing it. And some Manitobans are believing it, regrettably. But the truth of the matter is that it is a lie, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, within this Throne Speech, and as we get into the Department of Health's Estimates, that dedication to continuing levels of health services in all fields - personal care, hospital renovation, hospital new construction - will be clearly demonstrated and demonstrated in a most capable manner by my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time in this Throne Speech, without the kind of nonsense that the Leader of the Opposition had to do with respect to my colleague the Minister of Cultural Affairs, I am very proud that this government, sometimes viewed by members opposite of the left, they have somehow built an image that they somehow are the protectors and the representatives of all things cultural in the arts. They had eight years, Mr. Speaker, to bring about an overall approach to supporting the performing arts, the main cultural contribution to this province. They did nothing about it.

They sat for eight years while they watched our libraries, particularly our libraries in rural Manitoba languish. This Minister did something about it, and convinced her Cabinet colleagues to bring about a most substantial and welcome increase in library funding and indeed, a whole new approach to library funding and development in the province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, that is contained in this Throne Speech.

This Throne Speech is full of the kind of progressive developments that have always made me proud to be a member of this party. Mr. Speaker, in education, we carry on in the same progressive way with a major development program in the community of Brandon. In that particular level of educational activity that is presently feeling perhaps, the biggest pressure, or the bulge - I'm referring to the vocational, the comprehensive schools - unlike some of the enrolment difficulties at some of the other levels of our educational system, unlike some of the pressures in terms of enrolments that are dropping at some of our universities, but it is still very much present and felt in our Red River Community College, our Brandon, Assiniboia Community College at Brandon and our technical-vocational colleges.

So again, Mr. Speaker, we have addressed ourselves to that in this Throne Speech, we've dedicated ourselves to the continuation of those kinds of programs that we think we have to do.

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

Mr. Speaker, what we've also demonstrated is the concern that we have for the uselessness and the callousness that run-away government spending - and the major contributor of that is to the inflation problems, how that can affect, and how utterly worthless those kinds of expenditures can be. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose holds up several books about certain costs that he incurred. We are still - and I think we have passed that point that we will not belabour honourable members opposite, or members of the media any longer, about the kind of nonsense and garbage and government waste that we took over when we inherited it, that put such legitimate expenditures as \$300,000 for a report into - you know, it's just simply ludicrous for the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to suggest that he's going to be able to fund expansion of health services or build schools, or what have you, or run the government operations by cutting out the expenditures for a few reports.

Mr. Speaker, I could just relate to you one instance that I inherited when I became Minister of Transportation. With all the fuzzy thinking that was going on over there, it was decided to build a road into Molson Lake, and the Department of Highways spent three-quarters of a million dollars in doing that. Then all of a sudden, the other Minister in charge of that found out that if you complete that road to Molson Lake, 40 or 50 native people are going to be unemployed because they were working in a fly-in lodge. So the request came, stop, you can't build the road. If you build the road, 40, 50 native people in an area where every bit of employment is needed will be thrown out of a job. So we didn't build the road. So up there is three-quarters of a million dollars worth of road that's going nowhere, that's abandoned, because of the kind of fuzzy thinking that honourable members opposite planned for. That's just one small, little example, Mr. Speaker.

I am still the custodian landlord for that massive enterprise that the planners built for the community of Churchill. Mr. Speaker, they have facilities there that I don't think they will have or equal at the Moscow Olympic sites. They have an Olympic-size swimming pool, NHL-size hockey rink, they have basketball courts, and all of this housed in steel and glass, uninsulated, heated electrically, and the maintenance bill is \$1 million a year. They estimated \$200,000, and the bill is \$1 million per year. Mr. Speaker, that's every year. That's not just this year, that's next year and next year and next year. A million dollars a year, to, among other things, keep \$275,000 worth of tropical plants from freezing in Churchill. What particular social redeeming grace did that have in terms of public expenditures?

So Mr. Speaker, for us to carry out a promise, for us to spend \$300,000 on a report which is precisely what we said we would do when we ran for office - we said we would take a hard look at Autopac, we would examine it to see what possibilities were about introducing some competitiveness to it. And that's precisely what we did. We accepted some aspects of it, we accepted many aspects of it, the increased benefits, which in fact, Mr. Speaker, the Cabinet records and minutes indicate, were put before that government and rejected. It was helpful to have that underlined, to have that reinforced, that position in the report, and we wasted no time in improving the benefits to the accident plan of Autopac.

So Mr. Speaker, there is no apology needed or required for the normal expenditures of funds that governments undertake from time to time. I would shudder, Mr. Speaker, to try to tabulate all the reports undertaken by that government. Do we really want to get into a comparison basis? On a year-by-year basis? You remember all these people that we didn't really know, they drifted in from New York and from Tangiers, basketweavers collected from all these socialist capitals of the world that emerged here in Manitoba, all at government largesse, all writing reports --(Interjection)-- some even from Regina, that's right, Mr. Speaker.

Thank goodness that so much of that has been laid to rest, and thank goodness, Mr. Speaker that their imprints, Sir, their footsteps, Sir, like those made in sand or snow, they have literally disappeared. They have left no impression on us. They left no lasting impression on the people of Manitoba. All they've left is the deficit money that we still have to find to pay.

Mr. Speaker, I know we have troubles in representing to the people of Manitoba, and to people generally, the kind of arguments that are easily or readily understood when we talk about a debt, when we talk about deficit financing, and when we talk about the ills of it. When we get into those millions of figures, we tend to lose sight of - or they lose their relevance to us by the sheer size of it. But Mr. Speaker, when I tell you that before the Minister of Highways can build a single road, we have to spend \$65 million of your taxes, not to pay off the debt, just to pay a few money-lending institutions in Zurich, in Tokyo, in New York, on Wall Street, the interest on the money that largely they borrowed.

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

Mr. Speaker, that represents more than the Minister of Agriculture has for the entire agricultural industry in his department. That represents more than the Minister of Manpower does for providing new jobs in this province. That represents more than half a dozen departments of government spend annually. And we have to pay that every year. Every year. —(Interjection)— How many nursing care homes would that \$60 million build? It would operate the entire Seven Oaks Hospital, whose operating costs will run, I don't know, somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$15 to \$18 or \$20 million, and will be a burden onto us and a tax burden to all of us. That is how the debt has to be translated, that is how the debt has to be understood.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you are not concerned about that, and if honourable members are not concerned about it, then of course they are moving us and our society in a direction that I know if the question were placed before the electorate today, here in Manitoba or anywhere else in Canada, that there would be a resounding "NO" to it.

And, Mr. Speaker, perhaps Great Britain and her particular situation, both her political position and the position that she faces in the future, is perhaps the best and immediate guideline to us. But indiscriminate government spending, uncontrollable government spending, has done to Great Britain what successive Liberal administration supported by their New Democrat friends is coming very close to doing in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, our trouble within the Conservative Party is that we have perhaps not enunciated it clearly enough. We have relied too much on the tired cliché kind of approaches to electioneering that historically and traditionally separate us from the Liberals or the Socialists, and perhaps we haven't spelled out in clearer terms the real problems, the fundamental changes in society, that the honourable members opposite have in mind for us. —(Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable former Minister of Public Works says, "red baiting". You know I wanted to make some comments about my friend, whom I always enjoy debating with, the Independent Member for Inkster, I find it somewhat ironic that he was forced to make that particular move, and not in isolation by the way, Mr. Speaker; and let not the euphoria of this past election wipe out or try to hide the growing amount of difficulties that our friends in the opposition, as a party, are beginning to have. I appreciate that at election time the troops are rallied, and closed front and we all march off at election time, and that is kind of for the time being and presently shielded the growing difficulties that members opposite are having in learning to live with each other, in learning to live with each other. I mean after all it was a president of their party, and not a past past president, but a fairly recent president of their party that had to resign and leave that party after years of service because he objected in very clear terms to the kind of direction that the party, in his judgment, was going. It was one of your most capable members of your caucus and of your government that had to leave your caucus because of what he considered the undue influence of organized labour within your group. Mr. Speaker, it is precisely that kind of influence and that kind of exercise of power by a pressure group that has to a large extent brought the Labour Party of Britain to where it now stands.

Mr. Speaker, I think that as the session wears on, as the ineffectiveness of the opposition becomes more apparent, as it became so glaringly apparent during the last session, Mr. Speaker. Let's understand something. I think we can all accept the fact that coming with a backup of a big national election, an election where obviously a great deal of money and advertising and time was being dedicated to, and where you didn't have to face a formidable row of ministers and Tory members. The Leader of the Opposition began to lose that powder puff image. He all of a sudden began to look as though this is somebody that this government might have to contend with.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I make a prediction to you today, Sir, that with the help of that national election the party over there, and particularly its Leader, is starting up here on the graph and within a month or two will have been back to about where they were towards the end of last session. Do you remember where they were last session?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson): The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. ENNS: Where the 55-vote former Minister of Government Services was going to challenge him for the leadership; where the rumblings were all around the party about they had to change their leader, that under the Honourable Member for Selkirk it was obvious they

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

were not going to be able to mount an effective challenge or present an effective alternative to this government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let not the last few days, the last final days of the Federal Election or the euphoria that is now surrounding the New Democrats confuse the issue. Nothing has changed. Oh, I think the Honourable Member for Selkirk has been to a new hairdresser, but all of us do that from time to time. But, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't really change, with the exception of the Attorney-General, he doesn't indulge in those antics. But, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that his problems are more fundamental and his problems are going to become more serious as this session wears on, as we gird ourselves to the coming election some two, two and a half, three or four years hence.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: M. l'orateur, il me fait particulièrement plaisir de participer à ce débat, quelque semaines à peine après le jugement important que rendait la Cour Suprême du Canada. Il est encourageant, M. le président, de vous voir en si bonne forme et prêt sans doute à diriger le travail de cette Chambre avec votre impartialité bien connue. Le proposeur et le second de cette résolution se sont tous deux bien acquittés de leur tâche, mais dans leur cas, disons-le bien, avec beaucoup moins d'impartialité que vous M. le - (Inaudible) - Comme de raison, c'est bien traditionnel de rêver en couleur lorsqu'on propose qu'on seconde le Discours du trône. Je m'empresse aussi à féliciter les trois nouveaux députés. A l'un, je souhaite plusieurs années comme le représentant de son comté ici en Chambre; à l'autre, quelques années de moins, mais de bonnes années; et enfin au dernier, je me contente de lui souhaiter dix-huit mois, à peu près, intéressants ici en Chambre. Les trois nouveaux ministres méritent certainement notre encouragement et notre coopération. C'est d'ailleurs ce que je leur promet et surtout au nouveau ministre du Bien-être social, de Services communautaires.

Il me fait grand plaisir d'accueillir le nouveau chef de l'opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Thank you.

MR. DESJARDINS: Je lui souhaite tout d'abord le courage et la patience, et comme de raison, un grand succès dans quelques mois, quelques années. Je suis persuadé que sa dédicace, sa sincérité, son honnêteté et aussi son bon jugement lui permettront, après un court apprentissage, de devenir un chef par excellence et le prochain premier ministre du Manitoba.

M. l'orateur, j'en suis à ma vingt-deuxième année dans cette Chambre. Je crois avoir bien toujours lutté contre le préjugé et aussi pour faire reconnaître et respecter les droits de tous les Manitobains. J'ai souvent parlé en français, mais on me rappelait toujours que parler français, ici en Chambre, c'était seulement un privilège que l'on m'accordait et non un droit. Vous le savez bien, je n'ai jamais partagé ce point de vue, M. l'orateur. Aujourd'hui, je suis bien ému et je suis fier; je vous parle dans ma langue maternelle et maintenant c'est très clair, c'est bien mon droit. Il me reste à savoir si ce droit sera considéré comme un simple geste sans importance qui n'apportera aucun changement ou si, enfin, c'est un grand pas qui permettra de bien reconnaître le caractère bilingue de notre beau pays. Mais, si j'ai le droit de m'adresser en français, j'ai certainement le droit de me faire comprendre. Il faut que ça soit plus que de la poudre aux yeux. Ceux d'entre vous qui sont intéressés à écouter et comprendre les députés qui parleront français ont certainement eux aussi le droit de le faire. Je m'attends à ce que ce discours que je prononce en ce moment, soit rapporté dans les deux langues du Hansard manitobain et ceci dès demain. Je ne suis pas intéressé de lire dans le journal de la Chambre de demain: "Mr. Desjardins also spoke French. The translation will appear at a later date". Il faut absolument qu'après une courte période de préparation, qu'on introduise un Hansard complètement bilingue, c'est-à-dire, oui, dans les deux langues. Le plus important encore, il nous faut une traduction simultanée, car que servirait à un député de prendre part un débat important et par la force de son raisonnement, s'efforcer de convaincre les membres de la Chambre de supporter sa position s'il n'est pas compris. Il serait trop tard si la traduction de son discours ne ferait qu'apparaître dans le Hansard du lendemain ou du surlendemain, quelques heures, quelques jours peut-être après qu'on a disposé de la motion.

M. le président, si j'insiste, et paraît demander beaucoup, c'est parce que le jugement de

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

la Cour Suprême qui rend les droits qui nous avaient été volés, soit très bien compris et que la Loi ainsi que l'intention de la Loi soient bien observées.

En cette occasion, j'ai l'intention de parler simplement en français pour bien démontrer l'importance et les difficultés créées par ce jugement. Mais laisser moi bien dire au Premier ministre et au Gouvernement que mon discours ne devrait pas être considéré comme un discours partisan. Si je demande beaucoup de son gouvernement, je n'en demande pas moins du gouvernement fédéral et je compte aussi sur la coopération de mes compatriotes de la province de Québec. Je suis le premier à admettre que seul le Manitoba ne peut faire respecter cette loi. Le gouvernement fédéral, bien attendu, devra nous assister financièrement et prêter une coopération absolue à un gouvernement manitobain bien intéressé. Comme de raison, ça ne sera pas accompli du jour au lendemain. Mais il nous faut plus que des promesses vagues; le gouvernement devra se compromettre immédiatement, énoncer clairement sa politique et annoncer son horaire spécifique. Ce que je viens de dire est très important et je promet ma coopération. Mais d'après moi, ce n'est pas encore la première priorité. Si l'on veut vraiment travailler pour l'unité nationale, pour faire valoir le caractère bilingue de notre pays, il faut oeuvrer dès maintenant, M. l'orateur, dans le domaine de l'éducation et surtout avec les tout jeunes.

M. le premier ministre, lorsque vous étiez chef de l'opposition, vous demandiez au ministre de l'Éducation du jour, de changer le curriculum, de faire enseigner les deux langues officielles dans toutes nos écoles. Vous avez suggéré que l'enseignement des deux langues soit obligatoire. Vous vous souviendrez sans doute que je vous avais félicité. Il n'appartient qu'à vous maintenant d'apporter ce changement; nous avons le droit de nous attendre à ce leadership. Il faudrait aussi promouvoir l'école d'immersion totale si populaire auprès de la population anglophone éclairée. Ne serait-il pas juste si la province du Manitoba qui avait volé les droits des francophones et qui aussi a permis l'assimilation que nous constatons maintenant, soit la première province anglophone à prendre ce grand pas vers l'unité nationale, l'enrichissement de notre beau pays, le Canada.

Merci beaucoup, M. l'orateur.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to begin by congratulating you and the Speaker on the onerous task that you have again undertaken. Your reputations go before you, Sir, and I know that you undertake your duties graciously and punctiliously. Thank you for the generosity of your welcome to me as a new member. I congratulate also the Mover and the Seconder of the Speech from the Throne on the quality of their dissertations and the high standard they have set for those who follow them.

A mon ami de St-Boniface, M. le président, je regrette que je ne parle pas français.

I would like to thank all members of the Chamber, Mr. Speaker, for their warm and gracious welcome, both those to the right of me who are to my left, and those to the left of me who are to my right. I understand that I can depend on their goodwill right through to the end of this speech and after that no holds are barred except of course, Sir, within the rules and regulations of this House. Despite the implication of that understanding I think just working and being in a beautiful, historical Chamber such as this must be an inspiration to all of us who are called to serve in this particular area of public life.

Mr. Speaker, I feel I must draw to the attention of yourself and of all who are here the fact that last Thursday was an historic occasion in one sense. It is my understanding that never before in the history of this Chamber has there been a woman on each side of the House, Mr. Speaker, and I am proud to share that distinction with the Honourable Minister of Culture.--(Interjection)-- No.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that it is usual in presenting a maiden speech to dwell for a time on the delight of one's constituency. Fort Rouge is named for an early French station located where the rivers meet and was the first white settlement known in this area. It was occupied by Varenne de La Verendryé in the year 1738. I listened with interest as the Honourable Member for River Heights described his constituency on Friday and I was struck by the difference between his problem-free constituency and mine. The two are separated only by Crescentwood constituency and parts of all three were in the old Winnipeg south federal riding. As one moves from River Heights through Crescentwood and into the Fort Rouge constituency along the Corydon-McMillan area, Mr. Speaker, you find a neighbourhood of older homes many of which have been purchased by families intent on restoring former rooming houses, which have been rapidly deteriorating, to single family, exciting, individually

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

designed homes. These owners and others in my area, Mr. Speaker, are very much in need of tax incentives to enable their continued rehabilitation of this area. They do not seek funding for this purpose but merely ask for a freeze on the increased assessment for a three to five-year period so that they can proceed with the rehabilitation of the area and I would hope that this government will negotiate with the City of Winnipeg to make these incentives possible.

North of this neighbourhood and approaching the Assiniboine River remain some of the Wellington Crescent mansions which add so much of architectural distinction to our city and which grace the winding crescent and the adjacent river with serenity of years past. Unfortunately more and more of these mansions are falling to the wrecker and are being replaced by the apartment complexes which the City and Metro long ago decided should be concentrated in the Fort Rouge area. Presumably the reason for this decision was to insure sufficient rental accommodation should be constructed close to downtown for those who for one reason or another choose to rent rather than to purchase homes.

Many residents, sociologists, safety officials, environmentalists and politicians deplore concentration of dwelling units in a high rise format, high density format, unless careful balance is maintained between high density and surrounding green space. Nevertheless this type of construction does seem to meet the needs, at least in part, of many individuals and therefore it's with fresh concern that we see owners of apartment blocks, designed and planned for renters converting their buildings to condominiums against the wishes of the tenants. My predecessor as the Member for Fort Rouge, now happily, Mr. Speaker, the Member of Parliament for Winnipeg Fort Garry, successfully introduced legislation in this Chamber which in part corrected the situation but the ingenuity of some owners who are acquiring a number of the rental blocks requires additional safeguards and I hope, Sir, that I will be permitted to introduce such legislation at a later time.

A further concern is that, contrary to the intentions of the various successive planning authorities of the City, rental apartments, whether sold or not, are being converted to commercial use without approval of the City and without public hearings or the other requirements usual to such change. More of this also later, Sir.

On continuing my tour of Fort Rouge, and we have gradually approached Osborne Street to the north, we have apartment houses, to the south are homes converting from rooming houses to single family rehabilitation. Osborne Village of course is pure delight as many members and their spouses already know - exciting first quality restaurants, boutiques and specialty shops, a self-contained village of owner-operated shops, some new and some restored. Fifteen years ago, Mr. Speaker, this was known as the Osborne bottleneck, a shabby huddle of forlorn little shops, bleakly going nowhere until a couple of enterprising entrepreneurs with imagination and a sense of adventure began the infroconstruction and the conversion and restoration which has resulted in Winnipeg's answer to Yorkville and most of this restoration, all of the restoration I can say of the existing buildings, Mr. Speaker, has been done at private cost.

Leaving Osborne Village we past Augustine Church with its beautiful spire and enter a totally different neighbourhood known locally as the east of Osborne area. The river bank fringe along the Assiniboine east of Osborne Street still features quality apartment houses, mostly of a moderate density. River and Stradbrook have older walk-up good quality apartments and a series of Cul de Sacs, again restored older homes. This area was in jeopardy of being converted through spot rezoning to high density development. As a city councillor for the area, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of working with the residents to develop an Action Area Plan which has in effect confirmed the east of Osborne area as a restoration neighbourhood ideally suited to young families wanting to live close to downtown, to students needing affordable housing and to active seniors.

The very eastern most thrust of this area coming into the spot where La Verendryé landed so long ago is ignored as a historical site even though it is in fact one of our earliest settlements. Nestled in this area adjacent to the fork of the rivers are a number of manufacturing enterprises. Many of us hope some day to see this made into a small heritage park.

Mr. Speaker, crossing the Assiniboine River we approach a tragic situation. An incredibly strange combination of distinctive modern architecture, terrible modern architecture, beautiful heritage structures such as the CN Station, the Fort Garry Hotel, and the Courthouse, and apartment houses in various stages of repair and disrepair. I said tragic because as a residential area this part of town is going rapidly downhill. The tendency has been to concentrate assisted housing for seniors encouraging a general feeling that downtown

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

is a place for the aged, whereas we all know by now that that's not very good planning. There is some housing for wheelchair and other physically handicapped. More of that is needed. There are sadly neglected apartment buildings, Mr. Speaker, maintained at the minimally acceptable safety levels. Streets are abandoned at night in this heartland of the city. Police foot patrol, similar to affirmative action which was initiated in the city when I was a member of the police commission, is desperately needed on both sides of the river so that residents may feel safe on their streets in early and late evening hours. There is no excuse in a city like ours, Mr. Speaker, for downtown to be the public meeting place for the drifters and the dregs of humanity and yet that is what is happening in our downtown. Because of this my last motion as a city councillor in my area last fall and passed by council instructed His Worship the Mayor to request the province for financial assistance in order that more foot patrols may be made available to counteract the drifting into the city of troublemakers from other parts of Manitoba and Canada. I'm hopeful that the Minister, the Attorney-General will listen and act upon the city's request.

A serious liability in the area, Mr. Speaker, is the lack of support services. In particular, lack of a grocery store and we've heard much about that in the past year or so. I suggest to the government that as a major landlord they have a responsibility to arrange for the kind of support service that keeps our investment in housing viable. I have never asked, as the Minister for Housing suggested, that government should be in the grocery business; that would obviously be absurd. I do suggest government has a responsibility to arrange for this and other essential services to be incorporated into publicly funded development. These people have been dealt a further blow - and reference was made to this in question period today - with the announced cancelling of the Dash bus.

The deterioration of core area Winnipeg has continued dramatically since unification of the municipalities, Mr. Speaker. I doubt if the NDP government realized that the political structure they introduced effective January 1972 would have such a disastrous effect on the once proud city of Winnipeg, but the truth is that the former city with a 1971 population of a quarter of a million has been subjugated by the former suburbs, the largest of which had a 1971 population of I believe it was under 80,000. The boundary changes initiated by the present government have exaggerated this imbalance. The inner city, Mr. Speaker, has virtually no representation on the all-powerful executive policy committee. Of the five major committees of the City of Winnipeg three are chaired by St. James councillors, none by the inner city. In 1978, three out of four St. Boniface - St. Vital community councillors sat on executive policy committee, not one from the inner city; and concern for inner city is in direct proportion to this imbalance. According to the city's former Chief Commissioner over 70 percent of the city budget is spent outside of the inner city.

At the same time property taxpayers in School Division No. 1 pay the highest school taxes contributing a disproportionately large amount of the foundation levy and subsidizing property taxpayers in other school division by over five million dollars.

Mr. Speaker, that was a thumbnail sketch of Fort Rouge and I hope members appreciate what a diverse and interesting community it is. The very poor live there and the very rich and every economic group in between. Suburban dwellers make their money in the inner city and then they close their doors at night and they go home, unless of course they have tickets to the Ballet or the Symphony or the Theatre Centre.

An ideal situation exists there, Mr. Speaker, for creation of a model urban community with family homes integrated with wheelchair and other handicapped homes and seniors, with needed commercial supports, innovative transit with energy saving concepts. Inner city should be a place to live and work and play and sleep.

Mr. Speaker, I want also to comment on the Throne Speech which I feel raised more questions than answers; and while I am doing this I would like to say how pleased I was that the Honourable Member for Lakeside has regained his speech because, as he confessed to the House, we spent a number of hours together on election today. I must say in my own defense that the Honourable Member for Burrows was there also, and the Honourable Member for Burrows --(Interjections)-- No defense! --(Interjections)-- The Honourable Member for Burrows, Mr. Speaker, maintained a sort of controlled air of optimism through the evening. The Honourable Member for Lakeside, he had nothing to say for himself at all, he became very quiet and that's why I'm so glad to see that he's regained his speech. All the joy was in my corner, Mr. Speaker, on that particular occasion.

I was interested to hear about the substantial increases for post-secondary institutions and public schools. I'm afraid I fear I that the word substantial does not necessarily indicate that

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

the amounts will keep pace with rising costs, and I would be disappointed if we should realize, some time in the future, Mr. Speaker, that a provincial share in 1980 would estimate 70 percent as against, say, 73 percent in 1979. Where is the additional funding to come from? I have already referred to the subsidization of other school divisions by Winnipeg No. 1 and I earnestly hope the Minister of Education will join with me in pressing for a more equal equalization scheme. Winnipeg School Division No. 1 has been penalized enough, I suggest.

Mr. Speaker, will promised substantial increases for post-secondary education equal the fee increases? Will they be accompanied by realistic increased student assistance through student aid or provide summer jobs for students which will pay enough to enable them to continue attending post-secondary institutions? And will they fully meet the expectations of the federal government's block funding 50/50 sharing? If not, and if the present tendency continues, Mr. Speaker, I view with the gravest concern a return to the day when higher education is the prerogative of the children of the rich.

I know the Minister of Health will be disappointed if I don't mention that portion of the speech which emanates from his department. Mr. Speaker, this has been referred to before, but I just can't help but wonder in how many Throne Speeches Seven Oaks Hospital has appeared and will continue to appear. Since this is a continued project I wonder if the \$138 million for Health Sciences Centre is not also the same redevelopment we've been hearing about. I was naturally pleased to hear about new personal care homes being constructed. The need continues in Manitoba, and of course operating costs at about \$35 a day per diem are considerably less than other types of hospital care.

There continues to be a need for extended care beds, Mr. Speaker, above and beyond those included in the Seven Oaks complex; and for the life of me, in putting aside my own bias as a past member and Chairman of the Board of the Winnipeg Municipal Hospitals, I can't understand government's placing of extended care beds for long term beds in concrete complexes rather than in the beautiful 40 acre park which surrounds the Municipal hospitals known to many as the King Edward, the King George and the Princess Elizabeth. The Municipals, Mr. Speaker, are famed throughout Canada for their specialty of extended care and were among the first in Canada, certainly the first in Manitoba, to introduce home care in day hospitals, devised to keep those in failing health in their own homes for as long as possible, eminently desirable for their emotional health and consequently for their physical health, and economically advantageous to the taxpayer as well.

I was curious about the reference to substantial contribution to improvements in maternal and child health. As the Minister knows I am a member of the task force studying this enormously important health problem. Is the funding referred to the already committed funding of the task force or is it something new?

Of course, we all support improvements in care for the new dental insured services, expansion of dialysis programs, and a possible return of Winnipeg to the area of medical research. Before commenting though I shall await specifics on these and other programs referred to in the speech.

I am pleased with the announcement of an advisory council on the Status of Women since Manitoba is one of the last three provinces to establish such a commission. The Council on Aging, of course, is a repeat of last year's promise. One of my major concerns here is that the aging themselves should appoint their own representatives to this council. For goodness sake, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Minister, please don't use the seniors in Manitoba as guinea pigs. When you say you're going to do something for them, do it. Empty promises are unfair.

I would like to see this Legislature enable individuals greater freedom of choice in determining their own age of retirement, thereby reducing the discriminatory impact of the present mandatory retirement age, which in my opinion is an affront to human rights. I would like to see pensions for the elderly more portable to ensure that pension income closely reflects the real value of people's earnings and the number of years they spent working.

Retirement income plans for women should be revamped by this legislation to ensure that women have the same income security in their old age as men, and that they are not denied access to their husband's pensions due to widowhood or marriage breakdown.

Mentally ill people - expansions and facilities. To be meaningful this will require an amount of at least \$100,000 in the Budget. Similarly, with so many of the programs specified, approval depends on specifics and until specifics are presented can be approved in principle only.

Reference was made to continuation of the SAFER program, Mr. Speaker, formerly known as the Shelter Allowance. The Liberal Party is, of course, delighted that the government chose to accept in part my predecessors and our party's policy of shelter allowances.

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

But I do wish, Sir, that the Minister had read all the way through to the end of our resolution which quite clearly concluded, "beginning with those most in need." Among those most in need, Mr. Speaker, in our community, are single parent families; and in Manitoba, with respect to single parent families, over 50 percent of homeowners and 69 percent of renters cannot afford the housing they are living in now. That's over 2,000 single parent families in the inner city alone.

Many many people between 50 and 65 years of age, especially those whose employment ceased through one of the business closures of the past few years, and especially also those widows who, conforming to the mores of their day, gave up their jobs to become housewives and mothers. SAFER should be expanded to include those in greatest need.

I would encourage the government to consolidate its ad hoc housing programs under a new housing ministry, Mr. Speaker, with which a city housing department could work closely in developing joint policies, program initiative and funding arrangements. Such a provincial housing ministry would enhance city and provincial liaison with the federal governments.

The announcement, Mr. Speaker, committing the government to full development of the hydro-electric potential of the Nelson-Churchill system, preceded by several minutes, rather obscure reference to an environmental review process. The community disaster which accompanied the Nelson River project must not be repeated on the Burntwood River. Northerners who may be displaced by further flooding say the impression they receive from government is that environmental considerations do not have their top priority.

While I'm speaking of the north I must ask when the government expects to settle native land and water claims, Mr. Speaker. If these settlements are not concluded hydro development could be held up for years in the courts leaving Manitoba unable to develop needed power, postponement of which has contributed significantly to the fact that Manitoba's level of public investment in the economy is the lowest in Canada. The assurance that citizens of native ancestry will continue to benefit from government programs as they have in the past leaves them with a rather bleak prospect doesn't it, Mr. Speaker?

In the north some remote communities have almost total unemployment, frightful infant mortality rates, poor access to health care and law enforcement and high use of alcohol and other drugs and fuel sniffing. Thousands, in their despair, come to Winnipeg seeking alternatives and are so often faced with more of the same lack of opportunity. Responsibility for native people has been tossed around between provincial and federal governments like a hot potato. Native people are not just a nuisance, Mr. Speaker, but they're one of this country's greatest natural resources. All of our Manitoba governments have failed to provide natives with appropriate training programs to enable them to develop, create, and seize upon employment opportunities. Their home communities should be adapted so as to make them socially, culturally, and economically desirable places to live, for the young people to stay, if they wish to do so.

Natives who have migrated to larger centres should have been assisted to resettle in a planned, organized fashion which recognized them as contributing citizens instead of the tendency to ignore them in hopes that frustration will drive them back to where they came from. They will be here for a long time to come, we must not look on urban natives as a federal problem. Let us join with city government, with business and community volunteer groups to take a positive optimistic approach to a long-standing issue.

Returning to the subject of economic development, I must refer to the apparent lack of faith this government has in the inventive capacity of our citizens. The NDP, when in power, seemed to have a philosophy that government could succeed where private enterprise failed. The present government, while claiming to be the friend of private enterprise, seems so afraid of following NDP footsteps that it is unwilling to give real support to our own local inventors and small businesses. It is said that North Dakota's Chamber of Commerce's best friend and source of new enterprise is the Manitoba government, as hundreds of Manitobans are forced to go out of the province to seek start-up capital on new ventures. Mr. Speaker, we hear of small businesses, after frustrating years of attempting to secure start-up capital in Manitoba, crossing the border to be received by willing backers. These Manitobans feel that their ties to this province do not imply that they are less clever, or less resourceful than inventors and producers elsewhere, their product is probably designed to meet specific needs of Manitoba's type of climate and economic conditions. They take as much pride in their province as they do in their own ability. They want to keep their product in Manitoba, and they want to be recognized by fellow Manitobans for their contributions to our way of life. They want to live in Manitoba; they want to produce in Manitoba; and I shall say more of this in later debate, Mr. Speaker, but it is a backward step for any Canadian province to proceed

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

from exporting our natural resources to be processed elsewhere to exporting our human resources to foreign soil as we have with our inventors, small businesses, and so many of our trained experts.

Mr. Speaker, I've merely touched on many of my concerns and will elaborate on them in the future. I thank you, Sir, for allowing me this opportunity to speak for the people of Fort Rouge and for the people of my party.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. LEN DOMINO: Mr. Speaker, I think I'll dispense with all the formalities, they have been handled previously by other speakers. I would like to say that I was very pleased with the Throne Speech. I feel it comes as no surprise to members opposite, because I read in that Throne Speech a recognition by the government that they had met most of the original commitments that we have made to the electorate in 1977, and that the time had now come for this government to undertake some new commitments, to undertake some new initiatives.

The Progressive Conservative Opposition in 1977 made some promises to the people during that election campaign, and I was part of it. I think the major promises we made have all been kept, and they were what? (1) We were going to control government waste, we were going to control government spending; and I think we've done that. The very fact, as you listened over the last two years in question period, I think the opposition have recognized that too, because during the entire timespan of the last session I can't recall one question that involved excess government spending, or government waste. We had a lot of questions but the opposition didn't use up any of its time to point out waste or overspending, and I think that's a recognition on their part that the government has met that basic commitment to the people of Manitoba.

The second commitment we made was we said that the provincial deficit was unacceptably high and should be lowered, and I note that in the third quarter financial report, released just a few days before this session opened of the Legislature, that the projected deficit of \$225 million in 1977 had been reduced to something less than \$75 million. I think that is a major accomplishment. It took a lot of tough decisions in the face of what was very often childish and unfair criticism, in the face of what we called at the time, and I think fairly, the bed sheet type of politics, but the government stuck to its guns and it was able to control finances. I think that the government deserves a lot of credit for reducing the deficit.

I think that is very important because you have to understand what deficit financing is. When you are running a deficit you are asking our children and our grandchildren to pay for expenditures, services and benefits which we are receiving today. And that is not fair; that is not fair if you are going to do that on a long term basis continually.

This is not to say that deficit spending is always bad. There are times when we must have deficit spending, and I have noticed that the present government is still projecting a \$75 million deficit and at the present state of the world economy, the provincial economy, the national economy, I think maybe that deficit should be allowed to rise and that the government may have to let it rise to maybe \$100 million next year.

But the deficit of \$225 million that was projected in the fall of 1977, that deficit needed to be dealt with, that deficit had to be brought down, because that deficit didn't result from that government meeting the legitimate needs. That deficit came about because you had a group of very frightened politicians who were facing an imminent election. Those politicians read the public opinion polls and they saw that they were in trouble and they didn't have the courage to say no to anybody. So time after time they allowed spending to be approved which was inappropriate, which was wasteful and which was unnecessary. They did not have the ability to say no and the Province of Manitoba would have been burdened with a \$225 million deficit if the government hadn't changed in 1977.

This is not to say, of course, that I am against deficit spending at any point. I realize that you have to have deficit spending at certain times in the cycle of the economy and that deficit spending can be an excellent tool used by the government to stimulate the economy when times are slow and when times are hard. However, I think there is one thing that must be understood and that is that deficit spending, no matter what the reason, whether the deficit spending is for stimulation or whether it is to meet the legitimate needs of the people, deficit spending is spending like any other spending and just because you are going to use the money to stimulate the economy is no excuse to approve projects which are wasteful. It is no excuse to approve projects that have sloppy management. It is no excuse to waste the people's money, because money that we are spending, even if we haven't collected it yet, the

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

people who are going to be contributing that money down the road are going to have to work just as hard for those tax dollars which we propose to spend as the people today. Therefore, wasted money is wasted money, no matter what the purpose.

So I would think that even though I am encouraging the government at this point to increase the deficit slightly - I don't think there is anything wrong with that under the present circumstances. I would hope that they are not going to forget their commitment and that each and every project they approve, and that each and every expansion of a program or new program that they undertake, it be looked at with the same cold, hard, objective, financially-realistic look that we have been applying to all projects over the last two years. Because I happen to think - and I will outline a couple of them - I happen to think there are some areas in the economy; there are some needs that can be met that are legitimate needs and that could serve the purpose of stimulating the economy.

So I would like to congratulate this government, particularly the Ministers in the Treasury Benches. I think they have done a good job. I think they have taken unfair criticism. I think they have done an excellent job of controlling government waste, controlling the government spending, and reducing the deficit.

The government also promised to restore competitiveness of small business and we have kept that promise. We have reduced the taxes as we said we would. The stats, the figures show, regardless of what the opposition says, that there were 24,000 new jobs in Manitoba over the last two years. That record is substantially better than the previous government's record. To be exact, it took the previous government four and one-half years to create 24,000 new jobs. We have done that in just two years, under international economic circumstances which are not favourable.

We promised a tax reduction and we kept that promise. We have produced across-the-board tax reduction and, what is most amazing to me of all, over the last two and one-half years we have not increased taxes. If you take a close look at what happened over the last 15 years, both over the last Progressive Conservative Government under Mr. Roblin, who was a fine Premier, and the government under Mr. Schreyer during the Seventies, there was a continual . . . Each and every year the taxation rate in this province was raised. That hasn't happened over the last two and one-half years. We have managed to run this government without raising taxes.

We also promised to maintain all essential services and I think we have met that promise. I know the Opposition won't agree, but I think we have met that promise. Some time last year, at the beginning of last year, I sent a letter out to each and every one of my constituents and I said to them: Let me know if any basic essential services have been reduced. Write to me, phone me, tell me, because I want to know if what the opposition is saying is true. I don't think it is, but let's hear from you.

I received a lot of letters back; I received 500 letters back from my constituency and in those letters I received approximately 25 from people who had details of where they thought basic services had been reduced but, after investigation, in each and every one of those cases they had been misled.

Now, I don't feel, and I am sure the people in my constituency don't feel, that the hospitals have been reduced in their efficiency or their services. They have been made a little more efficient. They have been made to operate a little more intelligently, but I don't believe they are providing any less of a service or that their service is any less efficient today than it was under the New Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, what this government has done in the last two and one-half years I think can be summed up by simply saying that the Progressive Conservative Government in power in Manitoba today has respect for the mixed economy. Now the mixed economy is an economy which has served us very well in this country. It is an economy where there is a role for governments and where there is a role for private enterprise. Under the New Democrats, if you take a look at what happened, in each and every year of their government the public sector's share of the provincial economy rose by approximately one-half a percent each year. There was a continual invasion of the private sector by the public sector. If you take that and you extrapolate it for just a few years you will see that you will eventually arrive, after not too many years, at a point where there is no more private sector.

Now I know that that would make some of the members opposite happy and I fully recognize that other members on the other side would probably be very amazed and astonished at the day when we arrived at 100 percent government participation in the provincial economy, and they would probably be sorry. But they didn't speak out publicly during those eight or nine years of New Democratic government, and I note that over the last

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

two years in this province we have reversed that trend. I don't think it has to happen every year. We would be just as dogmatic as the members opposite if we insisted that the public's share of the provincial economy went down every year.

But I happen to think that right now, with the percentage we have, the percentage balance between public and private is a pretty good one. It allows for the public sector to do its job, which in a truly mixed economy there is a role for the public sector. The government has an important role, and I want this to be understood - in my opinion it does, at least - and that is to police the private sector; to redistribute income; to step in when there were excesses in the private sector of the economy; to operate in monopoly situations or in other situations where the private sector cannot operate. And as far as I know from my discussions with my colleagues, all my colleagues agree with me here too, and I think the past record of Progressive Conservative governments, nationally and provincially, shows that we recognize that.

But I happen to believe that the private sector of our economy is that sector of the economy which best produces wealth. Everything I have read and all my personal experience demonstrates that to me. And if you truly believe in a mixed economy, then you can't allow the public sector to continually invade the private sector. You cannot allow the private sector to be taxed to impotence so that it can't produce jobs and it can't produce wealth. I think that is what was happening.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that the key difference between myself and members opposite is that I really believe in a true mixed economy, and I really believe there is a long-term role for the private sector and that there is a role for the public sector.

Now when I listen to the members opposite, I see that we both want more prosperity for the people of Manitoba. We both want more jobs; we both want a bigger and better economy and, Mr. Speaker, believe it or not, I think there is room for a more equitable redistribution of income in our society, too. I don't see any major differences except that how the members opposite propose to go about it. Because regardless of what they say, their record was clear and their record was straightforward. In each and every one of the years in which the New Democratic Party was in power in Manitoba the public sector of the provincial economy increased. It increased in percentage terms which meant the private sector decreased, which meant that sector of the economy which produces wealth was made weaker and that sector which redistributes wealth and controls the private sector was made continually stronger. I think if you follow that through to its natural conclusion you end up in a totally Socialist state.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I think the provincial government made certain commitments to the people of Manitoba; I think they have kept those commitments. I hope and pray that never in this province again will we have a government that is not concerned about efficiency and not concerned about undue deficits. But I think now there is room in the provincial government's mentality for some new commitments, that we can undertake some new commitments for the people of Manitoba.

I believe one of the most important requirements and one of the most urgent needs is for the provincial government to undertake a commitment to the urban centres in our province. In our province, when you speak urban you don't speak exclusively of the City of Winnipeg, but you have to recognize the City of Winnipeg is indeed the largest urban centre in Manitoba and it needs help.

The City of Winnipeg recently has been going through its annual Budget procedure, and the city spends almost \$300 million a year. They are a large government all unto themselves. I think this government, if you take a close look, if you have talked to city councillors, if you have read the articles in the newspaper, you can see that the city government needs some help. I think the provincial government has undertaken some, what I think are very excellent, moves on behalf of the city government and other urban centres in this province.

Probably the most important and the one with the most long-term and far reaching repercussions will be the Block Funding Program. I congratulate the Minister of Urban Affairs; I congratulate the fellow members of my caucus for conceiving of this idea and implementing it. I think it is an excellent idea. It allows the civic politicians to operate on their own. It allows them to be responsible to their citizens, to their own electorate, and it limits the interference from the provincial government.

However, Mr. Speaker, when you take a close look at what is happening with city finances you can come to no other conclusion but that the city does not have sufficient finances at this point, sufficient funding at this point to maintain its services and improve them as the citizens demand.

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

Now I notice that there was an increase in the provincial tax revenue sharing formula and that was good. That was good for all the centres in Manitoba. I applaud the fact that the provincial government has responded in that way and that it is trying to help the City of Winnipeg.

I should also point out here at this time, and I think it is obvious to most people, that the problems the City of Winnipeg face are not unique to the City of Winnipeg; the problems that Brandon face are not unique to Brandon. These are problems which are endemic all across North America and certainly all across Canada. You find large urban centres with their requirements for money, their requirements for funding, rising faster than their ability to raise taxes.

I believe the City of Winnipeg and the councillors have taken a realistic and a very responsible view of their own expenditures, yet they're still faced with a quandary. They find themselves with having to place an extra burden on the property owners of this city or to reduce services, and they are in a situation where they have to increase property taxes faster than the rate of inflation or reduce services. The city, it appears, has chosen - and that's their decision to make - to reduce services in some areas.

It was mentioned today in question period and later by the Member for Fort Rouge that the DASH bus service is being cut out. That's a city decision; that's their responsibility. I'm sorry to see it go. I know that it cost a half million dollars a year. I'm aware of the facts of the DASH bus service. I don't think it's efficient; I don't think it works very well right now, but in terms of the future, in terms of the energy crunch and the energy crisis that we'll be faced with in the future, I think it's good to keep that DASH bus service going. I think it's an excellent move. But I'm not so sure that the answer is just for the province to turn over more money, or to turn over a special grant, because then we're going to end up with the same situation we had before with the province giving all kinds of grants to the city, all of them with strings attached, and each and every time we give a grant we interfere with the city's independence and with the political relationship between the city councillors and the members of caucus.

Now, I know that service was subsidized to the extent of about 61 cents a ride, even with the 10 cent service and that it had something less than 3,000 riders a day, but I'd like to see it continued. As a citizen of Winnipeg and as someone who lives downtown, I think it's a good idea, especially for the future, and I'd like to find some way to supply the necessary funds to the City of Winnipeg so they can keep that service in place, if they choose to.

Mr. Speaker, there are lots of problems the city has. The city certainly needs that \$1.5 million for two-way radio communication for the buses, to make the bus system safer. The city certainly needs more money for new buses because all across North America, at this time, cities are envious of us. They want better bus service; they want a better public transportation service, and Winnipeg seems to be standing still. We're not buying any new buses this year; we're not renewing our fleet, but we should be. The city needs more money.

But again, I don't think the answer is simply for the provincial government to once again get into the act of supplying the City of Winnipeg with direct grants with all kinds of strings attached. That's not the answer. Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the answer is to the urban problems all across this country. I don't know what the answer to the City of Winnipeg's problem is. But I know that we've got to begin to look for some long-term ways to supply the city with revenues which will grow as fast as their commitments, because you have to remember that they, of all the different levels of government, have the most labour intensive services to supply. And I know that if we don't begin immediately to seek some solutions to the city's problems, we're going to be in a major problem.

Let's not forget about the importance of the City of Winnipeg. I'll produce some figures for you. These figures are not meant to suggest that Winnipeg deserves a special deal or that Winnipeg deserves more money in direct grants; these figures are supplied simply to point out that Winnipeg is an important part of the economy of Manitoba and that Winnipeg is very important to the health of this province, just as important as the agricultural industry, more important than the mining industry.

If you take a look at where the provincial government's revenues come from, the main sources of provincial government revenue are, of course, income tax, retail sales tax, liquor sales tax, gas tax, and corporate tax. We can't apportion corporation tax between city and non-city in Manitoba, it's impossible because corporations operate across the whole city. But you can take a look at income tax, and you can notice that the province collects about \$370 million in income tax, and that almost 70 percent of that comes from the City of Winnipeg, and about 30 percent comes from outside the City of Winnipeg.

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

You can look at the retail sales tax, and you can see the province collects \$217 million in retail sales tax, and that \$138 million-plus comes from Winnipeg, which is about 64 percent of the total. You can look at liquor sales tax and you can see that we collect about \$72 million in liquor sales tax, or profits in sales tax on liquor. A good 71 percent of that comes from the City of Winnipeg. Gasoline tax, \$58 million for the province of Manitoba. Again, almost 60 percent from the City of Winnipeg.

The total, when you add up all these sources of income, you'll find the City of Winnipeg produces about 66 percent of the total revenue for the province of Manitoba, yet the city only has about 50 percent of the population, 52 percent of the population.

I don't present these figures so that you will all say, oh, the poor City of Winnipeg has been so badly done by. I present these figures to indicate the City of Winnipeg is an important economic entity within the province of Manitoba, and the City of Winnipeg and its problems are the problems of this Legislature. And this is not to say that we abandon block funding; it is not to say that we start to supply grants with strings attached, but I think we have to look for a solution.

Now, last year I was very proud of the Premier of this province because he realized that agriculture is one of our major industries, just as important as the City of Winnipeg to Manitoba's economic health. And he saw that there was a major problem in that industry getting its product to market, and he called a major conference, on his own initiative, and he said, let's get the people together here and let's talk about how we're moving grain, and how we can do it better. And we drew together, and I think that conference was very successful because it drew attention to the problem of grain hauling in this country. It brought together all the various elements who were involved in this, and it took some concrete action towards solving the problem. At that time, I congratulated the Premier, and I still think it was an excellent idea. He deserves credit for that move.

I think it's time in this province for the Premier to once again take some initiative, and this time to take an initiative to help solve the urban financing problem in this country. I would like to see the Premier once again use his personal offices and his personal prestige to get together these people who are interested in a major serious problem. I would like to see the Premier call a major conference on urban financing, and not just for the City of Winnipeg but for all the urban centres in this country, and get together all the municipal governments and the provinces, and the federal governments, and even the school board, because the school boards across this country play a significant role in increasing the burden on the property owners, with the property tax. I think the Premier of the province should call a special conference again, and this time the conference should deal with the long range solutions to supplying funding for urban centres in this country. Because as certain as I stand here today, we have to find a way to take the burden off the property owners.

For young people such as myself, it's not all that bad. It's a heavy burden, but the property taxes are rising rapidly. Most young people have a future to look forward to where their incomes rise rapidly too, but the real burden, those hardest hit, are people who have worked all their lives to buy and own houses, and whose major asset in this world is their home, and who are now being, in some cases, taxed out of it.

Now, I know that the last government brought in measures to try and relieve that problem. I know that this government has tried to add to those measures. They've tried to assist them even more with extra school tax relief, etc., but I also know that those measures have not been sufficient, that we've got a problem. But I still have retired constituents coming to me and saying, you know the property taxes that are levied against my house through the municipal government and school boards are rising substantially faster than inflation and, at very best, my pension is indexed to inflation, and that I have to continually, every year, take money away from what would be a vacation, or take money away from what would be household maintenance, or take money away from my food bill to pay those taxes.

We should remember that in Winnipeg the largest group of elderly people is made up of homeowners who are continually facing this ever-increasing squeeze of spiralling costs, and one of the most obvious and most difficult things to cope with are the property taxes.

I was pleased, and I'm sure all members of this House were pleased, to hear that we froze the cost of hydro and, over the years, to senior citizens and all the citizens of Manitoba, that will be a significant benefit, aside from the fact it will make us more competitive in terms of attracting industry. But the benefit that the senior citizens get from the frozen price of hydro, from the hydro cost not going up, is more than taken away by increased municipal taxes. We've got to deal with that problem. We've got to deal with the municipal tax problem. And I want the Premier to get involved in it personally.

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

I was very happy to see the SAFER program. I think it's an excellent program. I think it's excellent for a number of reasons. I think it's excellent, above and beyond all else, because it shows that you can find an answer to problems that doesn't involve the exclusive use of the governments. It's an excellent program. And by the way, I should point out to the Member for Fort Rouge that in my very maiden speech in this House I called on the government to produce something very much like the SAFER program, and I used the British Columbia example, and that my speech predated Mr. Axworthy's by some three or four months. --(Interjections)--

Mr. Speaker, I was speaking of the SAFER program. I think it's an excellent program because it supplies low income senior citizens with an alternative to public housing. It lets them stay in neighbourhoods, if they want; they don't have to move into government highrises. It encourages private landlords to supply accommodation to these people. And it's a public program and it's redistribution of income. I applaud it for those reasons, but inside that program there is an integral and important realistic role for private enterprise to play. And that's why I think it's an excellent program. And that's why I think programs like SAFER are superior to building huge government highrises. I think in the long run it's cheaper and it's better for our economy; it's more pluralistic in its approach, and that's what we need.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of all kinds of ways that I can stand up here and encourage assistance, and I think I can find all kinds of ways in which we can help the senior citizens. I think senior citizens shouldn't have to pay ten cents to ride a bus. I think the bus should be free to senior citizens. But I know that's going to cost the City of Winnipeg a half million dollars. I know that there's not a councillor in the City of Winnipeg who doesn't agree with me, but they all say, where are we going to find the half million dollars? That's why we've got to get to the root of the problem. We have to be able to supply, with no strings attached, through some sort of formula programs from the federal treasury and from the provincial treasury, the City of Winnipeg with the money they need. And the City of Brandon. And Toronto, and other urban centres in this country. --(Interjection)-- Oh, Thompson, for sure.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just sum up my remarks today with a few comments on Judge Hall's report concerning salaries for members of this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, it hasn't been decided what we're going to do and our caucus hasn't met and made a final decision. I understand the other caucuses haven't made a decision. But Mr. Speaker, I'm certain about what I know about this, and I'm certain that I've been in this House long enough, and in my 2 1/2 years as a member of this Legislature I think I've acquired enough of a feel for the job to know certain things. I know the Premier is underpaid; I know he should be paid more. I know the members of the treasury bench are grossly underpaid. No matter what comparison you make, I know they deserve more. And I further know that those two salary increases have to be brought in through Order-in-Council, and I would urge the Premier to do that right now, to show the courage, to go ahead and do it.

Some ignorant people will . . . Some of those who don't understand - that's what I mean by ignorant - will think it's a terrible move, but I think that the members of the treasury bench deserve more for the long hours they have put in and for the hard work, and members opposite who have sat on the treasury benches and members opposite who know what the job is like would agree with me.

But, Mr. Speaker, when it comes down to the salary increases for the members opposite here, I don't agree. I don't think that we should have a salary increase that is above the formula. We have got a formula in place. It allows for us to receive a salary increase which is almost that of inflation, or at the level of inflation. I think that is sufficient because you have opportunity, as a member of the Legislature, to find outside income if you are aggressive, and if you are worth your salt you will find some outside income if you think you can't live on the money. But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, the main reason I would vote against a \$2,600 increase in salary and vote instead in favour of the formula increase, which would be approximately half that, is because the \$2,600 won't make me a better member and I want to be a better member, Mr. Speaker, but I need other things for that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. DOMINO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to be a better member; I want to make a larger contribution; I want to have more contact with my constituents. In order to do that I need facilities and I noticed that the judge, I think very correctly, urged the provincial government to take some action to supply members with an office. I don't have an office; I have a carrel in a large room. I have no

Tuesday, 26 February 1980

privacy. I don't have proper secretarial assistance. I don't have any research assistance, or virtually no research assistance. I don't receive enough access to the mail, to free franking or to printing so that I can communicate with my constituents on an ongoing basis. Mr. Speaker, I do it and so do most members here, but they dip into their salaries to do it and they shouldn't have to dip into their salaries, because the salary we receive is sufficient, but it is not sufficient if you are going to take three or four thousand or five thousand every year and spend it on communication with your constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the caucus is going to say. I am not sure what they are going to do on this matter. I may have to vote against my caucus. As you know, I have done that before on minimum wage and on other things and I will do it again if I think I am right and they are wrong on an important issue like this.

But, Mr. Speaker, if a bill comes before this House, which we have to have to increase the . . . The Leader of the Opposition's salary has to be increased by the whole House, so do all of our salaries if it is going to be gone by the whole House. If a bill comes before us, I am going to bring in what I call the anti-hypocrisy amendment to that bill. I am going to bring in an amendment to that bill which will allow members who vote against it, who vote against the pay raise, to donate the salary increase to any registered charity of their choice. And then, Mr. Speaker, to do it officially and on the record so that we have got evidence of it.

Then, Mr. Speaker, next year or whenever the election comes, we are going to take a close look and we are going to see which members had the courage of their convictions. We are going to check out which members of this Legislature voted "No" and then took the salary increase, because I suspect that there are members in this exalted hall, in this Legislative Assembly, who feel they should receive that extra increase but who won't have the courage to tell their constituents that, and will stand up and be counted and registered in the media as voting "No", but then will quietly take the cheque and cash it and spend it. That is hypocrisy. Then they are going to say, "But we had no choice, I voted against it, but the government sent me the cheque anyways. What was I going to do?" Well, I am going to supply them with an out, the anti-hypocrisy amendment.

A MEMBER: Is that the Domino Theory?

MR. DOMINO: It is not the Domino Theory, but it may result in some of the members opposite, unless they are very careful, in falling like the dominoes fall in the next election, unless they are careful that they are not found in a situation where they are showing hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker, I think that just about uses up my time and certainly covers most of the important points I wanted to make today. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: M. l'orateur, comme vous êtes encore en charge de la Chambre législative cette année, j'aimerais vous offrir mes félicitations les plus chaleureuses.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to congratulate the new members, as well, who have been elected in the by-elections and also the Mover and the Seconder of the Speech from the Throne. I would extend my congratulations a little further to the new Ministers who have been appointed to different ministries and wish them well in these troubled times and troubled times we are facing, as we all know, not only in the province but in Canada and all over the world.

The Throne Speech, in my opinion, was uninspiring, a rehash of old news bulletins that we have seen from time to time on numerous occasions and perhaps the same old Conservative nonsense that we are becoming used to. I suppose perhaps it could best be described as a script maybe for a comedy play, because that is about what it amounts to. Once again the laissez-faire attitude, let everything as it will and things will finally rectify themselves. If we turn our heads away all the problems will go away as well.

The only direction that I can see in the Budget is which direction to leave the province. That is the direction that I see in this Throne Speech. What is the direction to go and find a job.

You know, that reminds me of 1977 during the by-election, during the last provincial campaign, we used to hear the Conservatives and particularly the Premier, let's free Manitoba. That was a favorite sentence, let's free Manitoba, let's elect a sane government and let's free Manitoba.

What has happened, Mr. Speaker? It turned into let's flee from Manitoba, that's what it has turned into. Let's flee from Manitoba, that is what has happened. So something during the last two years has happened to that particular sentence that was used, probably very effectively, by the Conservatives in the last election, let's free Manitoba, and it has succeeded because you know everybody is fleeing from Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, that was never more apparent than in the recent federal election. I had the honour to be of assistance to the newly elected Member for Dauphin, Mr. Laverne Lewycky. I was invited, Mr. Speaker, by the Dauphin Association to act as a guest speaker in about 10 or 15 meetings and we found people coming out to our meetings by the hundreds. Yes, by the hundreds, they were coming out. We had as many as 250 coming out to a meeting. In fact, we even outdrew the Minister, a big Minister from Ottawa, Mr. Mazankowski; we were even able to outdraw him in the same town.

Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the people that came to our meetings is that they are disheartened; they are very disheartened with what is happening, and they are discouraged about what has been happening. They are discouraged by the tough, dogmatic, doctrinaire, conservative positions.

The First Minister's statement, you know, that the economy is turned around just doesn't wash with them. It doesn't wash with the 21,000-plus people who have had to leave this province in the last two years to find employment; that doesn't wash. It doesn't wash with them that the economy has changed around for the better. If we look at the statistics, we have dropped to tenth place on almost every sector. We are dropping from what we were previously and we continue to drop down to tenth place on almost every sector of the economy. And I don't think that it will wash that this government can blame their failures now on what's happened in the past. They've been two years in office now and that just won't wash anymore.

I remember a little story, I don't remember exactly how it went but the Member for Morris used to tell it, about sending three letters, writing three letters. Well, you know, it's time to sit down and write some letters. I don't remember how that story went, but it was quite interesting. It was an interesting story.

Mr. Speaker, I remember very well that we were probably defeated by the Conservatives and their strategy in that last campaign. They were going around telling the people that this province was going bankrupt and that we couldn't continue. We were bankrupt, the Premier was saying and all of his colleagues, that we were in debt to the tune of \$3,400 each and this couldn't continue. That's imprinted in my mind. I can still remember that figure. That was a little high, by the way, as we find now. It was inflated a bit. The Minister of Finance tells us that it wasn't \$3,400 but was only \$3,130, but that's neither here nor there. That just makes the situation now much worse, because after two years of hard-nosed good business people that had to be elected in order to turn the economy around, we find that we're now almost \$4,000 in debt per capita, instead of the \$3,130 that we were.

So what has happened? Now the Minister of Transportation shakes his head in disbelief. Well, let him check his own records; let him check the Minister's blue book here, the September one, and look at the latest one, the one for December. It's all in the record and all he has to do is look at the 1979 Budget and he'll find the figures. So what has happened with these hard-nosed good business people? We are now further in debt by over \$800.00. So, if we were bankrupt in 1977, where are we now, Mr. Speaker? We must be in a disastrous situation.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen a lot of spending, which, of course, I don't all agree with. I was very disappointed. In fact, maybe we elected the Member for Dauphin on these two books. They were of much help to me in the Dauphin federal election. I had a lot of fun with these books.

A MEMBER: Explain.

MR. ADAM: Well, it wasn't hard to explain. I said, you know, this book costs \$300,000 and, you know, they could have bought a study made by another Conservative government in Ontario for about \$12 that said that the insurance in Manitoba was the best, the most efficient and the cheapest in Canada. And you could have bought it for \$12, \$15 at the outset but it didn't say what they wanted to hear, that report didn't say what this government wanted to hear. They wanted a report that would say that Autopac had to be changed and it was no good, that's what they wanted to hear. So that's why they cut the hot lunches for children in schools and spent \$300,000 on this kind of trash. Cut the hot lunches in the schools, Mr. Speaker. And here's another one, well this one went way out of whack

because it was supposed to cost \$300,000 and it cost a \$1.3 million eh! It cost \$1.3 million and cost hydro what, \$1.2 million on top of this? So there you have another \$3 million. How many nursing homes could you have built? Six or seven or eight nursing homes you could have built with the money that's spent by hydro and spent by the government for this Tritschler Report. You could have built about six, seven, eight nursing homes. And you could have left the hot lunches for the kids instead of cutting them back. So we got quite a few votes with this in Dauphin, by the way. Probably in other constituencies as well.

Those two reports, Mr. Speaker, were intended to try and enhance the popularity of a government that saw its ratings going down. They're looking for issues to discredit the previous administration, and I mentioned in my opening remarks that you can't blame your now failures on the past, it just won't wash, it doesn't wash any more. That's why the federal election results in Manitoba were as they were, because the people were saying, enough, enough is enough. Sure the federal election was a clear condemnation of policies of this government the past two years. Of course the budget brought down by Mr. Crosbie certainly nobody could support, not even their friends; not even their creditors would support it. Even Mr. Lyon was dissatisfied. He said it wasn't tough enough. He didn't like it either. He's quoted in the Brandon Sun as saying you know I want to see what the people of Manitoba are made of. Well I ask him, call an election. Call an election right now and you will see what the people are made of in Manitoba, call an election.

Mr. Speaker, they were coming out by the hundreds to our meetings and we were very pleased to talk to them and we never criticized. The candidate for the Conservatives in Dauphin says that the only nice people are in the Conservative Party. But I want to tell him that our candidate is a very very nice person and that there are probably a lot of nice people in the Conservative Party and in the Liberal Party and in the New Democratic Party. But I want to say that the member that was elected for Dauphin is a very nice person, because I attended about 15 meetings with him and I never heard him say one word or mention the name of any of his opponents, either Mr. Heschuk or Mr. Hale. He presented, he criticized the Conservative budget, he criticized the performance of this government but he never mentioned any personal attacks upon his opponents and I say he is a nice person.

Mr. Speaker, the people were concerned about their future. The farmers that came out to our meetings were concerned about loss of grain sales, by what the federal leader was doing and some of his Ministers, sabre rattling. They were concerned that they might lose their wheat sales and that the price would go down. Yes, and I was pleased that our leader came out, our leader came out to one or two or three meetings in the Dauphin constituency and he was very well received, he was very well received; and we wonder where the Premier was. Where was the Premier of this province? Why was he not out as well helping the Conservative candidate? And we wonder why he did not come out to help the Conservative candidates get elected but he was nowhere to be seen. And then, low and behold, you know, we stopped wondering when we saw this article in the Financial Post, February 9, which says: "Lyon Lays Low to Help Tories", that's what it says. So then we thought for a while that he was trying to hide but, you know, we said well, if we didn't know better, we thought maybe he was trying to hide but lo and behold we find this in the Financial Post, so it would appear that he was trying to hide.

Oh yes, here's another headline: "Federal Tory Budget Not Tough Enough" and they quote Mr. Lyon, not tough enough. Let him call an election; he'll find out if it's not tough enough. —(Interjection)— Yes, Mr. Pawley came out to help us in Dauphin and the leader of the government here was not around to help their candidates. They wanted to speak to him; they wanted to speak to him. They had a lot of things to ask of the Premier. The small farmers wanted to know what was happening to their energy prices. They wanted to know why the Premier had encouraged the federal government to raise the energy prices to the world level as soon as possible, instead of asking the federal government to hold the line, hold the line because farmers are going to be hurt and small businessmen are going to be hurt and everybody's going to be hurt by high prices. Here we have a Premier that stood up and asked the federal government to raise the energy prices to the world level as soon as possible. That's unbelievable, unbelievable. So they wanted to ask these questions. Farmers wanted to know why their energy costs would be going up so high. The 18 cents didn't bother them too much, it wasn't the 18 cents. Maybe you fellows think it was the 18 cents but it wasn't that; it was the 45 cents, it was the 45 cents increase that they were worried about and then the 18 on top of that for a total of 63 cents. That's what they were worried about.

The small business wanted to know why 44 percent increase in bankruptcies. They wanted to know why they have to pay 17 percent interest rates, they wanted to know. The school

boards wanted to know how their costs would increase with that kind of energy cost increase. And the municipalities wanted to know because they have to plough roads in the winter time and they have to build roads as the Minister of Transportation knows; they wanted to know what their costs were and how that would in turn fall back on the municipal taxpayer.

They wanted to ask the Minister about the fishery policies, why his Minister wants to privatize the lakes in the province so that just a few fishermen would be left on each lake; private lakes, Mr. Speaker, private lakes. They wanted to know why the Minister of Agriculture wants to wrestle the Wheat Board into the ground. They want to know that. They want to know why he wants to wrestle the Wheat Board into the ground. And I have a message for him, I have a message for the Minister of Agriculture, because I asked his Minister in Ottawa, Mr. Mazankowski, if he supported this Minister in his position on wrestling the Wheat Board to the ground and he says he'll have to wrestle me first; and that's your message, that's your message. —(Interjection)— And the Minister of Municipal Affairs waffles, he waffles on his comments. I heard him say in Swan River, I was there when he made the statement that he disassociated himself with the position taken by his Minister of Agriculture, I was there.

Mr. Speaker, there have been Ministers right across this province that have been asked that question, people like Mr. Mazankowski, Mr. Murta. And two Ministers today were asked that very same question: Do you support the Crow rate, yes or no? And there isn't one Conservative in Canada that will answer that question, yes or no. There isn't one.

You know, at a meeting in Portage just before the election, Mr. Mayer from Portage-Marquette was asked that very same question: Do you support the Crow rate, yes or no? And he said that's an unfair question, that was his reply; that's an unfair question, I won't answer it; and he didn't answer it because he does not support, and there isn't a Conservative that I know - unless it's the Minister of Public Works - that supports the Crow rate as such, as it is now today. They want it changed. They want to undermine the Wheat Board and that's why the Minister of Agriculture today has meetings all over this province conditioning the farmers, trying to condition the farmers to accept a change in the Crow rate and also to change the marketing system.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The honourable member will have nineteen minutes when we return this evening.

The hour being 5:30, I am now leaving the Chair and will return at 8:00 p.m. this evening.