

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, February 26, 1973

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 27 students of Grade 6 standing of the Rockwood School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Catherine Hill. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

We also have 30 students of Grade 11 standing of the West Kildonan Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. A. S. Jorowski. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, the Minister of Colleges and University Affairs.

And we have a further 40 students of Grade 11 standing of the Erickson School. These students are under the direction of Misses Bunny Gibson and Margaret Kaye. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

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

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

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Special Committee on the Rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further ministerial statements or tabling of reports? The Honourable Minister of

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I beg to submit the Annual Report of the Board of Internal Economy Commissioners for the fiscal period ending the 31st of March.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

The Clerk shall read the report tabled by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. CLERK: Your Special Committee of the House re-appointed to consider

MR. GREEN: Dispense? Dispense? Could we dispense with the reading?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I feel it should be read unless we will be given copies of it

MR. GREEN: It will be in Hansard tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable gentleman has been assured.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE RULES OF THE HOUSE:

Your Special Committee of the House re-appointed to consider the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba and allied subjects, was established by a Resolution of the Legislative Assembly adopted on Tuesday, July 11, 1972.

Your Committee, composed of Hon. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Messrs. Hanuschak and Paulley, Messrs. Bilton, Green, Jenkins, Johnston (Portage), Jorgenson, Shafransky and Sherman, met on Wednesday, October 4, 1972; Friday, November 10, 1972; Friday, February 2, 1973.

As its first meeting, your Committee appointed Hon. Mr. Fox as Chairman and set the quorum for all meetings at six (6) members.

At the meeting of November 10, 1972, your Committee gave approval to the following resolutions:

1. That permission be granted for the broadcast, on both a live and delayed basis, of the proceedings in the Legislative Chamber, as outlined in the brief submitted by the Broadcasters Association of Manitoba. It is to be clearly understood that such permission

(REPORT ON RULES cont'd) ... is granted only on the express understanding that there will be no cost to the public.

2. Since approval has been given for direct broadcast of the House proceedings, and as the Rules pertain to the Committees of the House, permission is also granted for the taping of committee meetings for re-broadcast.

3. That speakers, connected to the P.A. system in the House, may be installed in the Press Room (No. 256) and the T.V. and Radio Room (No. 245) provided that costs involved are borne by the news media.

The installation of any such equipment would be done under the supervision of and in accordance with the directives of the Department of Public Works.

Your Committee recommends the following amendments to the Rules of the House:

(a) That Rule 65, pertaining to the allocation of time for debate on Departmental Estimates be amended by deleting subsections (2), (3) and (4).

(b) That Rule 88(4) be amended by deleting the words "or debate" in the last line.

Your Committee recommends the following changes in practice and procedure:

(a) That the resolution suspending certain Rules of the House, commonly referred to as the "speed-up" resolution, be rephrased to ensure that the Report stage on any Bill reported by a Standing or Special Committee will not take place prior to one full calendar day following the receipt of the Report.

(b) That the Hansard personnel be instructed to pick up all remarks, interjections, etc., made during the course of a debate and record the same in Hansard, whether or not the name of the person making the remark is known.

(c) That the format of Hansard be changed and more use made of separate headings; e.g. "GOVERNMENT BILLS", "QUESTIONS", etc., to indicate the business under discussion.

(d) That "concurrence" resolutions be read by the Speaker rather than by the Clerk, as has been the practice in the past, in order to eliminate confusion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member is well aware of our rules which indicate that receiving a report is not debatable.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to submit the Annual Report of the Board of Internal Economy Commissioners for the fiscal period ending the 31st of March, 1972.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other ministerial statements? The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling at this time the usual number of reports beribboned in the Royal Blue.

No. 1. The Public Accounts of the Province of Manitoba and the Supplement thereto for the year ending March 31, 1972;

No. 2. The Report of the Provincial Auditor for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972;

No. 3. The Report of the Provincial Auditor on the Accounts of the Administrator of the Estates of Mentally Disordered Persons for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972;

No. 4. Return as required under Section 20 of The Public Officers' Act; and

No. 5. A Return as required under Section 114, Clause (2) of The Insurance Act.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have a report from the Flood Forecasting Committee which I'd like to lay on the table with copies to other members. I don't intend to read it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

PRESENTING REPORTS

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a report, the Annual Report of the Public Utilities Board for the year ending December 31st, 1972. When the Report has been printed there will be copies available for every member.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further reports to be tabled? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): I direct a question, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the First Minister. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the First Minister can inform the House whether or not the residents of Churchill shall have representation in this session.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I suppose that the residents of Churchill would be in the same position as the residents of Brokenhead on one occasion in the past.

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

MATTERS OF URGENCY

HON. I. H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that the House do now adjourn to consider a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, that the Government and Manitoba Hydro have announced that they intend to immediately let contracts for the diversion of the Churchill River and the flooding of Southern Indian Lake and that since these projects have never been debated by the Legislature or approved by the Legislature, and that since public hearings have never been held on these projects, an immediate debate is required in the House in order for the government to justify the letting of contracts for the diversion of the Churchill River and the flooding of the Southern Indian Lake; the need and urgency of such debate being justified by the imminent contractual obligations about to be assumed by Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now entertain five minutes debate indicating urgency, not on the subject matter but urgency.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, in rising to call upon you to adjourn the ordinary business to discuss a matter of urgent public importance I'm relying on Rule 27 of the House as adopted April 5, 1972.

The matter of urgent public importance is that, as more particularly set forth in the motion itself which has just been read to all honourable members, the government has announced through its instrumentality, Manitoba Hydro, that in effect without a single word of debate on the issue in this Chamber, without even the elementary principles of natural justice being observed through public hearings, Hydro is now going to let contracts for the work to divert the Churchill River and flood Southern Indian Lake. This means that perhaps within a day or a few days or a week, or a few weeks, this province will be contractually committed to spend millions of dollars, up to a hundred and nine million, on a project which has never been approved by this House, nor by the public, and indeed is under widespread attack from a broad group of experts who are politically independent.

In examining whether or not this is an appropriate time to apply the emergency debate rules, Mr. Speaker, I'm satisfied that this is exactly the kind of situation in which it is intended to apply. Looking at the words of Rule 27 and giving them their ordinary and their Oxford Dictionary meaning there are three key tests that have to be met. First -- and I might say that my understanding that the custom of this House as your previous rulings have indicated -- the degree of urgency required for such a debate must be that no obvious opportunity exists for later debate. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is a classic case of urgency by all of those definitions. If the debate does not take place now, debate at any other time may be valueless because the contracts may be let. And if there is a later debate which results in a subsequent change of policy then the people of this province may face millions of dollars of waste or damage in law suits for terminating those contracts. Clearly the kind of debate required cannot effectively occur during the Throne Speech Debate because of the time limits and the large group of subjects that must be covered in a legally restricted

MR. ASPER (Cont'd) time.

The second test is that the matter must be important. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, you'll agree that the spending of \$109 million, the flooding of 300 square miles of northern Manitoba is important.

The third test is that the matter must be important to the public at large, and that ingredient, Sir, is also obvious. The government's own Environment Council held a hearing and by a vote of 26 to 1 condemned the project and considered it of such importance as to call for full scale public hearings. The lives of several thousands Manitobans are to be dislocated by the project. They have launched a suit against the government to stop the project. The suit is in the courts and it's not yet been heard. If the government allows the contracts to be let we may face damage claims amounting to millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, there's one other point that makes debate at this time appropriate. It is alleged that this government has no mandate to carry out this project but rather is in breach of its own policy statements made in this House, the policy statements on which it was elected. That betrayal, Sir, is sufficient to warrant immediate debate because once you flood you cannot unflood.

Mr. Speaker, you may have noticed in Saturday's newspaper, the Free Press, that the Liberal Party Provincial Council met that morning and endorsed a commitment by the Liberal Party that should after the election the Liberal Party form a government, we will not be bound by these contracts nor will we allow them to stop public hearings.

We are getting into potentially a difficult situation legally, and I draw your attention to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we are approaching an election and when a government has no mandate on a major project, it's improper to make a commitment to commit a succeeding government on a major issue. The present situation is identical to that which occurred almost four years ago. Six weeks before the election of 1969 the Conservative administration signed a nearly \$40 million contract on the CFI project and we all know what happened. If an emergency debate had been allowed at that time on that issue, I suggest things might have been different. And for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you'll agree that our request for immediate debate is well founded.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the motion which is being presented by the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party today is in a sense a sequel or a follow-up to the motion that was brought forward by the Honourable the Member from Riel on Friday last. The only problem is that the motion of the Honourable the Member for Riel and what it seeks to do, is the direct and complete antithesis, opposite of what my honourable friend the Leader of the Liberal Party is trying to do today. In the five minutes allotted to me I will only say, Mr. Speaker, that clearly we have the other case of one political party that is dedicated towards the blocking if they can the proceeding with Lake Winnipeg regulation, and we have the other political party, the Liberal Party, that in more recent times has come around to wanting to block the Churchill River Diversion; both elements of which, Mr. Speaker, are in my opinion, and in the opinion of our advisors, a necessary feature of the Nelson River development which was initiated in the mid 1960s and which, even in the days when it was being initiated, was being predicated on the need for both Lake Winnipeg regulation and Churchill River diversion. Had there been a thought at that point in time that there would be a systematic effort made on the part of some people to block either one, or both, of these two construction aspects of Nelson River development, I daresay the decision might not have been taken at all, and economics would have dictated that the decision not be taken at all to proceed with Nelson River development. But what's more important here, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the Leader of the Liberal Party is not even correct in those premises which he brings forward in his motion. His motion is inaccurate in every major respect.

For example he asserts that there has never been debate, and there has never been debate in this Legislature on Churchill River diversion. Mr. Speaker, there has been debate on it ever since the period of 1966-67 when Nelson River development was initiated. In fact anyone with a modicum of common sense would know that in the very first capital supply bill presented on behalf of Manitoba Hydro to this Assembly back in 1967 for the construction of Kettle Rapids generating -- of the Kettle Rapids generating plant that right in that capital supply bill was the decision relative to Churchill River diversion. Furthermore in 1970 there was an announcement in principle of the need to proceed with

MR. SCHREYER: (Cont'd) . . . Churchill River diversion although on a reduced flooding scale and basis. Subsequent to then we have had capital supply bills brought forward to this House relative to Manitoba Hydro and the further development of the Nelson River. So there has been debate I would say in every year for the past four years at least, and I would venture to say six years.

Furthermore the Province of Manitoba in 1967 over the signature of Stewart McLean, then Minister of Public Utilities, and the Government of Canada over the signature of Jean-Luc Pepin, the then Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, bound the two governments to proceed with Nelson River development; hundreds and millions of dollars were loaned by the Government of Canada to the Province of Manitoba to proceed with Nelson River development, and the four essential ingredients were stipulated numerically, were enumerated in that July 12, 1967, agreement and, Mr. Speaker, one of those four elements was a diversion of the Churchill River. So my honourable friend, the Leader of the Liberal Party is so completely inaccurate and incorrect in everything he states in this motion as to become almost offensive.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, we haven't any hesitancy in supporting the request for the urgency of this debate. I think that two or three things though are in defense of it and a couple of things are against it. First of all the reasons for it, Mr. Speaker, are well established in the government itself because of the fact that many of the things we wanted to get at last year, and the intervening period since the last session last year, have required an urgency of debate, and that was why one was brought forward late last week for this purpose.

On the other side, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that one of the reasons that would work against the urgency of debate is that I'm not sure that the Leader of the Liberal Party took the matter and considered it urgent enough to attend the Public Utilities Meetings last year when they were in session, those few that we did have despite the fact that they were cut off towards the end of the session. I don't recall his attendance at that time to glean facts and information from the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro and those other people that appeared at the Public Utilities Committee. So from that point of view, Mr. Speaker, I can chastise the government for cutting off the proper investigation and for their actions since the last session particularly in September with the approval of the vastly increased amounts of money. But on the other hand, I don't think the Leader of the Liberal Party himself can stand up and say that he availed himself of the opportunity to sit in on last year's Public Utilities meetings when he was the leader of the Liberal Party -- albeit he was not at that point elected and I don't believe there was meetings of the Utilities meeting committee after or late in the session of the year.

So, Mr. Speaker, there's no question about it we'll support the urgency of this debate. We're well prepared to go after these matters if in your wisdom, or such as it may be decided that it is not -- I would like to suggest to the Member for Rhineland that we get on with the Public Utilities Committee formation at the earliest possible date so that we can take advantage of the government's offer to have this committee sit right away.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank all honourable members for their contribution to urgency of debate, and I am at variance with their view. In my opinion I believe that urgency within the rules as cited in Beauchesne's Citation 100, Subsection 3, applies to the matter itself -- does not apply to the matter itself but means urgency of debate. I believe there's ample opportunity for that. Motion denied.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD Cont'd

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and that is, does Hansard of April 14th, 1969 accurately report it when it says, quote . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe when a member wishes to quote something with reference he should give notice. It would be a courtesy that should be extended.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, . . . I do not believe a question to a Minister as to whether Hansard is accurate is a proper question -- (Interjection) --

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Four years later. You'll learn yet, Izzy. Hopefully.

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

MR. ASPER: I'll rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker, and ask the Minister, did the Minister not advise this House that it was his view that the Hydro project, which was the subject of the earlier motion, could proceed without the flooding of South Indian Lake?

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, when I was in the Opposition I indicated that the program that was being advanced by the then administration was not properly researched and that if elected, the New Democratic Party would consider a whole series of alternatives, one of which would involve a low level diversion which would not flood the community at South Indian Lake.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. There's a report in today's Tribune that we can expect a report on Manitoba's mining industry by Mr. Eric Kierens. Can the Minister advise the House whether this is true and when we might receive it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is referring to a report in the Tribune. I have no knowledge of such a report in the newspaper but there is a report to be tabled, I would think certainly sometime this week and probably even tomorrow, so I won't undertake that it'll be tomorrow, it will be very very soon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel a supplementary?

MR. CRAIK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the First Minister advise whether this report is part of the guidelines report that is to come out later?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of the report referred to will also in large part, if not completely, be the subject matter of a chapter in guidelines, but I don't know if that answers my honourable friend's question completely.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Could he inform the House how many cases of alleged welfare abuse were investigated during the past year -- just in round figures?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I don't like to give round figures. I'll take the question as notice and answer it specifically.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Will the Minister inform the House as to whether or not under the Equal Pay Act that there are institutions, provincial institutions, violating this Act?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker ...

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: No. I'll direct the question to the Honourable the Attorney-General seeing as how the Minister of Labour has been stricken dumb.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Perhaps the Minister, the Attorney-General, could tell us as to whether or not any of the provincial institutions employing male and female employees -- are any of these institutions in violation of the Equal Pay Act?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, when I can establish that I'll be happy to institute whatever proceedings are open.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Could he advise us if it's a fact that a group of civil servants in the employ of the province ...

MR. SPEAKER: The question is hypothetical.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: ... have entered a lawsuit...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the honourable member is aware that we do

MR. SPEAKER (Cont'd) . . . not use hypothetical questions.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: . . . the Minister, the Attorney-General. Is it not a fact that some government employees have entered suit against the government to make them comply with the Equal Pay Act?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of such proceedings at this time. I want to make it very clear that the government has continuously indicated to all parties that we respect and honour the provisions of the Equal Pay Act. There are provisions within the agreements executed between the Government of Manitoba and the Government Employees Association for the adjudication of any claims for reclassification. They have been invited by this government on many occasions and that still holds true at this date.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie -- last supplementary.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Supplementary question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. Would he advise private employers that they have the same type of recourse as the government is taking in this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the law is for all institutions both private and public and it is our responsibility to see that all consider those provisions and abide by them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the Attorney-General. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney-General can inform the House whether or not Mr. Trevor Berry at any time indicated to the Attorney-General any violations, or alleged violations of the Equal Pay Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: I'm aware of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there have been concerns in respect to equality of pay in a number of institutions, and I have indicated that in view of the fact that there is litigation presently before the Court of Appeal, that hearings that might otherwise have proceeded, particularly in connection with allegations concerning the Fairview Home in Brandon, we have felt it imprudent until the Court of Appeal makes its decision to have further hearings. As a matter of fact the Court of Appeal, I understood was sitting today in connection with the very litigation I'm talking about.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister in charge of Hydro. Does the government intend through Hydro to let contracts for the Churchill Diversion project before the courts have ruled on the lawsuit by the South Indian Lake community against the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know why the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party is asking that question now because approximately a month ago there was an announcement in the media by Manitoba Hydro's offices, indicating that a contract for the building of a road to the site of the diversion at South Bay had been awarded to Patricia Construction. So work is already under way and has been for some time.

MR. ASPER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it not a fact that the lawyer, the counsel for the Government of Manitoba and Hydro and your counsel, in the suit gave an undertaking to the Indian community counsel that no steps would be taken, no contracts would be let, until the lawsuit was heard.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asks is it not a fact? -- the answer is not, it is not a fact.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. I wonder if he would indicate to the House whether the government or the MDC is considering selling any of the Tantalum stock that they've -- I believe they took in as trust for a loan, and in view of the dramatic increase in the price of the stock on the market now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it's not clear from the honourable member's question whether he is wishing to counsel for or against such a course of action, but I can advise my honourable friend that there is no present intention to do so. We feel that the steps taken

MR. SCHREYER (Cont'd) . . . were in the public interest at the time and still are in the public interest that we maintain an involvement as we are doing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for hydro. Could the Minister advise us if the South Indian Lake flooding scheme will inundate 150 square miles or 300 square miles as alleged by the Member for Wolseley?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will not answer that question by referring to any numbers or figures used by the Honourable Member for Wolseley because in most cases those figures may not necessarily be accurate. I'll simply say that we are proceeding on the basis of the best possible advice available to the Crown, and we are proceeding after several millions of dollars have been spent on engineering and other studies over a period of several years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for the operations of Manitoba Development Corporation. Could he tell the House if he has received from the Chairman of the MDC a report covering the operations for the period ending 31, March, 1972, as required under the Development Corporation Act?

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, is he talking about the corporation itself?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my reference was to the report of the Manitoba Development Corporation.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, such a report has been received and will be filed, I hope, in the time specified by the rules of the House.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate whether the report was received by him on or before June 30, 1972 as required by the Act.

MR. GREEN: I, of course, was not the Minister responsible for the Fund until very recently. I know that such a report has been received.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him if he could advise dairy farmers why the one dollar holdback is being undertaken by the Milk Control Board at this time in contravention to what was in agreement by the Milk Control Board and the dairy farmers in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Public Works. It pertains to, Mr. Speaker, what is now presently cluttering up our once lovely Memorial Park. On the north end of it there's a sign that says it's a matter of initiative. Can the Minister indicate to me when someone will take the initiative to clean it up and restore traffic on that road?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the park is the winter park which was sponsored and directed by Manisphere was to run to February 25th, so I think that you will see the immediate take-down of that facility and shortly the reopening of that street.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the First Minister's challenge indirectly of the figures Hydro has been using, would the Minister be good enough to tell -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ASPER: . . . would the Minister be good enough to tell the House whether or not 300 square miles of northern Manitoba will be flooded under the South Indian Lake flooding scheme and Churchill Diversion?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would only make two points to my honourable friend in reply to that question. Whatever the extent of flooding it is approximately 20 per cent of what was initially proposed to be flooded; and point number two, the fact that there would

MR. SCHREYER (Cont'd): . . . need to be some diversion and some flooding was postulated in the agreement signed in 1967. My honourable friend should be aware of both those points.

MR. ASPER: A supplementary question. Has the government made a calculation as to the potential damage suits that may be faced by the government, or will likely be faced by the government, if the contracts are let and the court rules against the government in the lawsuit?

MR. SPEAKER: The question is hypothetical. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Crown, of course, does take and seek about for legal advice as it proceeds with this or any other construction and developmental activity.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the First Minister who is in charge of Hydro. Has Manitoba Hydro made a deal with City Hydro since we last met as to the sale of a block of energy and if so, what size and what rate?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it's not entirely clear what my honourable friend is referring to. I assume he's referring to the existing agreement for the sale of a block of energy by Manitoba Hydro to Winnipeg Hydro. On the other hand he may be referring to the sales of additional quantities by way of new agreements. And if the rules permit perhaps the honourable member could refine his question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes. At the time that we met at the last House, the negotiations were under way between the two parties for the sale of energy. I think both under the contract and also under additional amounts.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there have been continuing discussions between officials of Manitoba Hydro and Winnipeg Hydro and there has been negotiation and we are hopeful that within a period of weeks, not months but a period of weeks now, it will be possible to arrive at a conclusion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the First Minister indicate whether the Hydro rates in the City of Winnipeg will go up?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is aware of course that in one of the sections of the City of Winnipeg Act, as passed by this Assembly two years ago, there is a section in that Act which does require equalization of rates as between the suburban and inner-city users.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister in his capacity as Minister responsible for Hydro. Could the Minister confirm or deny that the docks, the roads, the schools, and 80 per cent of the houses in Cross Lake are below the so-called Hydro development line, and if so could he advise the members of this House what this means to the residents of Cross Lake?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, certainly in all of the advice and briefings that were given to me by Manitoba Hydro, there is no possibility that the water levels would affect the community of Cross Lake in terms of actual physical inundation. So therefore, if my honourable friend is referring to a Hydro development line, I will have to take the question as notice and get definitions as to just what is meant by that term.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, . . . question for the Minister of Highways. Can the Minister confirm that the six bridges that were built on the winter road route between Winnipeg and Berens River are inadequate for heavy loads and trucks and tractors.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I just didn't quite get the last part of your question.

MR. PATRICK: Can the Minister confirm that bridges built on the winter road route between Winnipeg and Berens River are almost obsolete or inadequate for the tractors and trucks?

MR. BURTNIAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's why I wanted to have the question clarified so that I could get the exact gist of the question. I'm sorry that the Minister responsible for

MR. BURTNIAK (Cont'd) that particular part of it is the Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Minister of Assiniboia redirect his question?

MR. PATRICK: Perhaps the Minister of Northern Affairs would be prepared to answer that question.

HON. RON McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, the bridges referred to are adequate for heavy traffic.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary? Order please. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Can the Minister of Northern Affairs tell us why aren't the bridges used?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I should give a description of the construction of winter roads for my honourable friend. The bridges if they were to be used would be used in the early season before the rivers were able to freeze up, or in the late season as they thawed out. Since the road was not in the early season they weren't used then and we don't know yet if they'll be used in the late season. They are permanent structures, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

ANNOUNCEMENT

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the Assembly that an Elmwood rink skipped by Bill McTavish has won the Canadian Seniors' curling title in Sudbury last Friday. I might point out that to qualify for the seniors the rink must have an aggregate age of some 210 years. This rink of Bill McTavish's -- lead, Harry Sulkers; second, John McLean; and third, Norman McLean -- just qualified for that. This was the second time that a Manitoba rink has won this championship, the first time it did was in 1965 when the event was first held. I might also point out that the McLeans are well known publishers and editors of the Elmwood Herald, and I would ask the members of the Assembly to join me in paying tribute to the McTavish Rink, the new Canadian Senior Curling Champions.

ORAL QUESTIONS (Cont'd)

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the First Minister. Can the First Minister indicate whether studies have been conducted on Cross Lake regarding the effective increased water flow on ice channelling and the dangers of northern transportation as a result of the ice channelling that may occur?

MR. SCHREYER: Well yes, Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice and just double check, but I would be very surprised if there have not been extensive studies taken of ice flow and possible problems with ice formation at various places along the streams that relate at all with respect to Nelson River development, which development of course has been under way in this province for a few years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. In view of the shortage of semi-skilled and unskilled workers in the mines at Thompson, I wonder if the Minister could indicate what action he has taken to help fill those jobs by sending some welfare recipients from Winnipeg up north?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, unless the Honourable Member for Thompson has specifics he'd like to bring to my attention, I would like to inform him and other members of the House that my regional director, Mr. Carpen from the north is in constant dialogue with the officials of Inco and other companies in the north pertaining to labour needs and they're ready to fulfill these jobs with any welfare recipients that are able to take these jobs.

MR. BOROWSKI: A supplementary? Could he indicate if any welfare recipients have been refused welfare because they have refused to go up in the north because there is still a shortage today at International Nickel of skilled and semi-skilled jobs.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I can inform the Honourable Member for Thompson

(MR. TOUPIN con't). . . . that some welfare recipients have presented themselves for work at Inco and elsewhere and have been refused because of lack of skills.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. There was indication by the government that there will be some assistance for police service to towns, and my question is, will financial assistance be given to towns and municipalities for police service, including those which are policed now by the RCMP?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will have to confine his curiosity until later when full details of the program will be forthcoming.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines. Could the Minister of Mines tell us how many surveys have been conducted around the South Indian Lake by his department or agencies of his department to determine the actual levels of the proposed high level of South Indian?

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

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't give the honourable member the number of surveys.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: I have a question for the Minister of Northern Affairs. Could the Minister confirm or deny that the Mayor of Wabowden who was a highly placed employee in his department, has resigned his position with the Northern Manpower Corps?

MR. McBRYDE: No, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. By way of explanation at the last session the Minister was asked the question as to how a private citizen's medical records were made available from the Manitoba Health Services Commission with respect to an investigation in the practices of dispensing medicine at the Mount Carmel Clinic, and the Minister said he would take the question as . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question, please.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, I'll put my question, Mr. Speaker. My question is, will the Minister give us the results of the investigation that he said that he would undertake at that time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, no information was given to an authorized person by the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the lawyer in question had quite a -- (Interjection)-- records.

MR. SPEAKER: Question, please. Order, please.

MR. JOHNSTON: . . . Could the Minister tell us how he got them?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health and Social Development is the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Health Services Commission and has access to records of the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

MR. JOHNSTON: Then I ask the Minister if he or any member of his department made available these records to the lawyer in question.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health and Social Development did not make such reports available to unauthorized personnel, and he is not aware of any of his civil servants in the Department of Health and Social Development and /or the Manitoba Health Services Commission making such reports available to unauthorized personnel.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has had two supplementaries.

MR. JOHNSTON: One last supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Minister gave an undertaking to this House last session that he would investigate and report to us, I ask him if he will do as he said he would do and make this report available to the House, because . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The honourable gentleman is debating the question. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I did undertake to have an investigation made and the result

(MR. TOUPIN con't) of this investigation was just related to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Public Works.

I wonder if the Minister could tell us when the independent members of this House will have some privacy in their dealings with any of their callers --(Interjection)-- an office.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member reads his mail he will recall that a week ago I sent a memo to each independent member explaining that within a week due to the space problems within the building we will provide them with a room.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Minister of Health regarding Mount Carmel Clinic. Could he indicate whether they have purchased it or are negotiating the purchase of their expropriation in view of the announcement made by his office recently.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I didn't hear the question correctly - the purchase of what?

A MEMBER: Mount Carmel Clinic.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, if it's the purchase of Mount Carmel Clinic, they own it, they're not to purchase it --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon? --(Interjection)-- That the government purchase Mount Carmel Clinic. Well, there's no such desire on the part of the government.

. . . . continued on next page

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Proposed motion of the Honorable Member for Flin Flon, The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, rumour has it that this is an election year, and certainly by the actions of the honourable members this afternoon, that rumour appears to be true. If that rumour should be true, Mr. Speaker, then we can be sure that this House will see its share of conflict in the days to come as all three parties prepare for that election. We have all I think done our best for the past four years to understand clearly what it is the people of Manitoba want from those who would govern them. Each party has tried to explain the things it stands for and that it is more trustworthy than any alternative political group.

Although we have all worked constantly at those things, the prospect of an election will certainly focus our efforts even more stringently than they have been to date. So, Mr. Speaker, there will be conflicts here in this House. That conflict will not be as self-serving as some might suggest, for it is only throughout that kind of contest that our alternative approaches to government and the choices facing the voters here can come clear. The fact that my party, Mr. Speaker, is in basic conflict with many things this government has done or has failed to do, does not mean that we will oppose blindly or for its own sake. Where the government appear to us to have merit in its proposals, we will cooperate with them. We will add our efforts to theirs in making the resulting legislation as good as it may be. Our disagreements with the honourable friends opposite are basic enough, striking right to the roots of our concepts of government, that I fear that those occasions, Mr. Speaker, will be very rare, but they will exist, Mr. Speaker, even if government should follow the programs outlined in this bland Throne Speech, for Mr. Speaker, in this disappointing document there are things that we can support. Especially, Mr. Speaker, we will support the steps outlined in the Throne Speech to lighten the crippling burden of special health care required by our senior citizens.

The government promises to put a ceiling on the amount any of these Manitobans will have to pay for prescription drugs. They will have our support in this, and we invite them to bring this program before the House immediately. It's a problem that has needed remedy for some time now. A fast passage and proclamation of the appropriate legislation will be a step nearer to justice for those who over the years have built this province.

We can say the same for the removal of health insurance premiums from the aged. Bring forward the legislation, we will support it. And the government will put care institutions for the aged and infirm under Medicare. This has been the policy of my party for some time now, Mr. Speaker. In the past we have suggested it to the government, and it is reassuring that they've listened to our suggestions and decided to follow the example already set by other provinces. The burden of nursing and institutional care costs has maimed the declining years of too many in this province. Removing that burden is a humane and necessary step.

Unless my enthusiasm for my friends opposite seem too large, Mr. Speaker, I must confess that even as we hear in the Speech from the Throne these proposals that we can support and agree with, that even as we find our own policies reflected in the government's intentions, we have our doubts and questions. Mr. Speaker, we have learned not to count on all this government promises us. These steps to help our senior citizens can easily be lost in the bureaucratic mire that so marks the activities of this government.

Personal care home under Medicare. Does that not present to our friends opposite the chance for yet another administrative nightmare? If Medicare is to pay the costs, they will reason, does not that mean that our officials must impose a system of classification on all who would enter these kind of facilities. Does that not mean that they will reason that now we should decide who should get into what facilities and when? Our doubts, Mr. Speaker, reflect one of these basic disagreements I spoke of earlier that so separate us from our friends opposite, for their reasoning is always that the government can make decisions better than the individual citizens of Manitoba. Where our approach to this problem would be to say that what is needed is merely to make the necessary financial resources available to our older citizens so that they in consultation with their family, friends and those who advise them on their health, may make effective decisions about their future without undue financial worry, where that would be our approach, this government is far more likely, judging from its record, to decide that along with the funds should go some government supervision of these private decisions.

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, we hope that the minimum contribution described by the government for care will not become a deterrent fee interfering with the proper operation of this new program, Mr. Speaker, we hope this will not be so, but we have hoped for similar things from these gentlemen in the past and have been disappointed.

We have another reason for doubt and concern. Even in the face of these proposals that we can support we have heard too many statements from this government in the past on things we agreed with and on things we opposed that have led to no action, or, even worse, have been the signal for the government to embark on a totally opposite course of action. Now, Mr. Speaker, we do not suggest bad faith here. We believe rather that carrying out the things proposed has simply proved too much for my friends opposite, that in the midst of carrying out the things they promised they have been distracted, perhaps by some silly manifesto that tells them that they should become manufacturers, or by their constant verbal arm-wrestling to decide whether their more radical or their saner members are to predominate or by their pressing needs to find a safe, highly-paid civil service job for one of their political appointees. And that is not bad faith, Mr. Speaker, and that is not what we suggest of this government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are a few examples. The First Minister for instance stated on July 5th, 1969, and I quote: "I don't believe that a growth in administrative structure benefits in any way those people who are on modest and low incomes." That was not the only time he adopted that position. On August 21st of the same year, Mr. Speaker, he said: "We shall as a new government exercise great care and restraint in the spending of public money." Well, Mr. Speaker, did the First Minister mean these statements and has he lived up to them? The answer to that must be in the two other questions and very simple questions. Has the government bureaucracy grown much faster than the real growth in this province? Has government spending grown extra extravagantly under the NDP? We believe the answers to those two questions are clear. We have supported--we could have supported his earlier stated intent, Mr. Speaker, but more than three years later and hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money later no shred of that earlier intent remains alive to support. But it can be said with some justification, Mr. Speaker, that our opposing views of the optimum size of the public sector led us to misread the First Minister's earlier statements, that they did not in fact refer to what we could accept as a real restraint in the growth of administrative structures or of government spending but to some other mysterious thing arising from the cant of the so-called social democracy. And so we may be unfair, Mr. Speaker, if we expect the First Minister to live up to statements he never meant in terms that we understood them.

But some things he said appear to have clear meaning despite our basic disagreements. He promised us to reform the Legislature to -- and I quote: "Restore the Legislature to its rightful role as the focal point of democratic government." Do even his own backbenchers think that this has happened? Do they find themselves really involved in the process of government? Was the Member for Gimli even consulted about the Lake Winnipeg regulation or was he simply told to accept the dictum of some questionable expert from outside of Manitoba? Is that member concerned now that that expert has departed for greener pastures? That member is of this Legislature. Was he part, Mr. Speaker, of the focal point of this bit of democratic government?

In September of 1969 the First Minister said, and I quote: "We hope, at least in degree, to open up the process of government to more scrutiny." In fairness, Mr. Speaker, he did not say scrutiny by whom but we seriously thought that the scrutineers might include those who are members of this House representing the people of Manitoba. And anyone who has witnessed our attempts to get information about Lake Winnipeg regulation scheme or the businesses that this government owns, will know quite clearly that if that were the Premier's intent it somehow aborted. Again to be fair, Mr. Speaker, we should acknowledge that perhaps the First Minister meant something else. No one could deny that every conceivable process of government is now open to the scrutiny of the swelling Planning and Priorities crew, not that they have much time to scrutinize being busy as they are in the preparation of little manifestos.

It is unfair then for us to wonder what value we can put on the high-sounding promises of this Throne Speech? For the First Minister is not alone among his colleagues in saying one thing and doing quite another. In fact he has at least one colleague who surpasses him and that of course, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Industry and Commerce. On June 9th of 1972 the Minister said, and I quote: "Never before has government of this province paid so much

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . attention, and been engaged in so many active, imaginative programs to provide jobs for rural Manitoba as this government has." --(Interjection)-- Members applaud on the opposite side, and Mr. Speaker, I agree it's a nice statement but where have the government actions been? Where has been their clear policy on transportation, on the local procurement of supplies and services or of even materials? Where has been the access to adequate financing needed in the rural areas? Without these basic components, Mr. Speaker, the Minister's statement is nothing more than rhetoric.

I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that when it comes to selecting quotations from the ministry, the Minister of Industry and Commerce soon becomes my favourite. He has a certain turn of phrase that can't help but endear him to anyone who follows his career, and my single favourite statement ever uttered by this Minister came on June 22nd of 1971. Since we all in this Chamber must speak in public and since all of us will sometimes say things that do not come out quite the way we planned them, we need not be too hard on the Minister for the statement although it does reflect the clear-headed and highly organized approach to Manitoba's problems that will doubtlessly make him a legend. He said, and I quote: "We in this government are determined to defeat the diseases of unemployment and underemployment and poverty, and we can only do this of course if we are enjoying robust economic health." Perhaps someone should tell the Minister that there are those in Manitoba who would wonder how we would propose to define "robust economic health" if it is to come without our first affecting unemployment, underemployment and poverty.

But the Minister's vision is clear. We must congratulate the Minister on living up to at least one of his statements. On that same day he said and I quote: "But we must be sure that the economic growth medicine does not kill the patient." We could say, Mr. Speaker, congratulations, Mr. Minister. Whatever may be wrong with the patient it certainly does not spring from an overdose of economic growth medicine. You have succeeded beyond anyone's wildest expectations.

But the First Minister has recognized some of the dangers that lie in wait for government. Way back in September of 1969 he said there was a danger, and I quote: "of trying to plan so comprehensively now, that the planning process takes so long that years pass before you actually get down to business. Could that warning perhaps apply to the government's vaunted economic guidelines for the '70's? It took three years to produce that document but like any other product with factory defects it had soon to be recalled for patching up.

Is the Minister of Industry and Commerce concerned about that plan, that it may not come out or may come out so late as to be useless? Not at all. In June of 1971 he said, and I quote: "I would rather be accused of delivering a good plan late than of rushing through a patched-up job," and today he's still working on the patches. And only one-third of the 70's has already passed, Mr. Speaker. But again we should recognize that our basic areas of disagreement will have an effect on how we interpret the statement and actions of this government, and that perhaps it is in the areas of economic development that our disagreements are deepest.

One of the areas where we need not be in disagreement -- well take this high-sounding bit of puffery from the 1970 Throne Speech, and I quote: "We are entering an era where for the first time solutions become possible to many classic social economic problems. New techniques of production, distribution, management and administration have brought the potential of a material abundance that has no parallel in all of our recorded histories. My Ministers believe that the extent to which these techniques are used to reduce disparities and equalize opportunities will determine the success of government in solving problems." Well, Mr. Speaker, what disparities has the government eliminated? We are not aware of any, and the government's own Barbour Report could also find none, and so we wonder, Mr. Speaker, and we question even the nice-sounding things this government has to say.

The same 1970 Throne Speech suggested that, and we quote: "We need to abandon old ideas, dogmas and traditions that have outlived their usefulness." Apparently many of this government's own promises fall into that category for they certainly have been abandoned. And that is what makes this government's Throne Speeches tricky documents to deal with. How much of what is said is really intended to happen? In 1972 the Throne Speech declared that the government is deeply concerned with various problems in the field of rail transportation but nothing significant has been done about the problem of high rates or branch line abandonment. But the Minister of Industry and Commerce did have a solution of sorts. He said, and I quote: "Give me one week, give me the arbitrary authority to influence freight rates and I'll bring

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . new industry to Manitoba and they'll be flooding in here as you've never seen industry flood into this province before." It's not recorded whether or not the Minister rubbed his hands together as he said it, but Mr. Speaker, it is the closest we can find to a statement of government policy on the question of rail transportation.

And so we wonder, Mr. Speaker, what should we believe when this government speaks? There are other examples. Where are the regional action centres? The First Minister promised them back in 1969. Each was to have been staffed by at least one person who spoke the ethnic language prevalent in each area and there was to be toll free telephones for them to air their grievances against the government. Perhaps they are still being planned. Where is the code of administrative practices promised in the 1970 Throne Speech? It was to have been passed to give firm guidelines to the semi-judicial boards and commissions that play a part in government. It has not appeared, although we understand, Mr. Speaker, that the Attorney-General has seen fit to offer the odd guidelines to the Human Rights Commission on his own authority.

Where is Manitoba's modern electronic mail-in farm accounting system promised in 1970 or the major programs of market intelligence and market development. These things were promised. In March of 1970 the Minister of Agriculture promised land bank legislation in the 1970 session. We never saw that legislation, and in the area of health and social service in July of 1969 the First Minister promised to restructure the Department of Health and Social Services. Since then the department's name has been juggled a little, the Minister has changed, the senior staff of the department has been shuffled and redealt five or six times. The result? Well now the department is bigger and slower and it spends a lot more money.

Take the community clinics promised in the 1970 Throne Speech. In June of 1971 the Minister of Health and Social Development said when questioned, and he said this with confidence and with pride and I quote: "We have five underway now." Well this is not quite two years later and the five have not appeared. And so, Mr. Speaker, we wonder. What ought we to believe? And we do not think that our impression that the NDP promises are usually broken springs merely from our basic disagreement with them. Even things to which we are totally opposed have been promised and then have failed to materialize, for which, Mr. Speaker, I suppose we all should be grateful. I go over all these things to explain why we have our doubts about even the good things this government promises. Their statements and their promises since their election have been marked by a certain lack of dependability. Neither we in this House nor the people of Manitoba are any more sure of what we believe from this government. And of course that lack of dependability injures the business of government; it attacks the kind of faith we hope people should have in our institutions and the men who aspire to run them. And so it concerns us in more than simply a partisan way.

There are other things in this government's activities that concern us too, Mr. Speaker, things that damage government in Manitoba. And these, I suppose, are the areas of basic disagreement that we have with the New Democratic Party. These are the ways in which our approach to government is different from theirs. Let me first speak of the public service of Manitoba. We cannot countenance the government's continuing decision to neglect the merit system in favour of shameless political patronage within the civil service. We believe that the appointments of mere political advisors, people who have no other claim to competence to the highest levels of the civil service is wrong. It debases the tradition of responsibility and merit that has marked our public service; it erodes the morale and the ability to function of those who with dedication will do their job under whatever government is in power. It sparks distrust; it interferes with the career of those who have devoted their whole lives to serving this province in favour of the advancement, the undeserved advancement of those who have shown no concern for anything but the New Democratic Party as a political party.

We would have hoped that the unfortunate experience this government has already had with the so-called experts they imposed on the Manitoba Development Corporation, on Hydro, on health and social development, would have been enough to persuade them. But instead they are now developing their own generation of experts created through patronage. Now they see nothing wrong with that. They say that previous governments have done the same. But of course those who were in the public service under previous governments know that this is not true. Under this government patronage has become a disease and it must be stopped, and the Progressive Conservative Party will stop it. We will disband the little groups of imported theorists that stud almost every department of this government. We will do away with many of

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . the boards and commissions that have been resting places for the faithful in far too many cases. And this is a basic disagreement, Mr. Speaker. Our friends opposite see nothing wrong with a political civil service. They would debase our traditions of neutrality in the public service and they tell us it is better this way. Well, Mr. Speaker, we disagree, and if this is an election year and when the Progressive Conservatives are elected to government we will change all of that.

Our second area of basic disagreement, Mr. Speaker, surrounds the importance of the voluntary and private sectors of Manitoba. What was it the First Minister said away back during the automobile insurance debates, that he would never consult with anyone who had a vested interest. Well what has that statement come to mean to Manitoba? Well, it means that the government is wasting the good will and the skills of the people of Manitoba. Are they planning something new in welfare? Those groups who describe themselves as self-help groups would like to be consulted. They are poor people trying to play an active part in what happens to them in Manitoba. They share the government's objective, to work to eliminate poverty. But the government ignores them. It wastes their determination to better themselves, it meets their hard work and concerns with their frustration of it's "we know best in all things" approach. And so they spend millions and hundreds of millions of our dollars and they ignore the willingness of the people of Manitoba to work together to make this province better. The same thing is true in other areas. Do they really consult with farmers about agriculture, or with business men about our economic development, or with the doctors and nurses and hospital administrators about our health systems, or with our municipal councils about the problems of our towns and cities?

Mr. Speaker, in spite of what the First Minister may say, the answer to all of these questions is no, and the result is waste; waste of the skills and knowledge of those people who are not part of this government or of the NDP, knowledges and skills that would be given freely for the asking. Even when they set up a forum of consultation, do they follow through? Look at the example of the Water Commission or the Environmental Advisory Council. Manitobans agreed to help and then were ignored by this government. The Progressive Conservative Party would change that too. We would work with the people of Manitoba to understand and to solve the problems that face us. We would listen when members of our communities came to help us because whether the NDP understand it or not, the business of government is too important to become the private preserve of any one political party and its high-priced experts. It is the business of every man and woman in this province, and most of the solutions to most of our problems can be found in the private voluntary actions of the people of this province if a government will only work with them. And a Progressive Conservative government, Mr. Speaker, will work with them.

The third area where I think we disagree, Mr. Speaker, with our friends across the House, has to do with a much discussed problem of government accessibility. I suppose that every new government vows to be accessible to the people and then at varying rates of speed moves away from that vow. I've heard the Member of Thompson speak of that danger that faces governments. I know he understands it and tried during his time in government to avoid it. It was sometimes suggested that he succeeded to a fault. But the problem is real and it is serious, and it exists strongly in Manitoba today. Ask anyone who has tried to see one of these Ministers or ask the members of this House, on both sides of this House, who try to do their jobs and have found that not even they had easy access to the workings of this government when they tried to act for their constituents. Our disagreement with the government here, Mr. Speaker, is not about the desirability of having a government that is accessible. The First Minister has been eloquent about this problem in the past, although rather more eloquent in the distant past than recent. Our disagreement here, Mr. Speaker, flows from the fact that we are more aware of the problem than the government would appear to be. We think it is urgent, more urgent than manifestos or the creation of new Assistant Deputy Ministers because we believe that it strikes to the very heart of the effectiveness of government in Manitoba. And we would move to change it. We don't claim to have all the answers to these problems and we have said it is only one that reoccurs in government time after time. To start with, though, we would look at those areas that have special geographical disadvantages and try to deal with government.

For one, we would establish a Premier's office in the north so that the people living there would have free access to the highest possible level of government. --(Interjection)-- Yes.

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) Satellite offices of the various ministries should also be established in areas where their operations have the greatest effort, offices that would allow people access to real government authority without the red tape and the expensive travel and delay and frustration that marks this present government's conduct. We could establish all of those offices, Mr. Speaker, for less money than it costs to run the Planning and Priorities Committee. And that is the basic disagreement we have with the New Democratic Party. We think it is more important for the people of Manitoba to have access to this government than it is for a few highly paid out-of-province experts to have office space in which to write their manifestos.

There is another problem area that plagues all governments where we find ourselves in basic disagreement with the New Democratic Party, and that is the question of accountability of the government for its actions. The New Democratic Party reasoning seems to be that since it is preferable that the government do as many things as possible and since they take tax money, if we are to believe them, only from those marked by ability to pay, the details of how the tax money is spent may not be released. And we would change that for a number of reasons. The costs of secrecy are simply too high. Even if the open revelation of all things governments do would be embarrassing from time to time to this or that politician, it also would act as a check on government. Nothing would be done or spent that could not bear public scrutiny, and that is not the case today. At the same time, secrecy saps public faith and trust in government, and governments today must finally acknowledge that this kind of accountability will do away with the secrecy of 1966 or the secrecy of 1973. And so we will do that. We will appoint a Provincial Auditor-General to report to this House when we become government. The New Democratic Party proposed doing this several years ago but lost their enthusiasm for that idea as soon as they gained power, and it would be difficult once such an auditor is appointed for any government to avoid being the butt of his report from time to time.

We believe that the scandal raised by the federal Auditor-General's revelations about the Bonaventure resetting, has prevented that kind of waste and extravagance from again occurring on the same scale. We believe a little frank embarrassment, if a government makes a mistake, is justified since it will help keep such mistakes from happening again. And Mr. Speaker, we would expand those areas in which detailed financial accounting are not available to the public corporations, to the Manitoba Telephone System and to the Manitoba Hydro, who would be required to release the equivalent of public accounts annually. If the people own those utilities, then they must be accountable to the people.

We would release detailed information on Leaf Rapids and the millions being spent there. If we are to run programs like the PEP programs we would detail the money spent instead of burying them in aggregate figures the way this government does. We would require public accounts of financial information from the Manitoba Health Services Insurance Corporation and from our universities and colleges, and the same would apply to the Manitoba Development Corporation, the businesses we own, all the Crown corporations. Too many people are spending too much of the public's money without ever having to account to the public for it and we believe it is important for the future of the government of Manitoba to change all that and the Progressive Conservatives would change it.

Where is our basic disagreement with the NDP? I suppose it is really about who owns all that money. We believe that the people of Manitoba own it and are entitled to know in detail how it is being spent and why. The New Democratic Party appears to think that the government owns it, that they somehow created it through the alchemy of taxation.

And that leads us to the final area of real and fundamental disagreement between our party and the government, Mr. Speaker the taxpayers of Manitoba, the people that the government has apparently forgotten. Well, are Manitoba's taxes the highest in Canada? --(Interjection)-- Well that depends on what set of figures you use. The First Minister is busily proving that they are not. Our corporate and personal income taxes are clearly the highest in Canada but the Premier is doing some arithmetic to prove that some provinces have higher taxes. Manitoba taxes are too high. They are raising more money than the government even with its profligate ways can spend. And the question becomes: where did that money come from? The Premier's answer: from those with the ability to pay. Who is he talking about and what is his justification for taking those funds?

The question is wrapped up with the matter of accountability, Mr. Speaker. If taxpayers are to be treated as nothing more than a source of unlimited revenue, if government programs are to grow and swell and eat up dollars at the whim of this or that Minister, if there is to be

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd no clear relationship between what our people pay in taxes and the benefits they receive from government, then it is not enough to say, "Well the people we took it away from didn't need the money anyway." It would not be enough to say that even if it were that the bulk of Manitoba's tax revenues really came from the rich, as the Premier tries to suggest, the NDP really believe that the government can spend our money more ably than the people of Manitoba can.

There are not enough rich people in Manitoba to finance this government in its spending. The money, Mr. Speaker, comes from people of middle income, people caught in the squeeze of rising prices for food and for housing, people who could themselves use that money to buy things they need or even just the things they want; it comes from the people who have worked hard to earn it, and it belongs to them. The Progressive Conservative Party believes that those people should control as much of the money they earn as possible, that the government should take as little as it possibly can, that the man who earns the money ought to have the first right to spend it and that's not so complicated. But without clear financial accountability in government, and without a government that respects the individual's right to the money he earns, we have today an intolerable situation in Manitoba. It's a situation that the Progressive Conservatives will change. The forgotten taxpayer, Mr. Speaker, has been paying the piper too long, and we think he deserves a chance to call the tune. As I said, Mr. Speaker, - and I don't expect my friends opposite to agree with anything I've said - our differences on these subjects go to the very roots of our different approaches to governing Manitoba. And because we can never agree on these things, I think they reflect best the different kind of government that the Progressive Conservatives would bring to Manitoba. And of course they are a large part of the reason we view this Throne Speech so skeptically.

Besides the things that are in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, those things omitted are important too. Mr. Speaker, this speech makes no mention of the fishing industry in Manitoba. Perhaps it is because the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources intends to continue his war on the fishermen. Or more likely it is mainly because his department overlooked this industry in preparing its part of the Throne Speech just as it has overlooked the industry for years in preparing its policies. We hope that in view of the bad feeling that has existed between the government and the fishermen, in view of what we think has been the disgraceful conduct of the Minister towards them, we hope that in view of these things the government will take the earliest opportunity to make some clearer statement to reassure all those who earn their living, or their livelihood, fishing in this province. That assurance is needed for you, the New Democratic Party, have shown yourselves to be no friend of the fishermen in the past.

And there was another paragraph we had hoped to see in the Throne Speech, if only a courtesy, Mr. Speaker, and it should have gone something like this: All of the people of Manitoba are encouraged to see the progress that the Indian and Metis people of this province are making in the management of their own affairs, both through their provincial organizations and through their smaller local organizations in every part of Manitoba.

It is long past time that the native people came to play their full role in the life of the province and they could be assured of the continued support and co-operation of the Manitoba government. Specifically, the government will be seeking an early meeting at the local level with native leaders from the east side of Lake Winnipeg to take the long overdue first steps, developing the economy of that region so that they, the people, there might have the opportunity to participate in the prosperity of Manitoba.

A simple paragraph or two, Mr. Speaker, that would recognize what probably has been the most dramatic development in Manitoba in the past three years. The government did not include these two paragraphs. Instead they promised us seven different studies and commissions to keep all their experts happily employed.

My colleague the Honourable Member from Riel has already spoken in this House in the emergency debate about our concern about the government's plan for Hydro and for Lake Winnipeg. He has told this House that our information leads us to believe that a medium level diversion is the optimum level both from an economic and environmental standpoint. He told the House that we believe that the Churchill Diversion could be essential to the proper development of our northern hydro resources, that since a medium level of . . . at Southern Indian Lake makes regulation of Lake Winnipeg unnecessary, and since the cost of the Lake Winnipeg Jenpeg Development have increased in the way that is alarming, our party

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) would ask the government to reconsider its wrong-headed determination to install the Lake Winnipeg rate controls.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, an admitted 77 percent increase in costs changes the cost benefit structure the government used to arrive at in its Lake Winnipeg plans in the first place. And it's difficult for us on this side to resist saying that we told you so. Your precious engineer turned out to be a better political engineer than he was a Hydro engineer. When he appeared before us and equivocated and showed his lack of understanding of his own responsibilities, we warned you, but his New Democratic Party credentials were very good even if his ability to forecast costs were not. But he has gone now. Now give us the information. I've outlined our position. Hydro has all the data. We're willing to consider it. Does the government or Hydro have evidence to prove that despite the ruinous increase in cost, the Lake Winnipeg regulation scheme is still justified? We're not opposing merely for the sake of opposing. We would like to know before the admitted 77 percent increase gets any larger, before more funds are spent, is the plan still justified? We would like to see the data that proves it. We speak for several hundred thousand Manitobans when we speak in this House and the government would do well not to forget that.

And we wondered too, Mr. Speaker, about the little Indian community of Southern Indian Lake, caught in its maelstrom of facts and figures and engineers' reports in opposing positions. This government does not have a distinguished record of dealing fairly with those who are hurt in its actions. The fishermen learned that to their discomfort when the current Minister of Mines and Natural Resources found it necessary to forbid them from making a living and then had to be dragged and chided and harassed into providing them with even a paltry level of compensation.

Mr. Speaker, we say to the members opposite, do not cheat the Indians at Southern Indian Lake. Tell them clearly and honestly what will happen. Provide them with competent legal counsel so that they may deal with you on some footing of equality. That too would cost you less than a month's upkeep on your precious Planning and Priorities Committee. Provide them with realistic and proper compensation.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech also speaks in very vague terms of some relief to municipalities. Our municipal governments are charged with a wide area of responsibility and must have the resources to carry them out. That means an inescapable obligation for the Provincial Government to take steps to realign municipal responsibility and municipal revenue. Well the Progressive Party will take those steps.

The first steps must be to work together with municipal authorities, to make local responsibilities compatible with local finances, and that must, Mr. Speaker, include revenue sharing. How will this government approach it? Well no doubt they will decide what is best and then tell the municipalities. We don't believe that will be good enough. Instead, our solution would be to sit down with the municipal leaders throughout this province and with the City of Winnipeg and work out a solution on revenue sharing. The provincial government does not always know best. The experts in their studies do not always know best. The people in our municipalities elect their leaders. In moving to solve the problem that faces local government, those elected leaders must be involved and they must be listened to.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech has little to say about the unique problems faced by the City of Winnipeg. Apparently the government has decided that now that it has created Unicity and is well on its way to divesting itself of its promises to alleviate the impact of the resulting higher taxes that we're sure to have, that they can wash their hands of it. Well, that must not be true. The City of Winnipeg is facing basic decisions in two important areas of major expenditure, areas that have major financial implications for the provincial government and for every taxpayer in Manitoba. The first of these is the Beltway; the second a proposed railroad relocation. And our party has clear suggestions to make on both questions, based on what we can afford in this province.

Clearly the Beltway proposal and a railroad relocation will cost the taxpayers too much money. We would sit down with the City of Winnipeg and work out a system of planning development and subsidy for a people's first transportation system for Winnipeg. Started now such a system can improve the quality of urban life, conserve our land resources from the spectre of freeways, and all at a reasonable cost to the taxpayers. We would also work out an arrangement for financing the bridges that are required. The alternative, Mr. Speaker, is for Winnipeg to follow most other North American cities in a slavish, costly and ultimately

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) unsuccessful effort to accommodate the thousands of automobiles that could cripple a city.

Mr. Speaker, we need programs of neighborhood improvement. Not the programs of the past with their bulldozers and disruption, but programs based firmly on the desire of people living in their neighborhoods to see them improve. We would support community educational programs to teach both children and adults in all the cities of Manitoba. These programs should provide such things as basic literacy skills for adults, urban orientation for migrants from rural areas, employment training programs. Community school committees should be established to assure that the resources of the facilities in schools are to be used to benefit the neighborhoods where they are located. The people living in the neighborhoods can help to plan and operate and staff these programs. This is part of the Progressive Conservative approach to neighborhood improvement. And no mention of it, Mr. Speaker, is found in this Throne Speech.

The other half of the neighborhood improvement program, Mr. Speaker, is a housing program. Provide public housing where necessary, where it will provide both shelter to those who need it and help to maintain and improve the nature of the community; but don't continue the New Democratic Party's efforts to turn the government into Manitoba's biggest landlord. Start instead with existing houses. How can they best be used. Can they be redeveloped for sale. Can they be upgraded through minimal expenditures. Cannot new housing be made available if necessary through a subsidy in existing neighborhoods. We would favour a rent subsidization program to give people the resources they need to find suitable housings on the open market. The key thing must be to stop the decline of the existing houses. To stop that problem means enforcement on landlords of very stringent standards of maintenance; but it must also mean the provisions of the skills and the resources for homeowners to maintain and improve their property. That means that we must co-operate with all the cities and towns to provide counselling and teaching to the owners, and a generous system of home improvement loans geared to income and family size, or even grants to those who do not have the resources themselves. And at the same time there should be a moratorium on tax increases for specified types of improvements.

The thrust of all these programs is to work with the people who live in the urban neighborhoods to improve those neighborhoods. Government should help to provide the skills and the resources, but government should not walk in and take over. And again I say Mr. Speaker, government need not be Manitoba's biggest landlord. But the Throne Speech says that the government is determined to continue in that; it mentions no flexible response to the problems of the cities; it shows no opportunity for the citizens to take part in the solution of those problems.

One last word on urban policy, Mr. Speaker. The Throne Speech mentions the Winnipeg Centennial. We have a firm proposal to make. Winnipeg proposes to construct a new library to mark that centennial. The Progressive Conservatives would take part in financing that library, on condition that it become a Manitoba library, a library for Manitobans serving the entire province. And this is what we mean by working together, by maximizing these benefits for all Manitobans of those things planned and done by people who are not members of the Provincial Government.

And finally, we urge the government to do as our party would and study carefully the proposals for the ethnic village that are now before the City Council. It can enrich the life in Winnipeg and throughout Manitoba.

The Throne Speech showed, Mr. Speaker, that the government was determined to speak of agriculture, although they have little new to say. Repeats of programs announced and a few vague promises to help young farmers to acquire land. But what are the real problems facing the farmer? This has been a good year for those on the farm, the first good year for more than half a decade. Does that mean that the government can sit back and wait for the bad years to return? Does it mean that farmers are all rich now and don't need any active government support? Well, Mr. Speaker, we estimate that about 20 percent of the farmers' capital investment in the form of machinery that has been made to last for all those lean years is now overdue for replacement. We estimate that the recurrence of decent levels of farm income will not permit the agriculture community to celebrate yet for awhile. We need policies to help meet the costs of retooling, costs that have been avoided for so long while farm prices were in decline. Will the government use the Farm Credit Act for this purpose? And the government's attitude towards agriculture is still restrictive. It is still based on the assumption that there's no future on the farm. Where is the alternative to

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) rigid supply management? Where are the aggressive efforts to sell the products of our farms, to develop and to occupy new markets? Transportation developments are of vital importance to all farmers and indeed to every inhabitant of rural Manitoba; but has the provincial government pressed for public disclosures or proposals to change our grain collection and handling system? They have not, despite the fact that such changes have a tremendous economic impact on the farmer. These systems should not be changes without full public disclosure and discussion and the formulation of plans to prevent their harming otherwise viable farming operations.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, the relentless effort of the railways to abandon branch rail lines throughout the West has gone on too long unchecked. We have now in Ottawa a weak and chastened government. Now is the time for our provincial government to move to force a clarification. How many proposals to abandon lines are now in limbo, putting the economic future of western farmers into limbo too. The railways enjoy tax concessions and subsidies. They enjoy these things in respect of the services they provide. We would insist that there be no shrinking or shirking of that service. We believe, even if the government does not, that western agriculture can enjoy a bright and prosperous future. The management skills are here, the gains of productivity have been won over the years; all that is required is government co-operation.

We looked in vain, Mr. Speaker, at that point as well for the government's policy on welfare. You know, Mr. Speaker, our welfare per capita costs are higher than any of the other prairie provinces. The government appears to be unable to stop the frightening growth in welfare spending; and that spending seems to be no good. What happened to the programs of vocational rehabilitation services to try to help the able-bodied unemployed to find useful work and then to keep the jobs once they had them? This government has practically wiped out such programs. The result not surprisingly is that people are trapped into continuing dependence on the state. We acknowledge that the government has an obligation to help those who can't make it on their own, but is this really any help, this dependency trap the government is building? Restore programs that are aimed at helping people to become useful and independent citizens.

The costs of welfare can be cut and can be cut drastically by a simple amendment of programs that are now subject to abuse. One very clear example: According to the government's own Barbour Report, more than 70 percent of those receiving mothers' allowances under our Social Allowances Act are not widows for whom this program was first intended; but deserted, divorced, separated or unmarried mothers. Forty percent of all welfare payments go for mothers' allowances. That means that almost one-third of all welfare payments go to support children whose fathers are living. It is easier for government to pay welfare than it is to enforce maintenance orders issued by the courts against these men. So a man can desert his family and his responsibility, knowing that his wife will be on Mothers' Allowance. He will not usually have to pay either maintenance or separation allowance. There's a solution to this, Mr. Speaker. Let the government help those women get what they have a right to from their own spouses. If a support order is given, have the government enforce the order. This will permit these women to be independent and surely this is the objective of our welfare programs. The system of active government enforcement of these orders has been tried with dramatic success in the United States. We must look after those who need our help, but we cannot afford the highest welfare rates in Canada. We are not the richest province. We cannot afford programs that merely perpetuate themselves, trapping people in unwilling dependence on the state.

And there's one other kind of welfare we cannot afford, and this strikes right to the heart of the NDP failure in Manitoba. Let me tell you some numbers, Mr. Speaker, taken again from the Government's own Barbour Report: In 1969 in the City of Winnipeg there were 168 single males on welfare. By March of 1972 that number had skyrocketed to 1,427; an increase of more than 800 percent in three years. The figures for single females rose almost as dramatically from 57 to 414. And the trend was roughly the same in respect of the rest of Metro. Why that huge increase? Well, the answer to that is that young people, many of them ambitious and educated, are being forced to take refuge on welfare because all the glowing financial reports of the First Minister notwithstanding, or his Minister of Industry and Commerce, there are not enough jobs for them in Manitoba. The unemployment rate among people under 25 in this province is almost three times that of other age groups. Everything

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) is fine, says the First Minister. Well, when our young people cannot find opportunities here to work and to be independent, Mr. Speaker, everything is not fine. And yet the First Minister is proud of our economic performance. Well, let us not argue numbers, Mr. Speaker, because let us not have to point out that the gross provincial product increase forecast and estimated and bragged about in the Throne Speech is of the order of five percent before inflation and therefore probably below two percent in real terms. Because it is not numbers that we must concern ourselves with, it is with the lives of our people.

The First Minister and all members of this House have heard my own programs to create more jobs so many times already, and I'm not going to repeat them. We can argue for days about which set of statistics and forecast is right. We can wonder how much of the real economic malaise of this province is buried under an overexpanded and under-effective public sector. We can wonder why if things are so rosy we have all these make-work projects all over this province. But that will not solve the problem. We do not have opportunities for our young people. By the hundreds they are unemployed. Some are on welfare; many are continuing to depend on their families while their ambition and their natural desire to become independent are frustrated. Is this what the people of Manitoba have paid millions of dollars in education taxes to see their children educated and among the unemployed?

Mr. Speaker, I do not expect the First Minister to produce a solution to this problem out of the air. It is a problem that is plaguing all of North America. I don't believe it is possible for government alone to solve it. The private sector, the voluntary sector I talked about earlier must play its part. But the government must lead. Let us set ourselves ruthless targets and let us ask the private sector to help us. Let us throw away the boon-doggle and the make-work and instead look for productive, important and satisfying jobs for the young. Let us not be so concerned with comparing our various views of what this economy is doing or not doing that we allow this problem to continue. The Throne Speech made no mention of this problem, Mr. Speaker; it is one that they would prefer to ignore, to have gone away. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a difficult problem indeed, but it is too important to ignore. Let the First Minister bring some plan, some permanent solution before this House, and let us all work together with the people of this province to make that plan work.

We disagree on so many things, but surely we can agree on all this. Unless we can provide opportunities for the young in Manitoba, then all our arguments and statistics will be meaningless. It would be nice I think to mark this session, probably the last of this Legislature, with some action we can all agree on. Because, Mr. Speaker, I think that in this kind of agreement lies the key to our economic future. We must work towards goals that will involve all of us in government and in that voluntary sector in deciding the kind of Manitoba we want and in building it. That is why our party would establish a Manitoba growth fund, a fund through which the residents of Manitoba can invest in our future. That is why we would make loans, funds available to the Regional Development Corporations so that the people of each region in Manitoba can help to plan the shape of their own future. And that is why we would establish for the City of Winnipeg and with the City of Winnipeg a City of Winnipeg Regional Development Corporation. Our solutions must be based on co-operation and on mutual trust and respect. They cannot emanate mysteriously from some back room in some planning secretariat, because so far no matter what figures we use our efforts to grow have not met the objectives we've held for them. This is as true of the public sector sprawl of the NDP as it is of the growth credo of the mid sixties.

And again, Mr. Speaker, according to the Barbour Report, in 1969 26.1 percent of the families and individuals of Manitoba were below the Economic Council's poverty line. Those figures have not changed. If anything, they are worse. We are running very fast just to stand still. So, Mr. Speaker, all of our statistics that say things are just fine in Manitoba are cast into question. It is clear that we need a new approach. Not the approach of 1966, but certainly not the approach of 1972 either. Neither did the job for us. We need, Mr. Speaker, to work together in Manitoba.

The Throne Speech included little that suggested there was any such new approach being prepared by this government. I must confess that I am not optimistic that they will change their ways or acknowledge any problem. They will instead find numbers to prove that everything is fine, and those numbers will convince no-one in Manitoba.

We saw no mention in this Throne Speech either, Mr. Speaker, of tax cuts, and yet the government obviously has more money than it needs. It has a duty to restore that money

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) to those who earned it. We would recommend that they cut personal income taxes by at least ten percent; that even if they persist in our uncompetitive succession duty taxes they move immediately to take the family farm from the succession duty provisions altogether. We would recommend that they take school taxes off farm land and senior citizens' homes owned and leased by them. They know we stand for these things, so I will not belabour them. I will merely say that the Progressive Conservative Party believes the taxes here in Manitoba are too high and that we would lower them.

We are disappointed too, Mr. Speaker, by the government's failure to mention any policy response to the special problems and challenges of the north. I have already mentioned that we would establish a Premier's office in the North to assure that the people there should not be barred by distance or isolation from access to the highest possible authority by government. Beyond this we have the question of the proposed Panarctic pipeline that may well be built throughout Manitoba. It will mean jobs in our north and development there.

Well, Mr. Speaker, has the government any policy to make the most of these opportunities that should arise? Has the government prepared itself to work with the people building the line and creating the corridor and in avoiding possible ecological damage? The Progressive Party would move on those questions immediately. And we would go further. We would approach the people planning the line to see just what plans they had for Manitoba. One proposal we would put would be that the provincial government would provide them with a corridor for the pipeline in return for expansion of natural gas supplies to the entire northern part of Manitoba. By cutting our energy prices and by assuring our supplies, this kind of agreement could have substantial long-term benefits for the province. Has the government considered such a proposal? Have they considered the pipeline and what it would mean for the north? If so, there is no evidence of it in the Throne Speech.

. . . . continued on next page

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)

I have outlined some alternatives to the House, Mr. Speaker, some of the ways in which our party would approach things differently than the government. We would carry that different approach in all parts of government activity. For instance in the health field. There is not at present any official representative of the medical profession on the governing body of the Manitoba Health Insurance Corporation. Surely the doctors have a contribution to make here. Surely they should through the Manitoba Medical Association choose their own representative to sit on that body and play a part in the planning of our health care. The problems of moderating increases in health costs while preserving a high standard of health care is a thorny one. The medical profession is involved in that problem and could make an important contribution. The government has not invited them to try. We would.

We would apply the same reasoning to problems like our provincial jails and correctional institutions. A very large proportion of the inmates of these institutions are of native background. We would cooperate with the Indian Brotherhood and the Metis Federation in the recruitment and training of native personnel to be employed in the jails to help us solve that particular problem of these inmates and to devise systems that will improve their chances of successfully re-entering society. For those convicted on non-violent crimes we would try to work our systems of job training and employment to try and break through the prison poverty crime cycle that now occurs. And again, the approach is simple. We would try to find those in the community who had special knowledge or understanding of the problem and ask them to help us solve it.

We would apply it in the field of education, both in terms of costs by dealing with the local people and in terms of the equality of education available in all parts of Manitoba. Since 1967 there has been a reversal in the trend that had existed, a reversal that sees education outside of Metropolitan Winnipeg growing more slowly in scope than inside the city. We would strive for equality of education working with the teaching profession, parents, all those who have a stake in our educational system. That would mean that we would abandon the ad hoc system of so-called experiments that the current government is running in favour of a policy that will allocate resources to meet the objectives of more equality in education across the province. Because the limits of the property tax base restrict at the present time the range of educational equality alternate means of financing must be found and the cost must be removed from property in a gradual series of steps to allow the changes without disruption. That would mean, too, that areas like many in the north with very sparse populations might have to receive special provincial support to permit them to operate school systems up to the provincial standards.

Our emphasis on working with people involved in government programs means that the curriculum would have to be more flexible so that the needs of specific groups in specific areas can be better served by our schools. We would encourage divisions to cooperate in the sharing of facilities and personnel. Our efforts in this area would be like those in others, to make the resources available so that the people can achieve the things they need. Such simple things as informing school divisions of changes in grant structures by January 31st so that they can plan their own budgets would be an integral part of our approach. That last has not been done in the past because it would always play havoc with the budgeting system used by the Provincial Government Department of Education. We think that if a government procedure gets in the way of these things that we are trying to achieve, then it would be changed.

Mr. Speaker, 39 paragraphs in the Throne Speech were pure puffery. They range from self congratulation to empty verbiage. Seven promised studies; only 25 dealt with programs, whether it be new programs or extension of old programs.

I have mentioned some of the things that I hoped to see in this Throne Speech. I've tried to describe the areas in which we find ourselves in fundamental disagreement with this government. I have tried through the Progressive Conservative policies I've discussed to point out the effects of these fundamental differences on our approaches to government. And, Mr. Speaker, it is on these fundamental differences that I must base my refusal to support the motion. The government has offered no solutions to our problems, it has offered no leadership, but most important, its very nature is contrary to what we believe a government in Manitoba ought to be.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the motion be amended by adding to it the following words: "That this House

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)...regrets (a) that the government persists in its political interference with the Manitoba public service to the detriment of the ability of that service to fulfill its responsibilities; and (b) that the government has wasted the resourcefulness and talent of the private and voluntary sectors in Manitoba by refusing to consult with or listen to all those groups who have a stake in this province's future; and (c) that the government has failed in its avowed intention to remain accessible to members of the community of Manitoba and has become distant, insensitive and out of touch; and (d) that the government has failed to take even the most minor steps to assure accountability of spending programs to the people of Manitoba thus permitting waste; and (e) that the government has forgotten the taxpayer, ignoring the need for taxes to be justified by benefits returned to the people, and has raised unnecessary amounts of money through excessive taxation.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from La Verendrye, that debate be now adjourned.

QUESTION put and motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, the motion before us is the one to set up the standing committee under Rule 70 of the House, and while there is quite a list of Standing Committees, many of these are of long standing. Many of them have been established for a good number of years. I recall when I first came into the House I think all of them were there except one. We've added one in the latter years and that was the one on economic development.

Now maybe in years gone by it sufficed to have the committees that are still on the Order Book, but I feel that times have changed and especially with the present government, that there is need of more committees. I think in their time the committees have done a good job, and over the years many of the Committees have done an excellent job. I have no quarrel with it. Some it is doubtful as to their achievements, and especially when we take a look at the Economic Development Committee which had hearings just recently, and you sometimes wonder just what is being achieved. But I feel that a committee still has its worth because of the many Crown corporations that have been set up over these last number of years and that this committee, the Economic Development Committee certainly has the power and the right to have various bodies appear before it, and to hear them and question them. So I still feel even this committee is very worthy of appointment.

We also find that because of the setting up of more committees and various types of boards that we're delegating more and more power to these outside bodies, and many of these bodies have large powers, of spending large sums of money, and this is where I feel we should exercise great care. I think it was two years ago or so a list of 59 different boards that had been appointed -- or was it last year that the report came out? These are a large number of boards and committees that are exercising certain powers and to which we delegate large powers. However, I feel that there is a requirement for one or two more standing committees, standing committees of the House, because when you look at the estimates, we find that we have a committee on municipal affairs. This particular department's budget is \$19 million. We find we have another one on agriculture which is \$16 million. Then we find departments such as education spending \$129 million. Not only that, but we also have the Colleges and Universities Affairs, which is education as well, and this department also spends another 67 million. The two combined are close to \$200 million. Yet we have no standing committee to refer matters to, that they can call these very bodies established under this department to account or to question. I feel that if there are any economies to be made they will have to be made by thorough investigation and thorough examining by members of this House. I don't believe in matters being referred to various commissions. I feel that we as members are duty bound to examine these kinds of matters and try and effect savings. Not only savings but I am sure that we could also give direction much better in many areas than when commissions make reports and that these reports gather dust on the shelves.

Not only do we have that particular department spending so much money. Take a look at the Health and Social Development which last year had an estimated budget of 191,295,000, yet again no committee, no standing committee to which we can refer matters to and which could call people before them. And we have so many different committees and boards established under these two departments.

(MR. FROESE con't)

When we take a look at education, the Public School Finance Board alone has a budget of 129 million roughly that they look after. It's not only operational; they also decide on capital, where capital is going to be spent, and I think I as a member of this House as do any other members of this House have a right to examine and to question these people sitting on these boards as to why certain things were done in a certain way.

I would also like to question them on the various budgets presented by school division boards to this, because here we have no idea on what basis grants are being made and refused because in certain conditions we find that large requests are being refused, and in other areas they are granted. Why? I feel that as a member of this House I should have the right to question these very boards that have this authority given to them, that we should have the right to question them. I won't debate all of that, because that aspect alone would call for a 40 minute speech.

I would like to refer also to the Health Department which I mentioned previously; an estimate of \$191 million. Here again -- and I don't want to minimize in any way the other departments' spending, such as Agriculture 16 million, and Municipal Affairs 19 million-- but we're spending a very large amount of money on health and health services. And the costs are rising, there is no decrease in sight. And the costs have gone up annually in both these two departments by large amounts. Just the other day I received a copy of, I think they call it the Green Paper, a report from the Manitoba Medical Association on the health care in Manitoba as of today and tomorrow. And I find that on page 2 they say, and I am quoting here: "Waste in the provision of health care therefore an inequality in its delivery are the two problems the White Paper must meet." I haven't had a chance to study it yet but certainly there is waste and I think we should try and economize. We should try and do away with any waste that is there. And how can we find out where the areas are unless we have a chance to examine the people and ask them on the various items.

Here again a number of bodies have been appointed under the health department and I feel that they should be summoned before a committee. We have the Manitoba Medical Association who have just published this book. After perusing it and studying it I would like to question them on some matters. Likewise we have other bodies such as the Health Services Commission which had a budget in last year of \$70 million. We never have a right to question them, we don't get a chance to question them. I feel that we are spending too much money freely without giving close examination and close scrutiny to the moneys that are being spent.

There are other bodies that should be called before such a committee as mentioned by the Leader of the Official Opposition, the Health Insurance Corporation. I would also like to have some of the hospital boards appear before such a committee because going into some of the hospitals, some are very good, others I think are so run down that you feel very poor going into some of the hospitals the way the situation is at the present time. I was in one the other day and I felt that that wasn't fit for people to be in there and the type of service they were getting. This is certainly not in my constituency because we have excellent hospitals and hospital care in my constituency, I can tell you. But we as members of this House are lax in our duties and we are not performing our duty if we do not examine these people and have them come before us and question them on it.

The same things holds true for welfare. Here is another area that needs very thorough examining in my opinion. The total amount for income security in our estimates last year was \$73 million, yet very little scrutiny is given to some of these large figures.

Take the University Grants Commission. How much money are they given at their disposal? No questioning at all -- very little questioning is done on the Grants Commission by members in this House, because we can only ask questions of the Minister and this is always secondhand when we get a reply. We haven't got direct communication with the people that are directly involved and are spending the money that we allocate. Therefore I feel very strongly that when we do set up the standing committees that we should have a committee on education and one on health. This is the only way in my opinion in which we will be able to deal with our centralized programs in education and in the social services. Because there is no incentive to economize. I would like to hear any member who can tell me where there are incentives to economize in both those areas. There is no reward for initiative to bring about savings because hospital district boards or hospital boards, are always anxious to increase their budgetting because if they show savings well then the next

(MR. FROESE con't) time around they won't be able to get the same amount the next year. So everything is spent and more than that. They go into deficit spending just so that they can have a bigger budget next time around. I feel that this is a sad situation in Manitoba and this is the only way we will correct it if we get standing committees so that we can call these bodies before the committee and get the information for us so that we can take the proper steps to remedy some of these situations. It's the only way we will be able to help to keep costs down and I think this is also one aspect or should be one aspect of open government for which you people came in here and came out so proudly during the first two years. Open up government, give us a standing committee, give us the chance to question these people on these expenditures that are being made.

I am sure that this is a constructive suggestion and recommendation that I am making, and I therefore move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Member for Rupertsland, that the motion be amended by adding and inserting after the words "economic development" in line 12 the following lines: "Education, Health and Social Development."

MR. SPEAKER: I must inform the honourable member I have to decline the amendment for two reasons: Rule 70 of our Book of Rules which outlines the committees that are to be elected; and secondly because Rule 51 indicates there has to be notice of motion for any other committees to be set up.

Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On a point of order. I still feel that the House is master of its own rules. Therefore I feel that it should be

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has the opportunity to challenge the Chair. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, just on the point of order so that there be no misunderstanding. . . The honourable member will certainly have the opportunity of making such a motion on the report of the Rules Committee or by substantive motion if he wishes to do so. There is no intention of the House to limit the honourable member's right to do so but not on this particular motion.

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

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I hope that I'm not in order if I should say a few words on the adjourned debate. I don't wish to prolong this particular debate but I wish to emphasize very strongly that while the rules state the number of committees that should be formed and while those committees are formed by the present resolution, that certainly consideration ought to be given to the proposals made by the Member from Rhineland. And I would suggest that there are very fundamental reasons for which these proposals ought to be made besides the one that he has brought out, that of emphasizing the amount of dollars spent in those particular areas.

I would like to suggest that we are I think about to be facing very serious problems in the area of educational finance and unless we have a systematic approach, an in-depth look at this kind of problem rather than by patching the difficulties as we are doing now by simply putting down the problem where it seems to be coming up instead of treating it as a provincial responsibility, a responsibility that tells us that government should treat all school divisions as much as possible in a similar fashion, that we will find ourselves in serious trouble of having emasculated the Foundation Program and having solved the problem in a piecemeal, bandaid approach and that is not good enough.

I would encourage very much, Mr. Speaker, the members on the other side to give serious thought to selecting or electing a committee on education for this coming session. I think the importance certainly warrants it.

QUESTION put and motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The business of the House having been concluded, unless there is further attempt I shall adjourn the House. The House now stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.