

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY of MANITOBA
Monday, February 21st, 1977

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 45 students of Grade 9 standing of the St. Norbert Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Sister Pat McKeown. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

On behalf of the honourable members we welcome you.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HONOURABLE SAUL A. MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Reports required of the Department of Finance. The first, the Return under Section 14(2) of *The Insurance Act*, second, the Return under Section C, 30.2 of *The Law Society Act*, three, *The Public Accounts, Main and Supplementary for the last fiscal year*, four, a Return under Section 66 of *The Legislative Assembly Act*, five, the Auditor's Report of *The Public Trustee*, six, a Return under Section 20 of *The Public Officer's Act*, seven, a Return of *The Special Municipal Loan General and Emergency Loan Fund Act*, and eight, the Report of the *Provincial Auditor*.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Reports or Ministerial Statements? The Honourable House Leader.

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a Return to Address No. 1 on the Motion of the Honourable Member for Gladstone, dated April 2, 1975. Copies of the Return were forwarded to the Mover and Party Whips on July 4, 1976 by my office, they were forwarded intersessionally.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, PREMIER, (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling seven copies approximately of the *Annual Report of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board* and copies of these as well were circulated to honourable members some months ago.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SCHREYER: While I am on my feet, Sir, just for the sake of convenience, I would like to indicate in a tentative way to honourable gentlemen opposite, that assuming that announcements of the weekend with respect to *Garrison Diversion* do not make the entire matter academic or redundant. Making that assumption, there is some desire on the part of the North Dakota State Legislature and Administration to meet for dialogue purposes with their counterparts here, and a date of March 3rd has been set, it is tentative, and approximately ten, I am advised, of their numbers will be in attendance which would seem to indicate, Sir, that representation, roughly on the basis of four from this side, three honourable gentlemen opposite, one representative of the group, the *Liberal Party* approximately would make it possible, at the same time to continue conduct of business of *Her Majesty* here on that day.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STERLING LYON (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, further to the comments by the First Minister with respect to the meeting with the representatives of the *North Dakota Legislature*, did I hear him aright when he suggested four from the Government side, three from the Opposition and one from the Liberal Party? — (Interjection)— It's not a jousting match, we don't have to be equal in numbers. We will look forward then, Mr. Speaker, if I may say so in response to the First Minister, we'll look forward to meeting with the First Minister or the House Leader privately and arranging representation from our side for that meeting.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-operatives.

HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this first opportunity that I have to correct a statement made by the *Winnipeg Free Press* on Saturday, February 19th — (Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. TOUPIN: This appeared on the first page of the Saturday paper, the second last paragraph on that page, where the *Winnipeg Free Press* indicates that I will not renew contracts of some thirty-five employees at the Rent Stabilization Board itself, and I did not say that.

I indicated that the contracts were expiring March 31st but the last part of the sentence "and won't be renewed" was not said by myself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

HONOURABLE EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable, the Minister of Finance. It relates to the judgement that was handed down from the Manitoba Queen's Bench on Friday declaring invalid the sales tax which was applied by Manitoba to aircraft over-flying our province.

In view of the judgement, Mr. Speaker, which will now require a rebate to Air Canada, could he tell the House what other aircraft companies will be involved in similar rebates for this unconstitutional tax.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I can't fully answer that question. I have not seen the judgement. Certainly

Monday, February 21st, 1977

Government will want to get a transcript of the judgement. All I know of it is what I've read in the newspapers. This decision was made a number of years ago for this matter to go to court. Further proceedings if any will have to be decided by government.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Then is the Minister now prepared to tell the House whether or not it is his intention to proceed to a higher court on the matter of the constitutionality of this tax.

MR. MILLER: No, the Minister is not prepared to make any statement in that regard and as I indicated this will be examined very closely, the transcript of the judgement will be read and studied by a legal counsel, a decision will then eventually be made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in respect to the statement that he just read to the House concerning a correction in the Free Press on the staff of the *Review Board*. Could the Minister indicate, if the contracts of the staff are coming to an end on March 31st, does he intend to renew them and does he in fact intend any staff changes in the composition of that board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, first of all Mr. Speaker, the part of this statement that was indicated as having been said by myself on Saturday, that most of the contracts expire on March 31st, 1977, is correct, apart from a few. In regards to the intention of extending those contracts or renewing for a given period of time, that is for government policy and it will be discussed and decided by my colleagues and myself in Cabinet. There is no indication at this time exactly what terms will be given and what period of time the staff complement there would be engaged for.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate approximately the number of outstanding cases still being considered by the Rent Review Board in terms of administration or implementation or adjudication.

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return. **MR. AXWORTHY:** A further supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister indicate whether the *Rent Review Board* has undertaken any studies about the impact of the rent review program, in determining the limitation on rents or its effect upon the housing market and would he be prepared to table such studies or analysis in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, there is a study being conducted now by both the *Rent Review Board* itself and the *Planning and Research Secretariat of The Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs*. To my knowledge this study is not yet completed.

MR. AXWORTHY: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, thank you. When the study is completed would the Minister commit to tabling that in this House so that other members would have an opportunity to also review its findings.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that request under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Continuing Education and Manpower. I'd like to ask him whether he can advise the House whether the aircraft maintenance course at Red River Community College is being wound down and phased out and whether industry has been consulted in this strategy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Continuing Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in all areas of instruction at Red River Community College and all our community colleges we do have advisory committees involving representation from the relevant area of industry and the level at which the course is presently being offered is in line with the demand for it in terms with the number of seats purchased by Canada Manpower.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise the House whether or not it is the case that there is room for an enrollment of twenty in that course, many of whom are financed through Manpower and current enrollment is only at about the level of thirteen.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, if there are any applicants seeking admission who are being denied admission despite the enrollment figures if they are what the honourable member claims them to be, I'll take that question as notice and reply at a later date.

MR. SHERMAN: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister also undertake to ascertain whether the course is being impaired through a diversion of funds from that course and department to other courses and departments.

MR. HANUSCHAK: That is quite unlikely, Mr. Speaker, but I'll take that as notice, too.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

HONOURABLE STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Commerce responsible for MHRC It was indicated in

Throne Speech Mr. Speaker, that there will be some 500 lots available for people this summer. Can the Minister indicate the location of those lots and has the land been properly zoned and when will it be onstream

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

HONOURABLE LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East): Mr. Chairman, with regard to the location, there are two or three possible locations; one of the major locations is in the north-west area of Winnipeg. There are certain matters that have to be seen to, zoning and so on, but hopefully if all goes well they may be onstream later this year.

MR. PATRICK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are the services in, all ready at this time, and what scheme will the government use or the MHRC use to dispose or sell these lots to builders or will it be to private individuals?

MR. EVANS: The area is not serviced at this time but as far as the policy of disposing of the land is concerned this is a matter that has to be decided upon and when a policy decision is arrived at it will be announced in due

course.

MR. PATRICK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate to the House the approximate value of each lot or what price will be placed on lots selling to individuals?

MR. EVANS: Well it's really impossible for me to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, however I would like to assure the honourable member that the price will be as close to cost as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Labour. I would like to ask him in the matter of compulsory overtime generally as distinct from the specific issue at Griffin Steel, is it the intention of this government to remove the subject entirely from individual collective agreements' in other words to rule compulsory overtime out as a bargaining issue?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY (Transcona): I think, Mr. Speaker, my only answer could be to my honourable friend that this will be a matter of government policy.

I do want to say to my honourable friend, however, that the situation that is prevailing at Griffin Industries in my own constituency has been a matter of grave concern and that at the present time the administration, and when I use the term "administration" I'm talking of the Department of Labour, is giving consideration to possible legislation in respect of overtime.

MR. SHERMAN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In connection specifically with Griffin Steel, is it the view of this government that a collective agreement on compulsory overtime has been breached?

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there was a breach of any collective agreement. At the present time the parties concerned, under the laws of the Province of Manitoba, are engaged in trying to arrive at a collective agreement aided by the Department of Labour and we have established in the Province of Manitoba the rights of free collective bargaining and free collective agreements, something that was unheard of really a few years ago when my honourable friend, the Member for Souris-Killarney, happened to be the Attorney-General. We are democrats — (Interjection) — Yes, that's right — that's right, Mr. Speaker — I don't know what your speed-up motion means, but I do say this, that as far as I am aware, as the Dean of the Legislature, free collective bargaining was never, ever considered as a fact of life under the Roblin Administration in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is with some trepidation that I ask that I ask a further supplementary but I will try it anyway, Sir. Is the Government offering and pursuing continuing mediation services in this dispute or does the Government take the view that free collective bargaining should not be interfered in by Government?

MR. PAULLEY: The Government of Manitoba takes the attitude that we believe in free collective bargaining and that there are times under the legislation prevailing in the Province of Manitoba, that there will be differences of opinion between management and labour, and that is the process that we are proceeding with at the present time. My honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, says that it is enough, I say that it is not enough. I say that if he would suggest that we should compulsorily impose conditions on workers or management in Manitoba, I will not agree with him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON (Wolseley): I have a question for the Minister of Labour if he is not tired out. I wonder if you could give me the per diem salary or budget of Mr. MURDOCH MacKay who is heading up this one-man commission to deal with the Day of Protest, October 14th.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: No, I cannot give any precise cost of the investigation. I do say that it would be worthwhile if between management and labour we were able to arrive at harmonious relationships between management and labour and that was the objective behind the appointment of Mr. Murdoch MacKay, Q.C., as an Industrial Inquiry Commission in this particular field and I wish him every success.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: I guess I will put it in the form of a supplementary which is really the same question. What is his per diem salary?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I am sure that the cost to the Treasury of Manitoba will be less than would normally be charged by a man of

the competence of Murdoch MacKay.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources responsible for MDC. It was indicated that the City of Winnipeg would be purchasing some 78 buses. I wonder if the Minister can indicate to the House will there be any requirement on Flyer Industries to make entrance provisions for handicapped people since the Government and I understand the City of Winnipeg are committed to improve the transportation facilities for handicapped people in the City?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the requirements will be in accordance with the purchasing requirements of the City of .

MR. STEVE PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate to the House has the Flyer Industries had the capacity to make provisions for handicapped people in the city or the Minister is indicating to the House there will be no requirement at all to make such provisions for the handicapped people.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker I am fully confident that Flyer Industries Limited are capable of meeting the purchasing requirements of the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour, responsible

for fire safety. In view of the recent by-law passed by the City of Winnipeg requiring new alarm systems in all existing buildings over four storeys, can the Minister indicate whether his department or the Government have any plans or provisions to assist owners in the introduction of those through financial incentives or any kind of support considering the fact that this will probably result in a major demolition of many buildings if they can't meet up with that by-law.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if press releases are accurate, I think that the honourable member who has just taken his seat is the least competent to ask as to the provisions of the Fire Commissioner's Department in eradicating hazards that exist in housing in the Province of Manitoba and I refer you just to an area not too far from here.

But in direct reply to my honourable friend, I would say that never in the history of Manitoba has any Fire Commissioner's Department been more concerned or more involved with the protection of people — (Interjection)— Yes, we've had more fires as a result of the deficiencies of the previous administration in Manitoba —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, Order please. Let us proceed amicably and get to the root of the questions that are asked and have the answers precise and terse. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I realize that you were not a member of this Assembly when discussions were taking place between the previous administration, under Dufferin Roblin, and the present Leader of the Conservative Party, for the provision of adequate fire alarm systems and fire exit systems. I will be pleased, as a matter of fact, yes to my honourable friend from Swan River, I do happen to possess one of the most complete records of *Hansard* and I will be privileged, in due course, to indicate to my friends opposite that it was their membership that deprived many tenants of the provision of adequate fire exits. —(Interjection)— Oh, my honourable friend says, "is it in order?" He should know because he was a presiding officer at that time and ruled that it was out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. I would again ask the co-operation of all the honourable members to keep our Question Period concise, terse and the answers short. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, you have my full co-operation and I will adhere to that providing the Opposition realizes what has prevailed before.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, taking in mind your instructions, I would simply ask the Minister, does the Government have any plans for assisting in implementation of this new City By-law to introduce a whole new series of fire alarms or smoke detectors into existing buildings? Is there any form of assistance going to be provided, yes or no?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my honourable, efficient, competent member knows the answer because we have attempted, within the Fire Commissioner's Office, to overcome some of the deficiencies, as he has suggested in his capacity as a University professor in the field of protection in the area of the preservation of life because of bum construction.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the other day the Member for Arthur wanted to get some information on the question of the Beef Referendum and the appeal procedures. I had indicated to him then that I would get the information for this afternoon. The people who are deemed to be not eligible to vote but who have applied for a registration or who have registered, have the option of phoning in their appeal, on a collect basis; of writing in, or of appearing in person before the Manitoba Marketing Board. The phone and write in deadline is as of today, the personal appeal is tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: I thank the Honourable Minister for answering a question that I didn't ask. I wonder if he now, while he's answering, would indicate to me the price of flax — I did ask him that question, I think, Friday morning.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the price of flax is this morning, but I believe that perhaps I was wrong, it was the Member for Rock Lake that had asked the question on the voting procedures and the appeal.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Continuing Education and Manpower. Can the Minister indicate to the House why the Library is closed on Wednesdays and Saturday mornings at the Red River Community College, and why some of the services at Red River Community College are curtailed or have been greatly reduced, services to students from the library?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Continuing Education and Manpower:

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I'll take the question as notice, but I believe that the library is open during those hours during which there is a demand for the use of it by the students, and if there is a demand on Saturdays or at what other times the library is closed I'll check into that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Labour, in charge of the Manitoba Fire Commissioner's Office, and would ask him if he could inform the House when the municipalities could expect to have the five percent sales tax removed from firefighting equipment which they are presently purchasing?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that has been drawn to my attention on numerous occasions. I did write a letter to the Minister of Finance, I believe it was the Minister of Finance twice removed, for this

consideration. I got from him I thought an intelligent reply to the effect that if this happened insofar as the removal of the sales tax in firefighting equipment, we would have to consider the justification of the removal of the tax from many other areas. I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend, as an alternative the Department of Labour and the Fire Commissioner's Department have instituted fire training programs that far exceed the amount of revenue that they would receive as a result of the imposition of the five percent sales tax.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Souris-Killarney.

ORDERS OF THE DAY — THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I last sat as a Member of this House, I guess it is going on almost eight years ago this spring, and as other members who value the dignity and the traditions of this Chamber and of our parliamentary system will understand it is a moving experience to return.

I know that the First Minister has had a similar experience because, as you know, he and I were elected at the same time, the year that goes back two decades ago, 1958.

The First Minister, of course, had a sabbatical from this House and took it in the House of Commons where he served with some distinction as a Federal member. By contrast my sabbatical was in private life. It is hard to remember, you know, when we think back to 1958 that he was the youngest member elected to the Legislature, and believe it or not, I was the second youngest. I am now recommending to the First Minister, after my experience as a private citizen and so on, that he might enjoy that kind of a period of privacy and reflection, in the private sector with his charming wife and his equally charming family. I think it would be healthy for his outlook, as indeed it has been for mine, because it brings to you a new perspective as to what people on the receiving end of government have to put up with from those of us who, from time to time, are in government.

I congratulate you, Sir, on resuming your position as the chief arbiter of debate in this Chamber. I can undertake to offer your office, Sir, the respect that it requires and the respect that it deserves, if we are to preserve the dignity and the amity that are so central to the proper performance of our duties in this Chamber.

I think it is also appropriate and traditional in this House for a new member to speak of his constituency when first he rises as a representative from that area. Although I have had the honour, in previous times, of sitting in this Chamber as a representative from a constituency now represented in such a distinguished way by my colleague, the Member from Fort Garry, this is the first opportunity that I have had to address the House as the Member for Souris-Killarney. And, Sir, I could not speak of that constituency without first speaking of the people because they are good people in Souris-Killarney, and before my honourable friend, the Minister of Labour, says anything by way of heckle, I would have said that statement, Sir, had I run third in the by-election rather than in the position that I did.

MR. PAULLEY: The former representative was one of my dearest friends.

MR. LYON: They are good people. The expression, "*salt of the earth*" is no exaggeration when applied to the people of Souris-Killarney. Like many other people in Manitoba they are self-reliant, they work hard, and for years they were represented faithfully and well by my predecessor, the late Earl McKellar. I think it would be safe for me to say that Earl McKellar embodied all of the best qualities of the people of Souris-Killarney in the attitudes that he brought to this Chamber and to each of its members, regardless of their party affiliation, and particularly by the unstinting devotion to his trust as their member.

When I stood for election last fall it was to fill out the unexpired portion of Earl McKellar's term of office as the Member for Souris-Killarney, and I am truly honoured to succeed him. I am proud and honoured as well, to represent the people of Souris-Killarney, and I am grateful to them for the generous and the hospitable way in which they have greeted my candidacy and made me feel at home in their homes throughout the constituency and in their farmsteads as well.

The economy of Souris-Killarney, Mr. Speaker, is solidly based on agriculture. But then, of course, the economy of most of Manitoba has agriculture as its linchpin. The Towns of Souris-Killarney . . . Souris, Boissevain, Killarney, Wawanesa, Glenboro, Ninette, Belmont . . . and a number of the other unincorporated villages and hamlets, they are good and safe places in which to live. The people there do not ask much from their government beyond leadership, consideration and respect.

Any member of this Chamber, Sir, who forgets, as I know all of us do from time to time who take part in public life, the basic values, the resourcefulness, the courtesy and the good sense that marks our people throughout Manitoba, any such person may see those qualities clearly by visiting Souris-Killarney.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to return. I was interested to hear the comments in the extended answers given by my old colleague and friend, the Minister of Labour, this afternoon, where he was busy blaming the setting of fires on previous governments and so on . . .

MR. PAULLEY: You'll hear more about fires later.

MR. LYON: The Minister of Labour and I ought to be able, from time to time, to provide a certain element of interest to the debates in this Legislature and from his standpoint, of course, I am sure from the indication we've had that there will be more heat than light provided. And I look forward as well, Sir, to working with other colleagues on the far side of the House who were members at the time I served in this Legislature. I look forward to working once again with the Minister of Mines, the Member from Inkster. He is an extremely able parliamentarian and he brings to the deliberations of this Chamber a clear set of convictions which, while I consider them to be totally wrong-headed, are always enlightened by a quick, flexible and tellingly-logical mind. And, of course, the First Minister and I, as I have mentioned before, have sat in this House together before and our relative positions are rather different now but ours have not changed, Sir, nearly so much as that of the Minister of Health.

I must confess that changes that have overtaken the Minister of Health in his career, are going to rob me of one recurrent pleasure that members here used to share prior to his conversion to the joys of Socialism. In those days,

Monday, February 21st, 1977

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Member from St. Boniface as he then was — he had no other title then — he had other epithets that were applied to him but no other title. He would rise regularly in his place and from his lips would ring impassioned and apparently sincere speeches as he told the then government again and again that no government with any principle whatsoever would be able to restrain itself from granting immediate and total public funding of private and parochial schools. As I recall, at the risk of being unparliamentary, Sir, the word that was most often applied to a government that would fail to do that was "gutless." I understand however, Sir, that these speeches are no longer heard here. I understand that now that the Minister of Health has a title, albeit a temporary one, he speaks instead of lotteries. But even of lotteries, Mr. Speaker, the Minister can be heard to speak with passion and apparent sincerity. It is indeed a wondrous gift that he possesses.

But I have begun, Sir, by talking about the past, by indulging briefly in some nostalgia, by remembering the time when I last sat in this House but such indulgence does no service to the problems of today. Our debates in this Chamber cannot afford to be about the past; they cannot afford to dwell on the things we agreed about or disagreed about five, ten or fifteen years ago. The people of Manitoba did not put all of us here to gnaw the bones of old contentions but rather to grapple with the future of this Province and its people. And they have put us here to help provide leadership and direction as all of us in Manitoba prepare for that future.

Sometimes, I know, this first debate at the opening of a Session sounds all too familiar. Sometimes it sounds like little more than another chapter in an old and continuing debate that we have all heard so many times before and that I suppose, Sir, is understandable because we do have some deeply felt differences in principle that will, by their nature, recur in our debate here without ever being resolved. But, as we begin this session, probably the last that we will have before we are once again weighed in the balance of an election, I do not wish merely to continue an old debate. I hope, instead, that we can begin a new one and I hope even to convince my friend, the Minister of Labour, that he should perhaps participate in that new debate. I hope we can debate not about five or ten or fifteen years ago but about the kind of a province and community that we and our children will live in five and ten and fifteen years hence. The starting point for that debate about the future is what? It is the present. There are some facts about Manitoba today that are not at issue in this debate. Some of those facts may be numbered among the few achievements of my friends opposite during their eight long years as Manitoba's government.

We have in Manitoba, for example, a universal Hospital and Medical Care Insurance Scheme which is now financed entirely out of General Revenues. That method of financing is accepted here and in most provinces across Canada and we plan no change in it. But it is not at issue in this debate. We have no Medicare premiums in Manitoba and as far as my party is concerned, we will continue to have none.

We have in Manitoba a Pharmacare program that assures the people of access to prescription drugs when and as they need them without excessive cost and that's a good program. It's not at issue in this new debate which I hope we can begin today.

We have a Government-run Automobile Insurance monopoly in Manitoba and whether or not one agrees that establishing Autopac had any social or economic priority, and one can certainly still get into a good argument about that, it clearly cannot be dismantled today in the public interest. My own and my Party's preference would be to restore competition and freedom of choice to this industry but I think it would be irresponsible of us to pretend to this House or to the people of Manitoba that that would be an easy thing to do or even immediately possible in the future. Questions affecting how Autopac can best be administered will certainly be debated here and with some heat. But the existence of Autopac has passed beyond the point of useful debate at this Session. It is here it will be incumbent on any government to run it efficiently, prudently and on a sound actuarial basis.

The programs of income and social support for Senior Citizens in Manitoba have been expanded. A special concern for the elderly was part and parcel of the system of humanistic services that this government inherited when they came into office and they have built and they have expanded on it. That tradition of concern and compassionate action towards the aged will continue to mark our approach to our social obligations in Manitoba regardless of which party forms the government. In the future it will take the shape of continued expansion of Senior Citizen's housing, personal care facilities and increasingly, I hope, of the kinds of home services that will permit more and more older people to remain independently in their own homes in the community rather than seeking residence in institutions. But our special obligations to the aged are not an issue in this new debate because it would be a great surprise to me if there were any member in this Chamber who would question that basic societal obligation.

This new debate begins with the present, Mr. Speaker, with a government that has fallen into such a bland and rudderless drift that it can muster nothing better than the pallid document we heard read here last Thursday. A government whose search for bright and capable people has degenerated into perhaps the most cynical system of patronage that Manitoba has seen in modern times. At what stage did this government's inability to manage affairs effectively or efficiently finally overwhelm its last effective good

intention? Because that is exactly what seems to have happened, Mr. Speaker.

Take an example, one of many, the Patient Air Transport Service. It promised to provide northern residents with the same access to specialist medical care as southern residents enjoy. But the dead weight of this government's flagging ability designed and administered it so badly that it was strangled by its own built in waste and abuse; a good program overwhelmed by government ineptitude. Or look at the NDP's initiative in the field of day care. There was and there is a need for this service and it will call for growing government support. But now they flail and stagger and abandon it because they don't know how to administer things.

And there were those who hoped that the election of the NDP, some few in Manitoba albeit, would lead to a sort of cultural renaissance in the Arts in Manitoba, and now the Chairman and three members of the Arts Council have resigned in disgust as the NDP's beauracracy continues to absorb the money and the energy that might well have made the Arts brighter and more flourishing and more vital in this province.

Or we can look at something as basic and as human as sport. Now that can hardly be dismissed, Mr. Speaker, as the NDP dismiss so much, as the private preserve of the rich because literally scores of thous=CF ands of

Manitobans take part in sports and by sprawling its involvement in sports through two different departments with contradictory and inconsistent objectives and guidelines the NDP far from providing government help to the hundreds of volunteers who work in sport in Manitoba imposes instead an arid of a wasteful bureaucratic burden on them.

Mr. Speaker, one thing that will certainly be true in the next few years is that we will need a government that is able to govern and to be responsive to the contemporary needs of people. But this government has somehow spent its energy to either govern or to be truly responsive. Its ability, its vitality have been drowned in the sheer weight of its mammoth spending, its sprawling bureaucracy and its leaderless drift. The consequences of its lack of self-discipline are now painfully obvious to all. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that it's time for this government to go. It can no longer serve the people of Manitoba as they deserve to be served and as they want to be served in the latter part of this decade and on into the eighties. The problems we face today will not be solved by their mindless devotion to outdated socialism which is about all that remains of the energy that this government demonstrated in some fields in its first term.

Let's look at our future and let us ask just what prospects we can offer our children and ourselves over the next few years in Manitoba. I can say clearly what my Party believes we must be able to offer.

We must have an educational system that adequately equips our young people to make their own ways in life, a system based on a clear core curriculum, clear evaluation and monitoring of each student's progress and clear and responsive leadership from The Department of Education. We must have government policies that free our teachers and our students to get on with the job of teaching and learning. We do not have those things today.

We must have an economy that is healthy and growing, an economy in which private business and private initiative, the best creators of jobs and opportunities, will flourish. Our basic industries, agriculture and mining, must be healthy. That is not the case in Manitoba today.

We must have a government with the will and the energy to do those things that government must do and the good sense and the restraint to refrain from doing those things which history has demonstrated are beyond the effective capability of any government.

We do not have such a government in Manitoba today, Mr. Speaker, and the result is an inability on the part of government to meet the real challenges that face us or even to divine what they are, coupled by an uncontrolled and continuing waste of our resources and of our collective income.

We must have a tax system that is not out of line with those of our neighboring provinces, a tax system that functions progressively but without the creation of disincentives to the kind of work and initiative we will need if we are to offer our children the opportunities that they have a right to expect. The tax system that this government has built to finance its wasteful and its wrongheaded ventures into areas where no government can usefully go is excessive and it attacks the will and the ability of Manitobans to build the opportunities that we need in this province. And, we need, Mr. Speaker, a system of social services that is flexible enough both to encompass new needs, as those new needs are perceived, and to redesign old programs that are manifestly failing. We need a social service system that efficiently meets real needs generously and compassionately. Instead, this government has turned our social services into a wasteful, ineffective bureaucratic nightmare.

We need a government whose efforts in the field of labour relations will be to diminish conflict and to foster greater trust within a balanced system. This government's approach has been to fan the fires of conflict between labour and management, to fan those fires to the cost of both and, in many cases, to the detriment of the public interest.

And most of all, Mr. Speaker, we will need a government whose vision of the future is acceptable to Manitobans. We know what kind of a future the First Minister and his friends prefer. We know this government's thinking. The First Minister has made it crystal clear, two and one-half to one. No one should be permitted to earn more than two and one-half times the lowest salary. Does one person have more ability than another? Never mind that. The Premier has spoken: He would permit no one to earn more than two and one-half times the lowest income. And eventually the true socialist's nirvana will come about. A total equality of income in what? In words which only this First Minister would use when applied to his fellow citizens, when this generic middle class comes about in Manitoba whatever in heavens name that is.

Mr. Speaker, that kind of thinking may seem fine and fair and logical to a socialist but it represents quite the opposite of the normal aspirations of the people of this Province. Manitobans believe with us that hard work and ability should be rewarded. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that the chance to excel and to receive material rewards for excelling are an important part of our tradition and of our heritage and will continue to be in this province. In the simplest possible terms, Mr. Speaker, we hope that our children may become prosperous and with a little luck and a lot of hard work, more than prosperous. But the First Minister and his colleagues would remove that hope and replace it with some government administered institutionalized envy. He would reduce our hopes and aspirations, Mr. Speaker, to a ladder with two and one-half rungs.

To make society better, he would place a ceiling on our aspirations for ourselves and for our children. Instead of rewards for excellence and incentives to strive and to sacrifice, he would offer us the pablum of mediocrity, underwritten and enforced by his armies of bureaucrats.

But the First Minister will say he hasn't done that yet. He hasn't put this envy-ridden two and one-half times one formula into law. He'll probably never really do it; that's what he'll probably say. He'll probably say it was just a thought. Just a thought. But it is more than that, Mr. Speaker. It is evidence of this government's true tendency and style of thought. It is the dull and heavy sham which only a socialist could mistake for a bright and hopeful future.

And it just will not do as a guide or as a beacon for our people through these next difficult years.

And they will be difficult years. If we are to debate the future we must speak more frankly of the difficulties that face us than the government has seen fit to do in the *Throne Speech*.

Let's . start by talking frankly about the cornerstone of our economy, agriculture. What does the government

say of agriculture in this *Throne Speech*? They mention "farmers' concerns over lack of moisture reserves in the soil." They say "income from livestock operations is expected to improve over 1976 levels." Well, Mr. Speaker, what are the facts that we have to face in this debate about our future in our most important industry? As the *Throne Speech* mentions in passing, we are facing a drought in Manitoba that threatens farm incomes that have already been eroded by inflation and by falling prices. Let's see what's happened to net farm income. In 1974, it was a record high, \$426 million. This year, it's down to \$342 million — that's using the figures that the government utilized itself in the *Throne Speech*. And that net income will, in all likelihood, continue to fall because of continuing inflation in the farmer's costs of operation — his equipment, his fertilizer, his fuel and his taxes. Farm taxes alone, Mr. Speaker, and note these figures, have sky-rocketed from \$21.3 million in 1974 to more than \$31 million in 1976. That is an increase of about 50 percent in just two years, and remember that they were two years in which farm net income declined by some 80 millions of dollars.

And so I say to my honourable friends opposite, it is pretty poor pabulum to say to the farmers of Manitoba today that the increase of education costs on farmland and on homes in Manitoba has decreased because quite the opposite has happened and the manifestation of it has hit perhaps more heavily on farmland than on any other unit of municipally taxed land. I know that may come as a opposite, strange message to some of my honourable friends but if they would travel in Souris-Killarney or in the rest of Manitoba, they would find that message quite clear from the assessment records of the municipalities or by listening to — or even — by listening to the *ANITOBA Farmers Union*. Total farm expenses reached \$649.5 million in 1976. That's \$100 million more than the total gross income of Manitoba farmers in 1972, which was only just over four years ago. The magnitude of the drought threat that faces us could well drive gross income down below \$700 million in 1977. Members here can do the arithmetic for themselves. The drop in net income could well be disastrous if that event takes place. This is just not a potential dollars and cents disaster, Mr. Speaker. Fully one-third of our economy is based on agriculture and when one-third of our economy is in trouble, then we are all in trouble. There will be fewer jobs generated and this at a time when we need jobs in Manitoba. Not a single man, woman or child in Manitoba would be untouched by a very bad year for the farmer in this province. And we have to look at this *Throne Speech* and ask just what is the government proposing to do to help to cushion the worst effects of these potential adverse conditions in Manitoba? They anticipate, and I think quite properly, that more farmers will participate in the Crop Insurance Program this year. They are dicker with Ottawa to integrate the Federal and the Provincial Beef Income Support Programs.

As a shining example of this government's ability to ignore any real problem in face of chasing after more socialist programs, the Minister of Agriculture has decided that what beef farmers really need is a government-controlled marketing board. Since the beef producers of Manitoba don't appear to want a marketing board and have never asked for one, and even the government's own Beef Advisory Committee recommended against one, the Minister has decided that he is going to have to bully them a little bit so he threatens them to accept government control or you get no support or co-operation from government. He has done his best to prevent all beef producers from even participating in the plebiscite that will decide the future of their industry. He's spent a few thousand dollars of the taxpayers' money buying heavy-handed advertising extolling the virtues of a government-controlled marketing board. By these actions, Mr. Speaker, the Minister — and this is really what deserves the indictment that has to be laid at his door more seriously than any — the Minister has driven a deep wedge between Manitoba farmers and their government at precisely the time when government and farmers will have to be able to work most closely and co-operatively together to weather the tough months that may be coming ahead. This, Mr. Speaker, I remind you is a government that talks about concern for people, and as it talks about concern for people, it is buying up more and more farmland.

Now, the NDP's state farm program

has now swollen to the point where they own more than 175,000 acres of farmland creating a whole new unwanted class of tenant farmers for the State and this year, with the farm net incomes almost certain to fall, and probably fall dramatically, they have decided to raise the rent that they are going to demand that their tenants pay.

We are told, Mr. Speaker, that the government 17 millions of dollars on its takeover has spent some of private farmland. The spending is continuing but who could even pretend that this program is being operated with the consent of the people of Manitoba? Who would pretend that it enjoys any measureable public support at all? Mr. Speaker, Manitobans do not want their government to take over private farmland. Manitobans want their children to be able to own their own farms; they want individual Manitobans to be able to own and work their own land. And you know, Mr. Speaker, until this government came into office eight years ago — until this government came into office eight years you never had to explain on a public platform in Manitoba, the desirability of private ownership in the development of the agricultural industry in this province. You never had to explain it because everyone knew it. But because we have a handful of misguided people temporarily in office with their little band of who believe that state ownership is better than private ownership, we've got ourselves into a situation in this province which is causing ire and dismay and deep anger among the farm community of this province. If the government, Mr. Speaker, spent a little bit more time listening to farmers instead of fighting them, they would know that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in the *Throne Speech* we find no mention of the Garrison Diversion. I'm sure that all of us in this House are gratified at the decision taken by the United States Government to halt work on the Lonetree Dam but I am sure it is important for all of us to remember that this U.S. decision is not a cancellation but rather a suspension of work and it has given us time to look carefully at the proposals for mitigative projects here in Manitoba in the event that the project does go ahead and it will give us time to cost these projects, to analyse their timing if they should become necessary. It will give us time to form and to document a clear opinion as to whether effective mitigation is possible at all. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the First Minister and his colleagues that they will enjoy the whole-hearted support and co-operation of this Party if they proceed now actively to protect the interests of Manitobans in this matter as related by that report.

There is so much that is not mentioned in the *Throne Speech*. 00022 01 21 02 77 MS There is no mention of drainage, or of flood control or of water conservation in the Speech I know that these matters that are prime

concerns of government have a low priority with this administration and always have had. Instead of spending millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money taking over private farms why is the government not moving on these problems as well?

In my own constituency of Souris-Killarney the Souris River has flooded for six out of the past seven years. The costs in dollars and in human dislocation (and I know that human dislocation would be an experience that would be difficult for some of my honourable friends on the back bench to understand) but it's real and it's human and it happens nonetheless) the costs in dollars and human dislocation have been tremendous. As I say, Mr. Speaker, this is not merely a question of dollars and cents. It is not merely a question of the sectional interests of one group in Manitoba. The health of agriculture will affect us all! but this government blinded by its outdated socialist doctrines and dogma prefers to treat Manitobans as though we were not interdependent. Well, we are interdependent, we depend one upon the other. It prefers instead to single out particular groups and to treat them as the Minister of Agriculture has treated the beef producers, as enemies. —(Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Speaker, to build the kind of future that we want for our children in this province we have to become again a community in Manitoba, and I'm going to repeat those words. We have to become again a community in Manitoba. But my friends opposite, I'm sure, have no conception of that at all. Mr. Speaker, this government has acquired the habit of power: the complacency, the lack of ideas, the lack of energy, the lack of new and capable members. This government is exhausted and this *Throne Speech* is proof of that exhaustion.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the people of Manitoba are prepared to trust an exhausted government to lead us into the future. Mr. Speaker, we do not pretend that any government of any province can be the only cushion for our farmers from the forces of the market or of the weather. We acknowledge as any reasonable person must that the Federal Government has an equally important role and the individual farmer has an equally important role. But I think we would all agree that what the provincial government can do must be done and the initial steps are clear. In the face of declining net farm income we would be sitting down with the Federal Government at this stage at the present time and with the Farm Organization and with the different agricultural groups and looking at and trying to consider policies of assistance to counter the adverse forces that may be upon us. A government which developed an imperfect beef stabilization program (and God knows it's imperfect) should be capable of devising at least some ad hoc potential assistance programs should they prove necessary as a supplement to the Federal Grain Stabilization Scheme. And we would begin again, Mr. Speaker, to operate responsible programs of drainage and of flood control and water conservation as this Government has never done.

We're not talking here about multi-million-dollar projects. The huge projects that were needed in the previous decade, the floodway, the Shellmouth, the Portage Diversion, these have all been completed, these have all been completed with measureable benefit to the total community of Manitoba. But what we're talking about now is the regional conservation programs involving a smaller expenditure, smaller Mr. Speaker than this Government spends annually on new government office buildings to house new civil servants.

There is no energy and there is no determination left in this Government except the determination to cling to power; and where is that shown more clearly in the *Throne Speech* than in the "deathbed repentance" that the Government makes about its education policies, if indeed they can be graced with the word "policies".

After years of tinkering and treating the students and the teachers of Manitoba as if they existed only for the convenience of the researchers and the planners in the Department of Education; the mothers and the brothers and the sisters and the cousins whom we number up by thousands (or hundreds now) the NDP has decided to change its ways or at least that's what the *Throne Speech* says. Let me quote for you: "A lasting and meaningful learning experience is based on a command of language and a facility with computational skills". You know, Mr. Speaker, it actually says that in the *Throne Speech*. Schools should teach children how to read and write and do mathematics. The problem is that that is exactly what our school system and our teachers used to do at one time and do pretty well and what they have been wanting to do over the last eight years before the NDP began treating our school children in Manitoba as a form of "guinea pigs". Now they say that they are going to provide more financial support for primary education and so they should. It's high time that they began to face up to the responsibility in the field of education instead of tinkering in that tremendously important field. But the changes I suspect are more imaginary than real because we have had eight years of lip service to basic education from this government, but the destructive tinkering has continued to go on and goes on as we sit here today.

But it's no secret to Manitobans what's needed from the Department of Education. Talk to the parents, talk to the teachers, talk to the school divisions superintendents, sit and listen for awhile, they'll tell you what's wrong in the education system; even though the previous Minister was not able to comprehend that, the present Deputy is apparently unable to comprehend it, the present Minister we don't know enough about yet. —(Interjection)— I'll read him a short lesson: "The job of the Department is to provide leadership", and the sooner he can get around to doing that after a vacuum of a good number of years the better will be his reputation among the profession that I understand he belongs to.

The Department of Education must return to a clear system of core subjects and clear monitoring of each student's progress. It must work once more to create the kind of environment in our educational system where teachers and students can work without interference from a top-heavy bureaucracy that has grown up in the department, and without instructional notes coming out week after week with no pre-consultation to teachers asking them to try certain programs that were tried five, ten, fifteen, twenty years ago and proved to be a dismal failure in other jurisdictions and the authors of those plans then hired to work in this province to try to tinker away with our young people in Manitoba.

Well, the newspaper arguments, Mr. Speaker, between the former Minister and his present successor do little to contribute to that kind of environment. The former Minister of Education was sent off after all to dismantle the Arts Council; and the new Minister is equipped as we all know with a strangely but blessedly quiet and silent Deputy Minister, is trying to begin to pick up the pieces. Well, I tell him, Mr. Speaker, he won't have much time but

Monday, February 21st, 1977

we wish him well in the few months he has.

Before we leave education, Mr. Speaker, may I make another suggestion because in education ideas are important. Even this Government is acknowledging the need for a return to a clear set of core subjects, at least that's what it said in the *Throne Speech*.

In the present situation we face in Canada would it not be the time for a clear statement that consideration might be given to making "French Language Instruction" a core subject? Would that not be a reasonable initiative to be considering in the field of education in Manitoba today? But this Government won't think of things like that, they'll continue with their socialist business as usual and do nothing. That's why they're not a fit government to lead us into the future.

Let's go back to what is in the *Throne Speech*, Mr. Speaker there is an announcement that the NDP will continue their programs of social housing. You know, it's wonderful the inertia that these spending programs build up. Back in the days when they still had the energy to start anything they started building public housing in rather a big way and they're still doing it. Public housing is a part, and I stress the word, is a part of the answer to our housing needs but it is far from being the whole answer. It is far from a perfect answer and as programs of public or social housing are continued, they should be continued only as a part of an overall housing strategy that understands clearly, what? That understands what the people of Manitoba want. Manitobans, for them, the best solution is for people to be able to own their own houses. It's a very simple proposition. For people to be able to own their own houses, it is a very simple proposition.

Let us look at some of the problems of social housing for a moment. They are reflected clearly in the Government's own program, and perhaps the greatest problem, and the greatest contrast between the results of this kind of program and the program that had as its objective "helping people" to acquire ownership of their own homes, is the continuing and the escalating costs of public housing. In 1969 the total administrative costs of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation were just under \$44,000, in 1975, the last year for which figures are available, the total administrative costs of the Corporation have increased to almost \$1.5 million. Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends opposite rap their desks with approval, because undoubtedly a number of their partisan friends are employed in that 1.5 million. Well, Mr. Speaker, the payroll has increased from about \$30,000 up to more than \$900,000.00. Now, given this Government's sorry record of waste and mismanagement, we are of the opinion that these costs could well be trimmed without affecting the ability of the Corporation to do its job for the people of Manitoba, but as long as public housing is the prime instrument in this Government's housing program these costs, well managed or not, will continue to increase, and the subsidies paid to make this cheap housing available to people will also increase. The total operating subsidy for the Corporation in 1975 was just over seven millions of dollars, of which about half was paid by the Federal Government. The point here is not that the subsidy was excessive, although it may well have been, it is this kind of housing does create continuing and growing costs. And the Honourable Member from Brandon East or Churchmouse or wherever he is from, had better listen to what the people in his own constituency, and throughout Manitoba, are saying. —(Interjection)— I would love to meet, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, on a platform any time with respect to that or any other topic, and I would have no hesitation in talking to the senior citizens or anyone else in Manitoba about that.

And we have had, Mr. Speaker, ample evidence that a program built on the basis of federal dollars is a program built on soft money. None of this is to say that public housing should not be part of the mix of housing initiatives that the Government of Manitoba will take, of course it should, nobody argues that. It is merely to point out that when people move into public housing the Government and the taxpayer assume continuing and increasing costs, and when people move into privately owned homes the costs do not continue to grow to the same extent, it is that simple. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that any unbiased observer, be he Socialist, be he Conservative, be he Liberal or anything else, would have to say after a fair observation of British Council Housing, that why are we, in this decade, involving ourselves in the same kind of dead end process when we know that private ownership is what the people of Manitoba want and when we should be facilitating the ability of the people of Manitoba to buy and to own their own home. And since historically, both here and elsewhere, public housing has acted not as a step toward independent ownership of homes, but is what my friend, the Member from River Heights, used to call a dependency trap from which people seldom emerge into independence. We believe the instrument of public housing should be used, not as the prime component in government housing programs, but as a secondary element in a program whose objective is to encourage and promote the greatest possible number of privately owned homes.

Even the NDP seem finally to be acknowledging the desire of Manitobans to own their own homes, Mr. Speaker, because we see in the *Throne Speech* that the Government is going into the land servicing business. They speak of 500 acres, and I understand that they already own almost that much land in areas slated for residential development. Now that 500 acres, Mr. Speaker, as it is explained to me is equivalent to about 3500 house lots, and that is not a large enough number of lots to have any major or long term effect on the price of serviced land in Winnipeg, but it is a start, I suppose. But if the work of servicing the lots is done efficiently it may at least result in about that number of houses, about 3500 houses, or something in the neighbourhood of one year's supply of new housing for Winnipeg, being put on the market at prices that more people will be able to afford. Well there will be a need for a new bureaucracy because of the way this government operates, to decide just who ought to be permitted to buy these lots, and how the houses on them ought to be built, because, of course the aesthetics will have to be left to the Government, and because the NDP are who they are there will be a need for an army of watch dogs to make sure that no one fortunate enough to purchase one of the resulting houses is transferred to Brandon and perhaps sells the house off at a profit. They would have to make sure by their terms of reference that all of these things are stopped, and we'll have to hire somebody to look after almost every unit.

Monday, February 21st, 1977

But, Mr. Speaker, we need more houses that people can afford, and if this program results in 3500 more privately owned homes over the next few years then it will be helpful, but it is only a start. But, let's be very clear, it will solve the housing problems of only 3500 people who move into them, it will not solve the overall problem. And, of course, Mr. Speaker, no single program will, but there are instruments available to government that can attack it more effectively and on a broader front than it is being attacked under this government. Isn't it about time that we started looking seriously at some system of mortgage interest tax exemption or credit, isn't that worth considering as an alternative means of helping to undergird this desire of the individual Manitoban. I know my friends opposite find the idea of any tax decrease, any tax decrease, they find that idea unattractive, because of course, that relieves them of some control of the individual's purse.

But I would ask, and I would suggest to them, that if a system of exemption would help more young families to own their own homes then it is a justified idea that they should at least be taking a look at at the present time, and it is not a new idea.

I would also suggest that designing such a system, in such a way as to prevent its abuse, would not be beyond the power of any normal government with simple management skills, although it may well prove to be beyond the competence of this staggering group across the way. But we will see no overall response to the housing challenge I'm sure from this Government, Mr. Speaker, because they don't share the objectives that the people of Manitoba share, and we keep coming back to this point. They are out of step with what the people of Manitoba want, they don't share the objectives of private ownership of farm land, of houses or anything else. They really can see no difference between people living dependent on the government and public house and people gaining independent ownership of their own homes. They can't see that difference, they are blind, they are blind. Mr. Speaker, they will continue with public housing as their main instrument, at least for a few months, and in an election year such as this one, with small and incomplete initiatives like their land servicing proposal. And nowhere can we see clearer evidence of this government's failure to understand the desire of Manitobans for a solution to the housing problem beyond public housing, than by contrasting two of their spending programs.

The first is the program of Grants and Loans to Senior Citizens and Low Income People for repair and maintenance of older houses. And this, Mr. Speaker, is a good program, one that we certainly endorse because, at relatively low cost, it assures that the older housing continues to be a useful part of our total housing stock. This year the Government announces it will budget up to five million for this program. Now I ask you to remember that figure, \$5 million, and then contrast it with the plans of the only Minister, the only Minister who to the great cost of Manitobans still seems to have some energy left, mostly energy to spend money in a foolish way, but he still has that energy left, the Minister of Public Works. He has the energy to select, if not to design himself, the exit signs that add his own curious touch to the appearance of this beautiful building. He has the energy to shell out the dollars that Manitobans worked to earn to pay for those lovely and unnecessary signs that now deface the halls of this building. We hope he will soon find the energy to inform the House just how many dollars were spent on that particular project.

And while, Mr. Speaker, we can understand the preoccupation of our honourable friends opposite with the word "exit," we don't think that they should be self-indulging themselves at the expense of the taxpayer. But, Mr. Speaker, his vision doesn't end with the curious exit signs, the Minister of Public Works, he longs for bigger things and so he is going to spend \$50 million to build the new Government Garage and new Government office buildings in the core area of Winnipeg. He says that he needs the office space and I wouldn't be surprised if he did. The number of government employees has increased by more than 60 percent since this Government took office, even though our population has increased by less than three percent over the same period of time. This Minister runs his department so efficiently that it often requires more office space per capita than any other operation might that is conceivable. In 1975, the last year for which we have figures, more than sixteen percent of all of the office space that the Government was renting, with the taxpayers money, wasn't even being used. Now contrast those two amounts, Mr. Speaker, \$5 million for grants and loans to repair older homes, owned and occupied by senior citizens and low income people, a good program, and \$50 million for a new government garage and a new government office buildings and then ask just what kind of impact could even a fraction of that \$50 million have on the housing stock in downtown Winnipeg. How many older homes could be restored and preserved. How many young families are there, who with only a little bit of help from the Government, by way of exemption or whatever, would be able to own their own homes and care for them and keep our core area and make it a better place in which to live. what way of exemption or whatever would be able to own their own homes and care for them and keep our core area and make it a better place in which to live.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what the Minister is demonstrating is a manifestation of this government. This government believes in bricks and mortar as long as the bricks and mortar are government owned. They will spend \$50 million on a new government garage and a few more government offices and then they will turn around and pat themselves on the back for spending \$5 million on repairing and maintaining homes.

In Thompson they have built a \$4.5 million to \$5 million new government office building while the children of Norway House still have to walk across the ice to get to school because there is no money to build bridges in that community.

They will participate in the building of a 4.1 or is it 4.5 million dollar state owned hotel on Hecla Island while the Souris River continues to flood year after year. This is the government that speaks of concern for people and of the human condition. I'll oblige my honourable friend anytime he wants and speak about CFI in a way that perhaps he hasn't heard in this House before and having asked the question once he refrains from asking again.

I say to my honourable friend the Minister of Exit if any time he wants to debate that subject we're ready - we're ready anytime.

But I want him to explain why, in the meantime, his Department with their craze for bricks and mortar and government ownership are building a 4.1 or 4.5 or what is it now - state owned hotel in Hecla Island while the Souris River continues to flood year after year. This is the government that speaks of its concern for people and of

Monday, February 21st, 1977

the human condition. It's the government whose total energy, Mr. Speaker, is spent maintaining itself - it's a dull and it's a tired government and it is out of touch with Manitobans which is the worst indictment. Do we want the kind of future that this government is capable of building for the people? Do we want to be the first generation of Manitobans whose children have to look with some difficulty to determine whether or not they can afford to buy their own homes? Do we want to be the first generation of Manitobans whose children can't afford to own their own businesses and farms as they could in previous years? Do we and our children really want to live in the kind of a province where only the government can afford to buy farms and only the government and large corporations can afford to own businesses? And that's the kind of future that this NDP Socialist bunch is building for us and that's very much what this new debate must be all about - what kind of a future do we want? Do we want more state controlled businesses, more big government, more big taxing, more big spending, more big wasting or do we want government that is truly responsive to what the people want without a pre-determined set of ideological imperatives that we must do this, we must do that as we jackboot our way into the Socialist nirvana - Do we, Mr. Speaker, do we, Mr. Speaker, really want to live, do we really want to live, Mr. Speaker, in a province with the most cruel and penal Succession Duty law in Canada? Is that what the people of Manitoba aspire to because they have an NDP Socialist government. We should have that kind of a law, a law that cripples the — "They voted for it," says that distant voice from the back who is never heard making a speech. They voted for nothing of the sort. They voted for nothing of the sort. A law that is crippling the ability of anyone to pass a farm or a business to his children. My honourable friend, the Member from Ste. Rose, had better stand up on a platform in his seat and tell the farmers, explain to the farmers of his seat because they have the joy of living in dear old Manitoba, that they must exist under the most penal Succession Duty law which impacts on farmers today in a way that was never realized I am sure even by my honourable friends opposite and that's why seven years after the event and seven years too late they are moving in because the heat is on them as it should be to make a change and they can't make it too soon.

But the First Minister is going to say we promised some changes in that law. Well I say bring out the changes and bring them out quickly because there are a lot of people in Manitoba, particularly on the farms in Manitoba who are suffering under the impact of this law at the present time.

Let me talk for just a moment about schizophrenic nonsense that this drifting government perpetrates. On the one hand, 0024 04 21 02 77 MK this government discusses as it properly should in a Committee of this Legislature, reforms in family property law, reforms that by and large are needed. On the basis for whatever reform is forthcoming is the clear principle as enunciated from the *Throne Speech* that the family, the husband and the wife are a single economic unit. But at the same time that this government pats itself on the back for those reforms, it has Canada's most penal Succession Duty Act that does what - that taxes estate passing between whom? Between husband and wife, the ones they call a single economic unit. That is just unmitigated nonsense propagated by my honourable friend, the Member from St. Johns when he was Minister of Finance and when he, in his pristine wisdom made the determination from on high that no family in Manitoba, said he, needed more than the present limit, \$200,000 as it first was to look after their obligation satisfactorily. He made that determination. He made that determination and interfered and intruded himself into the determination as to how a family would look after its own needs with respect to the future obligations of its family and of its children.

So my honourable friend I don't doubt but what he is roused by the words because he begins to see now - he begins to see now some of the nonsense of what he and his colleagues perpetrated on the people of Manitoba.

Now is it too much to hope, Mr. Speaker, is it too much to hope that the NDP will change that peculiar and perverse aspect of *The Succession Duty Act*? Is it too much to hope that? Is it too much to hope that they will ask their friends in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker — and I've never heard them say this — to change the capital gains tax so that it stops interfering with the ability of farmers and small businessmen to sell their enterprises that they have built without attracting savage tax penalties? Isn't that one of the jobs of government in Manitoba? Talk to the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, and you will find out, you will find out that what is affecting farmers, you will find out that what is bothering farmers in Manitoba today is the impact of tax laws on them when they wish to transfer their farms through to relatives or to neighbors, or whatever. Because they are attracting savage taxes, not all from this government. The capital gains tax implemented, I am sure with cheers and . . . of our honourable friends opposite is impinging and impacting today on the farm community today in Manitoba in a savage way and on small businessmen as well and my honourable friend, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, is the man who says he is in favour of small businesses - mind you they are a terrible bunch once they grow beyond a certain size - but he believes in small businesses. Well small businessmen friends are being hurt by that law so why don't my honourable get up off their shanks once in a while and say to the Federal Government this is impinging upon the proper development and the location of young people on farms in Manitoba. What can you do to increase the exemption under capital gains? That would be helpful to the farmers of Manitoba. They would applaud that kind of initiative if our friends opposite would carry that message to the Federal Government.

I know it's difficult for the honourable the Minister of

Municipal Affairs to understand when I am talking of a matter that the Provincial Government should from time to time make representations to the Federal Government. My honourable friend had great difficulty understanding basic mathematics when he was the Minister in charge of Autopac so we can understand why he doesn't understand what I am talking about when I say "make representations to Ottawa."

But never mind, Mr. Speaker, that these taxes are offensive. The NDP you know, are devoted to them because as they say they are a way of getting at the rich. You know if you've got no other motivation getting at the rich is good enough. Never mind if at the same time they get at hundreds of people that are not rich - thousands of people who are not rich - never mind if the existence of these taxes is actively driving hundreds of small entrepreneurs and retired Manitobans out of this Province. Never mind if they slow the creation of jobs in this province - that doesn't matter.

the spiteful envy that is the only motive left in this wreckage of a government will keep them from worrying about any of that. For the past eight years the NDP have been busily getting at the so-called rich. And today fewer and fewer young families can afford to own their own home. And today fewer and fewer young farmers can afford to buy their own farm; and fewer and fewer young people can afford to own their own business. And those are the problems we have to face if we are to build the kind of future that we want in this Province. And those are the problems that show the real reason that Socialism is bad.

It's a bad doctrine, Mr. Speaker, not simply because it denies people the opportunity or the incentive to excel; not simply because its envy-ridden nonsense is a denial of all that is best in the human spirit and in human nature; not simply because it encroaches more and more into the private lives and the responsibilities and the decisions of individual Manitobans. Socialism is bad, Mr. Speaker, because it doesn't really help people. In fact it works against the private energy and initiative which have conferred upon us in Manitoba and in Canada and in the Western World the greatest material benefits that any society have ever enjoyed since the dawn of civilization.

Let Manitobans ask themselves, are there more opportunities and hope in our province after eight years of this kind of perverse doctrine than there were eight years ago before the NDP came into office, and the answer overwhelmingly will be "no." And since that answer is "no" how can the Government justify its tripling in its spending; the 60 percent growth in its Civil Service; the thousands of acres of farmland it has taken over; the tens of millions it has spent on new government buildings; the tens of millions it has squandered on government-owned businesses making everything from Chinese food to airplanes. All that is left in this government is all the worst parts of the habit of power, the habit of waste, the habit of mismanagement, the habit of increasing the size in the cost of government for its own sake. There is no vision of the future left and no responsiveness to what people are asking for the future. There is no ability to recognize or respond to the very real human problems and the very real human needs that face us, and there is no basis here for the hope that Manitobans ought to feel about their future. The legacy of this Government, Mr. Speaker, tired and complacent government, will be part and parcel of the problems that Manitobans will have to face on the way to that brighter future.

The *Throne Speech* talks, Mr. Speaker, of Hydro. It congratulates itself on "the expeditious way" Hydro construction has been undertaken. The contracts, Mr. Speaker, that were on the desk of this administration when they came into office would have seen the Churchill River Diversion completed in 1972 at a cost of \$45 million, and now in 1977 as their less efficient diversion staggers onstream at a cost of \$175 million they call that expeditious. They say it smugly, Mr. Speaker, that Hydro engineering staff have received engineering awards. Well I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how many of those awards went to David Cass-Beggs. How many of them went to David Cass-Beggs and to the First Minister and his colleagues who sacrificed our heritage of cheap hydro electric power on the altar of political engineering.

The *Throne Speech* says, Mr. Speaker, that Jenpeg will soon be commissioned. The power station with the highest kilowatt hour cost — the power station with the highest kilowatt hour cost of any power station ever built in Manitoba will soon be operating and the Government is happy, the Government's happy. Jenpeg and the Lake Winnipeg controls won't work very well and we didn't need them in the first place, but they're finished and that's this Government's idea of an achievement, Mr. Speaker. The inexcusably higher costs — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I realize that my honourable friend is speaking about a condition with which he is much more familiar than I. But I suggest that he sit and listen because the inexcusably higher — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. LYON: I was under the impression that there used to be order in the Chamber, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps I'm wrong. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I hear some undistinguished barking from across the way. I can't really attach a voice or intelligence to the barking. If my honourable friend's ears were in as good shape as his tongue we would all benefit from that.

The inexcusably higher costs of the First Minister's administration with respect to the hydro developments are not just the result of inflation, Mr. Speaker' even though they would have us believe that. The costs are higher, Mr. Speaker, because David Cass-Beggs in three short weeks jettisoned about eight to ten years of careful hydro planning, disregarded the opinions and the reports of the most reputable hydro engineers available including Mr. Durnham whom he brought in and commissioned himself, in his three-week study he disregarded his report and he substituted for those plans a new system so well planned that it has only cost the taxpayers of Manitoba \$600 million of unneeded capital investment so far.

Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends opposite want some demonstration which I know they've had of the \$600 million of waste. Well, they can start just with Jenpeg and the water control at the top end of Lake Winnipeg which both are in excess of \$300 million and neither had to be built. They can start right there to get the first three hundred. They can look at the costs of the Churchill River Diversion which escalated from \$45 million to \$175 million and they'll get another \$130 million, and do they want me to carry on.

Mr. Speaker, the soundness of the original planning can be proved by the simple fact that the power stations that will follow Jenpeg in the north — where they should be — will provide cheaper power even with the medium level diversion and even though they are wrongly being built out of sequence, wrongly indeed. But the First Minister looking around for a political ploy tried to take the heat off his blundering management of Hydro has decided in this Speech to treat Hydro as an achievement. Well, Mr. Speaker, we will be debating that topic at great length during this Session and we'll find out just what the definition of an NDP achievement is by the time that debate is finished.

Mr. Speaker, there is speculation about the credit rating and I saw the denials in the paper and I for one hope that there is nothing to the speculation. The burden of debt that Manitobans will have to bear because of this Government's plunders is great enough, is great enough without further speculation and without higher interest costs. But the management that we undertake to restore the Manitoba Hydro can't recapture the 600 million that has been wasted by my honourable friends opposite. Good management cannot remove the harm that has already been done to the people of Manitoba and they have seen their hydro rates rise more than double over the

past three years and "they ain't seen nothin' yet." As if the cost of hydro electric power were somehow connected with the cost of oil, we're supposed to believe that because the rates have gone up in Nova Scotia why it's only natural that they should go up in Manitoba. Well, we haven't got time in this debate to get into that kind of — (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend the First Minister and some of his colleagues have been able to get away with that nonsense for awhile, but I warn them those days are through. That kind of superficial nonsense doesn't wash and the kind of response of using invectives and epithets and personal diatribes against the critics doesn't wash any longer either, Mr. Speaker, we want to hear some facts. We want to hear some facts. So, Mr. Speaker, good management is not going to face the fact that today a middle income family in a small house on Dominion Street here in the City of Winnipeg are paying \$17.80 for their electricity each month and three years ago they paid \$8.43.

This tragedy, and the First Minister's management of Hydro has been a tragedy for Manitobans, is not simply a matter of dollars and cents, it's a matter of lost opportunities. The interest on that 600 million for one year would fund all of the Day-Care programs you'd ever wish to see in Manitoba; you would fund all of the arts groups and the sports groups; it would refurbish literally thousands of older homes for young families; it would build thousands of new homes for young people; it would give the government the kind of elbow room it needs to meet the present and the perceived problems that we will face in the societal way in this province for generations to come. But that money isn't going to be available to us, Mr. Speaker, because it has been frittered away on projects that weren't necessary, to satisfy the political engineering of my honourable friends opposite. In this *Throne Speech* they now have the gall to come along and treat Hydro as an achievement. It treats the need to take more than twice as much money from people simply to pay their Hydro bills as an achievement. That doesn't wash in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. It treats the huge increases in Hydro costs that are strangling community curling clubs and hockey rinks all over Manitoba — it treats that as an achievement. Mr. Speaker, the government makes no mention of the fact that our chance to build a strong industrial base on the foundation of economic hydro-electric power has been compromised forever. Compromised forever! That is the inheritance that we and future generations of Manitobans will take from these eight blissful years of NDP mismanagement of our greatest public utility. A new government will have to set about rebuilding that base without the same kind of weaponry that we used to have in terms of cheap hydro-electric energy if we are to have the kind of future that we want for ourselves and our children. We have crippled one of our great natural resource potentials because these people fiddled and faddled and tinkered with plans that were beyond their ken and with engineering advice that was incompetent to say the least.

Mr. Speaker, the *Throne Speech* makes reference to our relatively flat unemployment rate. It is true that our economy is less sensitive to fluctuations in the business cycle than some of the other provinces but it is also true that literally hundreds of our young people who leave Manitoba each year help contribute to our relatively stable levels of unemployment. One thing we must do as we begin to talk about the challenge of building our future, is to take a harder look at our unemployment. The unadjusted unemployment rate for young people, for members of the labour force under 25, is almost 12 percent. The growth in our employment, that is the number of jobs in Manitoba was two percent last year. That is slightly below the national average and our labour force is expected to grow by about two and one-half percent in 1977. So, in total terms, that leads to only a slight increase in unemployment but in terms of the young worker, it will have dramatic consequences. In simple terms, Mr. Speaker, we are not keeping up with the need for jobs. The biggest losers of all in this are the young. They are the ones who are really paying for this government's failure to understand that it is not enough to devote yourself to big spending and policies founded on envy. They are the ones who are really paying because this government does not understand yet that making sure people have jobs and opportunities is the best social program — the best possible social program — and is best possibly done by the private sector and one of the surest ways to give meaningful and lasting improvement to the human condition. That's one of the best things that any government can ever do to create the kind of economic climate in which job creation can go on with the private sector as the main engine and motivating force in that. —(Interjection)—

My honourable friend sounds like a broken record. In fact, as I look at him, he perhaps is a broken record.

What will be the basis of growth in employment opportunities, Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba? Our farm economy faces the threat of drought, a fall in world grain prices and a government that treats farmers as the enemy.

Exploration in our mining industry has been brought almost to a virtual stand-still by this government's policies. My honourable friend, the Minister of Mines, I know is going to say "Oh, well, the figures are up this year." But he'll have to tell us how much is being spent by government and how much by the private sector. Before he gets up with the figures, I have already looked at them and I know the private sector diamond drilling is 50 percent less this year than it was two years ago. Now, you see, if I can just digress for a minute, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is falling precisely into the trap that I knew he would. He says the total is just the same so it doesn't make any difference. The fact that the public of Manitoba that he is reaching with his long, clammy hand into the pockets of the taxpayers of Manitoba and yanking out some dollars that they would sooner keep themselves to buy houses or to make improvements on their older homes, and he is putting that money into mining exploration, my honourable friend says, "That's great!" Mind you, we haven't found a mine yet but that's the way to do it. Mr. Speaker, I couldn't have asked for it to have been demonstrated in a more pristine way, the difference between the kind of philosophy which motivates our tired friends opposite and the rest of the people in Manitoba who really don't want to have their tax money taken so he can play around with mineral exploration about which government probably knows less than even a mole.

Well, Mr. Speaker, our farm economy faces the threat of drought, a fall in world grain prices and as I have said, we have a government that treats farmers as the enemy. Exploration is down as I have said, because the NDP can't really understand that they're not just taxing away profits from mining companies in Man companies that want to start up, they're taxing away future jobs and present job security. I invite my honourable friend, the Minister of Mines, and I don't begrudge one word of the tribute I've paid to him, I invite him because he is intelligent; because

he is probably only one of the few left from that side of the House who will listen, I invite him to go to Flin Flon or to go to Thompson or to go to Lynn Lake and listen to what the miners are saying today and hear why they are concerned that exploration is down in Manitoba because the miner in Manitoba knows that if the exploration work is wound down, then the chance of his job being perpetuated into the future is being wound down accordingly and no amount of pick-axing by my honourable friend, the Minister of Mines, is going to replace the kind of underground exploration work that has to be done by an operating mine if it is going to continue to amass those reserves ahead of itself on a four, five or ten year basis that are necessary for the proper economic operation of a viable mining operation. I know I am not saying anything that is strange or new to my honourable friend, I just wish that he would acknowledge the fact that this is what is happening under his own misguided policy today and that is why HBM&S and other major companies in Manitoba have almost phased out their exploration activities in Manitoba because it doesn't pay the investors to go ahead with exploration in this province when they are taxed on an unfair basis with respect to other operations that they can carry on either in the rest of Canada or in the Western World or around the world generally. That, my honourable friend understands. He, I know, is prepared to accept that as the price for socialist tinkering, but I say to him, all that I'm saying is that the people of Manitoba aren't. That is the message that is going to be coming through more clearly to my honourable friend. I only hope that he is prepared for it because it is coming through very clearly to me, to my colleagues and to people who in Manitoba are listening today about the concerns that people have as to what is going on in Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Speaker, metal production last year in Manitoba did fall from \$448 million to \$387 million and I don't blame my honourable friend *in persona* for that. I merely say that having regard to the figures that we see from other jurisdictions, that this kind of a fall — part of it might be blamed on that — but part of it surely is attachable to the kinds of penal tax policies that he and his administration have put into effect in Manitoba. That's a decline in the order of about 15 percent. The total mineral production, including oil and building supplies, total mineral production, including oil and building supplies, dropped from \$529 million down to \$489 million and so opportunities for young people in mining and related industries are declining and they are not increasing. Our economy is cluttered with the dead weight of failed or failing NDP-owned businesses. These companies were the NDP version of hope for the young and as they established them, they spoke in ringing phrases of the socialist millennium that was just around the corner.

The Minister of Industry and Commerce — we keep coming back to him — was positively gleeful as he announced that (and remember these fateful words) "but for the grace of himself and the hard-working members of his department, Saunders Aircraft would have gone to the Province of Quebec." I understand, Mr. Speaker, he almost had to go for an adjustment to a chiropractor because he hurt himself patting himself on the back.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose we in Manitoba ought to take comfort from the fact that by attracting Saunders Aircraft to Manitoba rather than permitting it to go to Quebec, and by squandering \$40 million, plus, of Manitobans' money rather than letting Quebec's money be wasted, the Minister has struck some sort of a blow for national unity.

But Mr. Speaker, the failures of Saunders and the troubles of Flyer and the shambles that has overtaken so many other government enterprises should be no surprise to anyone in Manitoba.

We know that government investment cannot replace private investment. The vast majority of the people in Manitoba know it. We know that governments frequently demonstrate their greatest inefficiency when they attempt to create jobs or enterprises in areas where the private sector has been active in the past.

And we know that one of the sign posts on the socialist road that the NDP are following that is most alarming is the greater and greater share of total investment in Manitoba which is coming from government. It is tremendously of concern. To a degree we have been living in a self-induced economy under this government over the past few years. One of the results of that fact has been the tremendous increase in our per capita debt: the NDP have increased our per capita debt until the government owes about \$3,400 for every man, woman and child in Manitoba today as we stand here.

And that is a heavier debt load than the people of 8 of the other 9 provinces have to bear. And it has not worked. All we have to show for it is debt, in many cases.

Government cannot replace the private sector and private business as a creator of jobs and opportunities. We had thought that the NDP in Saskatchewan had perhaps learned that lesson until Mr. Blakeney involved himself in his latest folly to take over the potash industry and his debt is going to sky-rocket up very shortly. It's about half right now of what Manitoba's is.

Government cannot replace the private sector and we cannot hope to have an active and a growing private sector in Manitoba until our taxes are in line with those of other provinces. That's something that our friends opposite have never been able to understand: You can't tax away profit without taxing away future jobs and present job security. It's a syllogism. It's something my honourable friend, I'm sure, from Inkster, the Minister of Mines, understands and he's prepared to accept it. But it's something that the rest of the people of Manitoba do not want.

How do we bring our taxes back into line with those of our neighbouring provinces? We do it, Mr. Speaker, not by dismantling the system of government services the people in Manitoba have come to rely upon, and not by having the kind of government that stands as this one does - immobilized by the need to control growth in spending, we do it by applying the ability to manage to the challenge of getting for the people of Manitoba a dollar's worth of value for every dollar the government spends. We do it by not having 16 percent of all the office space the government rents standing empty. We do it by not pouring out more tens of millions into more government buildings. We do it by not permitting the number of government cars and government airplanes and government long distance calls and government expense accounts to grow out of control, year after year, as this government has done.

We do it by putting a stop to government involvement in businesses. We do it by demanding from those who

Monday, February 21st, 1977

work in the public service the same accountability for the way money is spent as those in private business must accept. And, Mr. Speaker, this is not something the public service will resist. Far from it. It is something they will welcome because they have too long been without leadership under this government with respect to proper cost control and utilization of the taxpayers' dollar. And we gain the ability to bring our taxes back in line by taking a hard and a critical look at some of the programs of government. Can anyone in this Chamber recall a time when this government has ended a program, either because it had succeeded or met its objective, or because it was obviously not going to work? Anyone recall that kind of an occasion taking place?

But that is exactly what we have to begin to do. To take a look at programs that were started thirty, twenty, fifteen, ten, five years ago to see if they are still performing the same service for the people of Manitoba, to see if they are outdated, to see if they should be wound down, to see if they should be rationalized, replaced, or just put out of existence.

And in the social services, we will put the emphasis back on getting help to those who need it, rather than putting the money into the hands of an eternally growing bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, in Canada today it is estimated that a total of more than \$23 billion is spent on income redistribution schemes of one kind or another; that is from old Age Security to Old Age Pension, to Unemployment Insurance to provincial income tax supplements, to social allowances' all programs that would be supported by all members in this House. But the disturbing fact is for every \$100.00 that these programs put into the hands of people who need money another \$25.00 is spent on administration costs and even after this huge expense there is a growing and growing understanding that there is so little evidence that the programs have been truly effective and genuinely compassionately effective for the people who are in real need.

Mr. Speaker, no one in this Chamber would suggest that we should abandon any of those who need our help. No, but we can deliver that help more efficiently, more compassionately, and at a lower total cost. We have to. We have to - all of us across Canada have to, for the sake of the taxpayer. We can't any longer afford a wasteful government in Manitoba because that waste contributes to increases in the cost of living. It drives up taxes and that drives out opportunities.

And I would be the first to say that we also cannot afford to sacrifice government's ability to undertake those actions and expenditures that are necessary in the public interest. We can do that in Manitoba, and still get our taxes back into line with those of our neighbours, if we begin to manage our government in a sound and a business-like way.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday I asked the Honourable The Minister of Finance about the unusual delay in the publication of the Public Accounts which we received today, documenting government spending in the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1976. That's almost 11 months ago. He said that the reports would be ready and as I noted they were tabled today. But there was a suggestion that they were customarily not delivered until this late in the year. Well that is not really my recollection of the event but we'll take the Honourable Minister at his word. I notice that the Auditor's Report on the Public Accounts was dated the 25th of November, 1976. So why are we waiting ten and one-half, almost eleven months, to get the report of last year's / business?

The documents that permit the members of this House and the people of Manitoba to scrutinize the way that their government has spent their money are available only ten or eleven months after the money has been spent. Eleven months after whatever waste has occurred. And so can we really have a proper system of accountability with that kind of a lag time in the production of our Public Accounts?

Mr. Speaker, our Party undertakes to make a reform on that system and to make it immediately so that the government reports, so that governments are required to report, as corporations in the private sector are required to report, not once a year and eleven months late, but four times a year, currently each quarter, so that there can be real and meaningful scrutiny of government spending.

And that scrutiny will not come solely from Members of our government and even solely from Members of the House. It will come from people all over Manitoba who have a right to know just how well their money is being spent. That kind of scrutiny may be an uncomfortable experience for government from time to time, but getting a dollar's worth of value for every dollar government spends is more important than some Minister having the ability to waste a few thousand on exit signs or some other piece of foolishness, anytime the whim overwhelms him.

The result, Mr. Speaker, will be a government that is able both to lower taxes and to act effectively on behalf of the people of Manitoba. One of the causes of the fatigue that has overtaken this government is that, by its habit of waste, it has spent itself into a corner. And it has spent itself into that corner relying, to a large extent, on federal money. And yet they have known since 1972 that some of the federal funds would be withdrawn. The only way to get out of that corner is, Mr. Speaker, not more spending but more efficient government so that every dollar we spend really will return a dollar's worth of benefit to Manitobans.

And once out of that corner, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba and the new Government of Manitoba will have some very tough challenges to face. So we will begin to face those challenges with an understanding that government cannot make every festering problem disappear simply by applying the socialist money plaster. It doesn't work.

We will understand that government cannot control the cost of living simply by raising the cost of government. That doesn't work. That the greatest contribution a provincial government can make to the fight against inflation is to eliminate the waste within its own spending. We understand that. Why do not my friends opposite? But we will understand, Mr. Speaker, that our prime concern as a government and as a community must be to get down to the business of creating opportunities for everyone in Manitoba.

It's important to remember, Mr. Speaker, that there are still those in Manitoba who have never had an opportunity to share in our prosperity. I think particularly of our Native people. This government, motivated I'm sure by a real and sincere concern, has devoted substantial amounts of money to hiring more civil servants to help the native population.

But it must also be said that these efforts of the government, not surprisingly in view of the bureaucratic

Monday, February 21st, 1977

burden that was placed upon them, seem to have had but limited impact on the real problems faced by Native people in Manitoba.

The answer is not to hire yet more bureaucrats, Mr. Speaker, as the NDP almost certainly will. It may not even be to spend more money. But the answer must certainly begin by having individual Native people in communities all over Manitoba gaining a greater say in government policies that will affect their futures and sitting down and discussing and being listened to, being listened to. I remember quite vividly, Mr. Speaker, being in a remote community earlier this year at a Meeting that was attended by a good number of Native citizens from the Reserve nearby and hearing one of the old Chiefs of that Reserve, one of the former Chiefs of that Reserve, say "You know, when this NDP government, when Mr. Schreyer, came into office we thought that things were going to happen, and there was some concern at the beginning. We saw new people coming in. We saw government planes flying in. We saw people walking off those planes with big, fat briefcases, and so on. But the planes kept flying in and the civil servants kept coming but very little has changed. Very little has changed." And what he was saying, in effect, was that too much of the money that is devoted for the kind of programming that was probably well inspired or was inspired from the desire to better the lot of the Native people, too much of that programming, as is the wont of my friends opposite, has gone to hiring new social engineers rather than going to the people in the communities who need the money

and seeking their advice as to how programs and policies can best be implemented with community involvement within the community. Native people, Mr. Speaker, like every other citizen of Manitoba have a right to expect real and effective help from their government as they wrestle with their problems. They can't be left out of the future as they have been left out of this *Throne Speech*.

And what else is in this *Throne Speech*? Well, we have a proposal for a program of accident insurance, Mr. Speaker. And I say, by all means, let us see just how extensive is the need for such a service from government. Let us examine that, and let us examine it carefully. But by all means let us see just how such a service can best be delivered and let's make a realistic and a responsible determination as to whether the private sector or the government is the agency best equipped to deliver that kind of service. And then let us decide rationally, and let us decide based on a realistic kind of an evaluation of the need, and a realistic evaluation of the best means to meet that need, rather than what I fear will be some blind ideological knee-jerk reaction that we're liable to get from our honourable friends opposite.

We see in this speech references to legislation to control ownership of land by non-residents and by non-farmer owned corporations, and we will be interested to see this legislation, Mr. Speaker. But we would remind the government that a couple of years ago, as they trotted their famous "*Red Book*" on land ownership around the Province, the greatest outcry from farmers came, not about non-resident or corporate land ownership, but about government ownership.

And if the legislation is sensible, Mr. Speaker, my Party will support it, but if this government would really reflect the wishes of Manitobans, it would control and stop its own greed for land as well.

And may I say in that regard it should control and stop, right away, its own greed for mineral rights in Manitoba because *The Mineral Acreage Tax Act* today is working a hardship on retired farmers throughout the length and breadth of this province. I merely say to my honourable friends, if they want to expropriate mineral rights go ahead and do it and pay for it. But don't bedevil and harass a lot of senior citizens in Manitoba, who have retired from their farms, with bureaucratic phone calls, letters, messages and so on, asking them to pay a tax that they don't really understand and then threaten them at the end of three years that if they don't pay it that their mineral rights are gone. Because that's what is happening in Manitoba today. A tax, the product of which is \$330,000, which probably doesn't even pay the cost of collecting it. And a tax, Mr. Speaker, which is really a guise and a cloak to expropriate privately owned mineral rights in the province.

So, I say to my friends, look at that. If you want to do something that will help the farm community in Manitoba, relieve them of that burden. If you want to expropriate their mineral rights pay compensation. Don't try to do it by the subverted method that you have chosen in your ill-founded legislation.

Mr. Speaker, speaking about the foreign ownership, the government might realize just how inconsistent is its policy. If on the one hand it will prevent the sale of land to non-residents and on the other it continues to operate a system of succession duties that force people who have built up farms in Manitoba to sell them in order to pay the tax. Another disjointed inconsistency in their program which I suggest they take into account when they come to deal with farm land.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not the only inconsistency because we have sitting here a government which says, indeed advertises from one end of the province to the other, presided over by my honourable friend the Minister of Health, advertises *Windsday*, win a million, you can travel to Bermuda, or wherever, tomorrow. There is nothing wrong with being a millionaire, says this government, providing you buy a one dollar or five buck ticket and take a chance. There is nothing wrong with being a millionaire. But if you work, if you work hard, this government says we'll tax you the highest of any province in Canada and we'll have the most penal succession duty in Canada. But, on the other hand, my friends, don't worry about it because you still have a chance to win. Win a million bucks. Or win \$250,000.00 or win \$10,000.00 and that kind of small estate doesn't bother my honourable friends. That's all they can see. I understand why my honourable friend's face is so red, the Minister of Health. My honourable friend, The Minister of Health, has the distinct reputation of being one of the few ministers who presides over a lottery operation, which up until recent months, in any case, was losing money. Yes. So, I can understand why my honourable friend's face is red when the question of lotteries is brought up.

Mr. Speaker, this government in this *Throne Speech* speaks of highway construction. Well, I say it must be an election year when this government starts to talk about highways. They say, Mr. Speaker, that they are going to spend \$10 million four-laning another section of the Trans-Canada Highway. Mr. Speaker, if that project had been continued as they found it on their desks when they came into office, the entire Trans-Canada Highway would

have been four-laned four or five years ago.

Further, Mr. Speaker, if this government had even the faintest understanding — if they had even the faintest understanding of the importance of transportation to our rural community and to our urban community as well, that the maintenance of roads and highways was at least as important as the building of new government office buildings, if they had even that basic understanding, our provincial road system wouldn't be in worse shape than it was ten years ago. And it is. Our provincial road system today is a disgrace to Manitoba, as my honourable friends know. One of the special warrants that was recently approved by this government, however, Mr. Speaker, was for \$14 thousand plus to hire a public relations officer for the Department of Highways. God knows they need a public relations officer, even even if it means, as it did in this case, that they will exceed their budget for the year. But at the same time, when they have got money to spend to hire a public relations officer to explain away why they're not building proper road systems within Manitoba and maintaining them properly, that same Department of Highways took nine and a half months to replace the bridge approach that was washed out on a main trunk highway in my own constituency last year. They've got lots of money to hire civil

servants but they haven't got the ability to make a simple bridge repair on a provincial trunk highway which necessitates the public of Manitoba

by-passing, taking a detour for five or six miles for about nine months. That's the kind of priorities that they have with this government. This government, Mr. Speaker, has done a lamentable job of our highways but that's understandable. It's very difficult to operate an effective highway system if the only time you pay any attention to it is during an election.

And what does the *Throne Speech* say about the Department of Health? It says the emphasis in the Department's operations will be on personal care facilities, this government is planning, by the words of the Minister the other day, still planning a new \$32 million acute care facility for North Winnipeg when the *Throne Speech* says that such construction has no priority. But the *Throne Speech* says nothing of the continuing war ... — (Interjection)— I'll get to my honourable friend, my raucous honourable friend, who now, Mr. Speaker, seems to be coming back to life again, eh? The *Throne Speech* says nothing of the continuing war that the Minister and his department have been waging with Health Care professionals. I suggest that if my honourable friend will close that yawning gap in his face and listen for a moment, he may benefit — for once in his life. Because, Mr. Speaker, the Minister and his department have been professionals in this U waging a war with Health Care Province, doctors, nurses, and others in Manitoba, ...

A MEMBER: Quote 'em all!

MR. LYON: The people of Manitoba expect leadership from their government, Mr. Speaker, and they expect their government to assure their continuing access to high quality medical care and the functioning of our Health Care System cannot help but be disrupted by the constant government-inspired and personally inspired antagonism that this Minister seems to revel in. We are losing, Mr. Speaker, good doctors in this Province, while this man heads the Department of Health and we can't afford to lose the doctors. We can afford to lose the Minister of Health.

I venture, Mr. Speaker, to remind this Minister that his job is to oversee our health care system and not to sacrifice it in some phony class war that he has erected. I would further remind this Minister, Mr. Speaker, that he does no service to the public interest when he takes his own subjective anti-professional bias which he has so aptly demonstrated in this House for so many years and then has the temerity to erect that kind of individual misguided bias and sanctify it under the name of Government policy. Mr. Speaker, we can't afford that kind of self-indulgence on the part of this Minister or his colleagues and I say to the First Minister of this Province, who has some care I know, that he would do well to remove from the Department of Health a man whose conduct of that department has caused good, qualified people in the Health Care field to leave this province because they refuse to deal with that kind of a biased approach.

Mr. Speaker, that kind of phony class war that the Minister wages, I must say, with all of the zealotry of a convert to socialism, with all of that zealotry, there is no greater zealot than the convert ...

A MEMBER: Just like the guy who quit smoking.

MR. LYON: ... that kind of zealotry is at the base of much of what this government has done wrong in the Department of Health. The Minister, himself, said in an interview in a local local paper — the First Minister — that he would feel uncomfortable (I think that was the word he used) if he had the support of the the people in South Winnipeg. Well, I can only imagine the ripple of concern that ran through the heart of the Minister of Education when that statement was made because he happens to represent a seat, temporarily, in South Winnipeg. I mention that small incident, Mr. Speaker, only to indicate two things. One, our Party would not feel uncomfortable with support from any part of Manitoba because our responsibility as government will be to govern for all people in Manitoba. And I say to this Ministry and to its present incumbent, that government cannot pick and choose which geographic areas of Manitoba it will respond to or which groups of people it will treat with respect. I trust the Minister of Agriculture is listening because if we are to meet the challenges that face us, we have to begin by re-building that sense of community about which I was speaking earlier and not as this government does so often, by efforts to turn one group of Manitobans against another to the disadvantage of the continuing progress of this province.

What else does this *Throne Speech* promise, Mr. Speaker? It says that at long last the government is prepared to do something about our rural telephone system. Well, Mr. Speaker, after the report of the Public Utilities Board last Spring, as the saying goes, "It's about bloody time," because our rural telephone system, according to the Public Utility Board, was the worst in Canada in terms of line loading, and to put it in ordinary parlance in terms of party line loading, it's the worst in Canada. The government's own Public Utilities Commission called it a disgrace. And so it is. But the NDP have finally deigned to take some action on it as a kind of small mercy that they give us in this *Throne Speech* to which the citizens of rural Manitoba must learn, I suppose, to be grateful to this government and to pull at their forelocks and twirl their caps in their hands because 'they've seen fit to pay some

attention. What kind of a government is this? It will tinker away with Esoteric computers and lose money in the Manitoba Telephone System' at the same time giving the worst rural line loading of any province in Canada. Misplaced priorities, tinker with their own ideas — never mind service to the people of Manitoba.

In this speech, as I have pointed out, Mr. Speaker, we find no mention of national unity, and I was really surprised at the absence of mention of that topic. I have spoken of the idea and it's an idea that I think is worthy of consideration, of making French language instruction part of the core curriculum in the schools in Manitoba. But more than that is required. I might say to my honourable friend that when we were in government, we weren't burdened down with the kind of unintelligent comment that we just heard from him opposite.

Mr. Speaker, my party believes that the debate about the future of Quebec —(interjection)— I can realize my honourable friend has no concern about national unity, he's demonstrated very little about unity in this province in his overly long years in this House. But I ask him, in the interests of others who are interested, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps he might keep that yawning chasm in his face quiet for a few moments.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that the debate about the future of Quebec within our Canadian Confederation may degenerate into an exchange between extremists inside the province and extremists in other parts of Canada. To avoid that, we believe it is the responsibility of governments and of oppositions in the other provinces, to demonstrate by their actions and by their words, the determination of our people to keep this country together. When Canada was first founded, there was the Rouge Party within Quebec, the Separatists of those days, and there were anti-French forces in Upper Canada as well who, by their lack of temperance, threatened to flounder the union before it could be brought about. But men such as MacDonalld and Cartier knew that French Canada's hope of preserving its culture depended on membership in a strong and viable Canadian nation and we have all benefitted from that Confederation since, although it is true that we in the West have sometimes benefitted less than others. But, Mr. Speaker, we in Western Canada do not count our devotion to the Canadian ideal in mere financial costs or mere financial returns. Our people, out of proportion to their numbers, have fought and have died for this country and today in Quebec, we have the heirs of the Rougists, a Separatist government. Let us in Manitoba make very certain that there are none who can mistake our own aspirations in this province for a fairer position inside Confederation with the mistaken positions that the anti-Confederationists took years ago. Let us make sure that we and our government instead address ourselves to the majority of the people in Quebec who are as proud of being Canadians as we are, and let us address ourselves to the heirs of Cartier and Laurier who are in the Province of Quebec today and whose leader is yet to come forward. I think it is fruitless to address ourselves to the Rene Levesques of this world. We must address ourselves to the Federalists in Quebec and make sure that they understand that this desire for continuing rapprochement national unity and accomodation and is genuinely felt by all people right across Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the *Throne Speech* did contain a mention of the fiscal aspects of national unity, but our country as I have said before, is founded on more than mere financial convenience and I would hope that as he closes this debate, the First Minister will reiterate that clearly and will confirm the determination that Manitobans share to keep our country together.

Mr. Speaker, I have been speaking of a new debate and I have been speaking about the future that we in Manitoba must begin to build, and I have been speaking of the need for a change away from this dull, this tired and this complacent kind of government that we've had over the last number of years. I have spoken frankly of the problems that we face and I have tried to give credit to my friends opposite, where credit is due. And I have tried to indicate some of the directions that my Party and I will set when we assume responsibility for governing Manitoba, as we expect to after the next election. I believe that we do not have to settle for being the first generation of Manitobans who give up the hope that most of our children can own their own homes or their farms or their businesses. I believe we don't have to settle for the kind of future where the most important ability our children will have is the ability to leave Manitoba. I don't think we have to settle, as I said earlier, for a ladder of progress with only two and one-half rungs. We can build a Manitoba where our children can stay and prosper and, yes, with a little bit of luck and a lot of hard work, more than prosper.

We have taken our eyes off that goal these last few years. We've had a government preoccupied with dividing the old pie into finer and finer pieces and so we have neglected to make the pie any bigger. But we can do it — we've done it before and we can do it again.

Manitobans can take control of their own government once again. Manitobans can expect responsiveness from their government once more. Manitobans can look at the ways we have tried to help those among us who need our help and say, "There are better ways — let's get about finding them." It's time that we recaptured the hopes that Manitobans have always had for the future. It's time that we recaptured the excitement of working to make our community better and more prosperous. It's time we got down to the hard work that's ahead of us. It's time we recaptured the sense community, of as I've said before, that we once had in this Province. It is time we stopped the waste of our tax dollars and remembered again that our objective must be the greatest possible personal independence for everyone in Manitoba. It's time we began to rely upon ourselves again. The NDP Socialist dream here, as elsewhere, is out of gas. It can no longer serve us in Manitoba. It's time we recaptured the pride that Manitobans used to have in all that we had achieved and the confidence that we continue to achieve. It's time we stopped wasting our energy and our substance fighting over this or that social theory and got down to the common-sense job of building homes and mines and factories and farms, and of educating our children to equip them to live in the real world that is here around us. It's time we remembered the excitement we felt at our first job or our first responsibility and dedicated ourselves to making sure that our children will have that same opportunity to feel that same excitement. It's time we had a government that will respond to our needs and our aspirations and not just to some out-dated set of dogma.

A MEMBER: *Regina Manifesto*

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the things that I have said in this House are the things that the people of Manitoba are telling us. We will be saying that Manitoba can be better because the people of Manitoba know it can be better,

that Manitobans have the character and ability to make it better and we'll be offering the men and women of Manitoba a government that will be their partner, not their paymaster. We are offering a government that will not respond only to this or that rigid political philosophy but to the real needs and the real aspirations of the people of Manitoba. This is the proper role of government. This is the role that this government has failed to fulfill. This is the responsibility that they have lost in their out-dated socialism and in their habit of power. That is why I believe that when next the people of Manitoba weigh our two parties in the balance, there will be a change and there will be a change in favour of more freedom and independence for the individual and there will be a new government. custom is followed I guess by . his absence from the House, it probably won't be, my friend, the Member from St. Johns, usually as was his wont, would rise in his place and give his annual hand-ringing Uriah Heep speech. I always enjoy listening to him but it looks as though we are not going to be treated to that particular effort today. Whoever does follow, let him today try to answer frankly what has happened to this government. Where is the energy and the sense of purpose gone? Where did it all go wrong? Because it has gone wrong, Mr. Speaker, it has gone disastrously wrong. Not only for this Chamber, not only for this government but, more importantly, for the people of Manitoba. Manitobans know it and they can feel it. The people of Manitoba want hope and this government has offered arrogance and envy and that is just not sufficient as the hope for the future.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I come to a conclusion, I have detailed at some length some of the feelings that the people of Manitoba are expressing even though I know those feelings are not being heard by our honourable friend's office. friends opposite. spent some time today detailing the failures of this government — the waste, the mismanagement, , the habit of power, the blunders, Hydro, farmland takeovers, the inertia of many of their programs, the incompetence of much of their administration, and these things are all important, and these things lay a very, very serious indictment at the door of this government. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a further indictment that is even more serious and goes to the root of the spirit of the people of Manitoba. The indictment against these people, against this government today, the most serious inditement, is what these people have done in their eight years in government to destroy hope in this province, hope and the idea of opportunity, particularly for our young people. That is a more serious indictment than all of the dollars and cents that we have been talking about today, and God knows we've been talking in the hundreds of millions. My honourable friend never had much hope before he came to this Chamber so I can understand why he doesn't understand what I'm talking about.

Mr. Speaker, that is the most serious indictment and the job that is going to face a new government in this province immediately after its election is to bind up the spirit of the people of Manitoba, to restore that sense of hope and opportunity and self-reliance and that the confidence people of Manitoba have had in the past and want to have today, by the kinds of policies that are so foreign and alien to my honourable friends opposite that they can't see them for their own noses because they won't listen to the people of Manitoba. So that's the most serious indictment I lay at their door — what they have done to destroy hope in this province. Mr. Speaker, the young people of Manitoba know about what I'm speaking. The young people who are leaving this province in growing and growing numbers year by year to go elsewhere where opportunity, where independence, where initiative, is more highly valued than it is under the NDP in Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is with that thought that I conclude my remarks today and I conclude them with the hope that my honourable friends have learned something from what I was saying today in terms of what I was saying that is being said to all of us by the people of Manitoba. I know that they have not been good listeners in the past, I hope that they are listening now because what they have been hearing is what the people of Manitoba have been telling us.

So, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Riel, that the Motion be amended by adding to it the following words, "But that this House regrets that this Government through excessive taxation, mismanagement, wasteful spending, sustained and by its failure to understand or respond to the changing needs of Manitobans, have thereby forfeited the confidence and the support of the people of Manitoba."

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honourable Member for Riel. The Honourable Member for Portage La Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON, (Portage La Prairie): Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak , I would like to take the adjournment. , I move, seconded by the member for Fort Rouge that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that the House be now adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Accordingly the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.