

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): I want to welcome this afternoon students from Grosse Isle. This school is in the constituencies of Lakeside and Gimli.

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

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Department of Health and Social Development for the year 1977, and the Annual Report of the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba for the year 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Public Utilities Board for the year ending December 31st, 1977.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education and flows from the reply which he gave yesterday in this House making reference to some \$11 million.

I'd just like to ask the Minister of Education to clarify whether this \$11 million is the amount that is intended to be the increment in the upcoming fiscal year in the way of provincial grants to public elementary and secondary education.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, the money that the Honourable Member refers to comes under the Foundation Program and the grants that are contained therein.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that this may be a bit unorthodox but inasmuch as the figure was revealed in this House yesterday by the Minister of Education I should like to ask him, notwithstanding his reply, whether this \$11 million then is to be related to, or understood to be, the basic amount by which the province will be increasing its support to public elementary and secondary education — the increment over last year's amount.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: This, of course, Mr. Speaker, does not include the Property Tax Rebate or the amount of money that will go to lower and middle-income senior citizens.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I quite understood that it has nothing to do with the Property Tax credit rebate, but if the \$11 million then is the amount that is to be channelled by the province to the school divisions of this province, both through the Foundation Program and through the other grants that supplement the Foundation Program, can the Minister indicate whether this increase would constitute approximately one-third or one-half of the amount of increment that was found necessary a year ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Honourable Member posed this question to me yesterday and I think that he realizes the complexity of the school grants and of the Foundation Program, and I

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

took it at notice at that time and I am preparing the information for him and would hope to have it in the House tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for the Rent Control program. Will the existing program of rent controls be changed before September 30th, 1978?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the honourable member for Transcona, he is asking a question which relates to policy. Those policy decisions will be announced in due course in the House.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary. Is the past policy which was stated in the last session of the government still holding, that is that the rent control program would remain in effect as is until September 30th, 1978?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, there has been no change in any policy with respect to rent control up to this point, and when changes are made I assure the member they will be announced.

MR. PARASIUK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister prepared to table the evaluation of the rent control program by the Rent Stabilization Board so that members of the House as well as the CBC may have a copy of it?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the member for Transcona has referred to an in-house report. We are reviewing the report and I anticipate that it will be tabled in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism. I wonder if the Minister of Tourism could reveal to the House that professional report on the basis of which he has changed a perfectly well-planned Whiteshell cottage development by allowing a 200 unit condominium private development within a provincial park.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. ROBERT (BOB) BANMAN (La Verendrye): I thank the member for asking that question because there seems to be a lot of misinformation floating around. The development in question is not taking place at present, the gentleman that is proposing a development has been given permission to build a road at his own expense from a provincial road to his own property and that is all.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable minister telling us that a private person is being encouraged to build a road, from a provincial road to nowhere, without any expectation as to what he will be permitted in the future?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: With respect to this particular development the government is looking at developing different areas, we are asking and have been receiving different proposals, we will be discussing and evaluating each on their own merit, taking into consideration the ecological problems, taking into consideration the clean environment problems and the water control; so that we are looking for different proposals because we have an unemployment problem, we have a tourist deficit problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker I would like to ask the honourable whether there is not within his department, both original plans with regard to Big Whiteshell Lake and its development and also subsequent assessments which indicate that Big Whiteshell Lake is a saturated lake and is not one where there should be a 200 unit condominium development?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, if such documents exist they will be taken into consideration when a proposal is put forward by this particular person for development and if there are problems as far as the ecology is concerned, that will not be allowed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, a final question. I didn't get an answer to my first question. Would the honourable minister give the House a copy of any professional reports which he has available to him, which suggest that a 200 unit condominium should be superimposed on the present Big Whiteshell Lake development?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker in accordance with what we have allowed the particular individual to do, that is, to build a road from one of the provincial roads to his own private property, there have been no environmental impact studies done on that. And as far as the impacts upon a large condominium complex in there, they will be looked at once we receive a proposal along those lines.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD EVANS: Mr. Speaker, following up the question of my colleague from Inkster, would the Minister of Tourism and Recreation advise the House whether he or his department have not signed some agreement with this particular potential developer indicating approval in principle for that condominium to go ahead?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: No Mr. Speaker, the particular party in question has been given authorization to build a road at his own expense.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, there was a report on a particular radio station this morning which seemed to indicate and I would like to get a clarification from the Minister whether this is a true document or whether we are under some great misunderstanding. But could the Minister confirm that this particular potential investor has committed \$100,000 towards this project.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I can neither confirm nor deny that. He's building the road. If the road costs \$100,000 that's his responsibility.

MR. EVANS: Well a final supplementary then. Is the honourable minister telling the members of the House that there is no agreement in principle by virtue of some document signed by a senior official of his department with that developer?

MR. BANMAN: There is an agreement to build a road, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the Minister of Agriculture confirm that a decision has been made to discontinue the operations of the Interlake Manpower Corps?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm that at this time.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to question the Minister of Tourism who repeated two or three times that the permission was for a road only. It was clearly pointed out this morning that there was a document . . . Just take it easy, Red, and I'll ask my question. Just take it easy. Go back to sleep. . . . Mr. Speaker, that there was more than that actually. By his Deputy Minister there was permission granted and I would . . . Oh, you're clever. You've learned a couple of words since you're sitting on that side.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister to table that document signed by Mr. Gallagher and in the possession of the gentleman concerned and referred to by Peter Warren on his show this morning. Will the Minister table that document?

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

MR. SPEAKER: Order please Order please. The honourable member should — I would like to advise him that if he requests information of that nature he should file an Address for Papers or an Order for Return.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it was referred to this morning and it was denied by the Minister, I think that we have the right to let the people of Manitoba know what this document is all about and by the way, if he's a betting man, I'll bet that that man will build his condominium.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Hydro. I wonder if the Minister could tell us whether he has received from senior officials of that corporation, recommendations that the Government of Manitoba apply to the Atomic Energy Commission so that Manitoba will become the major depository for nuclear wastes in this country.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question I think is no but I wouldn't want to suggest by that that this question isn't being examined, not necessarily for Manitoba becoming the depository for waste but there are six or seven sites in Canada that are being examined by AECL and one of the sites is in Manitoba.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. If in fact there is consideration being given to a site in Manitoba becoming that nuclear waste depository, could he indicate whether that site has been referred to the proper division of the Department of Environment for an environmental impact review to determine whether in fact it is a safe site and that all the necessary protection and safeguards will be inherent in that site?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, at this point in time, although I do believe the question is probably hypothetical, I could indicate at this point in time an environmental study is not required. What is being investigated are the geological structures in Canada that might lend themselves to this type of an operation; and if the geological structures are indicated to exist an environmental study would at that time be looked at.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a further supplementary for the Minister. Could he indicate to the House what procedures he would propose to follow if there was a decision made to go ahead in the development of this site? Would he plan a number of public hearings? Would he insure that there would be proper process for public representation on this issue and that the availability of information concerning the environmental impact of such a site would be publicly released so that we would be able to know the full consequences of such a decision?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to the member would be that I would presume so. I would presume it might follow a somewhat similar sort of pattern that would be followed if one were investigating an atomic-powered power site.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is possibly to the First Minister or to the Minister of Education or the Minister responsible for the Task Force, whoever it may apply to. Is it true, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservative Government has in its employ people who are secretly evaluating the financial administration of school boards and school divisions in our province? — (Interjection)— That is, that they are carrying on this investigation of the financial affairs of school divisions without the knowledge and consent of the school boards in question?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

A MEMBER: Let him answer. Let him answer. Give him time to answer.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Rupertsland with a supplementary question?

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to show that no member on the government bench answered this question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education who appears to be rather stunned by that first question. Could he indicate whether or not he is dissatisfied with the financial ability of elected school boards in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Member for Elmwood. I don't think at any time that I have made that statement, either publicly or privately. I have had considerable confidence in the ability of the school boards in this province to run their affairs. The only statement that I have made at any time is that in fact we were cleaning our House in the department and would ask them to do the same.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Does the Minister and the government intend to exercise more control over the financial affairs of school boards?

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

MR. COSENS: We have no plans in that direction at this time.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister then explain his comment in a press release of March 17th saying that the Department does not intend to be reduced to a grant-paying agency? How does that relate to his comments *vis-a-vis* school boards?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Member for Elmwood, if we are going to start to analyse newspaper comments then I think all sorts . . . —(Interjections)— Let me in answer to the member's question say at this time that our directions in that regard will become quite evident when we go over the Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Is the Premier in a position to answer the question which he took as notice yesterday from myself pertaining to a Mr. David Young?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Given that we have at the present time a very rare condition or situation whereby farmers who still have quota eligibility are unable to deliver even to eligible quota because of the country elevators being plugged, literally plugged; given that we are only two or three weeks from the spring thaw and the advent of road restrictions, would the Minister undertake to relay an appropriate communication to the Federal authorities to take intensive action to bring about what is only a matter of common sense and that is that quotas still remaining open to individual producers will be able to be filled?

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

MR. SCHREYER: The matter is something which the Minister of Agriculture will find, upon checking, while not directly under the administrative purview of this province nevertheless is a matter which on previous occasions has been a basis for communications by Provincial Minister of Agriculture to appropriate federal officials.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we at this time are certainly concerned about the situation and will be pressuring the individuals in the Federal Government to act upon this serious situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Urban Affairs, I wonder if he can assure the people of Manitoba, and particularly the City of Winnipeg, that this government will not renege on the commitment made by the former government to maintain the provincial park and zoo for the benefit of Manitobans at the expense of the Province of Manitoba rather than at the expense of the citizens of Winnipeg.

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

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, since the Department of Tourism is charged with the responsibilities

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

of paying the grant for the operation of it we have asked the City to go ahead and size their budget to meet some of the restraints that we in the province are also exercising.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Tourism under whose budget the money actually flowed, is he suggesting that the provision of a park and zoo — The Assiniboine Park and Zoo — the unique one in Manitoba, really, and really an attraction, is that unimportant that the people of Manitoba should have to suffer a diminution of services in that facility in order to accommodate the province so it can offset its costs on the shoulders of the citizens?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, all we are asking the City and the particular park and zoo authority to do is exercise the same type of restraint that this government is.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, it is not the City of Winnipeg that determines; it's the Province that determines and that's why I'm asking the Minister. The City of Winnipeg, under agreement with the Province, simply administers on behalf of the Province and therefore any diminution, any lowering of the standards at that park has to be at the decision of the Province and not the City of Winnipeg.

So I'm therefore asking again, is the Minister of Industry and Commerce telling us here and telling the people in the City of Winnipeg that the City of Winnipeg Assiniboine Park and Zoo is not going to be maintained at the level it has in the past?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Province has asked the park and zoo to operate with a budget of \$2.5 million and we have asked them to operate that facility with that kind of money.

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

MR. MILLER: Yes, with a final supplementary question. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have to assume from the figures given that in fact the Minister is saying that the City of Winnipeg should operate on behalf of the people of Manitoba and Winnipeg the Assiniboine Park and Zoo at less money than it had last year to do the same job.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture would be prepared to give the House a statement with respect to Rural Water Services.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll be prepared to give a statement at the time of Estimates.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister indicated to the House that there was already a change taking place and I'm wondering, in view of that, whether or not it wouldn't be appropriate for the Minister to indicate to the people of Manitoba what that change is.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can indicate at this time, if the Honourable Member opposite insists, that the Rural Water Supply Depot will be closed and the grants will be continued to the farm people.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to find out from the Minister whether he is prepared to tell the House the reasons for closing the Supply Depot Transcona.

MR. DOWNEY: Not at this time, Mr. Speaker, at the time of Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister responsible for Manitoba Telephone System. I wonder if he can confirm that the computerization plan of the Manitoba Telephone System, which will not increase the service to the people of The Pas region will cause a lay-off of 40 to 60 people in The Pas area and whether a similar program will affect a similar number of jobs in Thompson and Selkirk.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the member for The Pas, I was given notice of a question, which I believe is essentially the same question that he puts to me today, that he placed to the House yesterday. I can tell him that about two years ago the Manitoba Telephone System decided to

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

introduce the traffic operator position system at The Pas and it was in keeping at that time with advances in technological equipment that was then available and is becoming available to the telephone industry, and it was the intention in introducing this equipment to upgrade the level of service at The Pas as it is doing in other parts of Manitoba.

With those changes at The Pas there will be a difference in the long distance work volume and that's expected to decline by about 25 to 30 percent, and as a result of that decline in the volume and the current drop in the use of long distance, present indications are that 17 of the 47 full-time operators at The Pas will be affected. It's not anticipated, Mr. Speaker, that regular employees will be affected. It will affect only term employees in this case. In anticipation of this installation of the traffic operator position system only term operators have been hired at The Pas for more than a year. Operators that are subject to layoff will be offered employment in other MTS departments and in other locations.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, then I'll just repeat the last part of the question because maybe the minister missed it. Will similar reductions be affecting Thompson and Selkirk thereby making it very difficult to place people? Secondly, are my figures correct that there are now between 65 and 85 employees, depending on peak, and that there will be in fact a layoff of 40 to 60 whether they're term or full time or whatever classification they use? Are those figures correct?

MR. McGILL: Mr. Speaker, dealing with the second part of the member's question the figures which I have do not agree with those which you have quoted. We're talking about operator positions. There are 47 and 17 of them will be affected.

As to the introduction of this kind of technology at the other points mentioned, I believe it was Thompson and Selkirk, I'm not able to respond precisely on those particular locations. We do know, however, that other locations in Manitoba have been, and presumably there will be others that will be affected, by this improvement in the equipment being used.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would consider having his colleagues intercede with Manitoba Telephone System since the service to the area is not going to be improved and ask them to postpone the implementation of this program because of the high unemployment in Northern Manitoba, much of which has been brought about by the programs of this government.

MR. McGILL: Mr. Speaker, the program which is an ongoing one began two years ago and it involves definitely a very real improvement in the service at The Pas. We are very much concerned about the employment situation and, as I mentioned to the member, alternative employment will be offered to those people that are affected when these layoffs become a fact which I believe will be in January of next year.

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A follow-up question of my leader to the Minister of Agriculture and I wonder if the minister would undertake to discuss the situation of the plugged elevators with the Minister Lang responsible for the Wheat Board. The main reason for the elevators being plugged is that the delivery of non-board grain and thereby only a few farmers are filling up the elevators, and I wonder if he could discuss this with the Federal Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, I can, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister responsible for the Alcohol Foundation of Manitoba. Can the honourable minister confirm that the AFM grant to the Churchill Health Centre has been substantially reduced for the upcoming fiscal year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: No, we can't confirm that, Mr. Speaker. Those matters are in the process of being reviewed in the Estimates exercise right now.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister reporting for the Manitoba Development Corporation, and it concerns the recent sale of Cybershare Ltd. Did the Minister give any guarantee to the new owners that Manitoba Data Services would not compete with the new company for private business?

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

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, there were no commitments made along those lines.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Did Mr John Turner, the new owner, seek such an undertaking or guarantee from the Minister?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, he was not given such an assurance and he did not seek such an assurance.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, the question arises from a newspaper article of February 24th which quotes Mr. Turner as saying that one of the key elements in his decision was to bid for the company was a guarantee from the Minister that Manitoba Data Services would not compete with the company for private business. Is he telling the House now that there was no truth to that statement?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, this once again points out the dangers of quoting some newspaper articles. The gentleman in question called me the day after and was very distressed with that particular article and assured me that I had never made those assurances to him and that he had been misquoted in the newspaper article.

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

MR. WALDING: Yes, I would like to ask the Minister if he had spoken to the writer of this particular report to advise her of that statement?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not responsible for those particular actions and the individual can certainly speak for herself, but let me point out that maybe the one thing that has encouraged the sale of some of these companies is the stated intention of this government not to get involved in business.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I look with you to the future naturally, I would like a telescope but turn it around. There are two ways of looking through a telescope. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Could the Minister confirm to me that Tantalum Mining Corporation, of which we the people of Manitoba are a 25 percent shareholder, made a profit last year?

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

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, we'll be discussing that at committee, at the Economic Development Committee.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that we will be discussing the profit of Tantalum at that meeting. I ask the Honourable Minister, to whom the Manitoba Development Corporation reports, whether he will not confirm that Flyer Industries Limited, owned by the public of Manitoba, which had very serious difficulties under private management, made a profit last year.

MR. BANMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, according to the statement the company did make a profit last year.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, given the fact that Cybershare owned by the people of Manitoba made a profit; Dormond, owned by the people of Manitoba, made a profit; Tantalum, owned by the people, made a profit; Flyer, owned by the people, made a profit, is the Minister going to quickly get rid of Tantalum and Flyer because he cannot stand profit-making organizations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. —(Interjection)—

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, that will be argued during my Estimates, I'm sure. Let me point out that one of the reasons that Flyer did make a profit is that they took a substantial loss on the contracts the year before, on anticipated losses on the contracts, and as a result made a profit. We are trying right now to try and get some more contracts for that particular company but because of the slow acquiring of these particular contracts we are facing certain difficulties there right now.

MR. GREEN: A final question, Mr. Speaker. I didn't notice the honourable member complaining about the fact that the loss was too large three years ago on the basis of a forward contract; I don't know why he should be raising that at this point. I ask the honourable member, is it not a fact that McKenzie Seeds Limited made a substantial profit last year?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, we'll discuss these particular issues I'm sure in an Economic Development meeting.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I direct a question to the First Minister, assuming I have the floor. Could the First Minister confirm that yesterday he and the Minister of Highways and Public Works met with the Chairman of the Insurance Bureau of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Company and I met yesterday with two presidents of two insurance companies in Canada. If one of them was the president of the association of which my honourable friend speaks, then that is the case. I was not introduced to him in that capacity.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, could the First Minister confirm then, that one of these gentlemen to whom he wasn't properly introduced, may have recommended a form of competition with MPIC that the government is now considering?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that a number of people in the insurance industry across Canada and the United States are making that recommendation to this government at this time.

MR. DOERN: As a final supplementary I would ask the First Minister whether this does not in fact contradict his position during the election when he gave indications that Autopac would remain intact.

A MEMBER: Well, it wouldn't be the first broken promise, would it?

ORDERS OF THE DAY — THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood and the amendment proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: I would like to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak in this debate. I should explain, perhaps by way of explanation, why I decided to break with that longstanding precedent that was established, that went back at least one Session, and that is not to follow directly upon the heels of the Leader of the Opposition. I must confess that the chance and opportunity to actually have a motion seconded was a temptation I couldn't resist. What may appear to be a mundane and humdrum opportunity for others in my special situation raises itself into one of those valuable and exotic opportunities — I certainly wasn't going to pass it by.

I would also say, Mr. Speaker, that I want at some time to examine very carefully the text of the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition. I took serious note of his basic thesis of his speech which is "the chickens had come home to roost", and I must confess to being, while not being a great expert on chickens and things, perplexed by that statement because I had been assured, at least from his seat by the First Minister in the previous session that members opposite were, in fact, breeders which I assume is the equivalent to roosters and I thought that perhaps the Leader of the Opposition had known that there had been some form of therapeutic operation on the glands of members opposite to change the roosters into chickens in between November and March. So I wanted to insure myself that that indeed hadn't been the case. I assume, Mr. Speaker, that while the intent and commitment of the Leader of the Opposition was right, his choice of species was wrong.

I would also like, Mr. Speaker, to pass on to you the good wishes of members of our party as we stand here. —(Interjection)— I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I note with great relief you're sitting in the Chair. I must confess to having been worried that we may not have seen your personage again in this House. It had been mentioned to me as events transpire since the new government was elected, that the hallways of the Legislative Buildings were beginning to remind one of the alleyways of Paris about 1793 at high noon. There would be a creaking of oxcarts and some other person would be hauled off to the guillotine and I assumed that perhaps in keeping with that that rather than having a Speaker of the House he might have been replaced by someone who'd be closer — a little old lady with knitting needles who was cackling away at the latest victim who was going to be brought forward. So I must confess to being highly relieved to see that we once again will be blessed with your presence and your discrimination and your keen eyesight.

In keeping with tradition as well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment upon the introductory remarks of the mover and seconder of this Throne Speech.

I was particularly intrigued by the remarks of the Member for Crescentwood who has a way with words. As I read the text in Hansard about his description of the government's theory of government control being one of a little stimulus, a lot more neutrality, a great deal of restraint, I thought that maybe he was for the first time really explaining to us where the economic theories of members opposite had been drawn from, which looks like it had really been drawn from a planned parenthood

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

manual and that they had adopted really the rhythm method of government control as a way of doing it. I would only say, Mr. Speaker, that in looking at those remarks there was an awful lot more neutrality and restraint than there was stimulation. I would suggest that if they read those planned parenthood documents more carefully they'd find that the rhythm method itself leaves a lot to be desired. It's not very satisfying and oftentimes not very effective. So I would hope that the peculiar and particular kinds of assessments that the Member for Crescentwood brought forward would indeed not be followed by this government.

As for the remarks of the Member for Portage. I think that his tributes to the constituency of Portage were well taken and I suppose it would be remiss not to remind him that the many years of successful engaging of major projects and economic development in that constituency could in a large part be attributed to his predecessor, who served that constituency in a much longer capacity than the present member. I suppose it does show the success and, if anything else, the certain pride we take in our own party, that whatever else we may be we are good constituency men and I was pleased that he was able to provide such an elegant and exact record of the accomplishments of my former colleague, the former Member for Portage la Prairie, in bringing about those major improvements and successes for the constituency of Portage la Prairie.

Now, when it comes to the Throne Speech itself, Mr. Speaker, I guess anybody who's been in the House long enough slowly begins to learn to distrust, in some ways, the written word as is portrayed at the beginning of every Session; that there is a certain art, I guess, to the writing of a Throne Speech which is to really be more the art of evasion and omission than one of declaration and commitment. So I think anybody who attempts to comment upon this particular document that appeared last Thursday would have to measure it in relationship to the actions of the government as well, because in this sense I believe that the deeds and the words must be combined together to get a more accurate idea of what really the new mode of government will be for the next few years.

We have been told by members opposite that October 11th ushered in a new era, that it was going to be an era of great change and refreshment, of invigoration and innovation, and yet strangely enough, Mr. Speaker, I think that you go through the text of that Throne Speech and look at the actions of the government and the innocent bystander would have to reach some very different conclusions. I would suggest that we apply ourselves to some very simple tests to what the earlier statements and activities of this government are in order to measure really what we can expect and what kinds of conditions people in this province are going to have to face.

The first test I think we should apply is how effective and useful, relevant, is their analysis and assessment of conditions facing Manitobans. As one old historian once said, "You have to ask the right questions before you get to the right answers. So I think it is proper for us to query as to whether this government is really raising the right questions about what is happening in the economic and social climate and landscape of our province.

And once we measure that test I think the next important test is how relevant and effective are the solutions that they prescribe as a result of those questions. What are they really proposing that we do about the changes and conditions that they have described?

Thirdly, I think it's perhaps, in one case, the most important question, is who are going to be the beneficiaries or the losers in that particular prescription? Who gets the advantages and disadvantages? Every government action or inaction always divides and distributes goods and services in an equal or unequal fashion, and I think it's important to ask ourselves who does this government want to serve?

Finally I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the final test is really that time-honoured traditional one of leadership. To what degree has the discussion and debate and direction that is put forward by any new government going to lead this province in terms of a different direction, and that the leadership will in fact be designed to inspire and create the kind of invigoration that they call for.

Well taking those tests, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make my own observations as to just how well this particular report card that has been issued last Thursday has been. The first and most obvious calculation that one has to make doesn't come as any great surprise, it's been one that has been repeatedly stated by members of the government and by commentators that they are basically obsessed with this whole question of the public versus the private sector. It's not surprising that they're obsessed by that. It was the basic hallmark of their days in opposition, that they solve the basic conflict, the basic issue in this province of one of saying, who should do what? Should it be the public sector which is emphasized versus the private sector? They created that kind of dichotomy.

The problem with that particular form of obsession is that it ignores a lot of other things that are taking place in the economic world of our day. To begin with it ignores a number of very critical issues because by becoming so totally fascinated by that particular philosophical dichotomy as to who in the public or private sector will be operating the levers of society, we end up with a basic omission of other issues that are equally important. For example, one that every government is now trying to cope with, the question of prices and costs. Does this whole issue of public versus private sector have anything to say about the continuing condition of inflation, of increasing costs of food and land and housing, rents? Is that really a public versus private sector issue, or is it really a product of a different set of economic forces at work?

And equally I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the kinds of descriptions that they make of the so-called public versus private sector leaves a lot to be desired because you can raise some questions about who is the public sector. Are they talking about large multi-national corporations — International Nickel — which has no particular sort of home base but simply works in a worldwide commitment, basically unaccountable to any level of government, vast resources exceeding that, in terms of

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

capital, of our own provincial government, is that the public sector they are talking about, or are they talking about the corner grocery store? Are they talking about the private sector of voluntary agencies, community organizations, is that considered to be the private sector, or are they just talking about large-scale business operations? Because until they answer that question there's going to be a great deal of confusion, and I would suggest Mr. Speaker, if you look at what they are talking about they really are not talking about the private sector at all. They're talking about one small segment of the private sector, the big business aspect of the private sector, because if they were really concerned and interested in trying to invigorate, stimulate the competitive marketplace then they wouldn't be allowing themselves to miss so many missed opportunities that even the previous government didn't deal with.

I would suggest Mr. Speaker, that one of the dominant conditions that forces up prices, for example, is the high degree of monopoly or oligopoly that we find in the province of Manitoba. In the milk processing one milk producer, one milk processor, dominates 50 percent of the total market, an American company at that, it affects the prices everywhere else. Now where is the government in terms of competition policy? Where is it in terms of making that particular market more competitive? Where is it trying to say let's create more of a marketplace in order to provide — (Interjection) — well, if they put in the marketing board then it is in the power of that government perhaps to change it, but where was any mention made in the Throne Speech about those kinds of things?

Where, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the whole question of the rising cost of housing — 20 percent a year largely a product of major oligopoly conditions in the land market around Winnipeg, was there any mention in the Throne Speech or in statements of members opposite that they are going to ask the Anti-Combines Division to come in and break up the land ownership into smaller packets to get more of the marketplace, more competition, try to bring land prices down? Oh no, the only interest is that they are going to sell the land off to those same big landowners. Now I'm saying that measured by your own lights, your own standards, by your own commitments to the private sector, you are a failure. You are not doing what should be done. If you really want a better market then do it. You know, live up to those ambitions. Don't just simply say that the private sector is only four or five or ten or twelve or fifteen companies.

Let's talk about making the private market more competitive because that's one way you can begin helping the consumer in this area. Equally so Mr. Speaker, as you look at the economic landscape you say well, is the Manitoba economy itself in isolation? Well, the whole thrust and direction of remarks — Minister of Finance, First Minister — is that somehow according to them that we are going to solve the economic problems of Manitoba simply, and if, we cut back on government expenditure. That is the way to do it, it's the only way to do it, and yet Mr. Speaker, on the other hand, the Minister of Finance issues a press release saying that all the economic problems are generated on the national level. Well if all the problems are there what's that got to do with the problems here? Inherent contradiction, yes, but it does mean to say I think that one of the major fallacies of this government is that it is not contending with the fact that Manitoba is not an island unto itself. It is in a world of changing economic forces, and that we are not going to solve our problems simply by burying our heads in the sand or by chopping off "X" number of civil servants.

I would suggest in fact Mr. Speaker, that if you get a hard economic analysis the marginal improvements by some reduction in Succession Duties or half of one percent on the Capital Tax will not really affect the competitive position of the private sector in this province. What really needs to be done is to improve its competitive advantage, and to do that, Mr. Speaker, we have to begin looking at the changes taking place in the western economy. I would suggest that the positions taken by the First Minister at federal/provincial conferences works in direct reverse to those interests. Here we have in the western part of the prairies, in Alberta and Saskatchewan, vast investments going in — \$4 billion for pipe lines, \$2 billion for tar sands. What is the end product of those investments coming back into Manitoba. At this point in time, a big zero, because there has been no demand, interest, request, plan, strategy, issued by this government to say, how do we become part of the action, how do we begin to share in those resources. We have got certain people on the Federal Government saying, look, shouldn't we have an arrangement where we put a preference on contracts for Canadians.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, we should be putting the same kind of emphasis, economically on developing a western strategy so we should say, what is our share of those contracts, where do we begin to get part of that economic action. And in fact if you look at some of the figures, we are in danger of harming and eroding some of our major assets in that kind of competition for growth and that competition for development.

What is one of the basic advantages that this province has always had? It has been really contained in the skills of the people in the city of Winnipeg, its professional class, its engineers and its architects and its managers and its financial people. For a long time the city of Winnipeg has provided one of the major economic thrusts for the growth in this province and yet if you read the 1978 Economic Report by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, in their overview of the prairies they say Winnipeg is losing its predominance, that the economic action is going to Calgary and Edmonton, that the firms and activity is begging to shift westward, that we are losing our predominant position.

What is the answer of this government? It is to cut off the economic wherewithall for our architects and our engineers, our consultants and our managers, and our professionals to survive. You go in the street today, and how many architect firms say that they are within a thin edge of going bankrupt, of closing down because of the Draconian measures taken over the past six months. So, what happens? Well let's follow that particular little argument through. We stop building housing, we stop building public works, we stop the economic action in this province, the firms go broke, they have to move to Calgary, they set up their own firms in Calgary, they come back and those Calgary firms then have to start doing whatever work is left in Winnipeg. We have eroded one of our primary economic assets because we don't recognize it as an asset. We are still dealing in a traditional conventional way and that, Mr. Speaker, is frankly economic ignorance on the part of members opposite, sheer economic ignorance on the part of members opposite. They simply don't understand how the private sector works and how the asset works.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister of Housing — the Minister of Housing is beginning to get a little interested in this whole debate. Let's raise this particular economic issue that in the last four years the Federal Government put in over \$300 million of capital in the province of Manitoba in a variety of housing purposes. Now the Minister of Housing says we don't want that, we are going to cut it back, we are going to cut that back in half. We are not building public housing, we are stopping all that. So what happens is if you take the nearest multiplier of a half of that and add what the economists normally put on, a five times figure, we are talking about rejecting close to \$½ billion worth of cash circulating in this province to create jobs, economic activity, and dynamics, capital coming from the external, from outside of this province.

Now that's the way to build this city, this is the way to build the economy to in fact reject that kind of cash flow, that kind of economic activity simply for ideological reasons, simply to satisfy certain commitments made to donors in the past campaign. Is that what we're doing, Mr. Speaker? Are we sort of cutting off the economic lifeblood of this province simply to satisfy political promises? So in fact, Mr. Speaker, we are running into a real danger that the economic the fundamental issue of how you ask the questions, are being asked in the wrong way in this province and as a result we are beginning to prescribe some very dangerous and some very damaging solutions.

We provide, Mr. Speaker, the kind of stimulus that we need in the area of new products and manufacturing. Where does the new creative economic lifeblood come from? It comes from developing new products, new ideas, new technologies. How is this government going about doing it? Well, we are sort of cutting back all the programs on the provincial level that supply those, we have reduced the expenditures in the universities to the lowest annual increase of any province in this country and we now expect them to provide the creative stimulus. How creative can you be when you have cut back all your services, all your research, all your development? That's how you are going to create a new economic climate in the province of Manitoba? By telling your most creative people, the productive people, that you are not interested in what they are doing anymore, that they are going to have to kind of go out and do it on a shoestring.

Mr. Speaker, what even surprises me, the opportunities that were missed. Let's take them by their own standards. If they want to use the private sector, great. What kind of stimulus do they give to develop risk capital or venture capital operations in this province so we can get pools of capital working in new adventures and new enterprises — didn't see any mention of it in the Throne Speech. It was just simply saying, oh yeah let's go back, let's cut back government, that's the way to do it. ker, Mr. Spea it really is a pretty old fashioned and pretty out of date way of looking at the kinds of conditions that exist in this province.

I would suggest first that the private sector that this government talks about is not really a private sector at all. They are not interested in stimulating the private sector, they are more interested in dismantling what the previous government did, they are more interested in engaging in a degree of vendetta. But if it really comes down to employing a full scale strategy for the private sector, it is not here, I have not seen it, it's not available and I await for

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's ask the second test that we might apply to what has happened so far and that is what kind of proposals did we see displayed before us. Well, there were some real zingers I'll tell you. The people of Manitoba are still flat on their back when they heard we are going to get international direct distance dialing, I mean they are never going to recover from that one, that really is one of those sort of audacious bold moves that only this Conservative Government can take credit for. Yet in the field of communications I recall with some relish and some appreciation the dramatic remarks made by the member from Fort Garry, now Minister of Health and Social Development, when we stood side by side, day after day, when we fought the Manitoba Telephone System saying that the amendments to that bill were going to suppress the opportunities of the private sector to have a competition in the communications field, that the control over the cable system was one that was going to lead into some very serious ramifications. What has happened now? So rather than taking an important kind of initiative that the member for Fort Garry waxed eloquent long and loud about,

where he could have had an input, where this government could have said, yes, what the member for Fort Garry last year said was right. Instead what have we done? We got direct distance dialing for international phone calls.

If one expresses a degree of disappointment about the degree of boldness and audaciousness of this government, I think it is in that kind of proposal by itself.

You can see it in other kinds of areas, Mr. Speaker. The proposals come forward, the Minister of Industry and Commerce who is displaying his boldness daily says, what is his plan for economic development? Well, he is going to negotiate with the Federal Government on Tourism. Well that negotiation has been going on for about the past seven years. Well it's good to hear that we are going to have a continuation of that negotiation. Another bold zinging move to get the province moving again.

The Minister of Health and Social Development in a very creative, positive way says, we are going to do some things in health services. But what he doesn't say is he leaves a lot of people out there hanging because he made statements, just more than six weeks ago, that he was going to close down Misericordia Hospital, he was going to replace it with Seven Oaks, he was going to make major changes in personal care homes. Where are all those commitments? Where is the kind of sense of plan and direction in hospital care? —(Interjection)—

Well, I'm sorry. The minister says he didn't make those statements. He was obviously sort of just speculating on what they were doing.

MR. SHERMAN: I said the options were being considered.

MR. AXWORTHY: The fact that his own members were agitated, the fact that it was reported, I suppose we're now into a little bit of a game of double think. What was stated and repeated and printed is no longer true. I certainly hope we're not going to start rewriting history so early in this administration.

MR. SHERMAN: I said the options are being considered.

MR. AXWORTHY: What about, Mr. Speaker, in the area of labour relations? Well, again this government is going to do the tough things they say. They're going to freeze salaries; they're going to keep them even and yet, you know, they still ignore what the previous government ignored and that is that the whole area of labour relations in the province and elsewhere is going through some very turbulent times. What do we do with public sector collective bargaining? How do we begin working out arrangements? There still is a major document called the Woods Committee Report sitting gathering inches and tons of dust, never been applied, never been looked at, and yet we know that that is one of the major causes of industrial dispute, one of the major difficulties, it is in fact one of the major reasons of pushes in public sector spending and yet there has been nothing done to get down to basic causes, to really deal with the fundamental issues of labour relations. So you really have to begin wondering about the kinds of prescriptions that they're going to apply.

Housing is another critical factor. I'm still trying to figure out what the government's going to do on that one but they say that they are not going to build public housing and yet they expect somehow that by magic all the people who still need low-cost housing will be supplied at less cost. And yet, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, if in fact the proposal of government is simply to use a rent supplement system, that it means that they will be paying out an average of \$200 to \$300 a month in rent supplements for the same accommodation in the private sector. Now how is that a saving? Because a saving comes about when you use certain public moneys . . .

A MEMBER: That's probably what they want.

MR. AXWORTHY: . . . you get it at a lower interest rate, two and one-half percent below the market. So immediately you've got less of a cost factor in that area. You are also able to build in certain kinds of facilities and services that are not available and the difference between the economic rent and the real rent that's going to have to be paid is one that will have to be supplemented which means that we'll be approving out enormous sums of money in supplement unless, unless, Mr. Speaker, in fact they don't intend to supply that accommodation at all, that unless what we're really talking about is not a replacement but in fact a reduction in the supply of low-income housing.

A MEMBER: That's what they're talking about.

MR. AXWORTHY: And I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that that might be closer to the truth than what has really been said so far, because the proposals that we've heard so far is not a cost-saving measure, it's not going to save the government any money unless they in fact pull back and reduce the program.

And so when we begin looking at the kinds of solutions and the kinds of prescriptions, Mr. Speaker, we really begin to say that one of the reasons why they're not so good is because the original questions weren't well placed. But even the prescriptions themselves are both faulty in their direction and they are also missing the mark by not applying themselves to many other areas.

You know, again it strikes me, in terms of kind of the actions that we read about, this government says that they want to deal with a private market and make it more competitive, deal with Hydro and yet what they are in fact doing is reducing the degree of regulatory capacity to in fact administer a

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

more private competitive market. They are not very grateful, in many ways, when it comes down to supporting and helping those who are prepared to help them.

Let's take a look at the major hydro issue. The basic problem there was that it took some of these initiatives to bring Hydro before the Public Utilities Board in order to challenge their rate increases. That was the way that the Public Utilities Act had to read. Who was prepared to do it? Well, it was some lawyers from a Legal Aid group who undertook a certain advocacy of their position. What do we read about this government's prepared to do? It's going to cut back the advocacy functions of these kinds of organizations.

A MEMBER: . We can't have that.

MR. AXWORTHY: Now here is a group that was fighting for the consumer to bring prices down to relate cost and what's this government doing, saying? — they're going to cut them out.

A MEMBER: Bad for business.

MR. AXWORTHY: What are they going to do . . . the same thing with the Consumer Bureau. My goodness, Mr. Speaker, we had a very passive, timid, Consumer Bureau. Hardly, would I say, were they a sort of major-like advocates out there in the barricades and yet the report that we read about is that they are going to cut it back even further. They can't even get out of their offices now. They're going to be relegated to handing out a pamphlet across a desk is going to be the sort of sum total. They can't seek out cases, they can't think out restrictions of trade, and yet here was an opportunity, if the government was really true to its lights, true to its standards, to bring in restrictive trade practices legislation, to make the market more competitive, to provide for a greater openness in that private market that they so strongly believe in but they're not going to do it because, in fact, what they refuse to recognize is that that market as it now exists isn't so much a market but monopolies and oligopolies where there is domination and the ability to set prices and administer them and they're not prepared to tackle that particular issue. Which again raises the question as to really how much do they really believe in the private sector.

The other test, of course, Mr. Speaker, is who wins and who loses in this Throne Speech Debate and this government action? Now we know who the losers are. They parade in front of this legislature kind of almost every day and I suppose one of the things we're going to have to do is work out some system of scheduling just to keep all the variety of minority groups sort of to know when exactly it's their turn to show up, students, tenants, women, day care people. You know, you name them, they were appearing. Why? Because they are afraid; they're afraid that there isn't the kind of interest or sympathy or sensitivity to the social concerns of this province and they have reason to fear because there hasn't been any expression of confidence or support in these areas.

One of the things that bothers me is that I can acknowledge that perhaps members opposite grew a little frustrated as did many people in the public of the kind of response that the previous government provided for social programs. I was a critic myself. I said in many cases there was too much the heavy kind of interventionist approach, too much bureaucracy to it, but that doesn't mean to say you stop reforming socially just simply because you didn't like the method that was employed by the government before. You don't simply close your eyes and ears to the ongoing existence of major social and economic problems just simply because you didn't like the way the previous government tried to deal with them. What you do is you find your own answers, come up with your own techniques. Build a better mousetrap if that's necessary but don't stop it, don't reject it, don't shut down the programs. And that really is the message that's coming through loud and clear.

I looked very carefully through that Throne Speech and through statements of ministers, reading their press releases, saying, which minister has really indicated that really profound concern about the growing edge of poverty in the Inner City of Winnipeg? Who is really concerned that we now have an in-migration of native peoples, sort of 5,000 or 6,000 a year, coming in without jobs or income? Who is talking about developing ways of responding to that particular program? Well, we hear how the Minister of Education is going to cut back on Inner City education programs, how he's transferring it to other departments. How we're going to cut back on nutrition programs. Now that doesn't give one much confidence that that particular major social issue, perhaps the most dominant social issue of this province is being dealt with with a great deal of thought and a great deal of responsiveness and responsibility on the part of members opposite because if they had been thinking about it, they would have said so This is their new era; this is the chance for them to proclaim sort of their intentions and where was those intentions? They were not here; they have not been in statements. In fact, what has appeared is a totally opposite point of view. So when those groups sort of parade around and say, "Well, you know, we're afraid," they've got good reason to be afraid because there's been nothing done or nothing said to give them any confidence.

There is nothing being done about the juvenile care program in this province. My goodness, the assistant superintendent of police said that the situation is a mess. You know, he's an objective observer, he deals with the condition every day. He said we must do something about juvenile care facilities. Well, where was the Attorney-General on that one or the Minister of Health and Social Development or Corrections or whatever it may be? Where is some intention of saying we're going to have to do something in that major area? Where is the confidence being given to the variety of private volunteer agencies who are working in this field? Well they're all wondering sort of where is their next cheque coming from? Where is the next bit of support coming from? Nothing being done to give

assurances in those fields.

So what we're really saying is that it's a total abdication of any indication that this government has a proper range of social commitments and pick your own. You know, you have to pick mine; pick your own. There's certainly enough to choose from but don't abdicate.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, what concerns me is that there may be a kind of cynical political judgment at work here saying well, you know, all those people, they don't have much power, they don't have much voting power and if so, they may not vote for us anyway. Maybe those public opinion polls that that \$1.9 million sort of supplies every third year. By the way, I should say, when I read the Throne Speech and they said that we must modify expectations. It seemed to me the most inflated expectations that we have is in the contributions to a certain political party in this province. I've never seen so much money spent for one party in all my life as were spent in the last three years in this province for the Conservative Party — \$1.9 million. My goodness, talk about inflated expectations and inflated expenditures. My goodness. But that's a digression.

The point I want to make is that maybe they're simply saying our public opinion polls show that it doesn't matter, that the majority is behind us. You know, the people who aren't being affected by the cutbacks and the unemployment. Maybe they're still supporting us. Maybe they like this kind of idea that let's get tough with the civil servants and let's cut back in child care. I mean it's that kind of macho, sort of 1978 style of sort of heavy-booted sort of influence on government. Maybe that is the kind of public mood.

Well, I would simply say this, Mr. Speaker, that if that is the attitude that's prevalent, then ultimately it is going to be a very heavy price that we will all have to pay because the longer that you forestall and don't deal with the issues of poverty and the longer you don't deal with the issues of social unrest, and the longer that you don't deal with the basic problems of children in this society, then you're chickens really will come home to roost. What we're simply doing is that someday, somehow, somebody is going to have to face those problems and when they do, it's going to be an awful lot more expensive and an awful lot more troublesome and an awful lot more difficult than if we had faced up to them now. And that, Mr. Speaker, is one of the really serious problems in this Throne Speech.

You're not saving us any money; you're not giving us any big deals; you're not doing us any favours by sort of putting those particular problems on the shelf for future examination, for some sort of day in the future. You are simply going to cause a much more costly, difficult and turbulent society. And what you are also maybe producing is that if the message gets through that there are real choices between those whom we think we can serve and those who don't matter anymore, then you're also going to end up with a very divided society, a society that is divided against itself. That, Mr. Speaker, is something that we shouldn't tolerate or shouldn't allow.

I have heard members of that government when they were in opposition say that they were critical of the NDP because they said they favoured labour too much and they favoured certain groups too much and they were providing a divided society. What is going on now? It's just simply a turn-around. They've got their favourites and they've got their preferences and what we're simply doing is again sort of splitting the society down the middle. The time when we really need a consensus to do the kind of things that we're doing. —(Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that I at least made the cut off this year. I expect, Mr. Speaker, I'll have a chance to make equal comments on the Member for Inkster when he arises.

MR. GREEN: I was just starting to agree with you.

MR. AXWORTHY: Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me comment on the last test that I would apply to this government. The one of leadership. Whether you believe in a restricted, limited government or not, there is still no question that the one thing that people look to their political officials for is some degree of leadership, some sense that they do have a vision of where they want to go, that they do have some aspirations that they want to carry out. I would really say, Mr. Speaker, and I try to be fair, but it's still early in the game, perhaps the flicker of leadership will appear, but the kind of leadership that we're receiving so far is one that really . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I just want to inform the member he has 5 minutes left.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: That's enough to cover that leadership.

MR. AXWORTHY: That's right, Ed. This is the shortest part of the speech, Mr. Speaker, because there isn't that much to talk about. I would simply say that if there is any spirit that embodies in this particular leadership, it is more the spirit of inquisition than it is the spirit of the Renaissance. That it really is a spirit, that it really is to kind of to get back at things and to kind of pry and poke as opposed to saying, "How do we create anew?" I think that that is the basic kind of dark philosophy that we're following. That what we really need in Manitoba this time is more of a lifting of aspirations than a demoting of them and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps accidentally, perhaps in their zeal to do the dismantling, to do the unstructuring, to pull things apart and restructure it, that they don't realize that that is beginning to beat them, that it is an unhealthy mood, it does provide for a kind of dark and

sombre and gloomy feeling. Yet, at the very time when the western part of this country is beginning to reach its full maturity, when it really is beginning to come into its own, and the opportunities of leadership that this government and this province could be taking in the whole confederation debate, talking about restructuring our national institutions, dealing with issues of language, facing up to some of the tough things that we have to face with, looking at the development of new economic policies, trying to restructure agriculture, build new economic institutions, look at sort of problems in a new fresh light, those are not the kinds of avenues and the kinds of ambitions that we are coming, rather it is one that seems to emphasize and pound down the idea that we've really got to kind of pull this belt in tight.

Yet, you know, I would suggest, I think that the Member for Inkster said earlier, that you can look at things in two ways: There is the question and there is always that basic philosophical question, is the glass half full or is it half empty? You can be looking at the economic condition of this province in the same way. Are we suffering because of the lack of revenue because we have been spending too much, or because there is a lack of revenue because we're not doing enough to stimulate the kind of growth and creative economic forces that we should be supplying.

That does come down, again, to the heart of the matter that this government has opted for the first emphasis, and not for the latter, that we're not interested in that kind of creative growth and ambition. And as a result the thing that will happen will take place as it happened before; the great crying shame in the city is how many bright and able people leave, how many resources we lose in terms of those kinds of assets simply because they don't think there is any opportunity here.

I would simply ask, Mr. Speaker, when you go through the rolls and list the people who are all of a sudden beginning to feel the heavy hand of what's being laid upon them, how many are going to feel encouraged to stay in this province and add their talents to what has been going on or how many will simply say, "There has got to be a better place for me to apply myself."

That, Mr. Speaker, is the most serious problem, that the leadership here is going to be more frightful and scary to people than it is in terms of engendering their best ambitions and their best aspirations and their most creative outlooks.

Oh, pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker.

I would like, therefore, to move, seconded by the Member for St. Boniface, the following amendment to the sub-amendment.

THAT the amendment be further amended by adding the following words: That this House further regrets that Your Honour's Government has

1. Failed to provide an effective strategy of economic growth for the province nor provided means for restraining food costs, housing prices when Wage and Price Control ends;
2. it seriously hurts the economic and social prospects of Northern Manitoba;
3. it neglected the needs of the inner city of Winnipeg for better housing, job opportunities and rehabilitation of its neighbourhoods;
4. and omitted any proposals for major reform in fields of child care, juvenile corrections and human rights.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to say, as my first words, that I extend my congratulations to you on your perpetuation in your high office, Sir, and my best wishes to a successful and productive session of the House for you as the chief arbiter of this Chamber.

I would like to extend congratulations, also, to the mover and seconder of the Address and Reply to the Speech From The Throne, honourable colleagues of mine who I feel made very significant contributions to the climate of this Chamber and to the coming session — both the Honourable Member for Crescentwood and the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

I would also congratulate the Honourable Leader of the Opposition for his contribution to the debate yesterday, and the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge this afternoon, and with those words extend the hope that it will be a challenging and a worthwhile debate with a result that will be of benefit, as all members of this House would desire, to the citizens, the people of Manitoba, in the months ahead, Sir.

I find myself in a dramatically different position with respect to Throne Speech debates to any that I have ever been in before with the exception of the brief session of the Legislature which we held late last Fall. At that point in time I didn't participate in the Throne Speech Debate in the usual manner, so that looking back over my experiences in this House and in politics generally I must take stock of the fact that I have to adjust my approach in the Throne Speech Debate, Sir, rather dramatically and diametrically from that which I have always taken.

I have always been one of those who has been assessing and analysing and dissecting the message from His Honour, reflecting the position of the government, and, if I may say so, I suspect at times I have been somewhat critical of that message.

This time, Sir, I cannot find it in my heart or my intellect — such as it may be — to be critical of that message. I think that it is a message of reality, a message of pragmatism, a message of fairness, and a message of necessity, facing the conditions — particularly the economic conditions — fiscal conditions that all of us, as Manitobans, face today. The challenges that are contained, either explicit or implicit, within that document are challenges that all of us must live with, must rise to, must

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

address in a creative and positive way if our province is going to be able to maintain and sustain the services and the lifestyle which we have enjoyed up to this time and go forward in the future.

So I expend and extend those words of acknowledgement to the message from His Honour with sincerity and with conviction, for the record, Sir.

It's not my intention at this stage of the new session to lay out the entire program of the Department of Health and Social Development but I do want to participate in the debate at this juncture because of the importance of some things that must be undertaken by my department in the coming year, and the importance of the general message that must be got out to those who work and serve in our health care and social service delivery fields.

There will be certainly appropriate opportunity when the Estimates are introduced in the House for me to go into detail with respect to the components of our departmental program, but the Throne Speech affords me this opportunity at least of getting a necessary message out on health and social development programming for the coming year. And I believe that that is essential, Sir, so that those who deliver the services in this field are advised of where they stand in terms of budgeting and planning capability with the minimum possible inconvenience and delay.

Some inconvenience and delay has been unavoidable because of the timing of the election and the calendar date on which the new government assumed office. It has not been possible to define and refine our programs and our approaches any more quickly than this and I recognize that that has been an inconvenience for the operators and the professionals and those who serve in our health care field. That's why I'm taking this opportunity now — the first opportunity since the House was called into session — to deliver a message to them. I wasn't in a position to deliver it any earlier than this. It was dependent on the preparation of our 1978-79 spending estimates now nearing completion and with an eye on the calendar the March 31st fiscal year-end date I wanted to take this opportunity to get that message out through the medium of this Chamber and the 57 members who sit here, Sir.

It won't come as any surprise to members present, Mr. Speaker, for me to begin by saying that everything we're doing in the field of health and social development this year is shaped and influenced directly by the government's commitment to fiscal restraint as the Number One imperative for Manitoba at this immediate time. That was a fundamental part of our election platform; that was a fundamental part of our mandate; that remains a fundamental element in our style of government as we pursue the first goal in our program for Manitoba for the next four years.

That first goal, as we have made abundantly clear, I believe, Mr. Speaker, is a sound financial position for our province, an objective that is of profound importance for every Manitoban and for all of Manitoba's endeavours in whatever aspect of life.

It's to none, I think, of more critical urgency than to those who deliver and those who consume our services in the fields of health and social development, that message of restraint geared to creation for the province of a sound financial status. For there can be no sound financial position for Manitoba so long as we would attempt to sustain either a top-heavy or a middle-heavy public service, so long as we passively accept the inevitability of huge annual deficits, so long as we impose the frustration of big government on the path of private initiative, or so long as we spend the taxpayers' money — or rather commit ourselves to the expenditure of it — without proper regard for the limits of the taxpayers' resources.

We won't get out of our deficit posture, Mr. Speaker, and into a balanced budget posture in one easy step or even two difficult ones. My leader and my colleague, the Minister of Finance, will have more to say about that. But we can do something and we are doing something right now to stop the slide, to put the brakes on, to stop the slide into deeper and deeper debt on the part of the taxpayers of Manitoba and to turn things around and then hopefully to start climbing back out again.

That's the first step: stopping the slide and creating the form that will permit us with diligence and commitment and good management to achieve that position of financial soundness that I've cited as our necessary first goal.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that no one has more at stake in this challenge than those of our citizens who deliver and those who consume our health and social services.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the most positive, the most constructive initiative that this government could possibly take at this time in the field of health and social development is the one we're taking, the initiative of spending restraint. And I will explain to my friend, the Honourable Member for Inkster, why. The initiative is an investment in the continuing health care of our people; that's why. It's an investment in the continuing delivery of humane and necessary social services. It's an initiative in the investment of the care and commitment to people in legitimate need in this province. This initiative is an investment in the future.

My friends opposite who spent like crazy when they were in office, with no regard for tomorrow, don't understand that. But, Sir, the people of Manitoba have put the management of their affairs and their immediate destiny in the hands of a government which believes that sound fiscal and financial management is necessary.

So this initiative, Sir, is an initiative that the people of Manitoba felt motivated to provide us with. The initiative of an investment in the future and that, Sir, is the only realistic guarantee of a future that is any way available to us at the present time. Without that there would be no future for our health care, our social services, our economic opportunities, our opportunities for our young people, our educational process. Without that there would be no future.

Without restraint now and sound financial management in the days ahead our capacity to be able to deliver adequate services to our citizens in these fields in the immediate future is in acute jeopardy. And that is no rhetorical threat. That is no grandstand position. Members of this Chamber are aware

of the almost infinite list of needs in our health care spectrum. I don't have to point out to them the needs that exist out there in the field: more personal care beds; more extended treatment beds; more psychiatric beds. redevelopment of the Health Sciences Centre; more practitioners for our remote and rural areas; more community residences for the mentally retarded; modern x-ray and laboratory facilities needed in many communities; more research support; more community mental health facilities; more wage demands; fire safety requirements; repairs, renovations, replacements to facilities throughout the province; more new procedures in the physicians manual; more insured services.

The list goes on and on, Mr. Speaker, and members opposite know that. A similarly lengthy list can be compiled in the social services field although I think it is important to observe here that Manitobans are fortunate to be able to claim a relatively rich system of social services right now — one that puts us well above the national average — and in this field I believe there are somewhat different perspectives or considerations that have to be brought to bear on the government's formulation of policy and spending requirements.

But in health care, at least, there are those needs to which I have referred and others, and there are some in that list which cannot be postponed permanently without reducing the quality of health care that we can deliver to the people of Manitoba in the future. Thus we must take the steps that are necessary now Mr. Speaker, to ensure that future, to insure that we have the money and the sound budget in the future to maintain the quality and meet the need, meet some of those demands that I have cited, and with which I am sure members opposite would agree. And how do we do that, Sir, without a sound financial basis, a sound economy, a sound budget on which to operate and on which to assess and deal with those requirements as quickly and as practically as possible.

High quality health care for our citizens is a top priority of this government. The capacity to meet those needs that I have cited obviously requires money, a great deal of money. We don't have that money today Mr. Speaker. On the contrary, we have debts and limited revenue expectations and patterns of expenditure that were permitted to grow in some cases virtually unchecked, that were to say the least dangerously wasteful, and we're paying the price for that today. The government inherited a score of running taps all over this province Mr. Speaker, and they are the kinds of taps that can't be turned off overnight, but we will persist with the aid of hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens who recognize as we do the job that has to be done. We'll turn off the taps of waste, Mr. Speaker, and turn on the taps of initiative and opportunity and refuel the economy that way and thus produce the resources, the revenues we need to deliver the health care and social services that we want to have for our citizens. A field of running taps, Mr. Speaker, running all over the place with no control and no concern, taps of waste, and that's why we are into restraint today, and that's why the health care and social service patterns and programs of this province are in jeopardy.

Since we assumed office Mr. Speaker, I want to tell honourable friends opposite that I have had a number, a wide number of civil servants, say to me that the difference in terms of fiscal responsibility between this government and the one that preceded us is as of the difference between day and night. I've been told, Mr. Speaker, more than once, that it was the practice of the previous government to institute plans and initiate programs without the slightest regard, Sir, where the money was going to come from, without the slightest regard, either for where the money was going to come from or what it was going to cost to initiate and then to maintain downstream, or what the cost of the money was going to be, let alone the cost of the program. The stock attitude of the previous administration of this province apparently — and this is on the authority to which I have referred — was this: Oh, don't worry about it, we'll find the money somewhere, the money will turn up. But what kind of method of programming is that on which to run the affairs of the people of the province of Manitoba or any province, Mr. Speaker?

A MEMBER: Name your source.

MR. SHERMAN: I named my source. I've told you that personnel in the public service of this province have said that to me, and if the Member for Elmwood wants any further identification than that I tell him this, that he can go jump in the lake that has been created in the waste that's come out of the running taps I have referred to. He can jump straight to there Mr. Speaker, because I'm putting the onus where it rightfully and legitimately belongs, and that is on those big spenders and big wasters including the member for Elmwood who was cheap and chintzy with respect to the kinds of things that had to be done through the Department of Public Works in terms of provincial institutions, but had no regard for the general overall budgetary position or budgetary responsibility.

MR. DOERN: You didn't do much better.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege. Certainly it would not be the intention of people on this side to ask the Honourable Member to reveal the names of civil servants, but if he believes, Mr. Speaker, that his credibility is so low that he cannot make a statement without attributing it to a civil servant then, Mr. Speaker, he is asking the House to rely on somebody other than himself and should expect . . . —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I want to remind all Members of the Chamber that I think it is a

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

courtesy to the Chair that when the Speaker stands that all members should respect that. I want to also point out to the member for Inkster that in my estimation he has no point of privilege. If he is rising on a point of order then I would ask him to state his point of order but in my estimation he has not got a point of privilege.

MR. GREEN: Well Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to the matter of privilege. The matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is that when an honourable member gets up and asks the House either to accept a document or something else which has been referred to him by another person and says there is a source, he should make available that source. I'm not asking the honourable member to rely on civil servants but when he does he should know that the House can expect him to reveal his source.

MR. JORGENSON: It's still no matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker I trust that that interjection was subtracted, or not subtracted from the time I have on the clock.

MR. GREEN: Gutless.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the member for Inkster has not yet come out from under the shock of October 11th. He still thinks he's running this House and this province. —(Interjection)— He talks about a document — I made no reference to a document; I made reference to conversation. —(Interjection)— You listen to me for a second. You got up on your feet and interjected, now listen to me, you're not running this province any more. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. I must ask the member for Inkster —(Interjection)— I must ask the Honourable Member for Inkster to make his remarks in his appropriate time. At the present time the Honourable Minister of Health is speaking and I would ask him to refrain from interjecting. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I make that charge in my own words too, I believe the same thing, but the member for Inkster talks about a document; there's no document, this is conversation.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster, state your point of privilege.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated in my matter of privilege that when a member quotes a source, either by document or otherwise, he can be asked by the House to give his source. I indicated that there is no document in this case, but he is quoting a source and he can be asked by the House to give his source.

MR. SHERMAN: I'll tell you this Mr. Speaker, if I had to go all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada I would not identify a source to the member for Inkster because I don't trust the member for Inkster. I never have. My source I said was conversation with public servants who I do not intend to identify, and my own opinion, my own knowledge of eight years in this province under the damage of an NDP administration. It was an attitude that said the money doesn't matter, it's only taxpayers money, the hell with it, we'll put the program in and find the money later, and that's my opinion, that is my opinion, and it is shared by many others in this province.

Well today, Mr. Speaker, the province has an administration that recognizes that you can't run the affairs of the taxpayers that way indefinitely, that recognizes that first of all the money has to be there or else we can't afford the programs, and what good are the programs if expectations are developed as a consequence of talking about them and putting them into place and then there's not the revenue there in the future to maintain them? The money has to come from the limited resources of our taxpayers and that is the perspective from which this government approaches its responsibilities in the field of health and social development and the whole spectrum of provincial affairs at the present time. Unfortunately we are paying the price, and the people of Manitoba are paying the price, for the very attitude to which I referred and which brought the member for Inkster fuming to his feet a few moments ago. The price of that previous irresponsibility — I don't mind saying it, I don't mind putting it on the record and I don't mind telling the member my source, and it's me, and thousands of other Manitobans who voted the way they did last October. That is why we are into tight restraints now Mr. Speaker.

I want to repeat Sir, that the biggest contribution we can make to the health care and social development field as far as Manitobans are concerned this year, notwithstanding the Health Sciences Centre and the need for more extended treatment beds and the other needs to which I referred in my list a few moments ago, the most positive investment we can make is to press on with that restraint program, including restraint in those two fields, until we have the fiscal position, the financial position of the province in shape to accommodate those programs in the future. I believe that any other course of action would be irreparably damaging and destructive and irresponsible

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

Because if we don't return to that kind of sound financial base we'll not have the capacity to meet those needs or even service our currently existing needs in the future. I believe any course but the one we are taking, Mr. Speaker, would constitute an abdication of this government's responsibilities to the people.

In the spirit of that conviction I am therefore calling upon our health professions, our health facilities, the Boards and the administrations of those facilities, our departmental programmers, the social service professionals, the external agencies we serve, to join with us, join with my colleagues and me in government, in sacrificing their ambitions for expansion this year and their ambitions for significantly increased public financial support in the service of restraint and in the interests of the future. I am asking our hospitals to operate within budgets in fiscal 1978-79 that will be 2.9 percent higher than their current year's approved budgets, and personal care homes to operate within a budget increase of 4.4 percent. The higher increase for personal care homes is predicated on the reasoning that they have a smaller base on which to operate than do hospitals; consequently they have less room in which to make budgetary adjustments and reallocations.

Discussions with health facility administrators, various health professionals and officials of my department have convinced our government, Sir, that hospitals and personal care homes can operate within these relatively narrow expansionary limits without any sacrifice of patient care or reduction in services. Our government believes, together with these professionals, that this is a creative challenge for our various health facilities and one that they will respond to and are responding to positively to make better, more efficient use of their resources. And further, Sir that they have only required that the challenge be put to them to prove that they can meet it successfully.

There is no doubt in the government's mind that there are reserves of managerial resourcefulness in our various health care facilities and institutions and those personnel will welcome the opportunity to introduce responsible economies into their operations and efficiencies that will streamline their services. They are responding creatively, and the result is going to be a more efficient, more finely-tuned service for patients and medical staff alike. Moreover, once set in motion, Sir, I believe that the emphasis of this type on better management and tighter administration as a self-feeding momentum can only be a benefit down the line to our whole health care delivery system in the future.

Mr. Speaker, in the case of one hospital, St. Boniface General, we will be asking its administration to go further. In addition to rationalizing its expenditures so as to live within the prescribed 2.9 percent budgetary increase we are asking St. Boniface to reallocate moneys within its budget in order to finance desired expansion of its widely recognized open-heart surgery unit. The desired growth would see the expansion of this unit from one that currently serves approximately 240 to 250 cases a year to a facility capable of serving about 300 such cases a year. This will reduce the necessity of sending a number of patients out of the province at greatly increased costs and also reduce the danger that is posed right now for many seriously ill cardiac patients who have to wait their turn on a long waiting list.

The cost of this expansion will be about \$300,000 annually and in the opinion of the Manitoba Health Services Commission it can be accommodated through rationalization and reallocation within the hospital's existing budget without impacting, either on general care, standards of care or quality of patient services.

I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that we're not asking hospitals and nursing homes to carry this challenge to economize a loan. We're asking for the same kind of commitment, the same kind of co-operation from all facilities, all persons, all agencies, in our health and social development fields. We're asking it from Manitobans right across the spectrum of our province and its affairs.

You're familiar, Sir, with our discussions to date with the Manitoba Medical Association, discussions which I might say have been conducted in an atmosphere of unqualified cordiality and mutual respect. We believe no Canadians are better served by their practitioners in the medical profession than are the people of this province and we intend to do everything we reasonably can to ensure the high quality of Manitobans' health care while also ensuring that our medical practitioners are given the recognition they deserve for the service they render this province.

We recognize the contribution they can make in bringing professional expertise and advice to bear on medical questions which face the government and therefore, although the question of the 1978-79 fee schedule for doctors remains unresolved as of this particular moment, we have established close liaison on this and other medical policy matters now and in the future by setting up a consultative committee to the Minister of Health consisting of two representatives from the MMA, one representative from the Manitoba Health Services Commission and one representative from my office.

Through this process of close communication with the medical profession and through our discussions on the fee schedule to date, we are asking our doctors to work with the government and with all Manitobans this year, Sir, to reduce the demands being made on the taxpayer and to help solve the province's budgetary problems. We're asking the nurses to do likewise; the other health professionals; service workers. We're asking our social service professionals; our departmental personnel; our programmers; our provincial institutions and agencies and the external agencies we serve. To all of them the message has been the same. They have responded with the general attitude that says, "Yes, we can do it better. We can do it more efficiently than we've been doing it in the past and we will work with the government in getting our spending programs in order." So I want to thank them for that, Mr. Speaker, on the record. I especially want to thank the staff of the Department of Health and Social Development, including the staff in Corrective and Rehabilitative Services, for the positive and constructive attitude that they've taken to the shaping of the new budget and the new

spending program for this year.

With restraint and with the imperative we feel at the present time for careful calculations of downstream costs and anticipated revenues, necessarily limited, we have to deliver a message at this time of the nature of that in which I've been engaged for the past few moments in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to do that in the presence of members of the Chamber since the House was in session rather than doing it outside.

There is a corollary message that must go out and it will no doubt produce some disappointment among those Manitobans — and there are many — with an interest in one or another of a variety of proposed health facility projects included in what came to be known, Sir, under the previous government, as the five-year capital program. As members know, this was a proposed capital construction program staged over five years that was to create and extend or renovate a variety of hospital health and personal care facilities in locations throughout Manitoba.

The capital cost of this program, Mr. Speaker, amounted to some \$135 million and the downstream costs over the next 15 to 20 years, including the cost of the money and the annualized operating costs of the new facilities themselves, have been calculated out, Sir, at approximately \$500 million, a half a billion dollars. Mr. Speaker, our government has had to look at that staggering kind of commitment, that staggering kind of financial obligation and at our present economic challenges; and we've had to make the hard decision, Sir, that the taxpayers of this province simply cannot afford to get locked into commitments of that magnitude at this time.

As a consequence, with few exceptions, Sir, we find it necessary to postpone the capital construction program for this year; with the recognition that as the economic position of Manitoba taxpayers improves we will move as responsibly and as quickly as possible to free up individual projects on the list and permit them to go ahead.

The exceptions to this universal deferral, as of now, are those announced in the Speech from the Throne last Thursday. They include the expansion of the Manitoba Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, the construction of the Cadham Laboratory on a new site, the Hemodialysis Unit for kidney patients at the Health Sciences : Centre, general fire safety upgrading in health institutions throughout the province and repairs and renovations necessary at a number of health facilities.

That, Sir, constitutes the capital program at the moment. It is the best in the circumstances that Manitoba taxpayers can afford and can do. And I take some pride I might say, Sir, in the context of the fiscal and financial difficulties within which we're operating and in the context of the challenges of restraint that are being shouldered equitably by all members of our government, to have achieved with my colleagues the position in our planning and fiscal scheduling for the coming year; a position that permits those critical projects to go ahead.

We believe that it's extremely difficult to isolate or identify in the field of health specific projects, specific programs that can be generally or universally accepted as enjoying priority one over the other because in this field we're looking at urgencies right across the spectrum. But if one has to make the hard and difficult choice of individual projects, if one has to prioritize, I would hope that most members of the House — all members of the House — and most Manitobans would agree that those which are being proceeded with this year would rank very very substantially near the top of their list of medical priorities.

Sir, there are a number of questions relative to specific programs and services in the health field and certainly in the social services field that I know come readily to the minds of all members of this House, particularly to members of the opposition, which I am not in a position to deal with today, either through the limitations of time or through the fact that some decision-making relative to Estimates and programming is still being finalized. I will deal as thoroughly and as extensively as I possibly can and as I'm capable of doing during the consideration of my Estimates, with the varied questions that I know members opposite have in these two critical fields.

I would only say that as a general thrust, we in the government believe that a rationalization of the overall hospital bed picture in Winnipeg, and indeed throughout Manitoba, is due and we are looking at the whole range of health and hospital facilities in Winnipeg and indeed throughout Manitoba with that kind of objective in mind.

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

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There has been a good deal of discussion about the intended size and useage of the new hospital being built in northwest Winnipeg, the Seven Oaks Hospital, and a good deal of discussion including speculation about the future of the Misericordia Hospital.

I would say this to members opposite that the decision with respect to the future of the Misericordia Hospital has not been made. It is under consideration by the government; but the consideration being given to the transfer option of taking the Misericordia out of its present site and relocating it on the Seven Oaks site, is justified, if not in some other perspectives as yet unresolved, is justified on financial grounds and the government has made it quite clear — and I'm sure members opposite clearly understand that we believe that our responsibility to the commitments and the undertakings of the taxpayers of this province is a very very profound one; and looking at the proposed renovation and the rebuilding of the Misericordia, at least one program for it, we are looking at capital costs in the neighbourhood of \$26 million and we're looking at annual operating costs in the neighbourhood of \$16.1 million, existing on that site right now, Sir. We have a new

hospital going up at Seven Oaks which costs out at approximately \$32 million capital and approximately \$17 million annual operating, with the cost of the capital amortized into that sum.

So what we're talking about when we talk about the possibility of moving Misericordia to the Seven Oaks site, is relieving the taxpayers of \$16.1 million at least in annual operating costs, downstream, starting the day it starts and continuing until some other change is made in the hospital spectrum. That is not a consideration to be regarded or to be dismissed lightly. That is why that option is worth looking at. But the decision has not yet been made. We recognize that there are community considerations; there are considerations of the medical staff; considerations of the service staff in the hospital; considerations with respect to patterns of medical practice; family practices; patients and relatives and the general economy of that particular section of Winnipeg. All of these are being assessed and analyzed as carefully as we can do, with a view to producing a decision that is not only responsible from the point of view of the taxpayer but that is fair and justifiable and reasonable and acceptable to Manitobans.

We'll make that announcement as soon as it's possible to make it, Sir, but it's a question that's still in consideration. I simply want to advise the House that the rationale for considering the option to begin with is an annual operating cost of \$16 million plus per year, not to mention the capital costs that would similarly be involved.

Sir, there are a number of questions of that kind that I know must be addressed by myself, as Minister of Health and Social Development and on which I will want the input and the contributions of members opposite, members of this House. I expect that there will be ample opportunity during the coming Session. I particularly acknowledge the fact that there will be a considerable opportunity during the consideration of my Estimates.

It's not possible to present members with a broader view or a broader picture of the Department of Health and Social Development's approach for 1978-79 in the moments available to me today. I simply wanted to take the opportunity to give members opposite the message about hospital and medical facility and personal care home budgeting at the same time as I was getting it out to the facilities themselves.

I thank members opposite for their patient attention and I look forward to serving with them in debates relative to this department during the coming Session of the House, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity at the outset of my remarks to congratulate you for your perpetuation — I believe that was the term used by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry in his response to the Throne Speech — your perpetuation as Speaker of this House.

I say, Sir, that it is remarkable, it is remarkable in these times that there is somebody associated with this government that has been able to sustain tenure unharrassed and remain secure in government service.

The honourable minister indicated in his preparatory remarks that he found it necessary to adjust his approach diametrically from the position that he had usually taken in previous sessions of this Assembly. I say, Sir, that that is untrue. He prevaricates. His position today is no different than it was before. He was critical and negative before and he, in sustaining the position of his government, has maintained and continued to be a negative force in this Assembly. He brings us nothing. He brings forward today a packaged press release — and that's what it amounted to, Sir — read into the record, and he says that this contribution is what the people of Manitoba require, it's what the needs demand. It's untrue, Sir. He described his Throne Speech, his government's Throne Speech, as being a message of fairness and necessity. I, Sir, am of the persuasion that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge was correct when he said that it indicated the prevailing spirit of an inquisition. It's a sour, negative premise, a sour, negative proposition on which to build a legislative program.

But there was one bright light in his remarks, Sir, one bright light. He did indicate that he was going to rely on the Civil Service. Normally, any member opposite when questioned as to authority for positions taken will refer immediately to a review team of the Task Force, they are awaiting the report of the Task Force. But now we have a new line. Now authority is in the Civil Service. This individual stands, he rises before us and he tells us that he heard about documented waste. Members of the Civil Service had documented waste and told him about it. So he passes on this heresy without telling us though from where the source emanated. When asked by the Member for Inkster to provide us with some evidence, to give us a name, he refused, he waffled.

I suggest, Sir, and I see he's turning his back on the Assembly now because he's made his press release, his appearance for today, the patrician appearance for today will now be at an end. I suggest, Sir, that there was no such authority, that the honourable minister was using artistic license as perhaps his government is so often wont to do. I suggest, Sir, that if there is such authority it's incumbent upon him to come before this House and tell us who, and to tell us whether or not that authority is an independent member of the Civil Service or one that perhaps carries his party's card. Is that a possibility? According to the honourable members opposite so many members of the Civil Service carried my party's card. Presumably a few may carry his party's card as well. — (Interjection)—

This is a government — and it's a supreme irony — this is a government that will never stand on its own feet. First its going to rely on a private task force made up of people who have no conception of

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

what government administration and service requires, no conception of the type of policy formulation that that entails. But now, today as he walks out of the Chamber, he's going to rely on some anonymous member of the Civil Service. — (Interjection) — Well, goodbye to him. He's gone now and I say, "Good haste."

This is a government, Sir, who has dwelt in the seamy underside of politics. Its first 4-5 months of office have not contributed to the general tenure of political activity and debate in this province, there has been no attempt at dialogue. Rather they prefer to dwell on the seamy underside, a furtive visit down the hall to try and stay proceedings against a chemical company, discovered unfortunately. — (Interjection)— No, Sir.

The burden of restraint they talk about is going to be born by those who are least able to bear it, those who are least able to defend themselves against it. Not by their friends, not by their supporters, but rather by the people in the Civil Service. The people in the Civil Service that now Mr. Sherman wishes to rely upon, and by those who are financially underprivileged. Those are the people who will suffer if social services in this province are cut back. So those who cannot answer for themselves, those who are dependent on government for their sustenance and their well-being, those who are in positions where they are unable to defend themselves are now being put in the position of having to bear the burden of this government's one policy — fiscal restraint — and it's a fine answer to the needs and demands of our times. Fiscal restraint, until it comes out of everybody's ears. We're overflowing with fiscal restraint — not the milk of human kindness but fiscal restraint. That's all we hear.

Well, let's look at the theory behind this, the momentous theory. The whole thing, of course, Sir, is predicated on the reliability of a task force, a task force composed of independent, objective, public-spirited citizenry. Well, I suppose at first glance, theoretically that's commendable. It's commendable if there are people in our community, if there are people in our community, I know there are, that are so public-spirited that they will contribute their time and efforts to this type of endeavour.

Even if some of them just happen to be the official agents of candidates during the election, even if some of them just happened upon their appointment to see their wives appointed senior positions in the government within 48 to 72 hours, even if that's the case. That's possible, isn't it? Even if one of them just happens to see his son appointed as an executive assistant to a prominent minister, even if that just merely happens. One knows that those people though are independent, they're worthy citizens, they've stepped forward.

A MEMBER: Pure coincidence.

MR. CORRIN: That is part of the social contract; that is the best aspect of the social contract.

I say, Sir, that the reality differs very greatly, there's a great variance between the reality and the theory of this task force. I say that it is devised to deceive the public. It is a crass political manipulation and I defy any member standing opposite to rise in his place, or her place, and put the lie in my mouth. And I hope this time, Sir, unlike the last session, that members will rise and they will debate and they will participate in democratic process.

You know, it makes me think when I'm talking about these people who have assisted this government in their task force, it makes me think that it wasn't unjustified perhaps that the minister responsible for firings, the minister responsible for this task force, refused until mid-January to divulge any of the names of the members of the task force.

A MEMBER: He was ashamed of them.

MR. CORRIN: That's right. I hear someone suggest that he was ashamed of them and it was true. He wouldn't announce publicly any of their names until all but six had been publicly named in the media.

MR. GREEN: Would you be seen with them? I wouldn't.

MR. CORRIN: So we're faced, Sir, with the questionable ethics of forming a task force, a government that forms a task force to objectively assess and evaluate the administration of government in Manitoba. They were going to make government more accountable to the people.

Well, now, let's talk about accountability to the people, because government administrators aren't the only people that have to be accountable. Other people are civil servants in a sense as well and they have a greater responsibility, they have a fiduciary, a trustees' responsibility to the public. Those who run for high political office — and now I'm speaking of people who have contested the post of First Minister of this province — have a responsibility when speaking during the campaign about government policies, to be forthright and honest.

Was it not true that in September of last year, the then Leader of the Opposition and now First Minister of this province wrote to a member of his own party — and I should add, it's of interest, I don't want to digress too much, but I should add — he even wrote to a member of his party who was nominated by another member of an objective task force, that on Family Law, Mr. Ken Houston, I should add that, it's fair. He wrote to that member of the party in response to a question about government policy, respecting Civil Service cutbacks and fiscal restraint, and he advised him that there would be no cutbacks save but by attrition. We've all seen that letter. Was it not true that in addressing an audience in early February in this City, the Minister responsible for the Task Force indicated that although there had been some cuts made in the size of the Civil Service, those had only

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

been made by attrition and he assured everybody, everyone present, that there would be no cuts by way of firing, by way of cursory termination, summary termination. Was that so? Was that borne out? Was that commensurate with the responsibility worn by those individuals, ministers of the Crown? No. Shortly thereafter we hear of the firings. This is nothing more, Sir, this is nothing more than a reign of terror. Everybody in the Civil Service has come to be fearful of their position. Even those who don't carry NDP cards; even those 50 percent who, like the other members of the population, may have voted for the members opposite.

MR. GREEN: Not those who say nice things to the Minister.

MR. CORRIN: No, not just those who say nice things to the Minister. So now, Sir, we have 373 members of the Civil Service fired before the Task Force reports. We don't have to wait. I mean, members opposite, the honourable ministers opposite, very few of whom are in their seats today, don't have to wait. Why should they wait? Why should they hear the opinion of that objective Task Force? Because they knew already, Sir, that is why. They knew what the Task Force was saying because the Task Force was saying what it was told to say. Actually, I'm not sure whether the dog was wagging the tail or the tail was wagging the dog. That we're not sure yet. But, one way or the other, there was certainly co-operation.

This is the only, as a matter of fact, instance of co-operation that I can think of with respect to members opposite. They're usually adverse to the theory and philosophy of co-operation but in this particular instance they're co-operating, co-operating to cost jobs and hurt the livelihood, impair the livelihood of innocent, defenseless members of Manitoba's Civil Service. Sure, some of them were political assassinations outright; some of them were vicious political assassinations and they were in the context of — and I quote, I will quote no less an esteemed personage than the man who now occupies the position of First Minister of this province, and would that he were here so that he could . . . I hope and I trust he will respond and rebut what I say, but I doubt it.

During the campaign — and I quote from the March 11th, 1978 edition of the Winnipeg Free Press — he said, "Any person who received a job because he carried an NDP card need fear for his job." Well, I ask you, Sir, I ask you, how does one establish whether someone received a job for that reason? How does one establish who is carrying a NDP card?

A MEMBER: You made files on them.

MR. CORRIN: We don't have access to the Progressive-Conservative membership lists. I think it's safe to presume that members opposite don't have access to our lists.

A MEMBER: Oh yeah? They broke into our building three times.

A MEMBER: How naive do you think we are?

A MEMBER: They broke into our building half a dozen times.

MR. CORRIN: So how will they tell, Mr. Speaker, how will they tell? They've obviously made some decisions, they've made some decisions. I wonder though, I wonder how far it's going to go. Are they going to require people — like during the war I remember some people in some occupied countries had to wear Stars of David on their sleeve. Is that what it's going to come to? Is it going to come to that?

A MEMBER: Be fair.

MR. CORRIN: Are there going to be lie detector tests administered so you can ferret out every one last subversive.

A MEMBER: You'll need a saliva test over there.

MR. CORRIN: What are you going to do? I presume the individual who said that will rise on his feet in his place very soon in order to disprove the theories I'm advancing. I know that we've not yet heard him speak and we're all anticipating with great expectation his remarks.

Well, what do we want in Manitoba? I suppose the ultimate would be the civil servant as ostrich, head buried in the sand, totally unresponsive to the currents of public policy that circulate in the general body politic within society as a whole. Is that what we want? We want a civil servant who is an archetypal vegetable.

A MEMBER: He wants a robot.

MR. CORRIN: And that's the man or woman that we will rely on to give us good judgment. Civil servants can't be like other people, they can't have the same liberties, they can't enjoy the same liberties as other people in the population. No, no. Rather they should be totally unpartisan. They should donate their tax dollars even though they may just drive a — and I say this with respect — they may be in an area where they are not involved in policy formation, in what might be conceived of as a

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

totally unpolitical position, people who work for Highways, in that particular area for instance. But they should not have any perspective, no critical perspective, as to how their tax dollars are spent. Better they should be vegetables. —(Interjection)—

You know you are going to have to clone them. The honourable member, the Minister without Portfolio, says that we are going to clone them in the future. —(Interjection)— Well, you may have to. You may have to clone them in the future because, you know, with the spirit that prevails, the morale that is prevailing today you may not have any. You may have to resort to artificial means, artificial methods, to have recourse and to obtain Civil Service members.

So this is what we are doing for morale and I notice the Member for Swan River has just returned to his seat. —(Interjections)— Oh, excuse me. Well I won't name names and I am not sure, but I know that there is one member opposite who was a member of the Civil Service and took a leave of absence in order to contest an election and he was successful, and I believe he is with us today, the Member for Swan River.

I wonder, Sir, why did he take a leave of absence from the Civil Service? I am advised he took a leave of absence from the Civil Service. Why didn't he resign his position, having taken out a card in a registered political party? Why didn't he resign his position, show the courage of his party's convictions? To save his pension is the response and I believe that to be true, and I for one would uphold that individual member's right to save his pension because he has worked hard and long for it. I don't expect any member of the Civil Service to go about his or her affairs without attaining any sort of critical perspective, without following the political activities of this province.

Now, Sir, we turn to the other side, the other group who will be rendered less articulate, who will be hurt by the recommendations of this so-called impartial Task Force. Those people, Sir, are the economically underprivileged, and what is going to happen to them? Freeze on child care facilities that is what a Social Service Review team has recommended. A freeze on child care facilities, cut of the \$500 subsidy. What is that going to result in? It will result in working mothers on welfare rolls, the closing of facilities, much-needed facilities, and substandard care. They are going to phase out the supplement for the elderly, they are going to save \$2.6 million per year, and what about those senior citizens who are so dependent on that supplement however small it is. And they are, to some of them as a matter of fact it may be the difference between eating three square nutritious meals a day and going without. And if they go without will the members opposite pledge that they will contribute to the higher health costs that are generated by that decision?

One of the supreme ironies, Sir, I noted, was a 50 percent cut in the salaries of the Law Reform Commission. On this point I think that is consistent, I must say, and I wish he were in his seat, the Honourable Member for Osborne, the Attorney-General, I wish he were in his seat, because it is consistent with his entire view towards the interpretation and creation of law. We all remember, Sir, the great show he made, and it was in all the newspapers, it was a great public show with a pronouncement and press releases, about those 12 unfortunate Liberals who had allegedly breached the Election Act. He was going to have his department look into the matter. Twelve Liberal candidates — and he was going to have his department look into the matter. Well, Sir, shortly thereafter it came to light that he also was apparently in breach of the same Act. What did he do? Did he delegate responsibility to members of his department to look into that alleged breach? No, Sir. Not at all, Sir. That alleged breach —(Interjections)— Do you want to know what it was? Receiving money from the Manitoba Hotel Association, the very body which he purports to regulate as Minister responsible for the Liquor Control Commission. A clear breach.

Now I suggest, Sir, that it is a supreme irony that in that particular instance, the latter instance, there is no delegation to the department, the Attorney-General indicates that he will look into his own breach. He and he alone, no one else need look into his breach, but the vast powers of his department are called upon to look into the 12 unfortunate Liberals and ultimately, of course, he was relieved. He received a pardon from the Premier.

During the election, Sir, we were treated to a very catchy piece of music, a jingle, and the words were something to the effect that we wanted to free Manitoba, free Manitoba in a sense *ad nauseam* because the jingle said very little else except free Manitoba. It was very catchy and as members opposite said, the jingle did work, obviously it was good PR, it worked, and other people apparently on this side are incited to make use of such catchy things as well.

But I tell you, Sir, that this is the only thing that was free, nothing else has been free since. Now we are talking about user fees for social and other services. The only things that are free in Manitoba today are free for the taking, boats that are being sold at a very small proportion of their value; companies that may be being sold for a very small proportion of their book value. We will never know because there will never be a full-scale investigation, not as long as this government remains in power. —(Interjection)— I find that ironic because while all the fire sale activity is going on, I can't help but remember and particularly remember members who sat with me on City Council and their support for the Winnipeg Convention Centre, and somehow, you know, it seems to me that the same arguments that were used to support and sustain a public subsidy of that centre were somehow perversely turned about in order to justify the sale of government businesses, particularly those in the tourist area. I find it so strange and I presume, Sir, that during the course of this Throne Speech Debate some of those members will rise and will explain how it came to be that they could on the one hand support public subsidy and on the other hand they decry it, they deplore it. Such an about-face in so few years.

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

Well, Sir, I ask what about the tradition in this province of humane and compassionate concern. We can't afford to rely on private charity in the private sector to help our less fortunate. They do their part. I am not one who will stand and suggest that the private sector does nothing for this province, that would be an absurd position, they do their part. We can't wholly rely on those people to assist those who are dependent on government to make their way easier.

So, Sir, I ask for a little bit of responsive reflection on the part of those members opposite in order that a more compassionate face can be put on this Throne Speech.

Before I conclude, Sir, I feel also that it is incumbent that I mention another thing that has come to my attention and one that I find somewhat ironic and I suppose ultimately humorous. The Minister responsible for the Task Force a short while ago held a press conference and he indicated that the Task Force may give birth to a successor. He indicated that the successor might even be a Sub-Committee of Cabinet and he even had a catchy bit of jargon to describe it. He called it an Organizational Analysis Unit. A rose by any other name, Sir.

So here we have what amounts to, I presume, a rebirth of what was formerly described as the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet, a Sub-Committee of Cabinet that was destroyed in order to accommodate that government's political purge against the NDP, and now we are faced with the situation where a new Sub-Committee of Cabinet is going to be created. A new bureaucracy, I presume, is going to be created to fight a bureaucracy. And I ask, Sir, who is going to staff the new bureaucracy? Could it be possible, Sir, that members opposite already have identified members of their party for staffing purposes? Is that possible, Sir? I suggest, Sir, that there may well be one job office in Manitoba that is very active in the next few months, and that will be the Conservative Party's job office. They will most certainly, and I suggest respectfully, they will most certainly assure those members of the Task Force, former employees of Great West Life, of tenure, of assured tenure during their reign as government of Manitoba and I use that word "reign" advisedly because that is what it has been.

So, Sir, I suggest that nothing is new. There is nothing substantive in this Throne Speech. There is nothing in that Throne Speech for the average person in this province. It is a negative, cynical statement and it is unfortunately being propagated, that statement is being propagated at a time when there was a need for inspired thought; when there was a need for bold new initiatives. But there is nothing new, nothing new whatsoever. It is the same old dogmatic rhetoric. It is hide-bound dogmatic rhetoric and it is not even bound in contemporary Progressive Conservative philosophy. It is bound in something that I haven't seen the like of in my lifetime, that I read about in text books while at the University, and I am ashamed to be a part of it.

But, Sir, I will fight it. It is my duty and the duty of members on this side of the House to fight it because we can't let, in these times, a war be waged on the heads of those who cannot fight back. We will stand in our places and we will do our duty, and we will fight for those who cannot fight for themselves. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as a newcomer in this House I would also like to compliment you and the Deputy Speaker on your appointments. Contrary to the insinuation from the members opposite, I feel great confidence in your ability to handle the demanding position that you hold. To date you have proven this to the House. I would also like to compliment the members opposite on their adjustment to the role of opposition and it appears even to my inexperienced self that the ease with which they have changed, that the role of opposition is much more within their ability than it is to govern.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the Throne Speech I would like to express my confidence in the proposals set forth by this government. These proposals are planned in such a way as to remove government interference and involvement in the public sector, and this is in keeping with the wishes of the majority of the people of Manitoba.

In keeping with the latitude that is allowed in the Throne Speech Debate I would like to take this opportunity, as the members in the past from the constituency of Emerson have in presenting views, and draw to the attention of the assembly here the political, geographical and economic situation in the constituency of Emerson.

Firstly, the political background. The riding of Emerson has changed representatives four times in the last four elections. I would like to at this time take the opportunity to thank the representatives preceding myself for the efforts that they have made on behalf of the constituency of Emerson. The fact that we have had four different representatives in the last four elections representing three different parties, is very significant and indicates that there is definitely a lack of something in the area. I will cover some of the reasons for this a little later.

Geographically, the constituency of Emerson consists of approximately 3,000 square miles, 120 miles long by approximately 30 miles wide. What makes it unique, is its very interesting borders that it has. To the west, we have the Red River, the famous Red River, to the north for the major portion of the constituency, we have a natural forest belt. To the east we have the Lake of the Woods and the Ontario border. To the south, and I think this is very significant, we have approximately 120 miles which borders the United States. Now it is in this area, we have in terms of natural resources three major lakes, all virtually undeveloped in terms of tourism. We also have in the eastern part the forest reserves, a virtual outdoor playground, again virtually undeveloped. The balance of our natural resources, I suppose, is that we have people, basically all dependent on agriculture. The

constituency is served by approximately 33 smaller service communities, the village of St. Pierre being the biggest one we have.

In having given the members here a brief area summary, I would like to get into the area of economics within the boundaries. We have to the south, along the border, four major ports of entry. Instead of being a tourist haven ready to help relieve the Americans of their tourist dollar we offer nothing. Instead the previous government saw fit to build Hecla Island and to involve themselves in private business. What has happened though, in the southeast corner is, that the people take our Canadian dollars across the line, not just tourist dollars, but they go there for their basic daily requirements including medical and dental needs.

The forest industry which comprises a portion of our constituency is gradually being deleted and helps only to sustain a floundering agricultural industry by people working in the timber industry to supplement their meagre farm incomes.

And now for Agriculture. The western part of the constituency is more viable, having better soil types and being more diversified. However, the biggest geographical portion of the constituency has been floundering around in the beef industry. Yes Mr. Speaker, I mean floundering and I want to state some facts. In the LGB of Stuartburn 50 percent of the land is either LGB vested land or Crown land. In the LGB of Piney, 80 percent of the land is either LGB vested land or Crown land and a very startling fact is, the annual gross income for 80 percent of the farmers in these two areas averages less than \$5,000 gross profit per year and we have statistics to prove that. I could relay more dramatic statistics but I won't at this time. What puzzles me though is, that the members opposite, the supposed champions of the underdog, have never lifted a finger to check into this. Maybe it is just as well, because what is happening right now, is that the people themselves, have given up on government and are organizing themselves and are working out programs which they are presenting to the government right now. Well thought out programs coming from the people themselves instead of being sent out by some unqualified consultants who tell them what they need. Our former Minister of Agriculture was famous for this. Never ask, always tell them what they need. And I might add, Mr. Speaker, at this time, that the people have confidence in this government and they have confidence that they will be heard.

Another startling statistic that I would like to mention here is, in the Consolidated School District of Sprague we have an average mill rate for the business sector of over 200. That in itself is a detriment for anybody wishing to establish a business in that area and makes it very difficult for existing businesses.

In summarization, Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say to the Assembly here today, is that we have problems in the constituency of Emerson. I cannot speak of the land of milk and honey as a former member L. A. Barkman, a long time member for Carillon and La Verendrye stated years ago.

I would like to actually speak more positively about the situation in Emerson but I can't. However the reaction that I have received from my constituents to date is positive. They have indicated their appreciation about our government action to date, and the fact that a government is prepared to listen to the needs of the people instead of telling them, which is the reason why the members opposite are sitting in opposition instead of in government - they refused to listen.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am optimistic and confident that after four years of this government that the depressed situation in my constituency will have greatly improved. Mr. Speaker it was not my intention to chastise the members opposite, but after hearing the abuse and criticism heaped on our present government in the early sessions after only a few months in office, I would be remiss if I did not draw some of their shortcomings to the Assembly's mind.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to the bungling efforts in the beef industry by the then Minister of Agriculture. The land buying programs which benefited only a few at best, at the expense of the public. The mineral acreage tax, now removed, the inadequate municipal planning program, the inadequate road programs. I could go on and on. I feel strongly, Mr. Speaker, that a program will be worked out with the people regarding sale of Crown land in an orderly manner and credit programs will be worked out for the people living beyond the escarpment, not just for the people living in the better soil areas. Resulting from this we will gradually have an upsurge of farm income, jobs and opportunities for young farmers, more viable service businesses. Mr. Speaker, we are looking forward to the development of what we now, and I hope the rest of this House will refer to as the new agricultural frontier in Emerson.

The Honourable Leader of Opposition kept making reference to the chickens coming home to roost. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the activity to date, by this government, is called coming home to roost, I hope they keep on coming.

Mr. Speaker, I close by once again endorsing the Throne Speech and I would like to say I am looking forward with confidence to the next twelve years with this government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: I wonder if we could call it :30, Mr. Speaker, and I could pick up the debate at eight o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: There has been a suggestion that we call it 5:30. Is that agreed? (Agreed) Therefore I am leaving the Chair to return at eight o'clock tonight.