

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Monday, March 27, 1978

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table three reports: The Annual Report for the Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management for the year ending March 31st, 1977; the Annual Report of the Resource Conservation Commission for the year ending December 31st, 1976; the Annual Report of the Watershed Conservation District of Manitoba, year ending December 31st, 1976.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAR: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health. I would like to give the Minister of Health the opportunity to confirm or deny the admittedly speculative reports in the press that within a period of approximately eight months or so there would likely be in the order of approaching 1,000 personnel in the hospital and health services field laid off.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I can, of course, confirm only that, like the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, I saw those stories in the press. As for the speculation, I would describe it precisely as that. It was a reaction on the part of administrations relative to individual health facilities in the province to the limited increase in budget which is being permitted this year under the Health Services Commission and I am confident that when those administrations start to work on their budgets from the global budgeting point of view, which they are going to be permitted to do, that there will be ample latitude for making the allocations necessary so that there need be no significant reduction in hospital staff.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, may I then ask the Minister of Health, just so there is no misunderstanding, whether he is confirming that it is his considered judgment, on the basis of the projected budgetary financing of health care services by the province and through the existing hospitals related health care facilities in the province, that there will be sufficient budgetary basis for the retention of the health care personnel in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (BUD) SHERMAN(Fort Garry): Sir, I would like to assure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that I and my colleagues in government are deeply concerned that health care quality be maintained, health care service be maintained and that employment be maintained. As a consequence I will be making every effort to ensure that those three objectives are achieved. At the present time, the instruction on the amount of support has gone out to the facilities, but they have not really had a chance to sit down and examine their own budgets from the new autonomous point of view. Certainly officials of my department and I myself will be available to work with them on that. I will make every effort to ensure that there will be no reduction in employment. I would welcome the assistance of the opposition in this Legislature in achieving that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, help is difficult to be forthcoming when there is distortion about the basic facts as to where we are at with respect to staffing in the public service and the related health care facilities. But, Mr. Speaker, quite apart from that aside by the Minister of Health, may I ask the Minister of Tourism and Recreation now, having had some several days, whether he can indicate whether he has a report for this Legislature with respect to the status of that rather peculiar agreement that isn't an agreement, or might have been, or wasn't.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of Tourism.

HON. ROBERT (BOB) BANMAN (La Verendrye): No, Mr. Speaker, not today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable First Minister. Mr. Speaker, I refer to the Winnipeg Free Press story on Saturday, March 25th, headlined "New Breeding Method May Revolutionize Cattle Industry." I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether we can foresee from this method that the Conservative Party is about to be made obsolete.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, far from being made obsolete, the Conservative Party, as was demonstrated to my honourable friend in terms that he will never forget, by 49 percent of the people, were told last October 11th to do exactly what we are doing now in all respects of government.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the article about breeding. If the honourable member wishes to stay away from it, I don't blame him.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, responsible also for the Environmental Management. I would like to ask the Minister whether or not there has been a change of policy, whereby the Clean Environment Commission has no responsibility with regard to site location, and that once a site is located by an appropriate authority, namely a municipality or provincial authority, that the Clean Environment Commission's sole jurisdiction is saying what are the best environmental practices which are required given the acceptance of the site over which they have no control. Has that policy changed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the honourable member is referring to precisely, but I can assure him that there have not been any changes in policy in regard to the operation of the Clean Environment Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker' I wonder if the Minister could advise the House, and, including by the House, the Minister of Tourism, that once a condominium is permitted by the authorities to establish itself that the Clean Environment Commission has no jurisdiction to stop it, merely to indicate what are the environmental practices which they must follow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask a question of the Minister of Health. Can he explain the apparent discrepancy in the kind of wage and salary settlements, or package settlements, offered to staff in our hospitals at 2.9 percent and the 6.88 percent offered to doctors some two and a half times.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the 2.9 percent, nearly 3 percent increase in the hospital budgets this year is accompanied by the virtual unencumbered right to administer their own budgetary decisions, to operate with autonomy in a global budgeting sense. Those boards, those administrations, will make their own settlements with the staff employees who work in those facilities. The Department of Health and Social Development has no control over that.

As far as the discussions with the medical profession are concerned and the MMA the responsibility for determining the fee schedule, physicians' fee schedule under the Manitoba Health Services Commission is the responsibility of this department and therefore we do have to strike a figure around which to hold discussions.

MR. DOERN: Well, again, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the Minister not agree that he has in effect offered over two and a half times the amount of money available for staff in one end of the health field compared to another?

MR. SHERMAN: Well I don't see how I could be expected to agree to that, Mr. Speaker, on a global budgeting basis. The institutions will have their allotments in front of them. They will then make the determination as to how much they can afford to bargain with in terms of wages with their staff. That's not determined, or determinable, by the Department of Health and Social Development.

I would also suggest that in terms of the discussions with the MMA, we are looking at a situation

Monday, March 27, 1978

there that called for a change in the basis on which the schedule was established to the fiscal year from the calendar year, so that, measured in terms of the calendar year increase, it would be substantially less than the 6.88 that the honourable member is referring to.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, another supplementary. Will the Minister assure the House, now, that in terms of the staff patient ratio that all health standards will be met in our hospitals as well as all safety and security measures, that there will not be any falling off beneath that minimum?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, it will be my job obviously to attempt to achieve the three objectives that I cited a few moments ago in response to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. If I fail to achieve those objectives I daresay I'll hear about it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, given the considerable publicity about Civil Service actions and Civil Service size in this province, may I ask the Minister reporting for the Civil Service Commission, may I ask the Honourable Lady if she would undertake to table in this House at her earliest convenience, either Province of Manitoba documentation or Statistics Canada documentation to show the present size, and the size a year ago, of the Public Service of the Province of Manitoba, both in our own context and with respect to all other provinces in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Yes, I will take that as an Order for Return. And while I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer to the Leader of the Opposition with regard to his question whether the Independent Medical Review Team is active with the Workers Compensation: it is under Dr. Hollenberg and also the Advocate for the Compensation is active and functioning.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I take it that the latter gentleman is one Mr. Hugh Jamieson. May I ask the Honourable Minister reporting for the Workers Compensation Board whether this entity, these two entities really, have been operational for a period of three months or six months?

MRS. PRICE: They have been operational as long as we have been in power, Sir. Bill Blankenship is working as an Advocate as well as Mr. Jamieson.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs. Since the Minister was able to do such a good job in having the Inter-Universities' program partially reinstated, I wonder whether he might be able to influence the other programs such as the FOCUS program and the Northern Affairs Extension program to see if they might be partially reinstated, or whether he agrees with these reductions and will not influence the change in those programs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I think the Member is aware that these will be coming down in Estimates and I can assure him that any programs or any deletions in Estimates, I will be prepared to discuss with you, as I'm sure you will question me on; also any additions that you may wish to question during Estimates, I'll be prepared to discuss them with you too.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if he might be able to tell us if, in his discussions with the Grants Commission or Mr. Condo, whether he received any more information in terms of what partial restoration of the Inter-Universities North program means? How much is partial restoration?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, that itself will be detailed to you if you wish, within I think three or four days.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister will confirm that he used his influence as a Minister of the Crown on the Universities Grants Commission?

MR. MacMASTER: Absolutely not. I think I just voiced my opinion the same as a lot of other people in Northern Manitoba, I would think including the Member from The Pas.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker' my question is directed to the Attorney-General. Would the Attorney-General confirm that he has received the summary of Task Force Recommendations on Legal Aid?

Monday, March 27, 1978

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I received a copy of a working paper.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Would he advise as to whether or not he has instructed Crown counsel to report through the Director of Prosecutions as to cases undertaken by Legal Aid counsel where it is considered that there is a lack of meritorious defence?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, could the Attorney-General advise the House in view of the announcement of the fact that no further funds are available for the University Legal Aid Clinic, and since it is wholly financed through the Federal Government, when his Department attempted to obtain funding from the Federal Government to renew the work of this clinic and whether in fact they have received a negative response from the Federal Government pertaining to same?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, that matter is under review.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Tourism. I would like to know if he has requested the Attorney-General's office and department to advise him how much it will cost the government to be released from its obligations under the Development Agreement for Condominiums which he instructed his Deputy Minister to sign?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't asked for that type of material.

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

MR. BOSTROM: I would like to ask a question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Renewable Resources.

I would like to know if he is promoting or intends to promote the opting-out of selected group of fishermen from the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation — for example, the group from Gimli who met with him recently and I believe have had made this request of him?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I am not advocating any particular group; I am not advocating that Manitoba as a whole get out in any way, shape or form. I sit in this House and I repeat that my efforts are to trying directed to trying to make the FFMC work — it means some restructuring in my belief and I think probably in his belief too.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the same Minister if he and his government are considering increasing individual fishermen's quotas on Lake Winnipeg, and/or eliminating the quotas altogether in an attempt to allow unlimited fishing effort on Lake Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, if I can answer the second one first, as far as eliminating all quotas on lakes throughout Manitoba — that's just nonsense. —(Interjection)— As far as looking at the industry as a whole, yes we are reviewing the entire industry throughout Manitoba.

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

MR. BOSTROM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like a more specific answer to the question with respect to individual fishing quotas on Lake Winnipeg. Will he be in effect eliminating those individual quotas and/or increasing them without the advice to do so from the biologist in his department?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess I'll take a couple of minutes to answer the question; he wants a more specific one. I've attempted to establish, and in fact I am establishing, throughout Manitoba from the north to the south, consultation with fishermen on all particular lakes. I am working with them along with the biologists. I feel that there has to be a lot more discussion between both bodies, government bodies and the fishermen, and I don't say that was lacking in the past but I want to see evidence of it. As far as quotas being reviewed, yes, quotas are being reviewed and we will continue to review them in conjunction with the fishermen and with the biologists.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Minister is now indicating that there will be a consultative process followed with the fishermen, may I ask the Minister reporting whether it is not a fact that there has always been one and usually two different organizations of fishermen which have not only been consulted with but assisted in a modest, admittedly modest, way but assisted nevertheless, for their continued operation as a federation of fishermen. Given that, and given the fact that there has been input and advice with respect to quota establishments, may I ask the Minister, what else is new? What else is new under the sun?

A MEMBER: Nothing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Education. Can he confirm that the province is discontinuing its support for the food program in the core city schools?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, that topic will come up when we go over the Estimates.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, is that program now being phased out as far as the province is concerned?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, again in answer, this will come up when we go over the Estimates.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the Estimates will be from April 1st on. The food program for children in the city schools depends upon the flow of money after April 1st. I repeat, is the Minister simply going to hide behind the Estimates to publicly state now whether or not the province is going to deprive needy children of food in the schools?

MR. COSENS: As far as the program is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I am sure provision has been made for these children who are of concern to the member.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could clarify that statement that provision has been made? Could he tell me by whom that provision is being made?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Is the Minister in the process of reducing staff at the Brandon Mental Health Centre in line with his announcement last fall in this Legislative Assembly?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, the hiring freeze that the honourable member knows about is in effect in the public service but the safety requirements in terms both of the fire code and in terms of care of the patient population are being met at that institution.

MR. EVANS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Last fall, we were given to understand that through the process of attrition over 1,000 term positions were potentially going to be eliminated at the three mental institutions. So I would like to ask the Minister a clarification question. Is he telling the House now that there will not be any reduction in term employees, whether they be treatment or non-treatment, at these mental institutions?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the figure used last fall was 100, not 1,000. There were . . .

A MEMBER: Oh, well, what's a factor of ten?

MR. SHERMAN: . . . No, it was 100, out of 1,100 positions it was to be reduced to the level of 1,000 through attrition and through maintenance of vacancy rates existing at that time across the spectrum of the three institutions. That called for certain floors to be established at those three institutions. As the member knows, there has been a special consideration given to the Portage School. The floors are still in existence at Selkirk and Brandon and the staffing level has not been permitted to fall below those floors. Those floors enable us to maintain patients' safety.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the Minister's comment on maintenance of floors but can he advise the House whether term staff will be laid off in the ensuing months?

MR. SHERMAN: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. I have spoken to my department officials responsible for monitoring the situation at the particular institution to which the member refers in the very recent past and my assurance is that the staff levels that are required to maintain service are being maintained and there is no intention to reduce them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Sir, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs. Mr. Speaker, can the honourable gentleman tell us how the provincial government will discharge its exclusive responsibility for the funding of Assiniboine Park and specifically, is it possible for the Minister to tell us whether or not last year's level of maintenance and service will be retained?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, our government has announced to the City the provision we have made in the Estimates for Assiniboine Park and Zoo. As he also knows, His Worship, the Mayor, has written to me indicating some concern over that amount and that is currently under review.

MR. CORRIN: Will the Honourable Minister give his assurance that his government will not impose user fees on any of the park facilities?

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he can indicate to the House if the Province of Manitoba, through his department, is going to enter into a new rural development agreement with the Government of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, we will be negotiating with the Federal Government in that area.

MR. USKIW: Yes, then can I take it that the report in today's Tribune is incorrect, that the decision has already been made not to enter a new agreement?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, at this time I haven't been informed of the information that's in the newspaper but we will be, as I said, negotiating with the Federal Government on an agreement.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. Johns): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable First Minister and the Minister of Agriculture, I believe, both took as notice questions asked by the Honourable Member for Selkirk about the employment or the use of David A. Young as a consultant to the . . . or advisor to the Provincial Progressive Conservative Government.

They've not yet given the response. So may I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him to explain how it is that his department in advertising a Practical Politics Seminar of the Agricultural Extension Centre in Brandon, did indicate that one of the participants would be a person who would speak on policy determination at the provincial level, a person named David Young, private consultant and policy adviser to the Provincial Progressive Conservative Government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think the information that I have available to me at this time, that Mr. Young did participate in a seminar; however, I would also like to bring to the attention of this Chamber that there was also one John Bucklaschuk that happened to work at one time for policy of one government, that was also at that same seminar.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure how I can ask a supplementary question to a question that has not been answered. Well, I think I have the answer too, Mr. Speaker. However, I am not entitled to answer questions so I will ask the question. I will direct it to the Honourable First Minister, who I believe is still the head of the Provincial Progressive Conservative Party, how it is that the Department of Agriculture, which is part of the government headed by the Honourable First Minister, could label Dave Young as Policy Adviser to the Provincial Progressive Conservative Government? That's the answer I'd like to hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for St. Johns want to ask another question, or rephrase that one?

MR. CHERNIACK: A supplementary to the question which has not yet been answered by the Minister of Agriculture. Could he then reconcile for the people of Manitoba, who must be concerned with the operations of his department, how it is that the Department of Agriculture labels Dave Youngs Policy Adviser to the Provincial Progressive Conservative Government and at the same time Mr. Dave Young, according to the newspaper report, states that he was embarrassed, and I don't wonder that he was embarrassed, by the billing that he was given as Policy Adviser to the Provincial Progressive Conservative Government. But now I'm glad the Honourable First Minister is listening, maybe he'll answer the question, how he reconciles the fact that a private consultant claims to be embarrassed by the fact that his Department of Agriculture has labelled Mr. Young as a Policy Adviser to the Provincial Progressive Conservative Government. Would the Honourable First Minister care to clarify his government's association with this elusive Dave Young, the embarrassed Dave Young? Now we've heard the question.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear a question, I heard some unctuous comments from my honourable friend, which is what I expect from him. But Mr. Speaker, at the behest of the Member for Selkirk, I took as notice the question as to whether or not Mr. Young was employed directly or indirectly in any capacity. A canvass has gone out among the departments; when that canvass has been returned, because of my honourable friend's terribly great concern about Mr. Young, who is a private citizen, I will be happy to answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns has had three questions. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. The City of Winnipeg will be discussing its budget this week. Can the Minister advise the House whether in fact the City of Winnipeg will be faced with a reduction of support for the transit system below that that is available under the former government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: The answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MILLER: Is the Minister saying that the Province is prepared to share the deficit of the transit 50-50 with the City of Winnipeg, and has the City been advised of that? Has the City been advised of that? They are dealing with it this week.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks knows very well what the response of our government was to the City in terms of our grant towards the Transit System; it is exactly the same as last year. The Province has agreed to continue the 50-50 sharing up to a maximum amount of \$8.4, \$8.5 million.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, just for clarification so that I will know and the people of Winnipeg and Council will know that the so-called maintaining the level has a ceiling on it, which in fact does not represent 50 percent of the anticipated deficit, and does the Minister recognize that this will force the City to increase fares by 40 percent and even 50 percent for pensioners and students?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no, the City was given a great deal of latitude in dealing with the special transit projects by being put in a position to transfer those monies to the General Transit Deficit, and in fact the 8.4 or 8.5 million is an amount which is estimated to be the amount of the deficit, an amount substantially over the deficit, even if the City decides to impose a transit fare increase.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for Northern Affairs. Can the Honourable Minister indicate to this House the present status of the Packwagon Operation in Wabowden?

Monday, March 27, 1978

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: A supplementary, then. Can the Minister indicate, in that case, if employees at the Packwagon Operation have been served with layoff notices?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, they have. We are in the midst of attempting to get a market for the product. If you have really looked, and I'm sure you have, you will know that there is just absolutely no market for the particular product that they are producing, and our staff has been working for the last three, possibly four weeks, endeavouring to get a market. I suppose I can enlarge on that. You know that there were — I'm guessing, but I think I'm close 51 or 52 cottage lots picked up at the Setting Lake area, and we are hoping that through a bit of a promotion in the Thompson area of the people that pick them up, that there might be those that would be interested in log cottages, and if we can get some of those orders going, we'll get that thing back in shape.

MR. COWAN: Well perhaps then, would the Minister please use his considerable political influence to create those markets.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to direct a question to the Attorney-General and ask him whether we can assume because of the conviction of a minor hockey player last week, that this is a sign of his determination to clean up hockey at all levels?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, that question gives me an opportunity to refer to a matter that has been publicized in the newspaper, the question of whether or not any criminal charges would be laid as a result of the March 12, 1978 hockey game between the Winnipeg Jets and the Birmingham Bulls; that matter is being thoroughly reviewed by my department and they have recommended that no criminal charges be authorized. That arises out of a number of matters, including the fact that no injury was sustained by Mr. Hull, and Mr. Hull has requested that no proceedings take place. I think, however, Mr. Speaker, that the department has in the past and will continue where warranted to lay criminal charges where criminal acts take place during any type of sporting event.

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister inform the House as to whether any other cases are being reviewed or under consideration by the department at this time?

MR. MERCIER: There are to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, no additional cases under review at the present time by the department.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. Would the Minister comment on the statement by Mr. Brodsky who apparently claimed that from now on there will not be referees making these decisions but policemen.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Health and Welfare, whatever his title is, I forget, Health and Social Development. I wonder if he could give me some indication of what is the fate of the courthouse and jail at The Pas, which was required to replace the fire trap facility that they had there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, that subject has been under review during the estimates process. I would ask my honourable friend to be patient. The estimates will be coming down shortly and the decision will be made known at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe I could ask a question to the First Minister or to that Minister whether or not, in fact, a letter to the Chamber of Commerce at The Pas has indicated that that facility has been postponed, and would it be the policy of this government to make all their announcements through the Chamber of Commerce rather than through the proper authorities, to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for The Pas want to re-phrase his question?

MR. McBRYDE: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the Chamber of Commerce does

Monday, March 27, 1978

have this letter, I wonder if the member could indicate what this does to an agreement the province has with the town of The Pas to allow temporary trailer facilities at The Pas, and that permit was conditional upon construction starting on a new jail. What will happen to that agreement now that they are not proceeding with the jail?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood and the amendment moved by the Honourable Member of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for Elmwood. Point of order.

MR. DOERN: I assume that even though the question period has a finite time, if a question is asked, that you would allow that Minister to respond to a member of this House who has put a question within the proper time frame.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well, if the Minister wants to respond to the question I will allow some time for it. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact I was getting up for clarification as to whether the honourable member was putting the question to me or to my leader. He addressed it to the Honourable the First Minister and/or to me. My answer would have to be the same as my answer to his earlier question that that subject was examined very carefully in the estimates process and we would ask the honourable member to wait for full discussion of it during examination of estimates.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood and the amendment thereto moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation.

THE HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like first of all, Mr. Speaker, to take the opportunity to congratulate you on your position as Speaker of this House. I did not participate in the Throne Speech Debate in the mini Session and did not have the opportunity at that time to congratulate you so, a little belated, congratulations, but they are there, and I'm sure that you will do an excellent job as you have been showing in the House so far.

There's no question that there are from time to time, Mr. Speaker, occasions when the members of the House do not make your job easy, and I'm sure that you're capable of handling that as you have been capable of handling all other jobs that you have undertaken in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a comment regarding the mover and the seconder. I think they did excellent jobs in their speeches regarding the Throne Speech, and their moving and seconding of the Speech I think was well done and very appropriate. On that particular point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention something about my constituency. My constituency has civic centers, it has parks, it has all of the things that the Member for Portage la Prairie mentioned, but I'll tell you they got there out of straight free enterprise in St. James-Assiniboia. And I'll tell you also that if the members on the opposite side of the House, including the Leader of the Opposition, is indicating that it was the government that built Portage la Prairie, or any other small community within this province, he is insulting them, because it was done by their hard work long before the NDP Government was ever in power.

Mr. Speaker, I . . . —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is — I thought I would take advantage of it while the honourable member was pausing for a drink of water — my point of privilege is simply that if the honourable member will peruse my speech he will find absolutely no suggestion, as he is now implying, that I intimated that it was because of the particular government of 1969-77; I was indicating rather that it was because of governments in a generic sense, there's a difference.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I accept the Leader of the Opposition's statement. I can only say that he protests too much. I only took an interpretation from his words and I still say that the people of Manitoba in the rural areas are from hardy stock and got where they are today without having government help.

Mr. Speaker, I would comment on the speeches of a couple of the honourable members opposite. I would say that the Member from Elmwood, who is probably the member on the other side of the House who created most of the reasons why they are sitting there now —(Interjection)— is doing a lot of talking, and the way he talks he will keep you there. I think he should really, really, really settle down, put a muzzle on him. He doesn't know what he's talking about the better part of the time, Mr. Speaker, and he is the main reason why they're on the other side of the House. There's three or four other Ministers there too.

Well, I only said the members of the Opposition who caused the problem. — (Interjection) — There's three or four others — I'll let them just sit with their own conscience, and they'll have to work it out themselves, but they're there — they're there, and there's no question about that.

And after I've made that comment, I would say in a very serious vein, after reading Page 118 of Hansard where I read reference to Hitler, Buchenwald, Fascism, I would hope that the members of this House would stand up and as a body, as a group in this House, request that that be stricken from the record. It is an absolutely disgust — it's disappointing to have to read that type of comment being made in this Legislature, and the member should consider where he is when he starts making statements like that.

A MEMBER: Here, here!

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I can only say that . . . I'm sorry the member isn't here, I haven't got time to go back during my remarks, but I can only refer to my deceased colleague, Earl McKellar, who was the member from Souris-Killarney. I can remember him one day standing up in this House, referring to Mr. Asper who was then the Leader of the Liberal Party, and he said, "Young fella', I've seen a lot of guys talk themselves into this House, and I've seen a lot of guys talk themselves out of it, and you are in that position." And I think the Member for Wellington is well on his way to being in that position.

Mr. Speaker, after all those few remarks I wish you all a Happy Easter. I hope you had a wonderful weekend, but by the same token, I still say to you that you deserve a bawling out, you deserve to be absolutely ashamed of the way you left the province. It's almost the same as when a man goes away to the wars and leaves his business with somebody to take care of and when he comes back it is broke. It is broke . . .

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SCHREYER: I am not going to waste time with my honourable friend, I'm making a very succinct point of privilege.

My honourable friends have been getting away with this for too long. Let me say, in a way that they can challenge if they wish, that if they say once more that we left this province with a greater number or a greater series of successive budgetary deficits and an oversize civil service, they are liars, liars — all of them.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. SCHREYER: And I don't back down from that — (Interjection) — and I'm not backing away from that statement, so let them challenge me if they wish. My point of privilege is — and here is the point of privilege — that my honourable friend's statement about the province being broke or that its budgetary deficits were even as great let alone greater than that of most sister provinces, or that our province's civil service was oversize, they are liars, Sir, liars — there is no other word for it. And I throw that back in their teeth.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I again say the Honourable First Minister seems to protest too greatly. I said it was like a man coming home from the wars and finding out that his business was broke, and I make the same reference.

A MEMBER: You are liars.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Has the Honourable Leader of the Opposition a point of privilege he wishes to raise, or a point of order?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, I've raised it, Sir. My point of privilege is that the successive years in which we were the government of this province that we did not have as great a series of successive budgetary deficits as at least most other provinces in Canada, and our civil service, Sir, is smaller than most provinces in Canada. When they say the contrary, I say they are liars, Sir. That's my point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways. **8HON. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, a parliamentarian of some standing and of some experience, knows full-well that to deliberately hurl the accusation of liars, individually and collectively to thirty-three honourable members on this side of the House is unparliamentary, and is not called for and is not tolerated in this Chamber. What he is doing is exercising, in the acceptable art of debate, and challenging positions put forward by this side of the House, positions that he doesn't happen to hold with. It is quite in order to enter into that debate, but it is not in order — and the Leader of the Opposition is fully aware of that fact, and if he wants to bring at this stage the level of debate into that level, then let it be clearly identified on the record that the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to

disregard the rules of this Legislature; is prepared to disregard the admonition that you give to us when every session starts and wants the debate to be carried on in that fashion.

Mr. Speaker, we are quite prepared to accommodate him, but you, Sir, have the responsibility of the decorum of this House, and you, Sir, are letting him stand up in this Chamber and deliberately antagonize you and deliberately antagonize this House by making unparliamentary references to honourable members in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, further to the point of privilege and the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside. I say, Sir, that I most emphatically do not want to make the task difficult for you.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside is correct however. This is twenty years of parliamentary involvement for me, and I think I know a little bit about the rules and the spirit of the rules in parliamentary procedure, and I repeat, Sir, so that the task is easier for you, that I serve notice — I have already, I'll repeat it — that any individual member who contends that Manitoba's fiscal position during the eight years we were in government was somehow deleterious in relation to the rest of Canada, I will hurl the challenge that they are liars, because we have documentary proof to the contrary and here it is: All provinces in Canada . . . And with respect to the size of the civil service, I serve notice that I shall accuse honourable member, whoever it may be, of being a liar, who suggests that the Manitoba Civil Service was oversize in relation to the rest of the country, because, Sir, it was below average in size. That's my challenge.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of privilege.

HON. WARNER JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I will leave it to you whether or not you consider the remarks of the honourable member are . . . outside the rules of this Chamber. I don't intend to insist that he withdraw. If he wants debate to sink to his level, that's fine, they can do that on that side of the House — it's not going to sink to that level on this side of the House.

What the member is suggesting is that we have to use his standards of measurement in everything. Well, Sir, everybody in this Chamber can use their own standards of measurement, they can use their own means of debate, they can interpret figures the way they choose. Simply because they do not agree with the honourable members opposite does not mean that they're false. But that is what the honourable member is attempting to suggest. It is not true at all, Sir, and as far as I am concerned he can call us all the names that he wants, but I'll leave it to you, Sir, to determine whether or not that remark is parliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER: I have listened to the advice that I have received from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the advice I have received from the other side of the House, and I have to say that the differences of opinion that exist within this Chamber are proper subjects for debate. That is why we have the parliamentary system. It is very seldom that you have complete agreement.

Whether it is a question of which set of figures is the correct set of figures or not, I think is immaterial and on that basis I have to suggest that the point of privilege of the Leader of the Opposition was not in effect a point of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I will be very brief.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes. My point of order is that what is involved here with respect to such all important information as size of civil service is not a matter of interpretation of figures. I am not using my own figures, my honourable friends may like to do that, but I don't. I am using Statistics Canada figures and therefore it is not a matter of interpretation as to whose figures are more correct. There is only one statistical agency in Canada, Sir, Statistics Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): That was not the point of order that was raised. That is not the question of privilege that was raised. It's whether or not my honourable friend has the right to stand up in this House and deliberately flout the rules of this House as he has just done. It's a question of whether or not the honourable member is going to be asked to withdraw. That decision, Sir, is up to you. We are not going to insist upon it because we know from whence it comes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: The matter of withdrawal, Sir, was not raised. I indicated that in the light of Statistics Canada documentation and material, that anyone who knowingly persists in using material which is at variance with Statistics Canada obviously. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I want to point out to the Leader of the Opposition that I was listening to the debate very closely and in my recollection, there was no mention of statistics made at all. The Honourable Minister. . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, we are to assume then, that you are not going to ask the honourable member to withdraw that unparliamentary remark he made and that remark will stay on the record, that it is now free for everybody in this Chamber to use that same kind of language in referring to other honourable gentlemen in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Schreyer.

MR. SCHREYER: I serve notice that with respect to contentions, with respect to the province being broke, that is how the matter arose, which is a wild exaggeration if there was ever one, that with respect to that and the size of the public service in Manitoba, I serve notice to you, Sir, as to what my intentions would be. I have no intention of withdrawing that notice because that would be quite incorrect.—(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please! The Honourable Government House Leader. Point of Order?

MR. JORGENSEN: Again the First Minister weasles as he has a habit of weasling. That isn't the original charge in this Chamber. What we have suggested, Sir, is that the honourable member has no right to use language that is unparliamentary. That is all we are suggesting, Sir, is that you either ask him. . . I am going to leave it up to you, but if that comment is allowed to stay on the record, that means that it's free for anybody and debate can deteriorate in this Chamber. And if you want it to deteriorate, that's fine, but I would tell my honourable friend it is not going to sink to the level that he wants it to sink to, not as far as. . .

MR. SCHREYER: I believe Hansard will show what was said; what wasn't said.

MR. JORGENSEN: You called the member a liar.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. It is my opinion that the Leader of the Opposition served notice that he would use those terms if figures were constantly thrown out at the time that he made that, it was not directed to any particular member of the House. All he did was serve notice. Now if I am incorrect I will reserve judgment and review the text of the Hansard as it appears tomorrow. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): I perhaps would wrap up this little debate if I should now also serve notice on behalf of the government members that when the First Minister begins calling us liars individually or collectively, as he has served notice he intends to do, that we then will claim the privileges of this House that that kind of language cannot be used.—(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: I was merely saying, Mr. Speaker, to that point of order raised, that your interpretation is quite correct and I believe Hansard tomorrow will demonstrate that to be so. This has been raised in the context of a remark. Honourable friends can call it interpretation if that gives them any comfort. This province is broke, to which I replied nonsense, if we are here, so are most provinces in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. I also want to point out before the Minister carries on that his time will be adjusted accordingly.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely aghast. The Honourable Member from Wellington came over and said to me that I had mentioned his name while he was out of the House, and he may have a point of privilege. I will tell him quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, that I said that he might talk his way out of this House, and also said, will you go away and not bother me, I am speaking. Thank you.—(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington on a point of privilege.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN(Wellington): As the Honourable Minister knows, I am a new member in this House; I have come to this Assembly in the last election. I am presumably not as conversant with the rules as he would be expected to be, being a member of some long standing. And it is true, Mr. Speaker, I did venture forward to that other side of the House, as he would see it, to enemy territory, and I did ask him if he spoke ill of me while I was absent. I was absent for two or three minutes and I had been advised that my name had been mentioned, it was true that I wanted to know what he had

Monday, March 27, 1978

said about me and I don't think it was improper conduct on my part. I take great umbrage, Sir, at the rather scurrilous manner in which he casts that in my face and makes fun of me for saying. . . — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Order please. The Honourable Member for Wellington does not have a point of privilege. The Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I won't dwell on that particular one, only to say I am in full agreement with the previous mayor of Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, I. . . — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington please state his point. Is it a point of order or a point of privilege? **MR. CORRIN:** Well, I think actually a question, Sir. I would ask whether the honourable minister would indicate which previous mayor of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: The immediate past mayor of Winnipeg.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (Cont'd)

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I can only say also, and I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition has left, that I was very disappointed the other day in the House when the Member for Elmwood, who I expect those things from, referred to when you corner Conservatives, they lie. I took that at that particular time where it came from and I was fully aware that honourable members on the other side, at least most of them, wouldn't use that type of wording. I am very disappointed that the Leader of the Opposition did, and I can only say that maybe he is setting the theme for the other members on the opposite side.

Mr. Speaker, you know, when I referred to the province being broke, when you are sitting at home in your living room very comfortable and you find out that you are 129 million dollars in debt in your general account at the bank, you are close to being broke. I assure you, that unless you have your own house in order, there isn't much help you can be to other people, and I don't think, in fact I am sure that the government during the last few years of office were putting their house in bad order instead of good order. They stand up on the other side and they brag — they all actually brag — about the balanced budgets they had, the surpluses they had at one time. They bring that forward to us and then they turn around and they defend, after they think it should be balanced or have a surplus, they now start to defend the fact that they created the debt that the province is in. All of a sudden it was all right, Mr. Speaker. As my colleague, the Minister of Health and Social Development, said, "The tap was on and running."

Mr. Speaker, we continually get these references to Ontario.

A MEMBER: Why not try Alberta?

MR. JOHNSTON: The Minister. . . pardon me, I have spent eight years in the House, Sir, and I still have a tendency to refer to some of the other honourable gentlemen as ministers as they were at one time, but the Member for Inkster kept talking about the deficits of Ontario.

MR. GREEN: What about the deficits?

MR. JOHNSTON: What about the deficits, yes. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that, you know, we live in a world today where people can move around very easily; anybody that has landed in Toronto or been down in the Golden Triangle in Ontario is fully aware of the tax base that's always available to the Province of Ontario, fully aware of the province's ability to overcome deficits, etc., which is just a ridiculous thing to compare to the Province of Manitoba. Just a ridiculous thing to compare, to compare the base of Ontario, with industry and population, to Manitoba is just absolutely ridiculous. You know, we turn around, and why can't the former First Minister and why can't the members opposite compare or talk about problems within Manitoba? For eight years they went along saying, "Well, they're doing it here; they're doing it there," and now they're coming back in opposition and saying, "You know, everything we did was justifiable because they did it somewhere else."

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what happens in the Province of Manitoba. The Member for Brandon East got up in this House the other day and asked a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce and he was concerned in his question about small business. He was concerned about small business. He was talking about, I believe, the layoffs that might have an effect on small business. Mr. Speaker, that Member for Brandon East should be ashamed of himself for asking what I think was a hypocritical question on his part. Because, as the Member for Brandon East, when he was the Minister of Industry and Commerce, did nothing — did nothing — to stop the honourable members opposite from strangling small business in this province.

Mr. Speaker, where was that member when he was the Minister of Industry and Commerce when

the Member for Elmwood, as the Minister of Public Works at that time, got up and said, "We will now buy everything from Morden Fine Foods; we'll make them the wholesaler of the province." You know, he was going to set them up as the only person, practically, that this province could deal through. The institutions would have to buy from them and everything. Where was the Minister of Industry and Commerce then? Did he not say to the Member for Elmwood, "You know, there are wholesalers in this town who hire truck drivers, warehousemen, clerks, salesmen, management people who are in business in this province." What did he say to them then? I can expect that kind of nonsense from the Member for Elmwood but I really would have expected, I really would have expected the Minister of Industry and Commerce to stand up, last year, and make it very plain that if you do things like that, all you will do is strangle or harm the small businesses.

What did he say when the taxes were being placed upon small businesses? Nothing. The Member for Fort Rouge was saying the other day about all the businesses that were trooping off to other provinces. Why? Why? Because the previous government was basically working in behind the scenes to make their position so uncomfortable in Manitoba that they would leave. I am sorry the Member for Fort Rouge is not here because I can tell you quite plainly, he said, "You know, shouldn't we be spending more money keeping those businesses happy so that they'll stay here?" Well, you know, we can all borrow more money. He talks about the money that comes in for housing. It's all borrowed money, Mr. Speaker, every cent of it; it's not given to us. We can borrow more money; spend more money; raise the taxes to pay the loans and the deficits. That's all you're doing and you're strangling those small businessmen. And they did it quietly.

The thing is, Mr. Speaker, what would happen is this. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, he would pass a law and say, "You can't go." I think that's about the only solution he has from the way he speaks. I will say, the honourable members on the other side, they wouldn't pass a law and say you can't go. The honourable members on the other side say, "If you don't like the way we're taxing you, if you don't like the atmosphere we create in Manitoba, go and we'll buy you out and we'll get in business." That was their attitude. That was the attitude of the previous government and that was the attitude that the people of Manitoba said they don't want any more of on October 11th. No more of the two and one-half times one. That's all over. No more.

Mr. Speaker, I can say to you that all we have said to the people of Manitoba is that we can't cure inflation in Canada or North America. —(Interjections)— No, no, we've never said we could. We can't cure it but we can, we can do something to make Manitoba competitive with other provinces so that people will want to stay here rather than be somewhere else. You know, Mr. Speaker, money has no boundaries. When the men in business, small or large, or even the honourable gentlemen on the other side, put their hand in their pocket and decide to invest in the stock market and, oh, my God, I know that's not quite the way their thinking is — I know the Member for Inkster has got two shares of one company anyway — but when they put their hand in their pockets to invest in a company, what do they say? What do they say? They invest their money where the best return is. Absolutely. So business will invest their money where the best return is and where they're being treated fairly and they have not been treated fairly in the Province of Manitoba in the last eight years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: On a matter of privilege affecting the members of the House. As is my habit, I like to stop demonstrations at the smallest step so that they don't get louder and I think that the gallery should be advised that they are not to demonstrate in any manner. I'm serious, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will ask the members in the gallery please to refrain from any active participation in the debates that occur in this Chamber. The Honourable Minister may proceed.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we had the statement in the House made, I think it was the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge again, he talked about bold, new initiatives. The only bold, new initiatives that he can possibly be referring to, with the way he describes it, is more spending. That's all that he can do. He keeps saying that we have a feeling that we must undo whatever was done by the NDP government. He says it's an obsession with us. I don't think it's an obsession to want to get your house in order. I don't think it's an obsession to want to get to a balanced budget or to a surplus the way the honourable members did at one time. They did it, I must say, Mr. Speaker, because there was inflation from the day they took office. I remember the first year they took office they had a windfall of something like \$50 million dropped in their lap from the Federal Government. They had nothing but things going for them and yet, after eight years, they still worked themselves into a position where the province is — and I don't care what the First Minister says — is in a position that you could call broke because when you're in debt to that extent you are, but there is a way out of it. There is a way out of it, Mr. Speaker. There is a way out of it. It's the same, you know, when businesses are in debt, or they have a deficit, they raise prices. They have to raise prices to get themselves back into shape again so that they can show a profit. But the profit of government is taxing the people. If you want to go out and tax the people more, that's right. Go ahead.

Now the other thing, Mr. Speaker, is this. Where . . . Do you have any idea where this money can come from? I remember when I was in municipal government and the previous Minister of Finance — who is not here at the present time — who I have a great amount of respect for . . . You know, if you were in debt at the end of the year, you had to find it. You had to find it the next year and do you think that this government is any different? We've got to find it and try not to raise prices and raise taxes.

We have to look to the programs that are not efficient. We have to look to all of those things and say to the people what we said during the election, that we will be responsible and try and work the province out of this mess. Mr. Speaker, that's basically what we said. I said it. —(Interjection)— You put him there.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I don't know why there is such great criticism about the task force. I have never in my life turned down good advice from anybody. —(Interjection)— That's right, especially if it's free. Let me tell you something, if you've got something wrong with you physically, you'll go to a doctor. If you've got something wrong with your plumbing, you'll call a plumber. If you've got something wrong with your electrical work in your house, you'll call an electrician and if you need some advice on how to administrate properly, you will ask a good administrator and so you go to people who have been successful in their different vocations and you ask them, you ask them for some help and some advice and I can see nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker. Except, Mr. Speaker, honourable members on the other side, when they were in government, wouldn't listen to anybody. I said that every year in the speeches that I made. They refused to listen to anybody. They almost showed up as know-it-alls. They wouldn't listen to anybody. It would be a complete sin to go to a successful person in his vocation and ask him some advice. My goodness, Mr. Speaker, and they stand up and they are critical of a group of people, of a group of people, a government that will take advice from people who are successful in what they're doing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if they want to say to me on the other side when they're speaking and when they follow me that they wouldn't have taken advice from people who are successful in their vocation, that's entirely up to them. But I can tell you that they act very much as if we are committing a very bad wrong by asking people for advice. We have had a task force that has given us different suggestions. We can operate on them and that will be our privilege. After we get the report, it will be our privilege to decide what is operated on.

Mr. Speaker, I was quite amazed at the Member for Inkster the other day.

A MEMBER: Amazing fellow.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, he is, a very amazing fellow. You know, when we took office, we have said over the eight years that Autopac is working well, or reasonably well, it still has some problems, there's no question about that, and we have said that it's operating, it will continue to operate and we will take a look at the competitive part of it. And the Member for Inkster said, you know, if we were back in four years, I am serving notice right now, right now, that it's over. There's a road from Toronto to Winnipeg, and a road from Winnipeg to Toronto. Mr. Speaker, even if it proved to cost the people of Manitoba less in four years, they would throw it out, that is their thinking. They wouldn't assess it. You could be paying less for Autopac, you could have a better situation for the people of Manitoba in four years, and those gentlemen on the opposite side are committed to throw it out, whether it's better or not. Isn't that right? Whether it's better or not, you'll kick it out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the attitude that I've been talking about, know-it-all, don't listen to anybody, just throw it out if it's your philosophy, even if it's good for the people of Manitoba, toss it out. Toss it out, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what they have. —(Interjection)— Well, let me ask the honourable members, if the financial statement is better after another experiment, will you still toss it out? Sure you will, sure you will, that's exactly what you said, you are not going to listen to anybody.

MR. GREEN: Because we know it will be better. Yes.

MR. JOHNSTON: We know. We know. That's exactly it. This government knew everything. Know-it-alls, and will not listen to anybody. Mr. Speaker, we are now getting the absolute philosophy of the other government.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question. Would the honourable member keep Cybershare and Dormond Industries if he knew that it was going to be better for the people of the Province of Manitoba, going to be cheaper and result in more money to us? Would he keep them?

MEMBERS: No. No.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in that particular . . . to answer that one, because we said that we believed that they could operate better. —(Interjection)— We believe, we said it before an election, we believe that it can operate better under private industry. Now if it doesn't, we'll see what happens. But that's not what the honourable member said. He said that it doesn't matter what happens, he said there's a road from Winnipeg back to Toronto. —(Interjection)— That's right.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege, I did not say it doesn't matter what happened. I said that we know it works better our way, and we believe it, the same way as the honourable member believes that it doesn't work better our way.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not too sure that what we have done is perfect and if it isn't, we'll correct it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. May I remind all members that their right to speak is one that they should guard very jealously, and you have a time to speak and a time not to speak, and when you ask to be recognized by the Speaker, then you may very well be recognized, but until you are recognized by the Speaker I suggest you refrain from taking part. Now, the Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the ability of the honourable gentleman to dwell on one word or another and it's not going to bother me, I still believe that they will not listen to anybody. They will not take advice from anybody.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say some words about the corporation that I have the responsibility for. Mr. Speaker, I have no qualms in repeating what I said in Estimates last year when I was the critic; I said, stop, go slow, take a look at where you're going in the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. You're getting yourselves into problems. The Minister at that time didn't seem to want to heed that warning although it came from many people other than myself. Their policy was to build at any cost, anywhere and at any time. It was just the sake of taking all the money you can get, don't worry about the need, don't worry about whether you are building it on expropriated property that you don't know what you are going to pay for it, and if you don't know what you are going to pay for it and CMHC do not go along with the price, you'll end up being in a situation where the province is paying twenty instead of ten, and the Federal Government is paying less than they should be if we can't negotiate those prices. But no, one fell swoop in the Cabinet Room one day and they expropriated, on two different occasions, property all over town, and they don't know what they're going to end up paying for it. But they were ready to build, they were ready to say, "Damn the torpedoes and go ahead."

The Minister at that time, during the election, went up into the town of Russell and started a public housing project of ten units, Mr. Speaker, and two weekends ago we held a public house up there to try and find people to live in it. Two hundred and fifty people went through; we didn't have enough people in Russell to qualify for ten units. We now have four people in those units and three of them are doubtful whether they should be there or not, yet it was go ahead, build.

A MEMBER: No plans. Just build them.

MR. JOHNSTON: They brought down in their Estimates last year in the capital part of it, \$57 million or something, and when we took office on October 24th, the Minister had applied for \$6 million, not \$57, not the \$32 that was allotted to us by CMHC, but \$6 million was all that had to be applied for, and the staff at MHRC — who I have a lot of confidence in, they are good people, if they hadn't had the wrong direction of just do what you are told and build — sat down and worked their butts off so we could get \$22 million out of that \$32 million allotted to us. Mr. Speaker, he went around and went into Roblin, threw a sign in the ground and said, "We'll build 40 units," and they had applications for 28. Birtle was the same thing; Rossburn the same thing. I wonder why. I wonder why in those constituencies, Mr. Speaker, there were 39 contract employers hired in MHRC between June 1977 and the end of September 1977, 39 contract employees hired in that time. I wonder why.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you. I wonder why. It certainly wasn't to build anything; they had only made application for \$6 million worth of projects. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you, the tap was on and it was running, and I invite, when my Estimates come up, the honourable member who is my critic to come forward because I've got a big file. He was the senior bureaucrat of the previous government, and all of these things happened with his Planning and Priorities Committee that paid no attention to any Minister. Paid no attention to Ministers, just went ahead and did whatever he pleased.

Mr. Speaker, the interest that we are paying in the province is getting pretty great. If we don't build another unit, our subsidies are over \$16 million. If we don't build another unit, our subsidies in two years' time will be \$20 million with inflation, and all we are saying is that when we go ahead, we will go ahead on the basis of need, we will go ahead on the basis of research, and we will go ahead in such a way that we will be able to look at what we build as a credit to both types of building. I'm not too sure, Mr. Speaker, that some of the ones we have had will stand fifty years.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time, my executives have been at four meetings with the Federal Government. Mr. Ouellet has made different announcements in the paper, he says shared costs project with the provinces would be gradually eliminated. In his speech at the Ministers' Conference in Edmonton, he was disappointed at the way that the large concentrations of public housing were being accepted, and he wants to change that. We are working very hard with the other provinces to come up with a good plan, or housing plan for the Province of Manitoba, and I have absolutely no intention of apologizing to the honourable members opposite at any time, because I am saying that we are going to analyze the way we have been, and it hasn't been very good, the way we went, we are going to go the right way. And I'll take your criticism any time you want to give it.

Mr. Speaker, I was quite amused the other day when they started to talk about, have you asked one specific federal member. Isn't that amazing? Did you ever remember the parade of federal members of the NDP that used to come in here all the time? I remember when they were first elected, the Honourable Mr. Knowles was their adviser on how to do everything, and they have the gall to

stand up and be critical because we ask a federal member about something. Mr. Speaker, I well remember the other day, the Member for Inkster standing up and saying, and he said to the Minister of Finance, "and what about the increase in Hydro?" And he said, when another Minister speaks, "and what about the increase in Hydro?" Mr. Speaker, I have a long memory too. I can remember Honourable Ministers on the other side when they were having their Estimates questioned, and you would say to them, look at the spending you are doing there. You know, we would be critical and one / Minister would get up and say, what about the rebate system? The Minister of Agriculture would claim it; then the next Minister, the Minister of Urban Affairs would claim it, because it came off the tax bills. The First Minister would say, "It's mine, I'm giving it away on the provincial bills." The Minister of Industry and Commerce, when we were in Housing last year, said "It's mine, I'm giving it away," and they have the gall to get up and talk about the fact that there is the same answer from some Ministers on this side, when we got the same answer from them all the time? Mr. Speaker, they have very short memories, very short memories.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said, we look forward to our Estimates. We can explain, I'm speaking for all my colleagues now, we can explain what we are doing, and we fully intend to and defend it, and we are fully aware of what went on the last eight years, and we are fully aware of where you went wrong and quite ready to tell you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am somewhat tempted to reply to the Honourable Minister who has just spoken, but I won't, except to wonder aloud, Mr. Speaker, that if he is so satisfied with this government's performance, why does he look so unhappy?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on . . . —(Interjection)— I am assured by members on the opposite side that the Minister is indeed happy. I congratulate you, again, Mr. Speaker, on your continuance in the Chair. I am one of those who thought you did a fine job in the last Session. I admired your sense of fairness and calmness in controlling this sometimes disorderly Assembly. I know that you will be very cognizant of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that as the servant of this Assembly, it is your job to serve all of the members fairly and equally and not to be a servant of the government.

I say a word, too, of congratulation also to the other two members who have assumed positions in this House, that of the Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees, and of his assistant, your Deputy.

It was mentioned to us on a couple of occasions that the Honourable Member for Radisson has had some connection with adjudicating in another field, and that this would probably stand him in good stead in this House. There is some superficial resemblance, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, in having two teams matched against each other, and sometimes it can be a bit of a brawl in here, but there are very many other profound differences that I am sure that the honourable member will appreciate and understand as he does his job. I will say to both the Chairman of Committees and the Deputy Chairman of Committees, having had some experience in that position, that they are likely to find the job somewhat tedious and trying; I assure them that they will indeed enjoy that, or rather, they will indeed earn that additional indemnity that is paid to them. I wish them good fortune in their work.

I was somewhat non-plussed to hear the remarks in seconding the Address to the Speech, from the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, who I don't see in the House just at the moment. His obvious satisfaction and pleasure at the large amount of public spending and involvement in his constituency makes me wonder why he's not sitting on this side of the House rather than on the other side. Since the spending of public money in Portage la Prairie has been so beneficial to that constituency, perhaps he is indeed pressing his colleagues to do a similar job for the constituencies of other members. I can assure him that a list of public spending in my constituency doesn't come anywhere near the list that he read out to us the other day.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that in recent statements by the First Minister that he has a certain sensitivity to metaphor. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that he has spoken on past occasions of a dog's breakfast and producing a favourable climate for business and he has mentioned also the ship of state. Metaphor as a figure of speech has become quite entrenched in our language and it is effective providing it is used accurately and properly. I notice that the tendency has tended to spread to the Minister of Finance. You'll probably recall just over a week ago, Mr. Speaker, that the First Minister in referring to the private sector made the statement that the private sector was now on trial in Manitoba. He was followed, I think it was the same day, by the Minister of Finance who disagreed with him and said that as far as the private sector was concerned that the ball was in their court. Now, if there is any confusion in the private sector, it's probably because they don't know whether they're in the law courts or on the tennis courts.

To go back for a moment to the other metaphor that the First Minister used, something to do with the ship of state now being on an even keel, . . .

A MEMBER: He sold the ship, remember.

MR. WALDING: . . . The Honourable Minister seems to like nautical metaphors and I will suggest one further one to him for his consideration. No one in this province should wonder that so many civil servants have been laid off for a ship that has no rudder doesn't need a crew either.

A MEMBER: A good point.

MR. WALDING: The Minister of Highways is making some comment which I will say to him that I cannot hear from here. If he would like to speak up a little bit or send me a note, I will reply to him.

Mr. Speaker, several of my colleagues have noted that this government was elected by 49 percent of the vote. They have suggested at the same time that the government does not have a mandate to act in certain areas. In my opinion, any government in Manitoba that gets 49 percent of the vote has a mandate to do anything that it wants to do.

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question at this point. Is he suggesting that any government that gets 49 percent of the vote has the right to take away individual rights from Canadians and Manitobans?

A MEMBER: That's what the Minister of Agriculture is doing.

MR. WALDING: I hope that that is not what the honourable minister is suggesting that this government intends to do or whether it intends to bring in legislation to that effect into this House.

MR. JORGENSEN: And you kept saying it too. That because you had a majority, you had a right to do anything.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear what the member says when he says it from his seat. If he wishes to stand up and ask it in the form of a question, I will attempt to answer him.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, I ask the honourable member again, is he saying that a government, simply because it has the majority, has the right to abrogate rights of the individual, rights and privileges of the individual, they can do anything they like?

A MEMBER: Ask the Minister of Agriculture; he'll answer you.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, the point I was attempting to make was that a government with a majority is entitled to bring in legislation into this House for consideration, any legislation that it wishes to. Again, it follows from statements that had been made, for example, having to do with Family Law, when some members on this side and members outside of the House had accused the government of having no mandate whatsoever to bring in legislation having to do with that.

There were undoubtedly many members of the public making up that 49 percent who voted for this government for strictly ideological reasons. I suggest that there were many of those who voted simply because of what they heard the Conservatives say, what they heard the leader say and what they read in Conservative campaign literature at the time of the election. We heard members say time after time that their own members had as much compassion as any member of the New Democratic Party. I would suggest even to peruse such a piece of Conservative literature as this would give the clear impression to anyone reading it that the Conservatives cared about people, that they cared about senior citizens. They mentioned in more than one position about providing more home care and more nursing home services. They talked about education and help for the taxpayer, help for the senior citizens, help for northern Manitobans.

Let me just as an aside, Mr. Speaker, read something from one of these pamphlets. It's a quotation by the Leader of the Progressive-Conservative Party who says, "I have a vision for Manitoba. A province of younger people fully employed and older people secure in dignified retirement, of family farms that are bountiful and prosperous and a North whose abundant resources are being developed by northerners themselves, of children well educated for a bright and productive future here at home, of job security and financial stability for every Manitoban." Well, Mr. Speaker, that sounds more like a prayer than a vision. —(Interjection)— The Member for Inkster suggests to me that it's a mirage rather than a vision. The Leader of the Conservative Party so far has scored zero on just about every one of those.

However, did the people who supported the government at that last election expect that the new government would continue those same compassionate and humanitarian programs that the previous government had started on? I recall being on a public platform on two or three occasions with the Conservative candidate in St. Vital who assured the audience on every occasion that the matter of our social policies, of medicare and pharmacare and critical home repair and senior citizens' housing, nursing homes and this sort of thing, simply was not a factor in this election, that a Conservative government would continue those programs and would in fact improve upon them in just about every case.

A MEMBER: Oh yes we are.

MR. WALDING: I'm happy to hear that assurance from the Minister of Agriculture that they will indeed improve upon those programs and I would like to deal with a few of those programs just at the moment.

The Conservative candidate in my constituency seemed to suggest that the matter before the

people at that time was not these social programs, it was a matter of being able to make tax cuts for people by means of withdrawing the government from involvement in business. There were figures such as \$40 million for Saunders on the one hand and \$40 million for Flyer on the other, and the suggestion was left, even if it was not stated explicitly, that this \$80 million would enable the new government to cut several taxes as well as continuing with these humanitarian and compassionate programs and, in fact, improve upon them.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it would be worthwhile just to take a quick look at several of the acts of this government since taking office, in view of that impression that it had given to the voters in September and October, just to assess what it has done and what we might intend to do from certain leaks in the newspapers and certain statements from ministers.

Let me refer first of all to the Portage School for the Retardates. I want to address these one or two comments specifically to the Minister of Health who I know, like some of us, has paid a visit to the school and has seen what conditions are like there. He, like us, has seen for himself the dedication and the hard work of the staff in looking after some 900 retarded Manitobans varying from the mildly retarded to the severely and multiply-handicapped out there. He has seen the conditions under which they live and he has seen for himself the level of care that the residents get. He has seen the education and training that is provided for the people there.

But, Mr. Speaker, it was this government that put a hiring freeze on which had particular effect on the Portage School. The minister knows from his reports that he is getting from there and one report in particular, that the level of staffing at the school had declined by some 28 persons. I am very pleased that it has now come off but that was the situation there. It had the effect, at that time, that nursing staff there who were well paid and hired to do a particular nursing job for the residents there were being required to do tasks such as cleaning floors and carrying out of garbage and even cutting the hair which is an inefficient method of proceeding. The minister might also be aware of another situation that was happening, that because the 28 people were not in fact working there, that the existing staff was having to put in considerable amounts of overtime. Not only was this running up a bill for overtime but what was in fact happening in practice was that the people who were putting in this overtime were asking for time off in lieu which meant that even the reduced staff was asking to be away which further compounded the question.

I'm sure that the minister, as he has shown by his actions in getting that freeze lifted, and all of the members in fact on that side, would wish to do all that was possible to be done for the residents out in Portage, would like to see that the standard of care, training and attention out there was maintained and preferably improved, that all the requirements of the fire commissioner's report would be fulfilled and that the school would continue to move in that direction of going towards the one-for-one staff ratio.

Let's move also to the matter of university grants which has been in the paper just recently. If my memory serves me correctly, there was an indication that the increase in the grant this year would be only in terms of \$2 million or \$3 million, something like that, which does not even keep up with the amount of inflation over the last year. Through this government, the Universities Grants Commission has made it quite clear to the universities that they should be expected to increase their student fees for the coming year. I know that there are members on the opposite side who have children at the university and I'm sure that all of those members are affluent enough that a 10, 20 percent increase in those fees could be handled by them without too much problem. The problem will come in for those at the low end of the income scale or for those students who are trying to pay their own way. They are the people who will suffer at any time that the university student fees go up as they are almost bound to do as a result of this government's activity.

Let us also look at the freeze that has been put on the construction of nursing homes. Now nursing homes are something that no one can quarrel with, it's something like motherhood and was something that the Conservative Party harped on time and time again at the last election campaign. But, Mr. Speaker, a freeze has been put on those nursing homes, the waiting list is getting longer and longer. I have never had so many had so many phone calls about nursing homes as I have in the past few months. The people who are getting now into desperate straits waiting for a nursing home bed to come — very conscious of the fact that the government has put on this freeze and it is likely to be a long, long time before they finally get into a nursing home.

On a similar note, we note that the municipal grants have been reduced for this year by the government. I don't have the exact figure with me, Mr. Speaker, but I do recall that the Minister of Urban Affairs had announced to a group of municipalities just a few months ago that they might expect a reduction somewhere in the range of \$2.5 million, which just incidentally and perhaps coincidentally, Mr. Speaker, is approximately the same amount that will accrue to the breweries this year as a result of the price of beer going up.

The effect of reduced grants to the municipalities this year will, of course, be reflected in the tax bills that go out to its property tax payers. It will affect my constituents in St. Vital just as much as any other area of the city.

It's not that the government is saving itself any money or saving the people any money by making this reduction for a reduction in the amount spent in this area by the provincial government has to be met by an increase in property taxes at the civic level, and the people who will be hardest hit will be those who are at the bottom end of the income scale, the senior citizens, the unemployed of whom we now have 37,000 — they will be the people who will be struggling to find these extra dollars. The property tax, as members are well aware, is a tax that does not reflect any sort of ability to pay basis.

Similarly in the matter of public housing, I don't want to go into this too much — the Minister has

already dealt with it and I understand that one of my colleagues also intends to speak on the matter. But public housing is another one of those motherhood issues, who wants our people to live in slums. That is the reason that MHRC stepped-up its building programs some eight - nine years ago, to provide decent, safe, warm housing for the people of Manitoba. That is a humanitarian and compassionate view of housing that I am sure is shared by all of the Members on the other side.

We are still waiting with some concern, Mr. Speaker, to know what this government intends to do about rent control. We know that Members on the other side supported the rent stabilization bill when it was introduced some couple of years ago. We believe that they supported it at that time because they were just as aware as we were of the amount of rent gouging that was going on, of reports of tenants receiving increases in their rents of 20, 30, 40 and away up to 60 percent or more, and it was time that something was done about it. It was made clear at that time by our government that it was as much because of the low vacancy rate as for any other reason that rent controls were brought in. We made it equally plain that we expected those rent controls to stay in place until such time as the vacancy rate had increased to somewhere in the range of 4, 5, 6 percent, where the natural market forces so beloved by Members on the other side would again come back into force.

Another similar area where we await with some concern announcements from Members on the other side is in the area of Day Care. I'm sure they have received representations from the Child Care Association or Day Care Association, whatever the correct term is, as have we. There is a common misconception by some people that the purpose of day care is to provide a handy parking place during the day for middle-income women to go out and take away a job from a man who is the head of a family and deserves the job. The truth happens to be, in the main, quite different from that — that the people who send their children to day care centres do so because they are the heads of single parent families. In many cases they are women who have been divorced or separated or deserted, and the only thing that is keeping them off of the welfare rolls is the opportunity to put their child into a day care centre and to go out and get a job or to get the retraining for it. When it is viewed in that light, Mr. Speaker, surely no Member on the other side or any Member on this side would possibly wish to oppose the continuation and even the improvement of day care in Manitoba. 121-05 I would like to refer next to something which has been in the news just recently, and which I know I will get no argument from Members opposite. I don't intend to read the article, but I would refer Members to four columns in Saturday's Tribune written by Val Werier, and it concerns a child abuse and a battered baby syndrome. The column I suppose comes about following the recent case in which a two-year-old child died; she had contusions and abrasions to the head, face, chest, stomach, back, arms, legs, hands and feet and she also had a broken jaw or broken collarbone and a minor fracture of the arm. That is just one case, Mr. Speaker, and there have been many like it. Members have probably seen photographs in the paper and on television whenever articles have been done on this topic, and it is something that shocks and horrifies us all and I'm sure that we look for some method of limiting this and, if at all possible, of eliminating it completely. It is reported that there were 158 reported cases last year and who knows how many unreported cases.

It is further indicated in here, and I can verify this, that the Children's Aid Society which administers these matters has now had its staff reduced by some 10 percent, due to the government freeze. Could it be, Mr. Speaker, that if that freeze had not been in that possibly some of these cases might not have happened or might not have been so severe. Is it not possible that if more money were found for the Children's Aid Society to hire more workers that there might be less of this type of abuse in the coming year? There should be, I'm sure, no disagreement between any of the Members in this House for the need of such care and such additional money to be found.

Refer just briefly to the cancelling of the Career Planning Office and its Affirmative Actions Section, I am told that there have been four people laid-off at that section. And the people that it is affecting in particular are the handicapped. I am told that there are some 300 people who have their names on the list with the office waiting to be given that opportunity — an opportunity on the same basis as everyone else to get a job with the Provincial Government. Can anyone take any sort of pride in the fact that one small department of government which was set-up to help the handicapped has now been done away with and four more bodies added to the unemployment rolls in this country?

Mr. Speaker, I seem to be getting towards running out of time. I haven't mentioned amongst this list that I have read out here of a few other areas — one of them is the matter of Family Law and Maintenance, of course. I know that some Members on that side have certain reservations about the Marital Property Act and some of them about the Family Maintenance Act, but surely no one who was at any of our committee meetings can but fail to be touched by the accounts of some of those separated women who came to us and told us the difficulties they were having.

There is also the whole matter of Northern Manitoba and some of the cutbacks and the lay-offs in the north. If Members on that side wish to know a little bit more about the north and the programs and what should be done, and what has been done, and what could still be done, they should read some of the speeches of the Honourable Minister — I'm not sure what number he is from River Heights — who made countless speeches over the last two or three years urging the government of the day to do much more for the development of the north.

I have not touched on the matter of unemployment and the 37,000 Manitobans who are unemployed and of the compassion that we all feel for them nor have I referred to the matter of Legal Aid.

Mr. Speaker, there is a whole page of examples I have given of cutbacks and restrictions in a number of very valuable and very valued people-type social programs. In all of those cases, the people who were hit were children, old people, the sick, the retarded, generally those people in weak

groups who were least able to speak for themselves.

That same clear pattern has not spilled over into the government's dealings with other agencies. We consider, for example, the government cozying-up to an eastern insurance company that wants to come to Manitoba and take away some of our money; it doesn't apply to the government's kindness to a couple of fertilizer companies out in Brandon where special arrangements have been made for them and nor has it applied to the hotel industry which, by special dispensation of this government, has had its maximum price of liquor and beer raised.

At the same time that the government's heavy hand has fallen on these dozen or so programs here, we note that the government at its last session instituted a number of tax reductions. They were having difficulty finding money for those programs but apparently they did not have difficulty giving away tax revenues in the field of succession duties and land speculation and gift tax acts.

Mr. Speaker, we may not know what those individuals are doing with that \$7 million that they did not pay in succession duties, but we have a pretty good idea of what the Portage Home could do with \$7 million. We know that not only could it comply with the fire code, but it could also bring up its staff ratio to the one-to-one that has been a long-time target.

Mr. Speaker, we do not know what those land speculators have been doing with that ten cents an acre that they no longer pay, but we have a pretty good idea what the Children's Aid Society could do with a few more hundred thousand dollars. We know that it could hire a few more people and do a very effective job.

Mr. Speaker, it might well be of cold comfort to those senior citizens in my constituency who are scratching around to find those extra dollars to pay for their property taxes this year. They can take cold comfort from the fact that the three breweries in Manitoba will have no difficulty whatsoever in finding their property taxes for this year. Members opposite, however kind and compassionate they may feel personally, have had to go this route because of their own ideology. They have, in fact, been trapped by their own ideology. Because of their ideology they have had to close their ears, shut their eyes to the genuine needs of the less fortunate and the needy. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, if the members on the other side did not know when they were elected what their ideology is, then they should know by now what their ideology is.

And if I might just close Mr. Speaker, with one quotation, I will leave it with members opposite as a reminder of their own ideology. It goes as follows: "Capitalism is the ideology of the predator. It is the freedom of the powerful to prey upon the weak and the defenseless. Capitalism is the doctrine of private affluence in the midst of public squalor. It is the triumph of the electric toothbrush over the public hospital. Capitalism is the enrichment of the few that have much at the expense of the many that have little. Capitalism is the creed of inheritance, the avoidance of taxes, the sanctity of capital, the exploitation of people, the maintenance of unemployment, and the worship of automation. Capitalism is the arrogance of indifference to the legitimate needs of the poor and the unemployed, the old and the infirm, the homeless, the hungry, and the hopeless."

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the House to adopt the motion? The motion was one that was moved by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood and seconded, the amendment by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to congratulate you on the position that you hold. There is really no doubt in my mind that you will very capably fill the duties that you will be called upon to perform.

I would like to take a few minutes this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to speak about northern Manitoba and I suppose more specifically to speak about the constituency of which I come and which I represent. I have been in Thompson, in about three months I will have been there 18 years and I think I am fairly well qualified to speak on behalf of the people in that particular constituency and the surrounding areas. There is an interesting factor in the City of Thompson that I have enjoyed over the years. It is an altogether different type of city than any I suppose exists in this country. One of the major contributing factors to it being different is, out of the populace, be they employed by the mining company or others, the average age in our town of Thompson is 26 years old. Young people come to that town and they find that if they choose to become involved in service clubs or church organizations, any particular group that they want to get involved in, in very short order in the City of Thompson they can get themselves ahead in it, they can become executive board members of it, they can become very involved in the minor recreation aspects of the city. They have opportunities in the City of Thompson, Mr. Speaker, that young people don't always have in other major centres.

There has been a recent situation within the mining industry which is certainly affecting Thompson and the entire north, and yes, in fact the whole province of Manitoba. The market for the product which we have been producing seems to have vanished to a degree creating a bad situation and particularly in the City of Thompson and I would think throughout the northern part of the province.

There are some encouraging signs; in the Snow Lake area, for example — I am sure the Member from Flin Flon will agree — that it is encouraging to see that HB8S is going to go ahead with M , I believe it is, the two to three million dollar concentrator that they are going to build in there. This in fact will employ X number of construction workers to put it together. When it is completed and in operation, I believe the figure is approximately 60 people that it will employ on a full-time basis, so

there is that encouraging aspect. We have been served notice — the government — from Sherritt-Gordon that they are interested, Mr. Speaker, in additional housing of some type in the Leaf Rapids area because they are going ahead with some further development of their mining complex in the Leaf Rapids area. So that, Mr. Speaker, is encouraging for those of us that live in the north and have a sincere interest in its future development.

We are blessed in the north with, I suppose, four basic industries, and I would like to just touch on all of them for a moment, if I would. I spoke about the mining. I really believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is going to come back; the troubles that we are going through now are not going to be with us forever. The people in Thompson have had two or three major setbacks in the short life of that particular community and they have always managed to come back, I like to believe come back better, and there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that the people in that City of Thompson are going to hold together and pull together and come out of this particular depression, if you wish, probably stronger than they were when they went into it.

There is another industry that is of interest in my particular constituency and it is certainly worth speaking about because there is two different approaches to it, and that is the forest industry. We have 8 community of Cross Lake who is the producing lumber to such a good degree and of such good quality that they are now shipping it out to the mining companies. They have now shipped, I believe their fourth boat has gone to INCO and I know they have been having meetings with Sherritt-Gordon from the Leaf Rapids area, and certainly it is encouraging to see these people putting the thing together and getting a product, and producing such a product that it can be a bit of a mini-boon to their small community.

You have another similar type of operation but it is, I suppose what we can call an internal type of forestry operation that's going on in the Pikwitonei community. These people are cutting the logs in the winter and they are going to get them into the mill in the summer and saw them up and they are going to build things just within their community and they are reasonably satisfied at this particular point that that type of forestry operation is good for them and we will certainly be encouraging them in that particular area.

The trapping industry is another one that certainly isn't unique to the north, but it is very prevalent in the communities when you talk to the trappers. Last year we came close in Manitoba to setting an all time record in the trapping industry and I am . . . with the continued push that the trappers are in the midst of and the cooperation that they have been receiving from various government agencies and the encouragement they have been given that there is a good possibility this year, Mr. Speaker, that the trapping industry in Manitoba may set an all time record in a variety of areas.

The fishing industry is again not unique to northern Manitoba, but northern Manitoba's problems are unique. The far-flung lakes, the particular freight problems, getting the fishermen together to harvest the particular product, is certainly not without its difficulties. I was questioned today on the possibilities of opening up quotas, increasing quotas; I would simply say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we are certainly prepared to review quotas, individual and otherwise, on all the particular lakes, both north and in the mid part and the southern part of the province. —(Interjection)— You'll have your time to question if you wish. Quotas will be established, Mr. Speaker, and the licencing now that has been raised, that will be reviewed also. I am prepared to stand in front of this House and talk with any of the members and do my best to answer their questions in relationship to the fishing industry any time they want to stand up at the appropriate time and ask their questions.

There is one other major event that just took place in northern Manitoba and that was the voting on and acceptance of the flood agreement. There is a great number of possibilities for the development of those particular communities that may come out of this particular agreement, Mr. Speaker. The possibilities of economic development for those particular communities is certainly great. The establishment of an advisory committee on the resource management of that particular area is certainly not a thing to be frightened of. I think we have all been dealing in the north over the years in a responsible manner as far as the resource management goes, and I don't see any change in this particular philosophy of resource management.

The Thompson situation, and I suppose I am entitled to 30 or 40 minutes or whatever, but I just want to close with a few comments on the Thompson Steering Committee, the group that's been working together so long and so hard trying to come up with responsible recommendations in relationship to the future of that community and some ongoing opportunities within that community. I would surely like to see, Mr. Speaker, the day when somebody not only in northern Manitoba but right from across this country, can suggest some type of industry that could be established in singular mining communities. It is a feeling you have when you live in a community that relies solely on one industry which is not always a comfortable feeling. It has been with us I suppose for a hundred years and after the studies that I have seen take place of a variety of proposed industries, I wonder just how many years it will be with us. You see, Mr. Speaker, it would be such a great thing for a mining community if there was another industry where the men within that industry and their families could mingle and mix with the people in the mining business. I think psychologically it would have a very good settling effect on one-industry communities, but when I look to the Ontario situation and the B.C. situation and northern Manitoba, I don't see it particularly happening.

This group that has been working in Thompson so hard, I would like to thank them myself, I am sure the people of Thompson thank them. This group was made up of representation from the NorMan Regional Development group and the City Council and the United Steelworkers and the Chamber of Commerce, a large variety of people within the community and they've come through, Mr. Speaker, with some pretty good recommendations. I've had several meetings with them and I

meet with them as often as I can when I'm home on the weekends. They have been into the City off and on and I think that some of the recommendations they've made will go a long way to improving the lot in the City of Thompson.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity.

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

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Honourable the Minister would yield to a question. I want to indicate to him that I wasn't intending to interrupt him when he spoke, I wanted to ask a question.

I wonder whether the Minister could tell us if the system of licensing fishermen and establishing individual quotas is something which the New Democratic Party can take credit for as a New Democratic Party philosophy or is it something that has been advocated by responsible fishermen, biologists and conservation groups, that it's not a political policy, it is a policy which is attributable to responsible fishermen, I repeat, conservation people and biologists. It's not something that the New Democrats can take credit for.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know who wants the credit. Again, the Member for Inkster is a pretty super questioner. He still throws in these statements and gets around-about sort of a question. It's difficult to determine what the question is. I'll tell you this, that there is a great deal of controversy amongst fishermen today in Manitoba for, I would think, at this particular moment they are lashing out at several things. I will say this very directly to the Member for Inkster. They are certainly lashing out to what they feel is a poor system being exercised by the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. —(Interjection)— I'm going to answer the way you ask. You know, you ask a lot of things. So, in the midst of their lashing out, they're being very critical of the quota systems and the licensing systems, so if you want credit for their criticism, fine. If you want credit for some areas where they seem to be reasonably satisfied, then I guess you can take credit for those that are happy and those that are unhappy. Does that answer your question?

MR. GREEN: If the Honourable Minister wants to pride himself in not answering one of my questions, he can take credit for that. I asked the Honourable Minister whether a system of licensing and establishment of individual quotas is a philosophy which is attributable to a political party or a philosophy which is attributable to conservationists, biologists and responsible fishermen.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, the method of licensing and the amount of individual quotas were established under the regime, the latest ones that I'm living with today were established under partly your ministry and partly the Member for Rupertsland's. So I get back to it. A couple of years from now you may say to me, you know, there's unrest, is that your philosophy or what is it? I suppose at that time I'll have to say that it's the established principles of the particular government in power how you quota and how you license fishermen.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to begin by congratulating you on your continued existence as Speaker. I notice that your Deputy Speaker didn't enjoy the same situation as you did. I would like to congratulate those people, the new Deputy Speaker who has been appointed to replace the previous one and also the assistant Chairman of Committees. I hope that their stay in fact will be somewhat longer than their predecessor's was in that particular position. —(Interjection)— Possibly more confident.

I also want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I am enjoying this Throne Speech debate much more than I did the last one in the mini-session. We're now getting an opportunity to witness the wit, the competence and the ability of some of the opposition front bench. Many of them haven't spoken yet. In fact, I am the housing critic and it was a pleasure for me to hear for the first time the comments of the Minister who is now responsible for Housing. I was moved to jot down a quick note to Dr. Richard Leachy, he's an anthropologist in Africa looking into the origins of man. I want to tell him that I do think I've come across a specimen of Neanderthal man and I think that the Minister of Housing is a very good specimen in that respect. I think, Mr. Speaker, that I'm probably coming across an entire sub-species of Neanderthal man and that's to be seen as we continue in our Throne Speech Debate.

I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to provide my comments on the economic policy of the Conservative government and the economic consequence of this policy. We have a policy which, in a period of recession, is one which is one of restraint, which is one of cutback, and this is in an effort supposedly, Mr. Speaker, to fuel the engine of the economy. This is because the private sector produces wealth and it is assumed that anything that produces wealth, *per se* is somehow going to be the engine of the economy. What isn't looked at, Mr. Speaker, is what is meant by wealth when people talk about wealth. Is that the provision of needed goods and services in society or is it something else? Is it something that doesn't really relate that clearly to what society and people in society need? Mr. Speaker, when we have all this talk of the private sector, the unbridled private sector, I'm really thinking that what we're getting is a collection of cliches from the

1920s and really what's required is to go below those cliches to understand what people are talking about when they say that somehow public spending is no good, it has to be cut back and that somehow private spending will be encouraged if, in fact, public spending is cut back.

Now, what this shows, Mr. Speaker, is that the Conservatives really don't have any knowledge of economic management policies. And frankly, Mr. Speaker, what's happening is that what they are doing will produce consequences that are directly opposite to that which even they would like to achieve. Mr. Speaker, one of the major reasons for this is that the Conservatives don't understand anything about the multiplier effects of public spending as opposed to private spending. I say you have to go below the cliches of private enterprise or socialism and look at what happens to public spending. Where is it spent, who is it spent on, who is involved in it? Does the money leave the province through public spending? If in fact you build a hospital or build housing, does the money leave the province? Or does in fact that type of spending create wealth, create circulation of money within the economy, creating some income on the part of the consumers so that they are able to buy from private enterprise, producers of certain goods and services?

Mr. Speaker, that was the philosophy and the management policy, in large part, of the previous administration and it worked quite well. If you look at any historical evidence, you will see that the economy did function in a much better manner over the last eight years than it did in the preceding eight years of Roblin-Weir administration. Mr. Speaker, the grunts of the Honourable Member for Roblin will not change truth. I think that the grunt that I heard just now was probably the most intelligent comment that I've heard the Member for Roblin make in a long while. It's somewhat indicative, Mr. Speaker, it's somewhat indicative of the quality of the mind of that individual over there.

Mr. Speaker, I've been hearing comments about leadership from time to time. I can tell my honourable friends opposite that we on this side do not do what they on that side do; we have no blood on the back of any of our people sitting on the front benches. That is somewhat different from that which took place on the opposite side of the House. That's what took place on the opposite side of the House. —(Interjection)— Oh, I don't mind that, but so did Brutus, but I don't like Brutus' politics either. I don't like Brutus' politics either.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we have is a system geared to putting more hands in some private individuals. The common people, no. The rich people, yes. Look at the tax cuts they provided. Thirteen dollars to a family earning \$10,000; \$500 to a family earning \$75,000.00. The interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, is to look at how that money is spent by those people receiving the \$500.00. The question is, will they in fact spend the money in Manitoba to help our economy or will they in fact leave the province? It was interesting to note that during the Christmas break — it wasn't a Christmas break for the ministers, supposedly, none of them were around. Were they spending money in Manitoba? No, they weren't, Mr. Speaker, they were spending money outside of Manitoba. They were helping the economy of Hawaii; they were helping the economy of Florida but they were not helping the economy of Manitoba. That's something that those people have a hard time understanding. It's called economics. I saw you with a very nice tan, too, by the way.

Mr. Speaker, when we in fact have this type of barren economic philosophy being thrust upon us, what we have to do is look at what's happened in practice with respect to private investment. You know, the Leader of the Conservative Party, before the last election, said that if the Conservative Party was elected, there would be this explosion, this veritable explosion of private investment in Manitoba. Well the Tories were elected. Was there this explosion of private investment? Nothing. Nothing. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the reverse occurred. Inco cut back on production; Greb Shoes left; Willson Stationers are leaving. Is that a massive explosion of private investment? Mr. Speaker, you're going to notice a change in attitude on the part of the Leader of the Conservative Party and you can notice it already. He's not saying that he's confident of private investment, he's challenging private investment to invest. He's saying, "I challenge you now; you're on trial; you have to invest." You know what's going to happen, Mr. Speaker? You know what's going to happen? Nothing will happen; nothing will happen. There will be no private investment because there isn't sufficient consumer demand to warrant private investment, especially when you've got an economy operating at only 80 percent capacity as the present one is.

Mr. Speaker, what's going to happen beyond this is that I fully predict that the Leader of the Conservative Party will go beyond challenging private enterprise. He's going to start asking them. For the good of the country, invest in Manitoba. And what will happen, Mr. Speaker? I think very little will happen. He'll go on beyond that and will start begging them to invest. He will start begging them to invest, Mr. Speaker, and what will happen? Nothing will happen. The private sector won't respond. The private sector will say there isn't sufficient consumer demand to warrant private investment. Finally, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— you're right. That's what the Leader of the Conservative Party will do, he will pay private investment to invest. He will pay them on good terms or bad terms, terms that we may not know about, Mr. Speaker, because that's been done before and I predict it will be done again.

That's what we're going to look at, Mr. Speaker. We will determine the extent to which we will have these payments to private enterprise to invest. We had it in '66; we had it under the table. Maybe we could at least determine whether these payments to private enterprise will be above the table but I would expect that they'll probably be below the table but we will watch very carefully and we'll monitor very carefully this type of investment policy and this economic policy of the Conservative

Party because it's not worked, Mr. Speaker. It didn't work in the '30s, it didn't work prior to the '30s when we had continuous boom and bust cycles and it won't work now. And that's exactly the situation that we find ourselves. We find ourselves in a recession, Mr. Speaker, that is being augmented and made worse by the very bad, ideological fiscal policies of this government. Mr. Speaker, that's going to hurt us in a lot more ways than just one.

Mr. Speaker, that is going to hurt us in a lot more ways than just one. Our economy will not grow as quickly as people would hope. Our revenues will not grow as quickly as people would hope. Because our revenues have not grown as quickly, that means there will be further cutbacks and because there are further cutbacks the economy will slow down further. That is what happened when the recession, Mr. Speaker, in the thirties was turned into a depression, and that is exactly the policies that are being followed today. You would think surely that some people would learn from the past, but I don't think we have had that situation here.

Mr. Speaker, we were also told that we would have a new era of accounting. We would have some very good accounting.

A MEMBER: Two sets of books.

MR. PARASIUK: There are two sets of books, that is the problem. There is private accounting or accounting of the firm, and there is social accounting or accounting of the economy, and unfortunately what the members opposite don't understand is that although you may in fact save money by cutting back on one program so that the bottom line looks better with respect to that program —(Interjection)— You have to look at the other side of the balance sheet — are we hearing Hydro rates or is that CEDF? If you look at the other side of the balance sheet you will find, Mr. Speaker, that the accounts will go up. And I will give you an example: northern development, because the Honourable Minister of Finance knows something about northern development, not much, I agree, but if you look at northern development, if you cut back on development programs, which are expensive in the short run, if you cut back on those you save money, it appears as if you are saving money, but you are in fact transferring that cost onto your welfare program, and once you start assuming that cost on the welfare side, and you start reinforcing that dependency relationship, it's not easy to get out of it. Then it starts costing a lot more.

If you look at the history of Indian Affairs over the last 100 years, we have got very good federal evidence of what took place when they decided to try and cut corners, save money on development programs and increase the maintenance side of the programs tremendously.

We can also save money by cutting back on day care programs. If you cut back on day care programs, that program looks a bit better. What happens with welfare as people are taken out of the work-place? They are put on welfare. That side of the ledger increases, so we are not really saving money. You have to go a bit beyond the clichés when you start looking at accounting, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— That's right. They are robbing Peter to pay Paul principle.

There are other more subtle forms and more sophisticated forms of accounting that have to be applied. You have to look at what takes place when you in fact start shifting the cost of programs from the province, where the cost is borne through progressive taxation like income tax, when you start shifting those costs onto the municipalities or onto school boards, and the costs are then borne by the individuals, they are still borne by society, but they are borne through unfair taxes, or less fair taxes, like the property tax system when compared to the income tax system. You are not saving any money, Mr. Speaker, you are transferring the payment onus onto the individuals through unfair taxes.

Mr. Speaker, when you start imposing user fees or start thinking of that and start putting on the medical system with only a 2.9 percent increase, to start proposing those type of measures, what you start doing is not saving money, you start increasing the costs to the individuals through their individual purchases of medicine if that is what has to take place. And if you look at the similar experience in the United States, you will find that in the United States, which doesn't have a medicare system, their per capita costs of medicare are greater than they are in Canada. That means society pays more for medical care in the United States, but it is not as accessible nor is it as efficient. Mr. Speaker, that is not sound accounting, that is bad accounting, and that is the type of accounting we are starting to develop here in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we brought in some special accountants. These are these task forces and the review teams set up under them, and the interesting thing about these task forces is that they aren't comprised of elected officials. I thought, and I think people of Manitoba thought, that they were electing Einarsons, and Minakers, and Orchards, and other people like that to the legislature, and they thought that the people would in fact in a responsible system of government, be able to determine policy. —(Interjection)— That's right. They don't have any influence, Mr. Speaker. They have far less influence than any of these non-elected task force members, but you can go beyond that, Mr. Speaker. You can go beyond that, you can talk about the Shermans, who were elected and appointed to Cabinet and the interesting thing, Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— I wouldn't mind, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't mind debating with him, he would be a cinch. But Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting to have the Minister of Health and Social Development be responsible and accountable for decisions that are made in the Department of Health and Social Development. . But that is not the case, Mr. Speaker, a whole bunch of non-elected people are, and that completely undermines democratic traditions of responsible government, the traditions of representative

Monday, March 27, 1978

government. It is assumed nowadays that if you elect a person to the legislature, if that person is appointed as minister in a cabinet, and if that person is responsible for a department he or she will make the decisions in that department. He will then ask the person in the legislature why did they make those decisions and that person is held accountable in the legislature and is then held accountable to the public.

What took place in the fall, Mr. Speaker, was that fifty people were cut from the Portage Home for Mentally Retarded people, and the Minister responsible said, "I didn't do it, it was the Task Force that did it". It was the Task Force that did it, is that responsible government? How do you get accountability in that type of system?

If we went a bit beyond that, we had one-third of the staff laid off in the Rent Control Program. Who was blamed, the Minister? "No, it wasn't the Minister," said the Minister. He said, "The Task Force cut those people".

We go a bit beyond that. We have some reporters getting hold of Task Force documents, these are real documents. They comment that some of the Task Force members are proposing to close down Brandon College. Now I think that is a silly recommendation. I think that is a silly recommendation. It is based on bad accounting, but, Mr. Speaker, that is not the way the government deals with it. They say that is idle speculation. They dismiss as somehow dishonest the reporting on the part of the individuals who got that document and reported to the public that which is being recommended for institutions like Brandon University.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we have is a government that has very bad economic policy, whose accounting principles are not public accounting principles, that are somewhat misguided and unfounded to a large degree private accounting principles, and we have a government where it is very difficult to determine who is making the decisions. I have asked whether in fact the Leader of the Task Force, the Co-Chairman of the Task Force, reports to the Minister designated as responsible for the Task Force. That is a normal type of situation in representative government. All people should be responsible to the Minister who is given the task of being responsible for that department or for that action. That is not the case in this situation, the Co-Chairman, Conrad Riley, doesn't report to the Minister responsible. Well, then who does he report to? What happens to all those Task Force people that report to Conrad Riley? What happens to all those civil servants, who in fact provided reports to Conrad Riley? We don't have Conrad Riley reporting to the legislature. He won't appear before a committee. We have a Minister who doesn't receive reports from Conrad Riley. He is only half-way responsible for that Task Force.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of getting advice or not getting advice, it is a matter of determining where you are going to get advice from, whether in fact that advice is responsible, whether in fact those receiving the advice and taking actions therein will be held accountable for their actions. The parliamentary procedure that has developed over the years has been pretty straightforward in this respect. No one has really tried to change it. No one has tried to tamper with it badly. The only ones that have, Mr. Speaker, are this government. Nowhere in the history of British parliamentary democracies has the power of the legislature been so diminished and secondly, nowhere in British parliamentary democracies has the role of a responsible minister been so drastically changed. I hope that change is only temporary. 124-09 Now, Mr. Speaker, I was overjoyed to hear the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation say something. For a long time I thought he didn't exist. But he exists. He has made some comments that are rather interesting, rather interesting comments. To me, Mr. Speaker, he is the perfect example of bad economics, bad accounting, and incompetence. Because what has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that he has slashed the Public Housing Program, he slashed it last year and he said, "This is only temporary, because those bad people, the NDP, before us didn't get all the applications in on time", and he said that again today. So one would assume that this man would be bursting with energy to get a whole set of applications in for this calendar year, but he was conspicuous with his silence about this year's program, and then he broke that conspicuous silence with some conspicuous incompetence. Because he cancelled the program in Public Housing, he cancelled it with respect to Low Income Family Housing and so far, as far as I can tell and as far the private sector can tell, he has also cancelled the Elderly Persons Housing Program as well.

Mr. Speaker, he has destroyed that Program. We have lost fifty million dollars of direct spending in the economy and there is a multiplier effect to that fifty million dollars that makes it far greater than fifty million dollars, because most of the goods and services used to provide housing are purchased in Manitoba. So we are talking about something in the order of a 200 or 250 million dollars loss to our economy, but he can't understand that because it is a bit too complicated for him, Mr. Speaker. What he wants to do is have no housing —(Interjection)— Oh, I wouldn't mind talking about borrowed money either, because you see when that fellow over there starts talking about providing subsidies to the private sector to get that housing built, what will it be built with? It will be built with borrowed money. Don't you understand that? I guess you wouldn't. And he says that we have a debt, Mr. Speaker, we have a debt and somehow we are broke if we own assets and have a debt against it. 124-11

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to ask whether any of those Ministers opposite have a mortgage on their house, because if they have a mortgage on their house, using the Minister responsible for Housings definition, they are broke. They are broke, Mr. Speaker. So if they use that same system of accounting here that they use at home that is what I would like to see. But, of course, they can't do that, Mr. Speaker, they can't do that. —(Interjection)— The NDP arithmetic isn't bad, at least it is arithmetic, Mr. Speaker. It is not plastic, comic-book fantasy. Mr. Speaker,

the Minister responsible for Housing has said that somehow if Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation gets out of housing that the private sector will provide housing for low income families and for senior citizens.

Now, we look around at other provinces and that has never ever happened. If you look around at Manitoba prior to '69 and it wasn't happening then. So I went around and I asked some of the private people in the private industry, how will this happen? And they said it won't, Mr. Speaker. It won't happen unless we get subsidies. It won't happen unless we get subsidies from that fellow.

Now, I think it is important to determine how large will the subsidies to the private sector be for comparable housing as it is right now to MHRC housing. The rents for MHRC housing, Mr. Speaker, are determined according to the original construction costs of that building. What's added, Mr. Speaker, are costs of operation and costs of hydro, those types of utility costs. If you start providing subsidies to the private sector they will ask for rent subsidies to cover the difference between what an individual can pay and what the going market rate is, and what is the going market rate? Is it determined according to the original constructions costs? No, it is determined according to the current market value.

So if you look at our Public Housing it might of cost something in the order of \$180 million to put up. We pay subsidies on costs of \$180 million. That housing is worth closer to \$400 million, Mr. Speaker, that is current market value. And if we had to pay rents on the basis of current market values we would be paying rents that in aggregate are twice as great as those that we are paying today. That is why people outside of Manitoba, people who are expert in housing, say that public housing and third sector housing or non-profit housing and co-op housing, because the rents are geared to original construction costs, is non-inflationary housing. That is the term used to describe that type of housing. So we are not going to have any public housing unless the private sector is subsidized in a manner that is going to be much more expensive to us than it was in the case in the past, or we will not have housing unless non-profits get going and co-operatives get going in building housing.

And what's been the record of the Conservative Party with respect to providing seed money for Co-operatives? I read with interest the debate last year when Bonnie C0-0p, a direct charge food Co-op, got a start-up grant from the previous administration. The biggest critics of that start-up grant for a co-operative were members of the Conservative Party. So if that's their track record with respect to co-op housing it won't help us right now to mouth a few platitudes regarding the desirability of co-op housing. Unless they get seed money, unless they get land made available, we won't have any co-op housing.

And what's the situation with respect to non-profit housing? That type of financing is provided by the Federal Government. I phoned them and I said, "What's happening with respect to non-profit housing?" Because the Minister in Manitoba, having cut off all this type of other housing, has put tremendous pressure on non-profits to have housing put in place, and they told me that the situation is somewhat disastrous. Last year CMHC didn't put any seed money for non-profit housing in their estimates. That means if a non-profit group wants to investigate the possibility of putting in housing they don't have any seed money to do it.

So I asked them, "What's been the experience of nonprofit organizations in developing housing without this seed money?" And they said there hasn't been any developed. That's what I mean about the Minister putting on his thinking cap and doing his home-work before he destroys a program, because there is nothing in its place right now. We will have nothing for this year, and given the lead time required to get housing in place, we will probably not have housing for two years. Even then there's going to be difficulties.

And we have another ingenious Act by the Minister responsible for housing. This concerns the critical home repair program. You can recall it. It's a program that is geared to keeping people living in homes that they own. I would have thought that this is totally in line with the Conservative Party's attitude on housing.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it provides renovations to privately owned homes, especially those owned by pensioners and those people earning less than \$11,000 per year, to all allow them to continue to live in their homes during periods of higher unemployment.

So what do we have, Mr. Speaker, right now? We have high unemployment. I think we've got high unemployment. It's the highest unemployment in Manitoba's history, and it's growing. But what does this government do? It freezes that program. It lays off a whole bunch of people, and it says we have to lay these people off to allow that program to deal with the backlog. I've never heard of greater nonsense. I thought it was nonsense. I couldn't understand it. I now can. That's not the program's fault, Mr. Speaker, it's the fault of the Minister. And I look forward to estimates. I looked forward to it. It's going to be very interesting to see how the Minister can justify his performance to date — his performance — which has been completely and totally destructive, and has left complete and utter chaos in the entire house building industry in Manitoba. And there are people who are quite confused as to what's going to take place.

I was interested to see Mr. Bergen saying, "I'll start two senior citizens' housing projects as long as I get subsidies from the province." But Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government won't cost share those subsidies. So what are we going to have happening now? — (Interjection)— He will, Mr. Speaker, he will. And that has come to me from other sources, and he told me that as soon as he can get the subsidies going — because, Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Bergen can provide housing for senior citizens so that they will not pay over 25 percent of gross income for rent, then I take my hat off to him, but he won't.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The member will have ten minutes left to speak when we next meet.

Monday, March 27, 1978

The hour being 5:30 I leaving the Chair to return at 8 o'clock.