



**Third Session — Thirty-First Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**

28 Elizabeth II

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Harry E. Graham  
Speaker*



**VOL. XXVII No. 8A**

**2:30 P.M. Monday, February 26, 1979**

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, February 26, 1979

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 Agriculture.

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the report of the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation for the year ending March, 1978.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour . . . Tourism.

**HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia):** I would like to move the tabling of the report of the Manitoba Arts Council for the year ending March 31, 1978.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I wish to apologize to the Honourable Minister. Notices of Motion.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON** introduced Bill No. 17, An Act to amend The Public Printing Act. (Recommended by Lieutenant-Governor)

**HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK**, on behalf of HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER, introduced Bill No. 15, An Act to amend The Garnishment Act, and Bill No. 16, An Act to amend The Real Property Act. (Recommended by Lieutenant-Governor)

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** To the Minister of Health and Social Development, Mr. Speaker, in view of the government's failure to proceed with an adequate correctional institute in The Pas, proper detention facilities for juveniles there, can the Minister confirm that an amount in the neighbourhood of \$20,000 was spent last year in order to provide escort services for juveniles being brought from The Pas, from Northern Manitoba, down to Winnipeg.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I can't confirm it, Mr. Speaker, but I should think it's highly likely.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. PAWLEY:** A further question to the Minister of Health. In view of the continued problems relating to the difficulties our courts are being faced with insofar as administering our laws in the province of Manitoba could he confirm that judges in our Provincial Judge's Courts have found it impossible to provide jails and alternative sentence because of the overcrowding facilities at Headingley and the inability on the part of the judge to ensure that those convicted will, in fact be placed in Headingley.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member of the Opposition touches on a very important and critical area and essentially the general point he is making is a correct one, not one that developed over night as he well knows being a member of the legal profession himself. It is related to the whole sentencing and remanding and court procedure in this province and he knows that jail populations in this province have doubled in the last decade while our general population has remained constant and there are now difficulties as a result of that. We have some eight to ten years of delay and procrastination in this area to remedy.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member of the Opposition.

**MR. PAWLEY:** A supplementary. Can the Minister then advise whether or not at any time prior to last week did a provincial judge find it impossible to sentence an individual before him to Headingley due to the overcrowded facilities' any time prior to last week, had we reached that dismal a situation in the Province of Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I can't confirm that, Mr. Speaker, but once again I would say to my honourable friend that it is certainly possible and may in fact be highly likely that has occurred in the past. I would say to him, no, and he knows full well that Headingley is not empowered to turn away offenders who are brought out there for incarceration. What happens is that the person being sent out under sentence or on remand, is accommodated and if it is necessary to make room for him, then a temporary absence pass is provided to somebody else who is close to the end of his sentence and judged capable of going back on the street.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. PAWLEY:** A question to the First Minister. Did the government present a position paper to the recent conference on grain handling and transportation that was called by the First Minister only a few weeks ago?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood):** Mr Speaker, the Government of Manitoba engaged fully in the discussions of all of the points of the agenda. There was no formal position paper as such that was presented to the meeting that I can recall but I'll check the papers on it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Could the First Minister advise as to what the Government's position is in respect to the retention of the Crowsnest Pass rates in freight?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, that subject matter was of course touched on indirectly at the meeting. The traditional position of the Government of Manitoba with respect to the crowrate or the protection that the crowrate affords the farmers of Manitoba and indeed the farmers of Western Canada has certainly been maintained, although the west is in a position at the present time of having to respond to the different initiatives that are being posed by either the Federal Department of Transport, and/or the Canadian Wheat Board, which might through the back door, try to negate some of the benefit that has occurred over the years from the Crow. That is why we have to watch very carefully at the present time certain suggestions that are being made by the Federal Minister of Transport and/or by the Wheat Board with respect to provinces participating with provincial taxpayers' money in the acquisition of hopper cars which, of course, my honourable friend would quickly recognize, would be one manner whereby compensatory rates could be introduced with the taxpayers of Manitoba, including the farmers of Manitoba, paying therefor.

Therefore, we have taken the position, with respect to that matter, that much greater discussion should take place before any provincial government in western Canada is called upon, or is requested to make financial contribution for the purchase of hopper cars. This is a national problem. It must be kept in the national context, and the role of the provinces must be to assist in whatever manner they can, to resolve the problem which is fundamental to the continued development and growth

of the agricultural community in western Canada.

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

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Hydro. In the past, the present government committed itself to providing some relief on the payment of Hydro rates by community organizations that run curling clubs and skating rinks. I wonder if the government could now indicate what plans it has to provide that kind of relief for the Hydro costs that these particular municipal organizations are now facing.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, the plan that the government has in mind has been announced publicly to the municipal association, and since then as well. I would think that the elaboration of the plan would come from the Minister of Sports and Recreation, when he tables his Estimates. The plan in mind is to provide a form of subsidy that would pick up the difference between the costs of demand billing and regular billing on community recreational facilities. But if you want the details on it, I would suggest that we wait very briefly, that will be before the House.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to either the Minister responsible for Hydro, or the Minister for Sports. Can either of them indicate when that particular plan may in fact be implemented, considering that the heavy period of Hydro use is now upon us in the winter months, and that in fact the Hydro bills are coming due to a very high average, whether the relief will be retro-active, or will it apply to the Hydro bills being faced by these organizations this year?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for Sports. **HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye):** Mr. Speaker, one of the problems with demand billing, in reference to the question from the Member for Fort Rouge, is the problem of the summer demand billing, and that is where the recreation facilities have been facing their problems. In other words, they have been paying for power when they haven't been using it, and that has been the big problem with that particular proposal. My staff is finalizing a system whereby we hope to alleviate some of the costs to the different recreation facilities, and I hope to have that very shortly.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Hydro. Can the Minister of Hydro indicate what negotiations are taking place with power companies in the United States for the purchase of power and the sale of hydro power for Manitoba and what particular proposals are coming forward for the rates and charges that will be used for those negotiations?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, the member's question leads to a very wide-ranging and detailed answer, and I can only indicate . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I would hope that the Minister doesn't get into a wide-ranging and detailed answer at this particular time. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, that's what I was leading up to. I think that the question does require some further in-depth discussion and perhaps there's a better opportunity. I would just indicate to the member that there are very extensive discussions going on with interests in the US, in addition to the east-west western power grid studies, and this includes rates, of course, as well as all the other features that go with it, diversity exchange and so on. But it is a much broader question than what you want to deal with at this point, I think.

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

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, to follow up on the questions of the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to ask the First Minister whether there have been any impact studies on the question of the abolition of the statutory grain rates by his government?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I would have to naturally take that question as notice. I am not aware of studies that may be carried on in other departments of government. I'll be happy to take it as

notice.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister would undertake also to indicate to us after he has considered the matter whether it would not be advisable to have a committee of the Legislature consider the question of the crowrate so that we would have a more unified position from the Province of Manitoba when we do have to confront the issue.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that there is any position that is not unified in the Province of Manitoba with respect to the crowrate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. KEN MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I have answers to several questions. I'll give two or three and then I'll sit down and let others ask some questions if they so choose. The Member for Churchill asked a question about poly chlorinated Bi-phenyls some time ago and wanted to know if we were reasonably satisfied with the procedures that were being used in regard to handling this particular chemical. My department assures me that the users, which is Manitoba Hydro and City Hydro and some others, are using proper procedures and that when we are called upon to assist in any particular matter in regard to handling this equipment, that our own people are using proper procedures.

The Member for Churchill asked a question in relation to when, if, where and how the Workplace Safety and Health Advisory Council had met, when it was meeting, and where it was going to meet. It did meet, in fact, Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1978. I have been in touch with the Chairman last week, who was attempting to establish a meeting for tomorrow. We thought the meeting would go ahead. The committee is comprised of three members of employers, three from the professional group and three from labour. The three from industry and the three professionals had all agreed to meet tomorrow and the three from Labour said they were not available tomorrow and would not be available for the next few days, so we are, in the interim, trying to establish a meeting approximately for March 13th.

In answer to a question from the Member for St. Vital, in regards to layoffs, spending layoffs, working hours, in the packing industry. My investigators tell me that at Burns Meats Limited, they had issued 100 layoff notices; they had acted on 40 of them, and I won't go through the specific dates, but all 40 have been called back to work so, in fact, today at that particular company, my advice is that there are no people who have been laid off.

At Swift Canadian, they laid off 10 people and they rehired or brought back 5.

Canada Packers, they laid off 20 and last week I understand they laid off an additional 60, and those people are still laid off.

Best Beef Limited, they laid off 15 people; and East-West Packers have laid off 20 people. O.K. Packers and Schneiders both say that possible layoffs may be pending but they're in a situation where they are dealing with a mixture of pork and beef and the supply is somewhat greater than it was just in the other packers who were dealing particularly with beef.

Not being an expert on that particular subject, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has said that he would add something to this particular answer which may be of value to the Member for St. Vital.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I think that the reduction in the cow numbers in the province, the reduction in the hog numbers, is a clear indication of what is really taking place and has caused the layoff of the people in the packing-house industry. For example, over the past several years, in the years 1969 to 1978, or inclusive in there, we've had reductions in cow numbers or increased cow slaughterings in the province. The statement can be made that we've killed the goose that laid the golden egg and I guess further demonstrates the \$40 million that was spent by the last administration failed to encourage to keep people in the beef industry, that the increased cow slaughterings have resulted in total net product to go to market to be slaughtered at this particular time.

The same in the hog industry. We've seen a reduction in hog slaughterings in the province, from 1.5 million in 1971 to about 791 hogs slaughtered in the province last year.

So I just wanted to add to the fact that it was a failure of the NDP agricultural policy to support the total agricultural economy in the province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. PETER FOX:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister wishes to make a statement or a dissertation of what his opinion is, he should do it under the proper procedure and then we could have a reply. He was not asked a question in this particular instance, he was just ad-libbing.

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

**MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to pose a question to the First Minister and ask the First Minister if the government has done any studies to determine the economic effects of abolishing the crowsrates.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I believe if my honourable friend had been listening to earlier questions, he would realize that that question has already been answered.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that it was answered in the same vein as I asked this question; it was different. I want to know when the government is going to apply itself to this very very serious question. I would ask the First Minister when the farmers of this province can find out what it's going to cost them to ship a bushel of wheat if the crowsrates are abolished.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'm assuming that the First Minister doesn't wish to answer my colleague question.

**MR. LYON:** It's already been dealt with.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, then I'm correctly assuming that he doesn't wish to answer the question. I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Health. Can the Honourable Minister of Health assure those people who are unfortunate enough to have to receive social assistance from the government, either at the municipal or at the provincial level, that the result of the ill-conceived federal plan of dividing the population of this country for the benefit of receiving family allowances into the so-called rich and the so-called poor, will not result in the people who are receiving social assistance, having their social assistance reduced by the amount of these so-called credit lump payments so that they will in fact be worse off, because if the family allowance was dealt with equally to all citizens, they would continue to receive those family allowance payments without having a deduction by virtue of this ill-conceived needs test type of payment.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I cannot assure my honourable friend, the Member for Inkster, of that fact at the moment but I do understand his concern and the principle which he is discussing. I can only tell him that in concert with many income transfer programs, that subject is being studied by my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Finance, and a decision will be made just as quickly as possible.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker' can the Minister assure me that insofar as his government is concerned, that they do not intend to reduce the amount that these unfortunate people who are in the position that they have to receive their sustenance from the state, will have that sustenance reduced, because the federal government has chosen to divide this population into two classes in terms of family allowance payments? Can he tell us that his government will not reduce the social allowance payment?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat to my honourable friend that I can't assure him of that today. I know what he's driving at; I assure him that his concerns will be taken into consideration by the government but I can't give him that assurance today.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, if he cannot give me his assurance today, can he tell me that he, in principle, agrees that people on social assistance should not have their sustenance reduced because they happen to be getting this ill-conceived tax credit rather than regular family allowances which they received in concert with all of us up until this year?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend knows from eight years of similar experience himself, that I am part of a collective decision making process. What I can tell him is that I am as unhappy with the federal tax rebate and child tax credit scheme as he is.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Would the Attorney-General be prepared to investigate the allegations that were made by the Ombudsman in his report, namely that there is a complete disregard of legislation which requires adults and juveniles to be held separately and probably there is no other institution in the whole of the country which so ignores the legal and professional requirements to hold juveniles separate from adults. Would he be prepared to investigate those allegations?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER:** I was late, Mr. Speaker, I didn't know whether I had changed ministries. Mr. Speaker, I indicated last week that I was reviewing the Ombudsman's report and would in due course be able to comment on it further.

**MR. DOERN:** I would also ask the Attorney-General whether he would be prepared to investigate the statement of Justice Garson that he was forced to let a convicted criminal go because there was no room in the Headingley Gaol. Would he be prepared to investigate that or meet with the judge?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that refers to an article this past week, on Saturday, in Saturday's daily newspaper, and we are looking at that matter.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would also ask the Attorney-General whether he can assure the Legislature that no dangerous criminals are being prematurely released by the provincial authorities, in view of the fact that one such person was let go by the authorities at Stony Mountain last week.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. MacMASTER:** A couple of more answers, Mr. Speaker. There was a question Friday in the House whether children had ever been tested, or examinations made of them in schools that were in the surrounding areas or in the near proximity of industries that were using lead. The fact is that there was a study performed on the school children in 1976 and those facts and figures were turned into the Clean Environment Commission at that particular time. There was another question raised Friday also in relationship to the laboratory that's being used for some of the tests as to whose direction it was under. The laboratory is under the direction of the Environmental Management Division of the Department of Mines, Natural Resources and Environment, but the staff that use a certain portion of it and those responsible for certain tests are within my department and they have their own workings within there.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development, and ask the honourable minister whether he can confirm that the new correctional institute in the City of Brandon has been redesigned so that one wing of that institute will house juveniles, contrary to the requirements of The Juvenile Delinquents Act of Manitoba, in violation of that particular Act.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I believe some minimal redesign has been completed, yes. However, as the honourable member knows, there is nobody in the new correctional institute yet.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, is the honourable minister indicating then, or hinting, that it is possible that the government will not proceed to house juveniles in that particular wing, and thereby be in contravention of the laws of this province?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, that decision hasn't been made yet. The government's course at the present time, in the interests of the taxpayers of Manitoba, is to make the most effective use of expensive institutions that we can.

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

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, from that last answer then, I would like to ask this supplementary. Is the honourable minister satisfied that he can proceed with the possibility of violating that Act, without any consequences, or is it the Minister's intention to change the Act, to turn the clock back, so that juveniles will be housed in the same institution as adult offenders?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, we're not embarked on any intentional course of violating any acts. We are keeping our options open.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. RONALD McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the same Minister since he's indicated his intention not to violate the Act —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, there are comments from the seat of the member opposite who probably should be flushed occasionally. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Corrections could indicate what action, if any, he has taken to avoid breaking the law in the situation of the temporary correctional facilities at The Pas?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, this government inherited a situation in which apparently there had been some acquiescence for some period of time in what members of the opposition and some others seem to think is breaking of the law. We have not yet resolved that problem. We are working on it intensively. We hope to be able to resolve it very soon.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder in regard to the simple question of whether or not juveniles are still being held at the temporary facilities with adults, are juveniles still being held, or are they being held elsewhere? Or are they still being held at the temporary jail facilities along with adults at The Pas?

**MR. SHERMAN:** The simple answer to that simple question, Mr. Speaker, is yes, they are still being held in that facility.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could give us some clue when the year and a half of deliberation thus far on the correctional institution at The Pas, when a decision will finally be made on that matter, if he has a target date by which a decision will be made.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, my target date has always been yesterday. It's been very difficult to achieve that because it's a complicated problem and the honourable member knows that. It involves far more than just some juveniles in that particular institution in The Pas. I think that that particular component can be resolved very quickly if we can deal with it in isolation from a broader problem that has consumed the time and energy and presumably the good intentions of governments preceding this one.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, on Friday the Member for Rupertsland asked me some questions in which he quoted some excerpts from the Provincial Auditor's report and then concluded his remarks with this editorial comment. "This department has no less than two Conservative Ministers, who pride themselves and indicate to the public of Manitoba that they're such good business managers. Why have they not at least provided for proper administrative



within this department.”

I would like to draw my honourable friend's attention, in case it has escaped him, that the period which the report covers was from April 1st of 1977, to March 31st, 1978, and I will leave it to my honourable friend to figure out who was in office during seven of those twelve months, Sir. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I am replying to my honourable friend's question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. —(Interjection)—

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, what my honourable friend has done is confirmed my suspicions, and my suspicion was that he asked the question for effect, not for re-information.

#### POINT OF ORDER

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland has a point of order.

**MR. HARVEY BOSTROM (Rupertsland):** The Honourable House Leader is referring to remarks that I made, and seems to be indicating that those remarks were made with respect to the annual report which was tabled. They were not. The remarks were contained in a memo which was dated September 20th, 1978, and referred to the operations of this department under the present government, and under the two Conservative ministers that were operating this department.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, my honourable friend's question was not intended to evoke an answer. Obviously, does not want an answer. My honourable friend is using it for editorial purposes. The quotations that he quoted from are contained in the Provincial Auditor's Report, on the first page. The four points that he raised are on the report itself, and that is what he quoted from. I might also point out to my honourable friend, —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I have the floor, and I would like to conclude my answer to my honourable friend's question which he obviously does not want.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland on a point of order.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I feel I am entitled to point out that the remarks I made were not the ones which were being indicated by this Minister, and, Mr. Speaker, if I am allowed to state my point of order, it is that the quote that I was quoting was not from the Annual Report dated March 31st, 1977. The remarks I quoted were in a memo from John Singleton, CA, auditor, to W.K. Ziprick, CA, dated September 20th, 1978, and the criticisms he makes are of those of the department while it was being administered by the Progressive Conservative ministers.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend has quoted from the report, and I do want to —(Interjection)— You see, my honourable friend did not point out all of the information that was contained in that report, because if he had read just the next paragraph, he would have found this excerpt, and he very conveniently left that particular excerpt out, and it says this: "These situations still exist at the present time. However, I am pleased to note that the Queen's Printer has taken preliminary action to rectify the situation." In other words, what he is saying, is that after years of mismanagement, which has now been confirmed by my honourable friend opposite, steps are now being taken to correct the abominable situation that existed while my honourable friends were in office.

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

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member state your point of order.

**MR. BOSTROM:** My point of order is that the remarks the Auditor made were with respect to the mismanagement of this Minister and his previous Minister in this government, and not the previous government.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. The Honourable Minister of Labour, in his reply to my question of Friday morning, stated that there was a report dealing with the lead testing of children within the vicinity of these plants. Would the Minister be prepared to table that survey?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I have no objections with that. It was done in 1976. I am not sure where the member was at that particular time, and it was turned over to the Clean Environment Commission, which he probably at that time had pretty free access to, but I am sure we can get you a copy of that report.

**MR. JENKINS:** A further question, Mr. Speaker, through you to the same Minister. Since he states that the laboratory is under the Department of . . . or perhaps it should be to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. The lab testing laboratory for lead poisoning is under his department. Could the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources inform this House whether this lab is certified?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Mines.

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney):** Mr. Speaker, I can only assume so, but I would take that as notice.

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

**MR. JENKINS:** A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Minister of Labour. Since the last testing of children within the vicinity of plants emitting lead poisoning was in 1976, and since it seems that the incident of lead poisoning rate is on the increase, would the Minister be prepared to have another test taken in the near future within the vicinity of these plants?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. MacMASTER:** I could certainly take that into consideration, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think the member should take assumptions from the benches behind him, that there is an additional problem in the lead industry today, that hasn't been there for some period of time. In fact, it's improving the entire industry day by day, and I think his assumptions are absolutely incorrect.

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

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Minister responsible for Hydro. Can he tell us whether he or members of the government have carried out any discussions or negotiations with American officials, towards the establishment of a mid-west grid for the export of a Manitoba Hydro power?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Hydro.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, there is no study called the mid-west grid, but there are two studies that are being examined in the U.S. that are both in the mid-west, so perhaps that answers his question, but there is no specific study called the mid-west study that includes Manitoba. He may be referring to either the Mandan Study, which is Nebraska and Dakotas, or the WAPA Study which includes the states further west and further north.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Let me clarify the question for the Minister. In respect to those studies undertaken in terms of an American mid-west grid system for Hydro Electric power, have any officials of the Manitoba government undertaken any discussions that would include the extension of Manitoba Hydro and the exporting of its power into that grid, and has there been any discussions towards the feasibility of that sale of power for that grid?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Hydro.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I think that probably the member is referring to what is called the Western Area Power Alliance, or the WAPA Study, and that being the case, the answer would be yes.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with a final supplementary.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. In review of the Minister's answer that discussions have been carried out, can the Minister indicate if there is to be any specific commitment or any specific program that the government intends to undertake to establish that connection with the mid-west system, or are there any agreed upon studies between the federal and provincial governments to undertake that kind of feasibility study about the allocation or exporting of Manitoba power into that grid?

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I would hope so. There has been some work done already. I would hope that there would be much further done and that it would be the sort of thing that we might be able to very logically and profitably become associated with. There has been some indication to the federal interests, the current government in Ottawa that we may well be wanting to approach them on this matter and we trust that we have an open mind to what would be likely a firm power sale. Now that would indicate that we are further along than we actually are. As the member probably knows, these international discussions take some time because there are many parties to the discussion. But to reply to his question, there have been discussions with the federal interests, The National Energy Board and the Federal Government, to indicate to them that we may wish some action on their part that will be in the best interests of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Time for question period having expired, we'll proceed with the Orders of the Day. BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Mr. Speaker, I have an announcement with respect to the Rules Committee. We would like to change the name of the Honourable Member for Logan for that of the Honourable Member for Inkster. (Agreed.) ORDERS OF THE DAY — THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the adjourned debate, the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Springfield and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to extend the customary congratulations to yourself, Sir, for being re-elected to your position as Speaker of the Legislature. I believe by the way in which you have handled the post so far that we can expect continued fair treatment from yourself. I hope as an individual member of the Legislature that I will be able to assist you by refraining personally from getting out of order too many times.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend congratulations to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in a speech which I believe outlined the main points of disagreement by this side with the operations of the present government and certainly pointed out many, if not all of the failures of the present government to deal with the problems that we face in Manitoba today.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to extend my congratulations to the Mover and Seconder of the from Speech the Throne, in particular the comments by the Member for Radisson in his obvious attempt to be very open-minded about the bilingual issues that are before us today. I believe he showed more statesman-like conduct than we ordinarily expect from Progressive Conservative members in this Legislature in the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to in the course of my remarks today comment on many different areas of operation of the present government. I don't expect to have enough time to go into all of them but I certainly hope to hit most of the main points of disagreement that I and members of our party have I believe with the operations of the present government.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the present government has certainly failed the people of Manitoba, failed even in meeting the promises which they made to the people of Manitoba in the election campaign of 1977, the glorious promises of a better Manitoba, a free Manitoba, a Manitoba that was going to have all kinds of employment for young people. I believe the First Minister in his remarks on television and in speeches to the public of Manitoba said he had a vision of Manitoba where there would be all these jobs for the young people of Manitoba. Well, it certainly is a sad state compared to that visionary expectation or promise that the first First Minister and his colleagues

had lead the people of Manitoba to expect his government would be able to deliver.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to go into the economic issues that are facing our province, as well, to go into areas where I believe the government's handling of education has been sadly lacking as far as the programs are concerned to assist the disadvantaged, particularly the people living in northern remote locations in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I also intend to outline some of the administrative weaknesses of this government, some of the administrative failures. And, Mr. Speaker, we had a classic example of one of those already today where we had the Minister of Consumer Affairs getting up and very lamely trying to point out something that I said was not correct.

Mr. Speaker, in my rebuttal to him I believe I pointed out just the opposite, that what he was trying to attribute to me was not correct. In fact the auditor's report, the memo that I quoted from is an indictment of his management of that department and his colleague who sits beside him, his former management of that department. In the year 1977 and 1978, Mr. Speaker, it is clear from the auditor's report that accompanied that memo that he tabled in this House that they are mismanaging that department and certainly not following the proper procedure. I will go into that in more detail later on.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that one of the most damning indictments of this government is their handling of the health situation in Manitoba, particularly with respect to the disadvantaged people, particularly with respect to the elderly in this province. And, Mr. Speaker, I intend to go into that in more detail as well.

Just on the economic side, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that Manitoba is slipping behind the other provinces of Canada, where we have the lowest growth rate in all of Canada, and regardless of all the statistics that the honourable members on the opposite side trot out, they can not deny the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we are in the lowest position in Canada growth-wise of any province. Mr. Speaker, whatever growth there is in Manitoba is fueled by the increases in the agricultural field, which certainly these members can not take any credit for. It's a matter of the economics of the day that the farmers are luckily, fortunately better off than they were two or three years ago. And, Mr. Speaker, it puts the economic picture of Manitoba in a better light than the case would be if the farmers were not in a more fortunate position that they are in today.

Mr. Speaker, we see 16 to 25 percent unemployment in the construction field, we see the drop in construction activity in the province of Manitoba, the drop in mining activity in the province of Manitoba, and Mr. Speaker, there are a number of undeniable facts which this government seems to want to deny when it comes to looking at the economy of this province.

It's clear, Mr. Speaker, that one fact is, that the government is not generating enough jobs to keep up with the expansion of the labour force in Manitoba. In fact it's pretty obvious when you see 9,000 people in one year leaving this province and these are the highly mobile professional people of the Province of Manitoba and it's a complete and inalterable loss to the people of Manitoba that these professional, progressive people have left.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, if the present trend continues, if Manitoba's population continues to decline with the same rate as we have experienced in this past year, Mr. Speaker, if the population continues to exit from the Province of Manitoba at the same rate, Manitoba's population will shrink from a peak of over one million people in 1976 to less than one million by the year 2,000 — around 900,000, Mr. Speaker, is the prediction.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest a campaign slogan for the Conservative Party for the next provincial election, going into the '80s. They can call their management of the economy of Manitoba "Shrinking to Beat Eighties."

Mr. Speaker, the loss of population to Manitoba necessarily, by definition, means a significant lower growth for the Province of Manitoba. It means a shrinking market for those people who are interested in investment in Manitoba and the Conservatives can crow and brag all they like about their friends in the business world but, Mr. Speaker, if the markets are not here, the entrepreneurs that are in Manitoba right now and those who would hope to come to Manitoba, are not going to invest in Manitoba when the markets are not expanding, when the population is shrinking.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Conservative policies, the policies that this government has followed since they came to office, are much to blame for the situation that exists in Manitoba today. Mr. Speaker, it's a matter of public record that provincial public investment has declined in Manitoba and the private investment has not increased to compensate for that loss. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we have a lower overall investment in Manitoba which is one of the many reasons for the lower growth in the Province of Manitoba and less jobs for the people who are seeking jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Conservative refusal to increase the minimum wage in Manitoba is certainly cause for great concern, particularly for those at the lowest income scale, the working poor. I believe that statistics would point out that there are approximately 60,000 people in that

category of working at the minimum wage in Manitoba. So, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative's refusal to increase the minimum wage in Manitoba, is affecting at least that many people in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the government's answer to their unemployment problem seems to be just to ignore it and to sit back and hope that people in private business will step in to fill the gap and, Mr. Speaker, that will never occur in the Province of Manitoba. This province has a history of public investment at a rather healthy scale to compensate for the lower rate of private investment historically in this province. Mr. Speaker, the cutoff of the employment and economic development programs in the various departments of government show that this government has really no concern for those, particularly those that are in the northern communities, and in the rural areas of Manitoba. The programs that the New Democratic Party government had brought in over the years to try to assist in economic development have either been cut or severely reduced by the Conservative government. One of those, Mr. Speaker, is the special northern employment program which I understand has only recently been chopped completely by this provincial government. The Communities Economic Development Fund, which is a loans program to assist small entrepreneurs in rural and northern locations, has been reduced to an almost do-nothing role as far as assisting local entrepreneurs is concerned. It is only working in those areas where the federal government is participating by way of a special ARDA application or grant. Mr. Speaker, what that simply means is that this government, where they are participating at all in economic development, are following the lead of the Liberal government in Ottawa whom they are always being critical of.

Mr. Speaker, the resource development thrust which the previous New Democratic government had brought in has been simply brushed aside by the present Minister of Resources and his predecessor in that post so that, Mr. Speaker, the remote communities in Manitoba that have levels of unemployment that members opposite like to not think about, and certainly never experience in their own localities, are ignoring them completely. Mr. Speaker, there are levels of unemployment in remote communities that I'm sure honourable members would be shocked to see. Many of the remote communities, particularly the Indian reserves in Manitoba, have unemployment levels at least at the 75 percent level.

Mr. Speaker, there is a certain welfare cycle which sets in when unemployment is that high and that is one problem that this government seems to want to ignore. In fact, Mr. Speaker, where they are not doing anything about employment, all they are doing is handing out more welfare. Mr. Speaker, I never believed that we, as a government, the New Democratic Party government, were doing enough in that area; I believe we should have been doing more. But, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservatives are doing nothing in that area. Mr. Speaker, it appears as though their criticism of the New Democratic Party as being a party which is associated with welfare is certainly not correct because, Mr. Speaker, this is the government that is most associated with welfare since they're doing absolutely nothing about unemployment and seem to prefer to just hand out welfare to the remote communities where there are high levels of unemployment, where there are resources to be harvested and where, Mr. Speaker, the people need the technical and financial assistance of an activist government in order to put those things together to create ongoing employment, useful, productive employment for the members of their community. Mr. Speaker, this government seems to be not interested in that and it's obvious when they cut programs like the special northern employment program which was designed to assist communities in economic development, to create long-term productive jobs for the people in their communities.

Mr. Speaker, the Northern Affairs department have cut all of their economic development programs and they seem to be desirous of establishing a role very much like the old Commission of Northern Affairs which was simply a co-ordinating function. Mr. Speaker, that kind of function proved to be a failure in the past and will prove to be a failure again. Mr. Speaker, in practice, they expect a lower level, field level civil servant in Northern Affairs to be able to co-ordinate the functions of all the departments of government and, Mr. Speaker, that's absolutely impossible. Even if that person was at the Deputy Minister level, he would have great difficulty co-ordinating all the functions of the departments of government. But, Mr. Speaker, to expect that a field level person in the Department of Northern Affairs is going to be able to co-ordinate the delivery of services into Northern Manitoba from 15 or 16 departments, is simply ridiculous. It just will not work. It hasn't worked in the past and it won't work in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated I would mention the failure of this government in its education programs. We are now witnessing a reduction in those very programs which are designed to assist, promote northern communities in the training of people to accept professional jobs, professional jobs that are located right in the northern communities, jobs that are in the area of teaching, nursing, public works jobs, environmental jobs, professional jobs that the New Democratic Party government had special programs established to assist the native people in these communities to receive the kind of training necessary to qualify them for those positions.

Mr. Speaker, we now hear that there are at least four special education programs that this government is severely reducing at a time, Mr. Speaker, when I mentioned that there are 75 or 80 percent unemployment in these communities, when if anything, they should be increasing the level of assistance, they are reducing it. We are told, Mr. Speaker, there is a 20 percent reduction in four of the programs that are operating to assist in the training of native people for professional jobs. One of them is the IMPACTE program, which is the Indian-Metis program for the advancement of teacher education. Another is the BUNTEP program, the Brandon University Northern Teacher Education Program. Another is the PENT program, which is the program for the education of native teachers, and a special Mature Students' Program which gave promising individuals an opportunity to take a professional degree, or a professional training, in order to qualify for positions in northern communities or in fact anywhere in society.

Mr. Speaker, by cutting these programs, this government again is showing that they are willing to be hard-hearted and heartless when it comes to the disadvantaged, the poor, the people that are lacking in opportunity, those that are not able to express a mass criticism against this government. Mr. Speaker, they show the stupidity of their policy when you consider that at the present time in northern Manitoba, through their own Frontier School Program and the federal government's program, they are importing teachers into northern Manitoba. They are importing teachers not just from Southern Manitoba, they're importing them from out of the province, they're importing them from out of the country, when, Mr. Speaker, the direction this government should be going is to train people in the native communities, in the northern communities, to fill those jobs, rather than bringing people in from out of the province, out of the country, to fill positions in northern communities where there is massive unemployment. They should be putting the funds in there to train people to fill those positions. Mr. Speaker, we were doing it and I would argue that we were not doing enough but, Mr. Speaker, this government is cutting back on those programs when they should be increasing them.

Mr. Speaker, even the Manitoba Teachers' Society, in a recent article, point out where in general in this province the Department of Education, the provincial government, is reneging on a campaign province which they made of financing education by 80 percent from provincial funds. Mr. Speaker, they have not only reneged on that side but on the other side they are raising tuition fees, raising the user fee to the individual who has to pay for his own education. They've abandoned the goal of 80 percent provincial financing of education in Manitoba. At least that's one story we get is that they are abandoning it. If you look at the figures, Mr. Speaker, in 1977 there was 76.5 percent paid by provincial funds; in 1978, it dropped to 74.5; and in 1979, it's down to 70.6 percent. So, Mr. Speaker, by their actions they are abandoning the goal of 80 percent.

But, Mr. Speaker, we get two stories, we receive two stories, much like the two stories we heard today from the Honourable House Leader. In March of 1978, it is reported that the Minister of Education told a Free Press reporter that the government had abandoned the 80 percent goal of provincial financing of provincial education in Manitoba. Yet, two days later, in this Legislature, the Minister of Education claimed they had not abandoned that goal. Well, Mr. Speaker, which story are we to believe?

**A MEMBER:** Neither.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, it's obvious from their actions that they have abandoned the 80 percent goal since there has been a steady decline in the provincial share of financing since this government took office.

Mr. Speaker, it's obvious from the handling of the Department of Co-operative Development so far, that the new Minister of Co-op Development is living up to the reports that we receive from him, or about him rather, that he doesn't like Co-ops and can't figure out why he was named Minister of Co-operative Development. Mr. Speaker, it's very much like the Minister of Labour who didn't like unions. It's pretty obvious from the way in which the government has been operating with respect to the Department of Co-op Development, where most of the department have been let go, there is only a skeleton crew of people at that department right now. Mr. Speaker, we will go into this in more detail when we come to the Minister's Estimates but I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, we will find that the government's handling of Co-ops and Credit Unions in Manitoba is going to be found sadly lacking. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe when we come to that department and examine it carefully, this will be one of the many horror stories that we will have to examine and reveal to the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I bring to your attention a letter which was written to the Premier of this province, and it's written by a member of an operating co-operative in Manitoba. The letter reads:

"It has recently come to our attention that the Department of Co-operative Development has been severely reduced in staff size and activity. As a new co-operative, we have relied heavily upon

the professional services and programs in the Department of Co-operative Development. Training programs, administrative advice, and member relation activities have been essential to our development and growth. In these, and many other activities, the Department of Co-operative Development played a supportive and invaluable role.

"You are no doubt aware that the development of co-operatives in Manitoba has been a key factor in both our rural and urban economies. Thousands of Manitobans are active supporters of co-operatives, and undoubtedly the development of future co-operative enterprises will be hampered by the dismantling of the Department of Co-Operative Development."

Mr. Speaker, it's obvious from the actions of this government so far that that's exactly what they're doing, that they're dismantling the Department of Co-Operative Development, and I think it's out of a vindictive revengeful attitude they have towards all of those things which the New Democratic Party brought into being when they were in government, and that is trying to erase from the history books all of those things that the New Democratic Party brought into being. Even those things, Mr. Speaker, that if they look at it closely, they have to admit are good and useful things to be done in the province of Manitoba, and Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba — and here is just one example, are certainly not happy with this kind of attitude towards good programs.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to comment for a moment on the history of administration of this particular government since they took office. We've seen politicization on a scale never before seen in Manitoba. In fact, Mr. Speaker we've seen patronage so obvious and so disgusting it's resulted in major editorials by columnists in both Winnipeg newspapers. Mr. Speaker, I don't recall that kind of publicity ever being used by the Winnipeg newspapers against the New Democratic Party while it was in government, and certainly neither newspaper could be accused of being overly friendly with the New Democratic Party, and yet here we have Mr. Speaker, patronage so disgusting that it results in headlines like the one we saw in the Winnipeg Free Press not so long ago, "Trough Getting Crowded". Mr. Speaker, I won't go into details on that because it's become a well-known fact. —(Interjection)— It's a headline, yes. "Trough Getting Crowded".

Mr. Speaker, we have seen their patronage at work also in the awarding of contracts and one example of that is the security contract with the Metropolitan Security having an opportunity to bid after the fact, after other companies were invited to put together their bids. Here we have an example of a very friendly company with the Conservative Party, having the opportunity to come in after the fact and put in their bid. It must be a nice position to be in for that company, to be able to have that kind of influence, that they don't have to compete with other companies in order to get contracts with this government.

Mr. Speaker, I have an example in my own constituency, where in Norway House, in the last Session, we had a school approved in the Estimates for the community of Norway House, a high school. After the Session, Mr. Speaker, the ordinary turn of events resulted in the administration people discussing with the community how that school should be proceeded with, and I understand Mr. Speaker that the Minister of Education made a commitment to the people of Norway House, the locally elected school people there, that they would have the opportunity to interview the architects that were to be selected from a list for that school project. And Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education made a commitment to those people that their selection of an architect would be honoured, and shortly after that, Mr. Speaker, after that list somehow got into the hands of the Minister responsible for making the final appointment, the Minister of Government Services, we find out that the Progressive Conservative Government is prepared to give the back of their hand, not only to the community but to their own colleague, the Minister of Education, who had made this commitment to the people of Norway House. —(Interjection)— And we hear that a certain architectural firm that was very friendly with the Minister of Government Services had been appointed the architect for the school.

However, Mr. Speaker, all is not completed because there seems to be differences of opinion within the Conservative Cabinet as to which of the supporters of the Conservative Party should get that particular architectural contract.

And Mr. Speaker, ever since this Session started, you can see members of the Cabinet benches squirming in their seats when I've been asking the Minister of Government Services if he's made up his mind yet as to who is going to get the contract. Who will be doing the architectural work for this school? Mr. Speaker, here a year later, a year after the money was approved in the Estimates for the building of this school, this government that supposedly prides itself on efficient administration, hasn't even made up their mind yet about who is going to be the architect. Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that their own internal squabbles over patronage are the real reason behind this.

Mr. Speaker, we see that one and a half years after the election of the Progressive Conservative Government, many of the departments of government still do not have Deputy Ministers, full Deputy

Ministers. In fact, until recently over half of the departments had only acting Deputy Minister. I understand now it's been reduced to about five. Here's 18 months or more after the Conservatives have been elected, they still haven't made up their mind about who is going to be running their departments, who is going to be the chief official in their departments.

Mr. Speaker, the restraint program is another obvious example of the sloppy administration of the Progressive Conservative Government. Here we see a government firing people, laying off people, and using the pretext that these positions are not needed, and at the same time we find out, from what source but the Winnipeg Free Press through the confidential memos that have been leaked to them, that while this firing has been going on, while there was a great freeze on hiring in the Civil Service, the departments were merrily going on their way, hiring people left and right. Mr. Speaker, while there was a supposed freeze there were over 2,000 people hired.

What kind of a joke is this? Either you have a restraint program or you don't have a restraint program. And in fact, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Government Services, in a confidential memo to the Premier, indicated that their restraint program was no more successful than the restraint program the NDP Government had a year earlier. Exactly the same number of people were reduced through a restraint program which we introduced with none of the fanfare and bringing in of dollar-a-year-men from outside. Mr. Speaker, there are many other examples of poor administration by this department. I don't believe time will allow me to go into all of the problems that we see. Mr. Speaker, seeing that I have very few minutes left, I would like to hurry on and get into one area which is of great concern to me and to many people in Manitoba, and that is this government's handling of the Health and Welfare Department that comes under the present Minister.

Mr. Speaker, we have had the evidence in this Session, of this government cutting down on the portions that are allocated to patients in institutions, particularly in those institutions where the patients are voiceless, where else but in the mental health institution in Selkirk. Mr. Speaker, it is pretty obvious from the reports that we received, that hospitals and personal care institutions in this province are cutting back on staff and on services.

Mr. Speaker, we have an example in this province of this government's lack of concern for the elderly, in the case of the cutting back of the social assistance to old age pensioners. Mr. Speaker, just in the Saturday newspaper, we have a column written by a popular Winnipeg columnist, pointing out the cold logic that this government is practising in terms of its cutbacks on the welfare assistance to old age pensioners. Mr. Speaker, apparently there are 642 pensioners who need extra help because of infirmity, dependence, or other reasons. They get welfare in addition to the old age security pension, and a guaranteed income supplement. These pensioners will continue to receive these benefits, but people coming into the system as of February 1st, will not receive that assistance or will receive it at a severely reduced scale.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking here about peanuts, we are talking about peanuts. Just a few hundred people. And this government has to take away the few pennies that these old age pensioners have. They are not just old age pensioners; they are people that have disability, dependence, or other reasons for receiving extra assistance. Mr. Speaker, under the present government's program, under the cutbacks, a person who is on an old age pension who would have been receiving a supplement, would receive \$78.69 less under the new program. Big deal; they are going to save \$76 in order to create more suffering for old age pensioners.

Mr. Speaker, it is pretty obvious also, in the government's cutbacks to the personal care homes, and in the increase in user fees to the people in those homes, that this government intends to tax the most disadvantaged in our society, and only provide for their friends at the top. Mr. Speaker, even the press releases that this Minister has put out are incorrect in that respect. They are taking back over half of the increase that the old age pensioners have received. Over half of the increase that the old age pensioners have received over the last year has been clawed back by this Minister in this government. That is how they treat the old age pensioners in this province.

Mr. Speaker, it is pretty obvious that all of these things point to the fact that this government is only concerned with the elite, the rich, their friends in the high income groups in this province. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious when you see that the tax cuts they have made only benefit the rich, and the tax increases that they have made are in the user fees where they are taking it from the poor, they are taking it from the old age pensioners, the elderly that are on welfare assistance because of disadvantage, the old age pensioners that are in senior citizens' homes that are being charged 50 percent more, 50 percent of their increase has been clawed back by this government.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to go into more of this, but I would like to end by a quote which is contained in a letter to the editor from the weekend newspaper. The editorial is headed "Wake Up Manitoba", and the woman writes: "It's time the people of Manitoba woke up to the blindness of the philosophy that this government is following, that putting restraints on workers. . ."



**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member's time is up. —(Interjection)— Go ahead.

**MR. BOSTROM:** . . .and taking them off to the owners and men of property is what autocracy has always done, let them eat cake. Wake up Manitoba, or you too will one day be carrying a sign wondering why there is such poverty in the land of plenty."

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, may I at the outset extend the traditional courtesies to you, Sir, in your maintaining the position of Speaker of this Legislature. It will be, I presume, a particularly trying period for you, attempting to interpret the rules of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition. I have had an opportunity to glance through them and I am going to have some difficulty in attempting to follow that new set of rules, as I am sure that you will as well, Sir.

May I also extend to the Member for Springfield, and the Member for Radisson, my congratulations on the addresses that they presented to this Chamber, in moving the motion for His Excellency.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a rather interesting debate, and I am sorry that the Member for Rupertsland saw fit to scoot out of the House, immediately he concluded his remarks, because I did want to comment on some of the observations that he had made. He started out the early part of his speech talking about the effects of the reduction in the Civil Service, and how they were interfering in the delivery of programs across this province. Then he got about three-quarters through his remarks and then took the position that there had been no increases at all. And then he concluded his remarks again, by reverting back to his original position, and all I can say to my honourable friend, that he can't have it all ways, he can't have it in every direction. Now it would seem to me that his remarks almost completely typified the sort of thing that we have been getting from honourable gentlemen opposite during the course of this debate.

What have we heard so far? Without a single exception, Sir, honourable gentlemen opposite have given us the impression that the only solution to any problem, and every problem, is to spend more money. That seems to them to be the answer to every conceivable problem that the country faces; throw money at it. There hasn't been one single suggestion coming from honourable gentlemen opposite as to where that money would come from. Oh, they haven't dared to suggest that we raise taxes, but it seems, and I include the honourable member for Fort Rouge in this group, that they never, but never, open their mouths unless it is at the taxpayers' expense. Every single suggestion they have made would result in spending beyond what this province could possibly afford. And of course, it typifies the kind of administration that they carried on in the eight years that they were on this side of the House.

My honourable friend, the Member for Inkster, introduced some very interesting comments, and it seemed to me, knowing my honourable friend, I give him a great deal of credit as he well knows, he was setting the stage for something. When he started raising the question of getting information and that he had been answered by somebody over there, that you could only get that information if you directed a request to the Minister. What impression he attempted to create, Sir, was that it was something new. What he attempted to do is to create the impression that all of a sudden, this is the sort of thing that happened. Well, I can tell my honourable friend, I can tell my honourable friend that for a few years when I was working just down the hall a little way, there were numerous occasions when they were in power, that I had phoned particular departments, or gone directly to particular departments asking for information, and almost invariably, I got the response, "You will have to direct a letter to the Minister, because only he can give that information." Where does he get off, Sir, trying to create the impression that that is something new. It started with my honourable friends opposite. . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend. Was he asking for public information, because I specified when I asked that information that the information I was seeking had nothing to do with the internal operations of the department. It was public information on the record in the Land Titles' office.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. JORGENSON:** My honourable friend knows that I have been around this place long enough to know the difference between that kind of information; that which is public, and that kind of

which should not be available to the public. As a matter of fact, I got into a debate in this Chamber on that very issue once, in 1969, and I took the position that interdepartmental information should not be made available to anybody but the people within the department. But he is trying to create the impression that we are hiding all the information, information that I asked for on those several occasions that I phoned departments, was information that was public. I was too lazy to compile it myself, that's all. I thought I could get it done by somebody's staff. But it was public information, so he better not come into this Chamber and attempt to create the impression that something new has now started, because nothing new has happened. It started with my honourable friends opposite. The first time it happened to me, Sir, I phoned and asked for information, and the departmental official said, "Surely, there is no problem, we will have it down to you in a couple of days." A week went by and I didn't get it, so I phoned again and he said, "Well, sir, we have been told, that the only way you can get it is to write to the Minister." All right. . .

**A MEMBER:** We accept that.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** As a matter of fact, I did accept that. Fine. I didn't quarrel with that. I didn't quarrel, and I never even asked any questions in the House on it, Sir. I take the position that the Minister is in charge of his department and he makes that determination. But my honourable friend should not come into this Chamber and try to build up straw men, and then attempt to knock them down. I suspect, Sir, that there is a reason for it. For the last several years now, the friend has been opposing the Freedom of Information bill into this Chamber. I suspect he is having a change of heart in this particular subject now. He is attempting to set the stage, and his argument is going to be: "I am not in favor of the Freedom of Information bill, but by God, with those nasty Tories on that side of the House, we need one." Well, we will see what will happen. But if it is a stage that he is attempting to build for himself, Sir, then I am afraid it is going to be very shaky. —(Interjection)— My honourable friend is shouting across the way, saying, "No sir". I accept his word for it. Perhaps I suffer from being in this Chamber for so long that I have become a little suspicious of actions of honourable gentlemen opposite.

But he attempted to do something else, Sir, that I think that most people in this Chamber saw through, and I think a lot of people outside the Chamber saw through as well . . .

**MR. ENNS:** And certainly the Speaker.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** . . . when he attempted to create the impression that the reason why my honourable friends opposite were able to get on this side of the Chamber was because of the policies that they pursued, because of the philosophy that they pursued, the philosophy of socialism. I say, "No, sir." My honourable friend knows better than that, he knows better than that. He knows the reason why they were on this side of the Chamber. Certainly a good many of those people in the back bench over there know the reason why they were on this side, and they were never allowed to forget it either.

With the departure of the former Leader of that party, I'm afraid that my honourable friends are going to find it a little more difficult to get back on this side of the House. Certainly, if they're going to depend on their philosophy and their policies, they will never be back here. What my honourable friend has forgotten is that after eight years of experience with them, the glamour that he attempted to identify with the socialist party of being the party that will help everybody, and help all the small people, as they call them, just didn't work out the way they planned, as all socialist plans do not work out. Enough people in this province have had enough experience in the past eight years to know them for exactly what they are, to know their policies for what they will and will not do.

Now, it's been interesting to watch them. The other day, the Member for Winnipeg Centre, after he had an opportunity in the Throne Speech to debate a particular subject — and he did, to a certain extent — came into the House the following morning and moved a motion to adjourn the House during the progress of the Throne Speech debate. It was a matter, Sir, that was so urgent that the ordinary business of the House had to be adjourned so that they could debate it. But, Sir, have you heard one single member from that side of the House mention that subject since? A subject that at one moment was so important that we had to adjourn the House, and then now has been forgotten. If it was so urgent, why did they not take advantage of the opportunity that was available to them during the course of this debate and beat it to death if they wanted to? To me, that smacks of some kind of phony opportunism.

The Member for Rupertsland, in the question that he raised on Friday, he didn't want an answer. All my honourable friend wanted was the opportunity to appear on television, pretending to ask a question of great importance, but when I attempted to give him the answer today, he obviously

was displeased because it was not the kind of answer that — as a matter of fact, he didn't want any answer at all. And that's been the practice of my honourable friends. The information that he supposedly gave to this House with regards to statistics, with regards to employment, and with regards to other matters, were pretty adequately dealt with by the Minister of Mines and Resources the other day, but does that make any difference? Not to them. They invent their own set of figures. They develop their own set of ideas, and they pursue them, come hell or high water, regardless of whether they are factual, regardless of whether or not they contain any semblance of the truth. Well, Sir, it's an interesting spectacle and they're an interesting group.

The other day, the Member for St. Vital was very concerned about the layoffs in the packing-house industry, as indeed most of us are. But perhaps my honourable friend does not recall — perhaps he wasn't here in 1969 and in 1970; I believe he came in in 1971. During those years, when we were on that side of the House, we warned the Minister of Agriculture time after time that the policies that he was pursuing with respect to the livestock industry could lead to difficulties, could lead to greater problems. And if I recall my remarks correctly — and I believe it was 1969 or 1970, perhaps 1970 — I told him that the difficulties that we were experiencing in the grain industry at that time were difficult ones but it would be a mistake to attempt to transfer those problems over to the beef industry because it would be a far more difficult problem to solve. Well, my honourable friend said it's nonsense. I warned him about that and other members on our side of the House warned him of the same thing, but they went ahead. They've created the disaster that exists in the beef industry today.

**MR. ENNS:** That's why we're laying off people today in our packing plants.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Then they have the audacity to stand up in this Chamber, Sir, and try to create the impression that the problem is one that we've created. I tell my honourable friend it won't wash. No. My honourable friend says we didn't say that, and he's right, he didn't say it, but he sure attempted to imply it.

Well, Sir, during the course of the debate, there is one other significant thing that sort of leaps out at you and that is the attitude of my honourable friends with respect to certain people in this country. It's a form of economic racism. If you have been successful in building a business, creating employment, then you are a subject to be reviled, castigated, and abused. How many times on this side of the House, when they were here, did we hear those statements from my honourable friends opposite? Time and time again, and they're doing the same thing again. Well, Sir, that kind of economic racism will come back to haunt them. There's no question in my mind that if you're going to practice setting economic groups against one another, if it is legitimate, as they appear to think it is, separating people in terms of how much money they make, what's the difference between that and making a distinction between how tall you are? Are we going to start discriminating against people because they're over 6 feet tall as well?

**MR. ENNS:** We should, we should.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** My honourable friends would do that because I don't see a great deal more difference between doing that than what they're doing today. They have absolutely no idea of how an economy is run. They try to peddle the nonsense that you can tax the rich and by so doing, everybody will be taken care of. Well, Sir, Dennis Healey never thought that, the Chancellor of the Exchequer in Great Britain in the Labour government, he didn't believe that.

**A MEMBER:** Sure, he was a socialist.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Oh, yes, but you see, he was in power long enough, and they'd run the country into so much difficulty, that the International Monetary Fund had to try and bail them out. When the International Monetary Fund stepped in to bail them out, they laid down certain conditions under which they could operate. That taught them a bit of a lesson. But Dennis Healey said that if they tax everybody earning \$12,000 a year and more 100 percent, even if he'd taxed them 100 percent of their income — and he would only do it once because they wouldn't stay there any longer — it would only take care of the budget for four and a half days. So the nonsense that they spout, that you can take from the people who make money, confiscate it from them and pass it around to another group of people, that the transfer of money in that fashion is going to solve the economic problems of this country is just sheer nonsense. It never has worked and it never will work.

Well, sometimes they learn, and I know that some of the lessons that were learned in Great Britain have never rubbed off on my honourable friends here. They're quite willing, indeed eager, to rush into the same mess they've created for themselves over there.

You know, Sir, I don't know what the objectives are. I can't believe — I find it difficult to believe — that with the experience that they had when they were on this side of the House running a government, that they were so naive, or so lacking in knowledge of how a country is run, that they could continuously believe that you could continue to take from one group and pass it out to another group and expect the country to survive.

What is the objective? Certainly it's economic totalitarianism. But, of course, the corollary to economic totalitarianism is political totalitarianism. Is that the objective? It certainly is the objective of certain groups in the United Kingdom. And my honourable friends should be the last people to want to pursue a course that could only lead to some form of totalitarianism, because every drive — every drive — towards totalitarianism in the world has used somebody as a scapegoat. You know what it was in Germany, in Hitler's drive for power? It was the Jews. And you know who the Bolsheviks used as their scapegoat? It was the landowners. In the Western World today, the scapegoat and the target is the businessman. Day after day, we hear it repeated by friends of my honourable friends opposite and they, indeed themselves, that we must bring them to heel. Well, bring them to heel all right. We will bring them to heel at the expense of the freedom of this country and the complete abrogation of civil liberties and rights.

They continue to linger in the past. One speaker after another slavers and drools over the Thirties. My honourable friend, the Member for Burrows, spent all of his entire remarks in the Thirties, you know, as if to conclude or to assume that nothing has changed since the Thirties, as if the situation and the conditions that exist today were similar to those that existed at that time. I think it's wishful thinking on their part because there has been an improvement in communications. People are better organized; people have learned how to use the ability to organize in order to help themselves. One would think that we're living in the Thirties and, of course, they want to live in the Thirties. That's been a habit of theirs ever since they came into this Chamber.

Comments were made about how much money you can raise during a war. Why can't you raise it now? Well, perhaps my honourable friends wouldn't believe me if I told them, but I'd like to read them just a paragraph from Henry Fairlie's book "The Kennedy Promise." I invite my honourable friends to read it, they might learn a few things. Mr. Fairlie, in describing this very situation goes on to say this: "In the total wars of the modern age, we are willing to surrender our individualism for the period of the war because we are persuaded that if there is no victory, there is no future. The danger is that this totalitarian spirit is then carried into peace. If we can perform such miracles in war, why cannot we perform them in peace. Such is the plausible cry. If we can build Pluto and Mulberry," — and for the benefit of some of my friends who may not know what Pluto and Mulberry is, they were the improvised pipeline in the artificial harbour which were constructed for D-Day — "why cannot we build schools and hospitals?"

"The answer lies, and we should be grateful for it, in the people themselves, who have recovered some of their individualism. They no longer have a single objective. Some want schools, others want automobiles, some want colour television, others want hospitals. Even those who want hospitals and schools may want universities and libraries even more. Which of these is the nobler aspiration is a matter of subjective preference, and the people cannot, with the return of at least a measure of their freedom, be confined to any one of them. In the free society, when it is at peace, a government cannot override the variety of people's choices. They can only marginally influence them. And in that margin, the politician works."

But that's not the attitude of my honourable friends because the former Minister of Public Works, when he was on this side of the House, made the statement that the people don't know what they want, that we have to tell them. And that's typical of the attitude of my honourable friends. No, speaking of going into the past, they continue to talk about the Depression, and they continue to suggest that the policies that we are following are policies of the past, of the Hoover era. Well, my honourable friends should know that some of the policies that they are following, some of the things that they are advocating, go far beyond that. It was during the days of the Roman Empire, in fact, it contributed a great deal to the collapse of the Roman Empire, policies that my honourable friends today are advocating.

One of the emperors uprooted grapevines to prevent overproduction, reminiscent of my honourable friend, the former Minister of Agriculture, when he was slaughtering chickens in this country. —(Interjection)— Diocletian. No, Diocletian imposed wage and price controls, and they were impossible to implement. Impossible to police. They had to throw that out. But my honourable friends want to bring those policies back. And in order to help maintain employment, there was a ban on mechanization. That's another policy you hear them talking about. —(Interjection)— Alexander Severus put commercial concerns under state control. Wasn't that a policy of my honourable friends opposite? They wanted everything to be under state control. That wouldn't work either.

One thing that my honourable friends had in common with the Roman Empire was vast bureaucracies. They had unbalanced budgets, they had enormous debts, they had inflation, they

had devalued currencies. And Mr. Speaker, this happened 2,000 years ago. And at that time they were considered to be enlightened, progressive and modern. —(Interjection)— Well, I know you just went back to the '30s, but I was attempting to point out that if our policies were bad in the '30s, then surely we've had a great deal more experience with socialist policies, and they still don't work. But honourable friends opposite continue to advocate them, continue to suggest that we should be implementing them, and it is to the detriment of the economy and to the very people that they attempt to help, or at least they purport to help, that those policies are implemented. —(Interjection)—

You know, Mr. Speaker, the prize comment, of course comes always from my good friend the Member for Elmwood. You can almost always count upon him to make a statement that is so ridiculous in its context, so outrageous that you can't simply avoid making some comment on it. He made the statement that there were no economists on this side of the House, and he considered that to be a great tragedy. Well, I suppose it all depends on what economists you want to believe. If you want to believe Marks, Immanuel Kant or Galbraith, leave it to my honourable friends. By all means. They can believe them. —(Interjection)— Well, I think that it's only fair to point out to my honourable friends that there are some equally reputable economists that profoundly disagree with those three. Milton Friedman, Henry Hazlitt and Von Mises. So who is right and who is wrong, to suggest that because we happen to believe one set of economists and not the ones that they want to believe, that we don't know anything about economics, or that we have no economists. And I don't profess to be an economist, but I know a little bit about human nature. And I suggest to you, Sir, that the economists who disagree profoundly with Marks and Galbraith, have a far better understanding of human nature than those economists do.

Because in the final analysis, what are we attempting to do in politics? We are attempting to apply human nature. And you can't, it's not possible that you're going to be able to destroy it because in 2,000 years, you've never been able to do that. It has not changed. You're going to have to deal with people as they are. Not as you would like them to be. They react in certain ways to certain initiatives. And if you don't understand how they react, then the results of whatever action you take are going to disastrous. And it's for that reason mainly that I am more inclined to believe Milton Friedman than I ever would be to believe John Kenneth Galbraith.

So I simply conclude that observation by saying, because we happen to disagree on economic philosophy doesn't mean that we have no knowledge of economics. I reject a suggestion by my honourable friend that we have to believe the same economists that he does. I hesitated to say this, but if he is using his friend, the Member for Brandon East as a typical example of a reputable economist, then of course my rejection goes even further. I have listened to my honourable friend talk and he makes no sense whatsoever when it comes to economics.

You see, what honourable friends have never been able to do, as far as I'm concerned, never been able to do in all the while that I've been listening to them, is to make what I think is a very important distinction, the distinction between the creation of wealth as opposed to the simple printing of money. And there is a significant difference. They seem to think that if you take the money out of somebody's pocket who has earned it through the creation of wealth, and then distribute it amongst the people that they feel it should be distributed to, that that is creating wealth. It is not. Wealth is created only from the harvesting, or the extraction of our resources, the processing of those resources, and the marketing of those resources. That's the only way that you create wealth in this country. Perhaps there's one or two other exceptions, and one of them is tourism, by bringing tourists from another country in here, that's a form of wealth, because it's dollars that you're bringing into this country and it is a form of wealth.

But government does not create wealth. There is no way that a government can create wealth, unless you take over the means of creation of wealth. Unless you take over all of the farms, unless you take over — which is what my honourable friend was attempting to do — the factories, which is what my honourable friends attempted to do, and the mines. Now they know enough, at least my honourable friend for Inkster knows enough to realize that. But unless the wealth-producing sector of this country is given an opportunity to create that wealth, then who provides the money to supply the need that they say exists, to starve out that wealth-creating sector is to effectively starve out the very programs, the very policies that my honourable friends are saying are so necessary. And I don't disagree with them. But there has to be a balance sought between the amount of money that you're going to spend in helping people, those who need help, and those that create the wealth. And unless you are prepared to strike that balance, then you get into difficulties, the kinds of difficulties that you have in this province today.

We had two tremendous sources of wealth available to us in this province, and my honourable friends opposite loused up both of them. One was our tremendous hydro resources, that has been a resource that has been dissipated through mismanagement, and the second is the great agricultural processing potential that we had in this province. That has been dissipated, because my honourable

friend, the former Minister of Agriculture was more concerned, was making sure that we did not expand our agricultural potential, he was more concerned about creating a situation where there was security rather than opportunity, and we lost that opportunity. We now have only the opportunity of producing mainly for the Manitoba market.

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

**MR. JORGENSON:** Well, I suggest to you, Sir, that the production for the Manitoba market in agriculture products in this province is far too limited. Far too limited. But once the die has been cast, it's going to be very difficult to retrieve it. So in those two areas alone my honourable friends have insured that the wealth creating potential of this province is not near as great as it could have been, or should have been. Then they will, as the Member for Rupertsland did just a while ago, talk about the great wealth and how we're falling behind other provinces. Well, the wealth-producing potential of British Columbia is still there, no thanks to my honourable friends opposite, or no thanks to Mr. Barrett, either. Everybody knows the kind of potential that Alberta has, and that comes from a natural resource as well. —(Interjection)—

The Province of Saskatchewan is just beginning to develop a tremendous mineral resource. They have oil. They have an agricultural potential that is tremendous. Manitoba have always had to run a little harder to stay in the same place. We have some agriculture, we have some oil and we have some mining and we have some manufacturing. And some fishing.

The greatest opportunity to expand our wealth potential would have been the wealth that could have been created by our water resources and the expansion of our agricultural potential processing. And my honourable friends can take the responsibility for the fact that they were not able to expand to the degree and to the extent that they should have, and it ill behooves them today, Sir, to stand up in this Chamber, after what they have done, after how they have destroyed the opportunities that would have been available to people of this province, and then to criticize . . . My honourable friend says, "We'll be back." God forbid that that group over there will ever be back taking over the reigns of government. That kind of a disaster, Sir, the people of this province can ill afford. I say, Sir, that kind of a disaster, the people of this province will never tolerate again.

Thank you, Sir.

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

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, it's indeed an opportunity again to stand in this Chamber debating the well-being, or the lack of it, of the people of this province. I hasten to add that the observations of most Manitobans are that their well-being is not as well as it was in recent times.

Mr. Speaker, in looking at the Throne Speech, the document that was tabled in this House on opening day, I found it very difficult to find anything in that document that would give us some hope of encouragement as to the future for the people of this province as to their particular aspirations and, in particular, the natural desire to want to improve on their well-being. I couldn't think of how to respond to that document, but it just happened that I picked up a Newsweek magazine — this is the November issue — and it gave me the sort of ammunition that I was looking for in probably the best way one could put it. That is, that it brought to mind, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Conservative government of Manitoba has been attempting to convince the people of this province for a couple of years or more, but certainly since they have been the government, that our ordinary folk have been living too high on the hog, and, therefore, we must psych them into expecting less. We must lower their sights and lower their standards.

Systematically, Mr. Speaker, this is what has been occurring in this province. But, you know, this particular document that I refer to, talks about an American situation and it's titled, "The Mugging of Liberalism," has to do with the trend of thought in society in the United States, not only from conservative quarters, but also from some very prominent liberal quarters in the United States within the Democratic Party itself and people associated with it. This particular author is none other than Coleman McCarthy who is a syndicated columnist with the Washington Post writers' group. He tries to point out — he admits being a liberal, of course — but he tries to point out that it is the conservatives that are indeed the big spenders. I would like to read a passage from this particular article.

It says that "liberalism's central dogma is that money solves problems and the more money, the better the problems." Then he goes on to refute that that is not correct, that indeed it's the conservatives that try to solve their problems in that way. "The real spenders," he goes on to say, "the dogmatists, the evidence suggests, are not the liberals, but the conservatives. Barry Goldwater, Carl Curtis, John Tower, John Rhodes, and others . . ."

**A MEMBER:** Sterling Lyon.

**MR. USKIW:** . . . "on the right " — Yes, we can add Sterling Lyon to this group . "Their voting records are gaudy, pompous, raised high to cheerlead programs and bills, for weapons, unexamined military schemes, useless public works projects, and federal subsidies for failing corporations. If someone in a nervous Pentagon announces that Russians are getting pesky, throw millions at the problem by spending a few billion for more bombs or planes. That is their typical reaction. If agro-business needs more water, throw money at the problem of building a federal dam. If an industry finds that free enterprise is a bit unpleasant, raid the federal treasury for a corporate dole." —(Interjection)— Yes, and you know, we've had our own corporate doles as we have experienced in this province under the administration of that group on the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. GREEN:** Two billion for Hydro?

**MR. USKIW:** "To rest their weary arms, turned sore from all this money throwing, conservatives sit back and attack those underfunded liberal programs that feed hungry children, educate the illiterate, clean the filthy air and water, restore neighbourhoods or keep open the libraries. That is their centre of attack. We must tell those groups that there must be a cutback on their spending. When citizens demand an end to government waste, whip them into a fever to cut back funds for people programs, that's the strategy of conservatives," Mr. Speaker, "while diverting their eyes from wasteful he-man programs for weapons, dams, power plants." He goes on to say, "You make America strong, but leave its people weak."

Now that is so typical of this particular document; it just describes the philosophy contained in the Throne Speech so accurately, and the way in which we have witnessed this government function over the last two years, that one cannot help but draw that to the attention of you, Sir, and the people of Manitoba.

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, it's a year and a half but it seems like more.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, yes, that's right. The Member for Inkster suggests it's a year and a half. To me, a year is a session in terms of the debate that goes on.

**MR. GREEN:** And it seems like forever to me.

**MR. USKIW:** So it's true, Mr. Speaker, we have here a document that fulfills very much the commentary in Newsweek Magazine of November of 1978, because we see on Page 3, reference to major initiatives. The major initiative on Page 3, right at the top, is the announcement that we are going to give away over \$100 million. And who are we going to give it away to, Mr. Speaker? You know, we are going to give it away to those free enterprising entrepreneurs who don't want any part of government. We were told in the last election campaign, all they wanted was for government to get out of their business. Here we have a good illustration of people programs being cut every day and the government grandstanding on those cutbacks as they are announced because "we just can't afford these things." Then they introduce a Throne Speech announcing a giveaway of \$100 million to a handful of people in this province, Mr. Speaker. It demonstrates very much the attitude and the philosophy of a government not dedicated to the greater improvement of all of its people, Mr. Speaker, but rather to the greater improvement of its selected few friends.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is not much in this document to commend it, as far as I am concerned. They make reference, Mr. Speaker, to the need for reviews and we have been hearing the question of reviews, analysis, changes that are going to be made or talked about, proposed, on every front having to do with services to regular folk, Mr. Speaker, for a year and a half now.

And this document continues in that pattern. "We are going to have to review the tax rebate programs." Another attack on the populace of this province because, Mr. Speaker, they have to find \$100 million somewhere. The \$100 million that they have proposed to give away to a handful of people has to be derived from the balance of our population and so the two go hand-in-hand and you can see a very dramatic shift of priorities, of financial support, from the masses back to the handful of friends, the corporate elite they represent, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there is mention in this document in more than one area where we are going to depend, where we are going to depend almost totally on the initiative of private individuals in order to bring about a healthy economic climate. And, Mr. Speaker, they say that in spite of the fact that they now have the distinction of being one of the slowest growth provinces in Canada. It's most interesting because at least, Mr. Speaker, and I hope they pursue this course at least long

enough to prove, not only to us who already are aware, but to themselves, that that philosophy will not result, that philosophy will not result in the betterment of standards of living for the masses of people in this province.

There is but very little mention, Mr. Speaker, of programs for need areas. The document is virtually blank in that regard. A lot of sort of innocuous commentary about it, but not any real substance to indicate that there is going to be some degree of progress made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morris of course doesn't like and doesn't agree with the economic analysis as the Member for Brandon East has presented it in this Chamber. Of course, I don't expect him to, Mr. Speaker, but I have here a copy of the Globe and Mail dated January 12, 1979. When we talk about the economy and what has to be done in this province, it's interesting to note how people in Toronto view our economic situation, because all of their philosophy of the last year and a half, as we have witnessed it, and the program that they have introduced, was supposed to get away from this kind of an economic problem, but we see that we are going in the other direction. This particular document verifies that we are indeed going in the wrong direction.

It says, "The lack of opportunities is forcing some of the province's citizens to move elsewhere to earn a living. Statistics Canada has forecast that if present trends continue, Manitoba population will shrink from a peak of 1,021,000 in 1976, to about 965,000 by the turn of the century." It goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, that "the loss of population through migration could be a real impediment to the province's future growth as a shrinking market will not greatly interest many entrepreneurs. Another factor that has been slowing Manitoba's business momentum is the Lyon government's severe spending restraint program."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I recall debating something very similar away back in 1966, or 1967, because in the mid-1960s, when we had a Conservative government in Manitoba, was a critical period of depopulation in this province's history and here we are, in 1979, again in that same position, again with the same kind of administration.

The article goes on to say that the bright spot, of course, is agriculture in Manitoba. But then, Mr. Speaker, it also elaborates as to why it is so, and it doesn't hand any bouquets to my friend, the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. I

The members opposite would like me to read the analysis. I would be very glad to, Mr. Speaker.

The report goes on to say that, "The declining value of the Canadian dollar has also been a blessing for the province's farmers since the prices of Canadian agricultural commodities have been progressively raised to compensate for the devaluation. This means in the case of export wheat, for example, farmers are getting about one dollar per bushel more than a year ago just to make up for the weakness of the Canadian dollar. " Now I know my honourable friend has been taking bows for the improvement in agricultural income but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party is condemning the Federal Government for the weakness of the Canadian dollar, and I just simply pointed out that they can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker.

The article goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, "That less pleased with the current state of the economy are Manitoba contractors and architects who are predicting that the building volume will be down to \$400 million in 1979, 35 percent lower than two years ago. " And that of course is based on the kind of government that believes that the private sector should do the job, Mr. Speaker. That is where we are at. As a matter of fact, in that context it was only last week that people in the construction industry were pointing out to the people of Manitoba that in this kind of a province, a province short of resources that there has to be a substantial amount of dependence on the public sector as far as the construction industry is concerned for it to survive. It didn't help at all.

The article goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, "The construction industry has been hardest hit by the province's spending restraint program." Unemployment in Manitoba's construction industry is running at 16 percent according to this article. And is predicted to reach 25 percent by this time, Mr. Speaker. This article was written a month ago. One of the difficulties according to this article is that Manitobans do not make much money and here is something that bears examining, Mr. Speaker, because one of the reasons for our slow economy according to the business report in the Globe and Mail is that Manitobans do not earn high enough salaries, their salaries are too low in order to be stimulative to the economy. It goes on to say that "Statistics Canada survey of incomes of 100 Canadian cities, Winnipeg ranked 82nd on the list even though it is the fifth largest urban centre in the country. Brandon, the province's second largest city, was even worse off, it was in 98th place as far as incomes are concerned. This problem and the shortfall in job creation are compounding another historical difficulty, migration. Manitoba had a net loss of over 7,000 people because of interprovincial migration in the first nine months of 1978, "and this is the kind of picture that the Globe and Mail report on business, report on Manitoba's economy, is giving the people



of Canada. How are we faring in comparison with the rest of the country? It is not a very good report to read, Mr. Speaker.

This report goes on to say, "That there is change in the offing because of the advent of a new government but so far the government has only come up with expressions of hope rather than any major industrial project. Even if things go extremely well," the article goes on to say, "Manitoba will still have one of the lowest growth rates among the provinces." Now that is a very current report, Mr. Speaker. And it tells us something about the inability of the private sector to assume the responsibility that quite frankly belong at the seat of power, the responsibilities to make sure that all things are done that would motivate towards, and I mean publicly and privately towards a fuller participating economy, more people involved so that we have more income. And that has to touch, Mr. Speaker, the important question of an incomes policy and in this connection, Mr. Speaker, the Globe and Mail points out that one of our handicaps is low wages. We don't have the spending power even if our people are employed. We don't have adequate spending power because of a low wage situation.

And here we have in Manitoba, three years now since we've had a change in the minimum wage, a direct cause to our present economic difficulty the fact that too many people are not earning enough money to buy goods and services. You have to have the capacity to recycle, you have to have the capacity in the hands of every individual in this province in order to make this economy what it ought to be.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Gladstone should understand that wage policy has to be one of the more important decisions that is decided upon from time to time by government in order to maintain the kind of stability in the economy that is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I was most intrigued by the comments of, and I regret that he's not here, the Minister in charge of the Health Department. He gave a speech to Age and Opportunity Group in Winnipeg very recently. This is a February 14 article in the Winnipeg Tribune, a report on his speech. And where he suggests to the elderly that restraint is really good because it will help the province help them and you know, Mr. Speaker, that makes a lot sense if you subtracted this \$100 million of a give away program to the people who already have enough and don't need it. That would make sense, yes, that kind of restraint would make an awful lot of sense.

But when you recognize that all of the restraint package has to do with people in the very category that he was addressing, could you imagine the inflationary impact of an increase of two dollars a month to their pension, or three or five dollars? That would be some inflation problem we would have, Mr. Speaker, if we would just give those pensioners ten dollars more to spend. That is the philosophy that is enshrined in the minds of the Members Opposite, Mr. Speaker, that you mustn't give the people at the bottom of the income ladder another buck because you might have some inflation. What a bunch of nonsense.

You know the Conservative propaganda machine talks about giving tax breaks, you know, it is just unreal. You know, restraint on one hand and tax breaks on the other hand and it talks about giving the people of Manitoba a tax cut of \$83 per capita. Mr. Speaker, who the hell do they think they are kidding? Mr. Speaker, who are they kidding. Go to any home in Winnipeg and find out how many homes had a tax break of 83 times the number of people in that household. Remember, Mr. Speaker, that not everyone is a taxpayer which tells you something about where the money is being or in whose favour the money is being directed.

**MR. GREEN:** Not every one inherits a million dollars.

**MR. USKIW:** That's right. In that figure is the abolition of some wealth taxes. But you know there were only 148 such people in 1976 or 1977, you know, that is the kind of nonsense. And we have a Minister of the Crown telling people who are trying to live on a subsistence level of income that restraint is good for them in the long run because we'll be able to give away a \$100 million dollars, or more, to people who already have too much and to people who by the way with an extra level of spending power will not necessarily spend it here in this province but may spend it elsewhere.

So the question is, Mr. Speaker, if restraint is a good policy then the question is to restrain where and that is where the division lies, Mr. Speaker. Restraint, who shall we restrain in terms of our provisions in our spending, in our budget, in our estimates?

We have an example here of a very serious housing problem in this province. Yes, there are two problems. We have a over supply of high priced houses and an under supply of low rentals. We have over supply of high priced units and an under supply of low cost housing and this government has done nothing in that field since they have been elected, Mr. Speaker. Notwithstanding the fact, Mr. Speaker, that they are claiming to have put on the markets some additional 1,700 low rental units, all of which were programmed before they became the government,

Mr. Speaker. All of them.

Now when we get down to how to make their government look financially responsible, how they are going to try to balance their spending, in relation to the revenues, we find that what they have decided to do is to starve the local government, school boards, municipalities hospital distris. Each of those particular institutions have to find other ways and means of augmenting their incomes in order to carry on their program or they must cut programs, it's one or the other, to make these people look good. And it isn't going to succeed in any event, Mr. Speaker, but that is their attempt.

You know they gave the school diVisions some \$12 million, I believe it is a six percent increase but according to what the President of the Manitoba Association of School Trustees indicates, he suggests that just to stand still, Mr. Speaker, they will need an increase of 10 percent because the bulk of their spending is locked in in wages. They don't have much discretionary spending, you see. So here we have an example of the government trying to balance its accounts and are shoving the deficit problems or the taxation problems on to the municipalities. And if you examine every area whether it is school district, hospital district, municipality government, you will find that all of them will tell you that they have been told to expect less and that if they want to continue their program they had better levy extra taxation at the local level. And I suppose there will be a combination of both right throughout the province, Mr. Speaker, lower level of services, a reduction of services, combined with an increase in local taxation.

According to the President of the School Trustees Association they will require about a 10.5 percent increase in their property taxes in order to offset the situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is very minute reference to a very old problem in the Throne Speech and it has to do with our native population. There is just one short paragraph about the government's interest in promoting the cause of our native people, the Treaty Indians, with the Government of Canada — and that is all they have to say about a problem that is at least as old as this province and much older — but a problem which is growing day by day, year by year, because the populations of our treaty Indians are increasing, the populations of many of our Reserves are increasing very dramatically, without opportunity for those youngsters who grow up in those areas, to find their way into the main stream of the economy of this province. That is a very serious problem, and I don't believe that provincial governments, or any level of government, can pass the buck and say, well, it's somebody else's problem and we're really not involved in this thing. They are indeed, Mr. Speaker, citizens of this province and we have to be very much concerned with what their future is going to be, because it is no longer possible; it has never been possible, Mr. Speaker, for those people to extract an income for survival on many of those reserves, and they have indeed been dependent on the federal government for too long.

We have to chip away at that problem with probably a whole host of approaches that will bring them into the main stream of economic activity, and if you reflect on our past, Mr. Speaker, in that connection, I think it is tragic that we take too many short cuts when we are developing resource industries in northern Manitoba that we somehow are not able to and don't have the capacity to involve more fully the natives of northern Manitoba in those jobs. That is an indictment of what we have been doing and I include those of us on this side, Mr. Speaker, as well as what is happening today. It goes back to Day One, but it is a problem that is growing faster than it has ever grown before, at a rate which I believe will bring us to a crisis situation before too long.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to Agriculture. We have a situation in this province where the Government of the Day has decided to go back to pre-1969 policy. —(Interjection)— No, it's not that far, we're back to Square One. We're back to the philosophy of the government of 1958 to 1969; that's where we are.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity just last Thursday, to debate on a panel discussion at the University of Manitoba, with a number of distinguished people. One of them was a member of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, Mr. Don Gibb. The subject of that particular panel was large-scale farming enterprises. And, Mr. Speaker, here we have a policy maker on the credit corporation, who suggested that there are only 15 percent of our farmers in this province that are worth looking at, and that government initiative should be directed towards that 15 percent. I presume the Minister has a question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture on a point of order.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the honourable member. Did he refer to Mr. Don Gibb as being a member of the Manitoba Credit Corporation? If he did, that is not correct.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that he was, but I know that he was very much involved with

the policy of the Conservative Party. Mr. Speaker, perhaps he is not. I would like to believe that he was representing the MACC, and if that is incorrect, that is fine, but notwithstanding that, Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that he belongs to the Conservative Party and attempted to win the nomination in Pembina during the last election. He indicated, Mr. Speaker, to the panel, that Manitoba should really dedicate all of its resources to the top 15 percent of our agriculturalists in this province. reminded me, Mr. Speaker, that we were back to the principles of the TED report where the government had endorsed at that time a complete withdrawal from agriculture. In fact, they were promoting an out migration from on the rural Manitoba scale that we have never witnessed to that period of time. —(Interjection)—

**MR. ENNS:** I hesitate to interrupt the honourable member, but. . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Has the member a question? Will the member please state his point of order?

**MR. ENNS:** My point of order is, and we just had it a few seconds ago with him attributing remarks by some person as belonging to a government agency such as the Manitoba Agricultural Corporation. Now the speaker is again, and that proved to be not the case, now the speaker is attempting to attribute a report referred to as the TED commission report, as being a document of government policy. That was never a document of government policy, and the honourable member knows it.

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

**MR. USKIW:** I would like to know if that was a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Points of order requiring clarification can either be raised immediately or after the member has completed his speech.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the member has stated an opinion and I believe that he really wanted to use up my time, and that is the reason I raised the question.

Mr. Speaker, we have the spectacle of the First Minister convening a conference on grain and transportation only a couple of weeks ago and, Mr. Speaker, it was quite a spectacle, because if you read the Throne Speech, they talk about that particular conference as being unique in Canadian history. It was unique in the sense, Mr. Speaker, unique in the sense that the First Minister convened a conference to which he didn't have a position paper; that's how unique it was, Mr. Speaker. We have had many conferences on that very question over the years. We had many conferences on that particular issue, and we didn't meet the particular exercise entered into by the First Minister for none other than a political reason, Mr. Speaker, and that is valid I suppose, that here we are, we're going to have an imminent decision made on the question of railway transportation and the Crow rate so we have got to get into the act to come out as if we were one of the important actors in this thing.

Mr. Speaker, we have had conference after conference, and many positions have been taken by various interest groups throughout the country. But to call a conference and then not have a Manitoba position, that has to be unique, Mr. Speaker, and I suppose that explains why that terminology was used in the Throne Speech. Mr. Speaker, the issue is extremely serious.

The Province of Saskatchewan has put together a model on the effects of the elimination of the statutory rates. They have calculated what it would cost the producers of that province, if indeed these rates were abolished, and the farmers were put in the position of having to pay compensatory rates in the movement of grain. And, Mr. Speaker, according to their analysis, that it would cost, based on the railway submission to the Snavely Commission in 1974, it would cost an additional 36 cents a bushel to move wheat from Saskatchewan to Thunder Bay. Which means, Mr. Speaker, it would cost about \$3,400 to a wheat farmer producing no more than 400 acres of wheat. That's really the effect of that change. But, Mr. Speaker, to their credit, they did a much deeper study than just to find out what the impact would be on the producers themselves. They did studies to find out what the impact would be on the whole of the economy of Saskatchewan, and it's interesting to note that they have projected hundreds of millions of dollars lost, in the Province of Saskatchewan to the spinoff of that kind of decision, and have dug their heels in to block any decision that would raise the costs of transportation to the people of Saskatchewan. I would have hoped, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba would have been in a position to back that kind of position that we cannot afford to give away something that we already have, unless there are very important trade-offs that will benefit us equally as much and which will not take away from the income levels of our farm producers

in the Provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, but more importantly to ensure that our economic position either is enhanced but certainly not worsened in the process.

This is something that I would have expected, from the First Minister having convened that meeting, but which he wasn't prepared for, and that is why we wanted to know today whether or not there was a position paper, and if there was one, what is Manitoba's position. To date, we have no position, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that we cannot do anything else. Given the whole host of economic problems that face our people, and in particular, such an important issue as that one, we can do none other on this side, Mr. Speaker, but vote for the amendment.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before I recognize the First Minister, I believe the Member for Kildonan has a point of order on changes on committee.

**MR. FOX:** Not a point of order, Mr. Speaker, but a couple of changes in respect to the standing committees of the House.

On Public Utilities and Natural Resources, I would like to place the name of the Member for St. Vital in place of His Excellency, Mr. Schreyer. On Municipal Affairs, take the name of the Honourable Member for Selkirk off, and replace it with the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet. On Economic Development, take the name of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon off, and replace it with the Honourable Member for Transcona. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I welcome as usual, the opportunity to participate in the Throne Speech debate, which is the first opportunity that each of us as elected members from our 57 separate constituencies has to voice either our approval or disapproval of the government program as set forth in Her Majesty's Speech from the Throne.

Before doing that, Sir, I should like not only because it is the customary thing to do, but because I feel it deeply, to congratulate you on your re-assumption of the position of Speaker of this House. I say that, Sir, because you have demonstrated over the past period whilst you have occupied the Chair of the House, the kind of evenhandedness and judiciousness in your decision making and in your deliberations, that I think has found favor on all sides of the House, and we rejoice in the fact that you are in good health again, after a brief period of ill health, that you are able to maintain that kind of evenhanded impartiality over the debates and the speakers in this House. And may I say, Sir, that we rejoice as well in the knowledge that in the different affairs at which you must represent the Province of Manitoba, not only with your fellow speakers, but with other distinguished guests from around the world, and outside of the province, that you do at all times represent our province with a great deal of distinction, and in that, all of us take pride.

I congratulate the Deputy Speaker, the Member for Radisson, for his decision to reassume the responsibility of that onerous position. We are sorry, of course that the Member for Crescentwood was not able to carry on as the Chairman of the Committees of the Whole of the House. We know what an excellent job he did last year, but we are encouraged of course by the fact that the Member for Emerson has seen fit to accept that appointment and I am sure that he will carry on the tradition of that office in the high manner that has been established by his colleague previously from Crescentwood.

May I as well, Sir, offer formal congratulations to the Honourable Member for Springfield, who moved the Address and Reply to Her Majesty's Speech. I am wont to say, from time to time, and I'm sure with some element of considerable pride, and I would hope that honourable members opposite would not think that it was just mere egotistical bragging, that we have a depth of talent in the present government of Manitoba, I think in which all members of the House can enjoy and can take some comfort and strength from. The Member for Springfield demonstrated that in the manner in which he spoke to this important motion as he launched this debate, and is demonstrating it day by day, week by week in the manner in which he serves his constituency and the manner in which he departs himself in and out of this House as an esteemed member of the Legislative Assembly of this province.

Likewise, the Member for Radisson, Mr. Speaker, I mention him twice because he, of course took on the responsibility of seconding the Address and Reply to the Speech from the Throne and did so with that excellent mixture of humour and common sense that has become his trademark in the House. I suppose that is one of the reasons that he succeeds so well as Deputy Speaker,

because he, like yourself, Sir, enjoys that kind of respect on all sides of the House because of his good humour, his ability to see the humorous side of pretty well every situation, and at the same time his dedication to this House and to his constituency and to the people whom he has the honour to represent. I understand that he also makes an extremely good host on trips to Brandon back and forth and does his best to make sure that the crowd of members and their wives are always kept properly entertained on those occasions. So he is deserving of our congratulations for the contribution that he made in seconding the Address and Reply.

I will be repeating myself, Mr. Speaker, but I think that is a fault that can be forgiven if I mention again the Honourable Member for Selkirk now sitting in a new position as Leader of the Opposition, and in these moments when we are able to speak frankly and with some degree of personal feeling, one toward the other, to wish him, as I have done before, to wish him sell in his task. It is not an easy task to be Leader of the Opposition. He will have many, many problems to contend with and notwithstanding the fact that he will get probably little support or help from this side of the House, it may be of some comfort for him to know that there are members here on this side of the House who understand the difficulty of the position and at the same time wish him personally well in his occupancy of it.

We realize quite well that a leadership convention is to be held by the New Democratic Party sometime later this year, and without trying to get into the internal affairs of that party in any way at all, it would not surprise me if we were to see, to some extent in this Session, some pre-run of that leadership convention taking place in the House. That won't surprise us either. We are a party that has been known, from time to time to have leadership conventions and we know some of the joys and some of the problems that come with them so we can only say to my honourable friend, the Member for Selkirk, welcome to the club and we're sure that you will fare reasonably well but in your internal deliberations with your colleagues, make sure that you keep your eye on the ball, that you're aware of what you want, that your party is in shape for for this kind of a meeting, and that you emerge from it as relatively unscathed as is possible for any participant in it, having regard for the fact that there may be one, two, three, four or more people who may be seeking that same position.

I remind my honourable friend and all of his colleagues of a statement that I made early in the life of this Legislature. It's one that certainly I did not coin. It's one that has come down to us through the annals of parliamentary government, namely that a good opposition can help make a good government, and the better the quality of the opposition that is given, then the better will be, by and large, the quality of the service and the responsiveness to the of the government to the people of Manitoba.

I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that based on the track record thus far, and I'm referring not only to this Session but indeed, the last Session as well, that the government is going to be pretty well left to its own devices because there hasn't been too much by way of good opposition coming from across the way. —(Interjection)— We're always prepared, Mr. Speaker, to receive help because we do not pretend, unlike our predecessors, we do not pretend to have a monopoly on all wisdom and all ideas, on all thoughts for the public interest in Manitoba. We like to receive good progressive ideas, but there has been such a dearth of them from the other side of the House, not only this year but last year as well, that we have come to understand that there is going to be little help available to us in the onerous task that we face in providing good government to the people of Manitoba.

So Mr. Speaker, we look forward to an improvement in that track record, something a little bit more than opposition by press clipping, something a little bit more than opposition by dogma. Something a little bit more than opposition out of the Regina Manifesto or out of some of the earlier 19th century writings to which my friends are so addicted. We want them to join with us in facing the realities of the times that Manitobans face and I will be touching on that topic a little bit later because that of course was one topic that my honourable friend mentioned in his opening remarks as Leader of the Opposition.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think the government finds itself in a position totally opposite to that of Oliver Twist. You remember Oliver Twist, when he was staying in the kind of young man's poor house, and after receiving the very weak gruel that had been served up by the headmaster there, he went forward rather timidly and asked for more. Mr. Speaker, I can tell my honourable friends opposite that unlike Oliver Twist, we won't be asking for any more of the weak gruel that they've been handing out during the past seven or eight days.

Mr. Speaker, it might be an appropriate time to call it 5:30 and resume at the regular 8:00 o'clock hour.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock.