

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, March 28, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): At this time, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 18 students of the Red River Community College. These students are under the direction of Miss Burkhardt. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan. On behalf of all the members, we welcome you here today.

I should like to apologize for the smell of paint. There are paint thinners that are prevalent in the Chamber at the present time. I've been told that the painting has now stopped and we hope that the smell will disappear slowly from the Chamber.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to report to the House that under the Executive Government Organization Act, the Department of Continuing Education and Manpower, previously known as the Department of Colleges and Universities Affairs, will be amalgamated with the Department of Education effective April 1st of this year. This combined ministry will be known as the Department of Education under, of course, the head of the present Minister of Education, and will consolidate the education programs and operations of both public school and post-secondary institutions. By this means, we will be able to eliminate duplication for it will entail consolidation of the research, accounting, personnel and payroll branches of the two departments as well as other administrative functions.

The present Deputy Minister of Continuing Education and Manpower, Dr. Lorimer, will become Deputy Minister of the consolidated department and Mr. Bob Dalton, who had undertaken to hold the Deputy Minister's post in the Department of Education until March 31st, has agreed to remain with the department for a further three months, that is to the end of the school year, as technical advisor to the Minister of Education.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I will be equally brief. I would merely say in response to the statement by the First Minister that the internal organization of government is something which changes obviously from time to time. I have no particular evidence to bring forward to suggest that it is necessarily and inherently better, one way or the other. Suffice it to say that from time to time, because of what may be current policy issues of the day or of the moment, but also given the nature of the senior personnel in respective departments, that this and other provinces from time to time have seen fit to operate the Department of Education really bifurcated as between elementary and secondary education on the one hand and post-secondary on the other. Far be it from me to suggest, however, that it cannot work this way at least as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Government, Air Division, for the year ending March 31st, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Arts Council. It is the Eighth Annual Report for the years '76-'77, and I would also like to table the Annual Report of the Communities' Economic Development Fund for the year ending March 31st, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I have three reports to table. It is my privilege to table the Annual Report of the Department of Education for the year ending June 30th, 1977; also it is my pleasure to table the Annual Report of the Universities Grants Commission for the year ending March 31st, 1977, and the University of Manitoba Annual Financial Report for the year ended March 31st, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): I would like to table a number of reports, Mr. Speaker: the Report of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board covering operations for the fiscal year April 1st, 1976 to March 31st, 1977; the 1977 Annual Report of the Manitoba Human Rights Commission; the Fifth Annual Report of Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba to March 31st, 1977; proceedings of the Fifty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the Uniform Law Conference of Canada, August 1977; Fifty-Fourth Annual Report of the Liquor Control Commission for the fiscal year April 1st, 1976 to March 31st, 1977; Fiftieth Annual Report of the Chief Inspector, Province of Manitoba, covering the operation and enforcement of liquor law in Manitoba for the year January 1st, 1977 to December 31st, 1977; Seventh Annual Report (1978) of the Manitoba Law Reform Commission; the Auditor's Report and Financial Statements for the year ended March 31st, 1977 in regard to the Liquor Control Commission; Returns under the Controverted Elections Act for the period January 1st, 1977 to December 31st, 1977 from the Court of Appeal and Court of Queen's Bench; and the Sixth Annual Report of the Manitoba Police Commission (1977) for the period January 1st to December 31st, 1977.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the First Minister.

Can the First Minister indicate if a report will soon be forthcoming with respect to the prognosis relative to employment of students during this coming summer season. I refer to summer employment for youth the age of seventeen and beyond that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in response to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I've no detailed information as to timing of such a report or prognosis as that of which he speaks, but I would think that in the ordinary course of events during the course of the Estimates of the various departments, particularly my colleague the Minister of Education, and in the course of the Budget statement by the Minister of Finance, there may well be statements bearing upon that topic, and if there are any further reports that come to hand I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that they will be laid before the House in the usual way.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, given that dealing with the Estimates' in the normal course, one presumes that this will be in the order of three weeks or so. It would seem that the problem, if there is a problem, the extent of the problem really has to do with the time-frame that commences some time within the next two to three weeks, and so there is some urgency. I would simply pose the question if the First Minister will make inquiries to see whether the prognosis could be brought forward just in advance of the Estimates proper so that there is at least a better relationship to the time-frame itself.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition for that suggestion and we will certainly keep it in mind as we are developing the various items that I spoke of, namely Estimates, the Budget Speech and so on.

MR. SCHREYER: It's not a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, it's a question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I would ask the Minister if he's in a position to confirm or deny reports that one of the more major companies doing business in western Manitoba, namely Hooker Chemical, has announced the lay-off of forty personnel.

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

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that I have spoken with management out at Hooker Chemical. They have laid off a certain number of staff, I believe about twenty staff members dealing with one particular aspect of the plant because of slow markets and poor sales with regard to that particular section of the plant. They have not informed me, Mr. Speaker, that they would be closing the total plant dealing with the electrolysis that's going on there right now and have assured me that they would inform me if any such steps were undertaken.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Attorney-General. Is the Attorney-General in a position to confirm or deny reports that the RCMP have been investigating allegations pertaining to a break-in by the RCMP of the offices of one Julius Koteles in the City of

Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the member for having given me notice of his question yesterday afternoon but I'm not yet in a position to do that and as soon as I am, I will advise.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I find it necessary once again to rise on a matter of privilege, and to do so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a document.

This is a letter from the office of the Minister of Corrections and Rehabilitation Services to Mr. R. D. (Bob) Campbell, President of The Pas Chamber of Commerce, dated March 14th, 1978, and I will quote one sentence of that paragraph, Mr. Speaker:

"The proposed facilities at The Pas were given careful consideration, and the decision has been made, with my concurrence, to defer construction for one year."

This is in reference, Mr. Speaker, to a Court House and jail facility at The Pas. This letter is signed, "Yours truly, R. L. Sherman." Carbon copy Honourable Sterling Lyon, Carbon copy Honourable Gerry Mercier, Carbon copy Doctor J. Banman.

Mr. Speaker, you are aware that yesterday I asked a question about this matter, and the member said that no such letter had gone out. The letter is now tabled.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you could make it further clear to the ministers opposite that they are to answer questions in the House, and not give information outside the House that they will not give to members inside the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I want to say on the same point of privilege that when the question was put yesterday by the Honourable Member for The Pas, I did not say that no such letter had gone out. I said, and I have the transcript from Hansard in front of me, that I would ask my honourable friend to wait for a discussion of that subject under the estimates.

I also asked him, in a second answer to a second question that he put, for clarification, whether he was directing the question at my leader or at me, because he had indicated that he was directing it to either/or, and I said that my answer would have to be on the second question, the same that it was on the first — a request to him to allow me to discuss it with him on estimates.

I do want to say though, since he has raised the point today, that he is absolutely correct. A letter did go out on March 14th, over my signature, to the President of the Chamber of Commerce, referred to by the honourable member, indicating that construction of that particular project has necessarily been deferred for a year.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, if I could speak to the matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and I would like some clarification from yourself as Speaker, the member would not give information to the House. The question on whether or not this project had been postponed was asked directly to him and to no one else, whether it is a violation of the privilege of this House or not to give information outside the House and ask members inside the House to wait for estimates to get the same information that has been given outside the House. Mr. Speaker, I would say that is a matter of privilege, and I would like your ruling on that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I say to the Honourable Member for The Pas, until I have seen the transcripts of Hansard, at that time then we will take a look at whether or not it was a matter of privilege of the House.

The Honourable Member for The Pas with a question.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I have some questions then for the Minister of Health and Social Development.

I what this announcement that the minister made to the Chamber of Commerce at The Pas, what this will do to the agreement that the province has with the town of The Pas — an agreement whereby the town gave special permission for trailer facilities to be built within the town of The Pas town limits, on the understanding that a jailhouse facility would be constructed by the end of 1978. What does this announcement do to that agreement?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, all I can say to the honourable member is that that agreement is being looked at, may require renegotiation — I can't answer that question at this moment. The construction project has been deferred due to restraint, hopefully it will not include or imply the ramifications to which the honourable member refers that might create additional difficulties. That process has to be examined and possibly renegotiated, but the priority decision was the one having to do with deferment for reasons of restraint — that decision was taken. While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to the honourable member, because I certainly did not intend to convey information outside the House rather than conveying it to him, I took special pains when I was asked by the Press about it yesterday to say to them that I would not give them that information because I had not given it to the honourable member. I can't be responsible for where the Press gets its information. I wrote a letter to the Chamber on the 14th of March — this House wasn't convened, Sir, until the 16th of March — I could not therefore announce it to the House

before announcing it to the Chamber.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I wonder if the Honourable Minister would indicate what action here his department will take if the town of The Pas in fact withdraws the permit to operate a trailer park and therefore there are no jail facilities in the community of The Pas.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows full well from his own experience as a Minister of the Crown, that that is a hypothetical question that can't be answered at the present time, but we will make every effort to ensure insofar as possible that that kind of difficulty does not develop.

MR. McBRYDE: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could tell me, in the efficient and effective review in making decisions, what projects to proceed with and which projects to delete for the upcoming year; whether or not they consider the possibility of building the jail part of this facility; whether those figures were broken out so they could fit within the government's program; whether they looked at the whole project, or whether they were willing to look at part of the project — the part that is urgent that would be proceeded with.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, figures of that kind and projections of that kind are still being broken out and examined, and I did say in my letter to the president of the Chamber, that I look forward to reviewing our present decision in the near future and I intend to be conscientious about that commitment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Labour. Would the Honourable Minister please advise the House whether Hooker Chemical and Simplot Chemical of Brandon are still being exempted from the regulations of the Power and Engineers Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Yes they are, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Honourable Minister please advise us how long she intends to allow these companies to be exempted of these regulations, keeping in mind the question of safety of the operation of the plants involved?

MRS. PRICE: I believe that's all in the Order for Return, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Fox has requested.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether the Honourable Minister heard my question. The question was: How long did the government, or the Minister, intend to permit these companies to continue to be exempted from the regulations of the Act? How long into the future would this go on? I believe that is over and above what has been asked for in the Order for Return.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I believe one of the questions that was asked is the length and kind of exemption that is taking place with each of the companies and that will be answered in the Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to inform the Member for Brandon East that he has had his question and two supplementaries. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works concerning The Pas courthouse and jail. Has he requested, or does he have approval for an extension or special dispensation from the Fire Commissioner's office for the delayed construction of that facility?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the Fire Commissioner's office has been contacted with respect to the plans that are in deferment at this stage at The Pas.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I assume that the Minister will undertake that. I would also like to ask him if he could indicate to the House the nature of a reported dispute of the contractor who was awarded the contract for The Pas courthouse and jail.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I can indicate to the Honourable Member for Elmwood that there is no dispute. Undoubtedly the contractor would be happy to get on with the construction of the facility at

The Pas.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I then understand that the Minister is saying that there is no dispute and that the contractor is willing to forego any penalty for the delay of the construction, and secondly, will hold his price for a year.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is free to speculate in response to his own questions all he wants. I made no such commitments nor did I answer him in any such manner.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Sir, on Friday, March 17th, and Monday, March 20th, questions were put to the Minister by myself and the Honourable Member for St. Boniface respecting details of a recently established federal-provincial block funding agreement respecting social services. On both occasions, the Honourable Minister was asked whether moneys would be received by Manitoba on an unconditional basis. He replied to that, Sir, and I quote from Hansard March 20th, Page 12: "Mr. Speaker, my response was intended to convey the information that there are strings attached, that the block funding is not available, as I said, *carte blanche*, that is, to be transferred for use in other areas."

Today, Sir, I have provided the Minister with a copy of a Globe and Mail report on the cost-sharing arrangement that he negotiated, detailing particulars of a statement made by the Federal Minister of Welfare, the Honourable Miss Begin. This statement was made at the end of the federal-provincial conference to which I have referred. For the benefit of those present, I have already provided this to the Honourable Minister and he knows the question but for the benefit of those present in the Assembly today, I will quote from the Globe and Mail report . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Orders of the Day. On the Adjourned Debate, the Honourable Member for Kildonan . . .

MR. CORRIN: Excuse me, on a point of order, Sir, I believe I am entitled to put my question to the Honourable Minister. Certainly since he's had an opportunity to anticipate the question, and inasmuch as I've given him this report, and inasmuch as I only want to table this report, as it were, before the honourable members present . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. There is a place on the Order Paper for the tabling of reports. The Honourable Member for Kildonan with a question?

MR. PETER FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister acting as Chairperson for the Committee for the Deployment of Civil Servants who have been displaced or laid off can inform the House whether that committee has met and how many times it has met.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, the committee has been arranged for but the head of the MGEA has not given his acceptance to attending the meeting and that's what we have been waiting for. — (Interjections)—

MR. FOX: I see everybody wants to get into the act on the first question I'm asking. Is the Minister saying the committee has not met because the MGEA has not agreed to participate?

MRS. PRICE: The president of MGEA said that his member who he has designated will not be attending but he has not said it officially to me.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister indicating that they are not interested in doing the job of redeployment of people who have been laid off because they can't get the co-operation from the MGEA?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, the committee will go on regardless.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health. Is it true that the people of Snow Lake can expect a new hospital and the services of two doctors in the near future?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Member for Flin Flon for giving me notice of

this question. I wish it were true, Mr. Speaker. No, it's not true that they can expect either of those things in the near future but my department officials and I are working on it in an attempt to expedite the medical problems in that area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for the Task Force. Last fall when people were laid off, we were told that they would be redeployed. Have any of these people been redeployed and has any mechanism been established to allow them to be redeployed? These are for the layoffs last fall.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for the Task Force.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK (River Heights): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary: What were those mechanisms, Mr. Speaker? How many people have been redeployed who were laid off last fall?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member will file an Order for Return, I'm sure it will be answered.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Northern Affairs. I wonder if the Minister would provide the House with documents which are already public but are very lengthy, that is, the Northern Flood Committee Agreement which apparently has now been ratified, and, Mr. Speaker, the agreement that was signed by the previous First Minister which was sent to Ottawa signed by the Government of Manitoba but left unsigned by the Northern Flood Committee, so that members can see the differences between the two documents.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, could the Member for Inkster clarify whether he means the document that was directed by the then First Minister be signed or the one that you intervened on and supplemented a clause that you requested to be signed.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member wishes to peruse the files he will find that an agreement was signed by the authorized representative of the Province of Manitoba, namely, the Premier, sent to Ottawa, and as far as I know is still on the desk of the Minister of Indian Affairs in Ottawa; that is the document which I am referring to. If the Minister doesn't know of such a document, I assure him that one exists. I wonder if he would table in the House so that the members can see the agreement which has now been signed with the Northern Flood Committee and the agreement which was sent to Ottawa prior to the new administration taking office, signed by the First Minister of the province but not signed by the Northern Flood Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, may I suggest to the Honourable Member for Inkster that probably orders of that nature may be better handled by an Address for Papers.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I raised that at the outset in making my remarks because it's not a paper which is not available. It is a document which has been made considerably public and all I'm asking the Minister is to let us have a copy of it. The document has been made available, it's been discussed in Thompson, it's not something I'm asking to take out of a secret file; I'm asking him to make it available to the House and therefore it should not need an Order for Return. On the other document, if he doesn't wish to present that one, then I will ask for an Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I can supply the Member for Inkster in this House with the two or three and possibly four sets of documents that were signed and directed to be signed and finally consummated; we will provide this House with all of them.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that's fine. I just want to go on the record that there were only two documents signed by the authorized representatives of the Government of Manitoba; two.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, there were certainly three that I'm aware of that through direction were signed; one was signed, the other parties couldn't get together to sign it, and now we have one that all four parties signed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, since it has been insinuated, although not made exactly clear by the Minister of Northern Affairs, that there was more than one proposed agreement signed by myself, I rise on a point of privilege to advise the House and the record that there was only one proposed agreement which was signed by myself and forwarded to the Government of Canada. Only one, Sir, not more than one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, in relationship to what the Leader of the Opposition has said, he's aware that he directed a senior civil servant within the then government to sign a particular document. That document was not agreed to by the gentleman sitting to your right, and because of some debate there was another clause drafted: that one, I understand, you signed; that one, I understand, you sent to Ottawa and couldn't get concurrence from anybody else to sign. Since the election we have sat down and discussed with the various people involved, and we now have an agreement which we are reasonably satisfied with. Now I am prepared to file all those, but I don't think you can stand up — the Honourable Leader of the Opposition without leaving the impression in this House that there wasn't more than one document. Precisely, you say you signed one; that's right, but Sir, you directed that an original one before that be signed.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is precisely the point of privilege that is the insinuation that I directed someone to sign something binding on the Crown in advance of my having read it, and Sir, that is impossible by definition. I gave no one direction to sign anything in advance of my perusing it in its entirety. When it came back from perusal, that's when they were advised that it was not acceptable in the precise wording in which it had been brought forward to me. Let that be clear.

The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs, Sir, I pose a question to him now, if I may, and that is, will he simply table the two documents, the two versions requested, so that we may see just what wording he has changed?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, I am prepared to table all the documents, Mr. Speaker; I think the House should have a look at them all. Just in relationship to what the Leader of the Opposition has said' that he is trying to leave the impression there is some question as to whether you directed that that document be signed — I'm alleging you directed — then the flooding took place, on the presumption that your good word was good enough for the flooding to take place, Sir.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know why my honourable friend raises that point, because if his honourable colleagues had had their way, the flooding would have taken place without anyone's consultation or concurrence.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. Within the past few days the honourable minister had published an advertisement requesting public response to proposed plans for the development of a portion of Whiteshell Provincial Park, and I would like to know whether that area of the park that has been designated for future development, which the government would like to receive public response by way of response to an ad, whether the Jarmoc property is within that area or outside it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the member will read the ad it says it's a Whiteshell Review and he knows the particular property in question is within the Whiteshell Provincial Park, so the answer is yes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, yes, I appreciate that the Jarmoc property is within Whiteshell Provincial Park, but if the honourable minister will recall the manner in which the ad was drafted, it showed only a certain portion of Whiteshell Provincial Park that was the subject of this particular inquiry. Is the Jarmoc property within that portion of Whiteshell Park or not that is the subject of this particular enquiry.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, we are undertaking a full review of the Whiteshell Provincial Park. We are trying to get some input from the people in the area as well as people who will be using those facilities, and that's what the review is for.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, my question was very simple: is the Jarmoc property within the area of Whiteshell Provincial Park designated as the area under study, or not?

MR. BANMAN: I wonder if the member who was Minister of Tourism would say that that particular property is within the Whiteshell Park?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, you know, I am tempted to ask the Honourable Minister of Health when he will consider including the ailment of psycho-sclerosis as one included under a Medicare plan, because that ailment appears to be reaching epidemic proportions on that side.

However, my question was not whether Jarmoc property is within Whiteshell Provincial Park or not. My question, and I will repeat again, is, "Is it within that portion of Whiteshell Provincial Park which was shown as being the area designated as a study area for future development and inviting public response thereon' or is it outside the boundary of that portion of Whiteshell Provincial Park?"

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, as the ad indicates it's a Whiteshell Provincial Park review, and as a result we're reviewing the whole park.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I point out to the member that he has already had one question more than others. The Honourable Government House Leader.

Hon. Warner Jorgenson(Morris): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could indicate to the House under what provisions of our rules is this debate taking place at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Sir, my question again is to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. I've given him the Globe and Mail report. The Honourable Minister of Welfare has indicated in that report that it is only a matter of trust that block funded dollars be spent on Social Services and not on roads. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. May I point out to the member that this is the period for asking questions. There is a place for statements. There is a place for debate. The question period is designed purely for the benefit of all members of the Legislature and their opportunity to ask specific questions of specific members of the Treasury Bench. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: The question is, Sir, can the moneys be spent on roads as well as Social Services and is the Minister willing to restate or retract his former information to this Assembly?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Member for Wellington for having sent me a copy of the report to which he refers. All I can do, Mr. Speaker, is reiterate the statement that I've made in this House in the past with respect to the new Social Services Block Funding Agreement. I know what the Minister of Welfare for the Province of Saskatchewan had to say about it. I know what the Minister for British Columbia had to say about it. The fact remains, Sir, that there are three conditions tied to the block funding; one has to do with residency, one has to do with reporting, and one has to do with recognition of federal contributions, and the reporting category insists that the provinces supply data and information backing up their Social Services' programs in order to qualify for the money.

Now the honourable member's point is well taken because there has been some objection, some criticism raised by some of the provincial Ministers. The legislation is not written yet. This is going to be written into the legislation, and when we see that legislation, if members of this House, including the Honourable Member for Wellington, don't feel that there is a sufficient safeguard of Social Services written into that legislation, then obviously this House will not be prepared to give this government the mandate to support it. But at this point in time, Sir, that kind of protection is intended to be written into the legislation, that's all I can tell my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington with a supplementary question.

MR. CORRIN: Is it true that this agreement to which the Honourable Minister has referred is to become effective as of April 1st, this Saturday?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the intention is that when the legislation is perfected and passed that it would be retroactive to April 1st, 1978, that's correct, but that retroactivity feature will be built into it at the time. At this present time we're still continuing under RVDP, and that will have to be the situation until the new legislation is ready.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare. Can the Minister confirm that cutbacks in funding for the alcohol program operating out of the Churchill Health Centre will necessitate staff cutbacks in that program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that. The subject will be examined in detail during my Estimates, but I wish to confirm that for the honourable member.

MR. COWAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister then confirm that he's been informed by medical authorities in Churchill that the need for the alcohol counselling services in Churchill will increase in the near future, not decrease, under the present economic conditions facing that community.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the decision with respect to the Churchill Health Centre was taken by the Board of the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, based on their perception of the needs in the Churchill area and was acted upon by me on the basis of that advice among other advice. I can only rely on their professional expertise. They are convinced that the necessary program can be maintained with a slightly reduced staff.

MR. COWAN: In light of new advice, Sir, from no less an authority than the president of the medical staff of the Churchill Health Centre protesting that cutback and asking the Minister to review that cutback, can the Minister indicate to this House whether or not he is willing to review the cutback and take into consideration the new advice he's been offered.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll assure my honorable friend of that undertaking; I'll review it. I would say that in the case of the appropriation for the Alcoholism Foundation it's a global appropriation in a sense. The Foundation Board has considerable freedom to make adjustments in allocations and I expect that my honourable friend and I will have a pretty intensive discussion of those decisions during my Estimates.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI (St. George): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to pose a question to the Minister of Finance. Could he confirm or deny whether the reports in last night's Tribune about the Provincial Government withholding effective March 1 the two-cent gasoline tax from the Insurance Corporation are accurate or not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen the news report referred to and I can neither confirm nor deny the question the member asked.

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

MR. URUSKI: I'll rephrase it then, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister indicate whether they are now withholding the two-cent gasoline tax from the Corporation?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I do not have any information available to me that would indicate that that in fact is what is happening. With regard to any further decisions concerning that particular tax, I suggest that the honourable member await the Budget statement in the House.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to — the Minister is out of his seat now — I'd like to pose a question to the Minister of Tourism. There were reports in the press about four or five pilot projects that were referred to similar to the Jarmoc property that we've been discussing in the House the last couple of weeks. Could he indicate to the House where those pilot projects are going to be undertaken and what types they are?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the projects that I have referred to, different individuals have asked if they could make proposals to the government. We have said yes, we would be looking at proposals, and there have been several individuals that have expressed interest in presenting those proposals to the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Attorney-General. Could the Attorney-General confirm that he is ordering a review of the announcement by the Chairman of Legal Aid, Manitoba, insofar as the freezing of the eligibility requirements pertaining to applicants for legal aid?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Attorney-General. Is he going to order any review of any of the announcements by the Chairman, Legal Aid, Manitoba, pertaining to the operations of Legal Aid in Manitoba and changes thereof?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, at the present time, our department is awaiting formal confirmation from the Board of Legal Aid as to what precisely the cuts they expect to make will be, and I will await that formal document because I am not yet certain as to precisely what reductions in service Legal Aid will be making. The Chairman has indicated they will be considering a number of matters.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for questions having expired, I will allow the member for Selkirk to ask his final supplementary question.

MR. PAWLEY: I would like the Attorney-General then to indicate whether or not the announcements by the Chairman, Legal Aid, Manitoba, received his approval prior to the announcements thereof.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. On the adjourned debate on the motion of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, and the amendment moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for Pembina has thirteen minutes left.

MR. DON ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It appeared as if, at the close of discussions yesterday, that I was dwelling upon the implications of the Budget, and the rather frightful state in which the government elected October 11th inherited, namely, a \$225 million deficit. Now honourable members opposite have justified their term in office saying, "Well, we balanced the budget, we did a good job. We only ran into a deficit the last year."

I think it is of importance today, Mr. Speaker, to point out that in 1969, when the honourable members opposite formed the government . . .

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

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will help my honourable friend out in this case. It would be incorrect for him to say that we, on this side, said that we ran a deficit only one year. The fact of the matter is we ran deficits more than one year. It is also a fact that we ran surpluses more years than we ran deficits.

It is also a fact that my honourable friends, when they were in office in 1960s ran deficits as often as they ran surpluses. It is not that simple, my honourable friend.

MR. ORCHARD: I want to thank the Leader of the Opposition on his enlightenment on how to balance the budget, particularly in view of the \$225 million deficit we inherited.

But at any rate, they have enabled to justify their budget deficit of the last fiscal year by saying, "We did a reasonable job. We balanced the budget more times than we experienced a deficit," if I understand the Leader of the Opposition correctly. Well, I say, "Hurray, very good job." Because, in 1969 when friends opposite inherited the government, they inherited a road system, which at that time — and I know from fact — was far superior to that of our neighbouring province of Saskatchewan. In 1968, I graduated from university, and I took employment in Regina, Saskatchewan, and the common sympathy extended to me was that you were leaving a province with good roads and going to a province with very poor roads in comparison.

I must say that in the eight years that the Province of Manitoba enjoyed the socialist experiment in government, we went from the enviable position of a very good road system to one of a very poor road system. Our sister province of Saskatchewan did a very good job in improving and upgrading their road system in those eight years, and now the shoe is on the other foot, and that is part of the total package that our honourable friends opposite inherited in 1969 to enable them to proceed very smoothly on an almost balanced budget and maybe a surplus because they didn't spend money on roads in southern Manitoba. They lived on the investment placed there over the past few years by the previous administration, and in circumstances like that it's probably very easy to operate within budget restraints and, in fact, have a surplus upon occasion.

Now we have had over the last few days in the Throne Speech Debate — we have listened to some rather incredible remarks tossed to the floor of this Chamber by some of the members opposite, and I must point specifically to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose in particular. His total dwelling was on Mein Kampf, comparisons to Hitler, the accusation was laid outright that our leader was a Fascist dictator — I believe that was the exact terminology. I am a new member to this Chamber, and I find remarks like that totally incredible from an elected person — totally incredible and out of place in this Chamber. Furthermore, I would ask the members opposite how am I, as an elected representative of

Tuesday, March 28, 1978

this House and this government of Manitoba, how am I to justify the position of going back to my constituency, and when I go to my constituency and I'm approached upon the question of, "That Member for Inkster," and I'll use him as an example, "he is an outright communist!" How am I, after hearing the remarks from the Member for Ste. Rose, going to be able to justify the position that the Member for Inkster is not a communist. And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, how am I to justify, when members of my constituency say that the Leader of the Opposition is nothing but a communist wolf in socialist clothing, how am I to justify those . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Does the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose has a point of privilege?

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Pembina seems to be hurt by remarks that I inferred that the Leader of the Conservative Party had Fascist leanings. Now I believe in calling a spade a spade, but I have been accused, I have listened to eight years in this . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, , order please. May I point out to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose that the matter he raised was not a point of privilege. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: I trust, Mr. Speaker, that you will calculate these unnecessary interruptions in my allotted time.

I listened with some amusement to the Member for Inkster, and I'm sorry he is not in the Chamber. I listened with a great deal of intent to his speech on Thursday, I believe it was. I found it to be quite a humorous speech. He did a very fine job of enterentertaining the Assembly, and I thought that that was rather a strange position for such a serious debater, Mr. Speaker, to develop a humorous program for the members of the Assembly. And then it clicked for me, why the Member for Inkster could develop such a humorous program. If I was sitting in his shoes, after having an eight-year ride in government and deficit financing this province into practical oblivion' I'd be sitting back right now and laughing very, very hard at the government side of the House in their attempts to remedy the mismanagement that they went through in eight years. I can appreciate how he can take it so light-heartedly and jokingly.

I also found of interest the Honourable Member for Inkster's reference to the prayer issued by the Lieutenant-Governor in his delivery of the Throne Speech. Now, as usual, the Member for Inkster has a very specific interpretation. It didn't take me long to sit in this House and find out that he has interpretations to suit his own need. He indicates that the Lieutenant-Governor's prayer was a direct result of the fact that nothing to solve the unemployment problem was found in the Throne Speech. On the other hand, I think the interpretation that the Lieutenant-Governor was to leave through his prayer was that we on this side of the House had inherited such a blessed mess that it would take the force of God to remedy the wrongs done in eight years of socialist government. His prayer, his earnest and heartfelt prayer, Mr. Speaker, was to guide us in wisdom to solve the horrid mess we inherited.

Also, the Member for Inkster made quite a lot of reference to the Honourable Minister of Finance in his questioning — "Well, what about the hydro rates? What about the hydro rates?" Well, let's discuss hydro rates just for a brief minute. Members opposite claim, with a great deal of confidence and pride, that they went four to five years without having to increase the hydro rates in the Province of Manitoba — "We did a good job." Well, we have been in office not six months and already we have had to have one hydro rate increase, we are probably looking at one, or maybe two years in a row of hydro rate increase. Once again, I think if we take a close look at hydro, that we will find our honourable friends opposite banked on considerable wise and very sound investment by previous administrations in the development of hydro and very neatly, very easily piddled that down the road in eight short years of mismanagement in hydro development. In the two years, and in their question of what about the hydro . . .

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

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to dwell on hydro rates because those will be developed in full course and in due time in this Chamber but I think it's another example of how we, on this side of the House, have inherited a rather monstrous problem to solve, as with the \$225 million deficit, and I thank the electors of Manitoba — all 49 percent of them — that they returned us to government' they put us in government, rather than leaving the financial mismanagement of the other side there in place for another four years.

You know, I have often looked at the Woodsworth Building, that great monument to socialism in the City of Winnipeg. I've often wondered, what is amiss with that building? It didn't quite look right to me and I asked myself, is it the green trim on the building? I admit it would probably be more appropriate to have a sunset pink on the building rather than the green because, after all, socialism is in its sunset in this province. Is it the fact that it was partly rented? No, no, that wasn't it. And then finally it clicked on me, and you know what the problem with the Woodsworth Building is?

A MEMBER: I know, it keeps falling apart.

MR. ORCHARD: No, besides that, that's another problem. The problem with the Woodsworth Building is that it's not on the square. It's not on the square with the world and I think that probably was indicative with most of the programs that the former Minister of Public Works stuffed on the Province of Manitoba. Not quite on the square. Slightly helter-skelter with the world. But we'll try it anyway; we'll try it anyway.

Mr. Speaker, in drawing my concluding remarks, I must say unequivocally that I am sitting on the right side of the House. I am sitting with the Progressive Conservative government on this side of the House. I believe in the profit motive; I believe in a person being paid well for doing well; I believe that if he wants to make an investment he should receive a return on that investment; I have confidence in the private sector; I believe the private sector can solve a lot of the economic woes that are left with us, vis-a-vis the previous administration; and I do believe that if a person feels that he is worth more dollars that he should be able to ask those dollars and if he can get them, he should take them from the economy — if he's earning them, he should take them.

I have no difficulty with those kind of philosophical beliefs sitting on this side of the House, but, I must say that some of the members opposite must have a great deal of difficulty sitting there representing, as they would have us believe, the poor man, the down-trodden, the less advantaged person in society. They are their representatives, they are their champions. And why I think that I would have difficulty, and I think some of the members over there would have difficulty sitting over there, I would refer you to a press statement, a television statement, that the Member for Elmwood entered in the press and in the T.V. from last December, I believe it was. Basically, during the debate on succession duties and gift tax, we listened to the Member for Elmwood say, "Not one of my constituents will benefit from succession duties; not one of my constituents will benefit from gift tax." He was vehement. He represents a lower income group of people and then on the other hand, he states, on television, that he has a great deal of difficulty living on a \$19,000 MLA income. He'd like to get a teaching job as well and supplement it with another \$16,000.00. I think that he is a socialist. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The honourable member's time has expired. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to first seize this opportunity to congratulate you on the work that you are doing in performing your duties. Certainly within a democratic society, the role of a political minority is all-important toward the sustaining of a democratic society. Your role within that House, therefore, is critical toward ensuring the continuation of healthy democratic interplay and, Mr. Speaker, I assure you and I am sure all members can assure you of their efforts in order to assist you in achieving the purposes for which your office sets you aside.

Secondly, I want to congratulate the mover and seconder in the speech and reply. I was impressed with two new members and as I am with most of the new members in the Legislature, sitting here for the first full session. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that sometimes new members are in for somewhat of a shock. They are sworn in one day and then find themselves sworn at the second day and I think that every new member in this House will find that out from their own personnel experience.

Mr. Speaker, it was the founder of the Conservative Party who extolled the virtues of minority groups and who has said, at one particular point, to have indicated that the rights of minorities must be protected, and then he continued to make the point that of course, the rich are always purer than the poor.

Mr. Speaker, in the past three years we have produced to us evidence that the Conservative Party in the province of Manitoba has realized some one-half million dollars in unknown donations, donations that have been received from certain private interest groups, donations that have not been identified as to their source. I would refer refer honourable members to the article in the Winnipeg Tribune of Saturday, March 16, 1978, in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, I suspect very strongly that for those unknown and those anonymous donors, these are not times of restraint as they are for most Manitobans. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we have here a government which is democratic as to form, but autocratic in behaviour; a government that is backed by a small group which is vastly superior to it in many respects, a group of privileged and wealthy individuals within the province of Manitoba, a group that are not satisfied with the control of the industrial and commercial sectors of this province, but are anxious to ensure the domination of the political sector of this province. That is a group — that is a small select group — the invisible government in the province of Manitoba. We have in front of us the visible government; behind the visible government, Mr. Speaker, there is the invisible government that are pulling the strings in the province of Manitoba at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, these of course are for example the officers and officials of Great-West Life who have seen fit to become openly and very much involved in a partisan way, who find there is no restraint imposed upon them insofar as the opening of the portals of this Legislature, who find that there is no restraint imposed insofar as they are concerned in obtaining easy and ready appointments to see Ministers of the Crown, while the representatives, for example, in day care centres must wait for weeks and months without receiving satisfactory response to a request for an appointment from the Minister responsible for the day care operations in the province of Manitoba.

We have a government presently in the province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, that has now been able to solidify its ranks. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to all honourable members that when a member is speaking they try and keep their own personal conversations down so at least I can hear what the member is saying. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we now have a government in the province of Manitoba that has been able to unify its ranks, has been able to solidify itself from what was a serious schism in its ranks only two years ago, and why? Mr. Speaker, it is a cohesive power of the spoils and patronage system which we are about to witness and are beginning to witness on the part of the government opposite.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen in the past five short months that these are not times of restraint for some. It was only last week that we re-read the announcement of generous increases insofar as the breweries are concerned in the province of Manitoba, generous awarding of funds, of additional prices to the breweries per gallon of beer, which in fact the former chairman of the Liquor Control Commission, who had taken careful calculation of what they were entitled to prior to his departure from the chairmanship of the board, indicated very clearly that the award was excessive. So to the breweries these are not days of restraint, these are days of generosity.

These are not days of restraint insofar as Messrs. Cholakis and Einarson and the province of Manitoba are concerned — two buyers who are able to acquire a boat which replacement-wise is in the neighborhood of three million dollars — a boat for the price of \$250,000.00. Mr. Speaker, there was no reserve as to the price that that boat would bring, there was no conditions that the boat must continue to operate in the province of Manitoba, and let me say, Mr. Speaker, I hear ominous reports daily as to where that boat might be destined. It concerns me and, Mr. Speaker, I wish the Minister of Education was here, because I do not know who the Minister of Education is speaking to when he indicates that people are applauding the sale of that boat in the Interlake. He must speaking to the president of the Gimli Conservative Association and members of his executive only, because the people I speak to in the Interlake are outraged about the sale of the Lord Selkirk — a boat which provided an industry to the Interlake, which provided jobs to the Interlake, which attracted tourists from all over the United States into the province of Manitoba. That boat has been sold for peanuts. We don't even know if that boat is to continue to operate in the province of Manitoba and there was no restraint insofar as the awards to the purchasers of that boat in the province of Manitoba. And, Mr. Speaker, the people of the Interlake particularly will never forgive this government for the fire sale of the Lord Selkirk.

Mr. Speaker, there are others that are beginning to loom in the province of Manitoba, that are beginning to loom with their power and their influence. There are others that will not be living in days of restraint in the province of Manitoba; they are those that are connected with the insurance industry. They are those that are represented by the Insurance Bureau of Canada and to new members I would like to relate to them the experiences that we had in 1971, 1972, when Mr. Piper, Mr. Vannon from the Insurance Bureau of Canada, individuals who openly boasted that they were arriving in Manitoba from eastern Canada because they were going to dictate to the politically elected people of the province of Manitoba where they were to get off, and who threatened the politically elected people in the province of Manitoba as to what they had better do insofar as the insurance industry is concerned. They were the same people, Mr. Speaker, who met one night with the Conservative caucus and assisted the Conservative caucus in developing what was called the Weir program, which was announced the following day in the Legislature by the then leader of the Conservative Party, the former premier, Weir. They dictated a policy, they accepted it within hours after having years, years, Mr. Speaker, in order to formulate a program; within hours they accepted a program dictated to them by the Insurance Bureau of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to second the remarks the other day by the Member for Inkster. We will be ready to show the insurance industry the road maps back to Toronto, back to Montreal, back to Chicago, if they should re-establish in the province of Manitoba in collusion with the government of the day.

Mr. Speaker, it is a period of restraint insofar as most Manitobans, however. Most Manitobans are beginning to be concerned. Mr. Speaker, there are many Manitobans who voted for the government of the day, who now feel betrayed by the government of the day, and there are others who are beginning to feel very disappointed in the government of the day because they had hopes for the government of the day. But, Mr. Speaker, there was one that was taken in by the government of the day, a Mr. William Jackson, president of the Manitoba Government Employees' Association. He was taken in, he participated in a task force review, and Mr. Jackson only a week ago — and, Mr. Speaker, I regret that Mr. Jackson had to be taken in — said very clearly that although he had had his differences with the former government, at least they were men of honor and integrity. He went on, Mr. Speaker, to say, "This bunch, I can't trust them." Those are words from Mr. Jackson, who only a few short months ago, expressed optimism as to the direction of the newly elected government, October 11th, 1977. Mr. Jackson is representative, I believe, of the disillusionment that is developing within the province of Manitoba, maybe slowly but steadily, steadily building up, Mr. Speaker, and I do not believe that the government of this day will be able to turn back what will be the increasing development of that disillusionment by Manitobans?

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister of Labour that there ought to be no restraint imposed upon those of minimum wage within the province of Manitoba — no restraint. If there is a group that suffers from rising costs in the province of Manitoba, it is the working poor in this province. Only the other evening, I spoke to a gentleman receiving about \$500 a month, five children, paying out rent of some \$175 a month, having to ride in a car pool from Selkirk into the City of Winnipeg, and having to support five dependents and having to live on a minimum wage. And the Minister of Labour

announces to this province that they particularly must be restrained. They, in particular, must pay the price of a restraint policy to keep down wages, those on minimum wage must be singled out.

There ought to be no place, I say to the Minister of Labour, for those workers working in plants to face the steady and continuing danger from safety and health. The numbers that have been killed within our mines and within our plants in the last four or five years have been at such a rate that it was an area of priority for the new Democratic Party government to develop the Safety in the Workplace Act in the province of Manitoba. The former Minister of Health indicated that was one of his crowning achievements, to have developed that legislation in the province of Manitoba, and I say to the Minister of Labour that she must exercise guts within that Cabinet room to ensure that the life and safety of workers in this province will not be jeopardized from a government which has in many ways become drunk with its own desire to impose restraints on most Manitobans regardless of the price that that policy develops.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs that municipal ratepayers are increasingly concerned about the expectations of sharp mill rate increases this summer. To reduce unconditional grants this year from eleven percent, I believe is without any justification. What, in fact, the Minister of Municipal Affairs is permitting himself to do, Mr. Speaker, is to unload costs from the ability to pay, again into the field of user fees, which this government is very very prone to do, and will result in sharply increased municipal taxes for most Manitobans this year. And I say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs that he must demonstrate some guts to ensure that municipal ratepayers in general do not pay the price of this government's desires.

Mr. Speaker, we have a Minister of Northern Affairs that is not in his seat, but seems to be bent upon delivering the northern areas of this province into a vast wilderness park. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed, since October 11, 1977, announcements involving some 600 jobs in Thompson; we have noted the converting of northern programs into nothing, programs which meant so much to our native and to our Metis people, programs which have already been scuttled by the Minister of Northern Affairs.

I remember a gentleman by the name of Gordon Beard, a man well respected in this legislature, who represented Churchill for a period of time under the Conservative label, and I remember Gordon Beard speaking with heavy heart as to the disillusionment he had had with the Conservative Party in Manitoba, a party that was more interested in its influential and wealthy friends in southern Manitoba than it obviously was interested in programs for northern Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the spirit of Gordon Beard lives on in this House, and Mr. Speaker, it's true, it lives on within the motivation of four elected members in this House. That will strive to prevent the Minister of Northern Affairs from turning Northern Manitoba, as I indicated earlier, into what could be little better than a vast wilderness camp.

Mr. Speaker, we are seeing a government which is deforming the legal aid system in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Attorney-General has attempted to rescue some of the better aspects of this program with his colleagues; it is my understanding that the slashing of legal aid took place out at the bunker in Camp Shilo — good place for this Cabinet to disappear to, to protect themselves from the wrath of Manitobans — and they may have to remain there permanently. But it is my understanding that the Attorney-General attempted to rescue many of the basic qualities of the legal aid program in Manitoba. He wanted, it is my understanding, somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$3.1 million for legal aid in Manitoba. His First Minister cut him down, cut him down to \$2.8 million. Mr. Speaker, if we review the words of the First Minister uttered in this Legislature last year during Estimate Review of the Department of the Attorney-General, when he rethought out loud his great admiration for the days prior to 1969 when legal aid was provided as a charity by the lawyers in the Province of Manitoba, then we know what the motivation of the First Minister was in overriding the efforts by the Attorney-General to rescue some of the better qualities of that program.

Mr. Speaker, we have the handicapped in this province who are facing the restraint of this government. I mentioned Mr. Jackson, disillusioned, who had found out that the word of this government means very, very little. The Handicapped Association of the Province of Manitoba, in the Tribune, Tuesday, March 14th, 1978, referred to a letter which they had received from the present Premier of this province stating, in answer to their concerns as to what a Conservative government would do in Manitoba — the First Minister said, "Creating conditions that would permit handicapped people to be employed and independent in Manitoba will be a priority for the Progressive Conservative government." Will be a priority. Mr. Speaker, we have the farcical situation of a betrayal of this promise by the First Minister in which the handicapped are bearing a price for the restraint program, the Affirmative Action program being disposed of, and the advice that the Handicapped Association in this province were neither consulted, nor was this move discussed with them. The handicapped have been chosen, along with the native and the Metis, the old and the ill and the aged, to share the heaviest burden of the restraint process exercised by this very, very conservative government in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we had a speech yesterday by the minister responsible for Housing, in which he attempted to excuse a do-nothing policy which he appears to be on the verge of pursuing insofar as housing, by claiming that we had overbuilt. Mr. Speaker, I would be interested in finding units that are fully completed in the Province of Manitoba, elderly persons' units, that remain vacant — that remain vacant in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, it is my observation, and certainly it is within my constituency, that there are long lists waiting permission to enter into both senior citizen housing

and family housing.

Mr. Speaker, if anything can be said, it can be said that the previous New Democratic Party government did not move fast enough insofar as providing decent housing to low income and elderly persons in this province. It certainly cannot be said by any that we have overbuilt, and that the needs have been satisfied: they are far short of having been satisfied. So, Mr. Speaker, it is with alarm, when we hear the comments by the minister responsible for housing, that some way or other they would turn back the housing program in the province.

Mr. Speaker, during the last election the present First Minister stated, on October 3rd, 1977 — charged — that not only is the New Democratic Party Government anti-business, but that it is also anti-people, because he said it had picked fights with virtually every group ranging from the beef producers to professionals. The present Leader went on to say, "We are going to end that war of government against the people." Mr. Speaker, I've been here for eight years and I don't believe I've ever seen so many demonstrations by people in the Province of Manitoba against the government of the day than we have observed since the election of that group to the government of this province. Mr. Speaker, as was said the other day, I'm sure it will be necessary for you soon, Mr. Speaker, to arrange for scheduling of groups before this Legislature, giving them particular days and times by which they can participate in demonstrations against the un-thought of callous actions by the government of the day. Days and times will have to be scheduled for the many groups that will be interested in so participating.

Mr. Speaker, what we are facing now rather than an ending of a war by government against people, as was charged by the First Minister, we have had very clearly a declaration of full-scale war by this government against most Manitobans, by their policies.

Whether it's those that are involved in day-care concerns, tenant concerns and rent control, whether it is those that are concerned in the labour movement by a Minister of Labour who has professed her antagonism toward the labour movement, whether it is those that are joining quickly, one by one, the ranks of the jobless and unemployed in this province and who feel it necessary to demonstrate to attempt to jar this government into some human conscience about the unemployment situation in this province, a situation that is worse, Mr. Speaker, than any year, according to my information, from the Thirties, that this province has ever faced. Whether it is those that are involved in concerns pertaining to family law because they have yet to have clearly defined for them exactly what this government intends to do in the field of family law — and I want to say this again because I want to be fair to the Attorney-General, obviously the Attorney-General is losing that battle — and I regret the position that the Attorney-General is faced with because I do believe that the Attorney-General is one of human concern, a member of human concern who is fulfilling the role of Attorney-General, who finds himself steadily, day by day, being over-ruled by a First Minister who does not share I think what are the basic instincts, the basic human concerns of the Attorney-General in this province; in fact an Attorney-General that I suspect is very much standing all alone, all alone, Mr. Speaker, in attempting to stand up to his ruthless and right-wing colleagues on every program from legal aid to family law and to human rights, within the Cabinet. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would suspect that the Attorney-General will be like the gentleman I referred to earlier, Mr. Gordon Beard, that at some point, with heavy heart — because he has a conscience, will part company with his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, this government is not declaring war upon the unemployment situation, it is not declaring any war upon poverty, instead, Mr. Speaker, this government, with the assistance of those few I refer to later, those few who are influential and wealthy in the Province of Manitoba, those that are the invisible government of Manitoba, have declared open and vicious war upon those of average and modest income in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, if I may use this opportunity to congratulate you on your election as Deputy Speaker. You and I have had some opportunity in the past for you to take the position of an arbiter or referee, and although we have matching foreheads, there are some years in difference between us, and I must say, if you carry out your duties as well as you did on the football field as a referee, and if I can only carry on my responsibilities under your guidance as well, I'm sure you will be a success.

I would also like to take advantage of this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the Speaker. My understanding is that although I was not a member of the previous House, the Speaker did carry on in an exemplary way as Justice critic, or Attorney-General's critic in Opposition, and I think it was only the mere formality that he did not possess a degree in law that prevented the previous Attorney-General from awarding him a Queen's Counsel.

Mr. Chairman, the member for Selkirk referred to comments made by the previous Liquor Control Commission chairman and the increases in costs awarded to the breweries. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that the bulk of those negotiations were carried out by the previous Liquor Control Commission chairman, carried out by the same negotiating team, the same members of the Liquor Control Commission, the same accountants. The new chairman of the Liquor Control Commission, Mr. Teillet, met on only one occasion with that new team prior to formally forwarding the matter to the Public Utilities Board where the documents are all a matter of public record. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that the previous Liquor Control Commission in 1977 forwarded to the Public Utilities Board for approval a package of cost estimates that would have given the breweries an 8.5 percent

increase, that because the increase in costs that occurred over the year did not occur, and in fact my understanding is, as in the past two years, the breweries suffered a loss. This recommendation was only in keeping with the past practice of the Liquor Commission and is very similar, exactly similar to the recommendations made by the Commission to the Public Utilities Board in the past. This was a public hearing, Mr. Speaker, and if the previous chairman of the Commission had these great concerns that he exhibited in the newspaper, then why did he not take unto himself the responsibility of attending the public hearing? I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that his comments had more to do with the article that appeared to the left of his comments with respect to the increase in prices, and that article dealt with his nomination as a federal NDP candidate. —(Interjection)— He hasn't been nominated, no; if he continues his past practices and his past successes, he probably won't be nominated, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Selkirk indicates that he's the best chairman the Liquor Control Commission has ever had. I can only wish, Mr. Speaker, the law firm to which the Member for Selkirk belongs success in their action against the government, or good luck in their action against the government for six years of vacation pay.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested to hear the Leader of the Opposition speak with respect to a couple of items that involved my departments of Urban and Municipal Affairs. He made a comment with respect to what he suggested was a lack of support this government was providing to local government. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that in the past fiscal year, the one just concluding, the Province of Manitoba under an NDP administration committed less money to the City of Winnipeg for operating assistance in their current budget than our government will be doing in the coming fiscal year. This, Mr. Speaker, does not relate to the unconditional grants which the Member for Selkirk referred to and he suggested in his speech that we, the government, were reducing those unconditional grants. I'm sure he was mistaken in those comments; I'm sure the Member for Inkster would remind him that those were the growth taxes that municipal governments have been asking for for a number of years. They relate to the income tax, two percentage points of personal income tax and one of corporate tax. When there's no growth, Mr. Speaker, the funds from that source drop and this government has no control over it. This government has no control over that.

With respect to the capital budget of the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that on a cash flow basis the previous government, in the 1977-78 fiscal year, turned over to the City of Winnipeg approximately \$9 million, whereas in 1978-79, our government has committed to the City of Winnipeg on a cash flow basis of some \$15 million.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Selkirk have a point of privilege or a point of order?

MR. PAWLEY: No, a question if the honourable member would accept same.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to accept questions at the end of my speech.

Mr. Speaker, I noted a comment of the Leader of the Opposition referring to the formula that we have offered to the City of Winnipeg for assistance to the transit operations and he suggested that there might be some members sitting on this side now who had in the past referred to the previous provincial government as "parsimonious" — I think was his word. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that I have, as a city councillor, made a lot of effort in the past on behalf of the City of Winnipeg to persuade the previous government to increase their formulas from year to year to the point at which the transit deficit was funded 50-50 between the City and the Provincial Government. During those years, Mr. Speaker, we were quite aware at the municipal level that there were many many projects that were receiving a great in the sincere belief that the law that had been developed simply would not work. We gave a commitment to the people of Manitoba that we would be open to any and all submissions made by interested parties. We appointed the Review Committee and many many submissions have been made. I tabled that report in the House, Mr. Speaker, a few days after receiving the final report. There may, in fact, be more comments and recommendations which will be received from members of the public. We've given our commitment at this session of the Legislature to introduce our amendments to the existing legislation.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition Leader refers in his amendment to not defining its intentions in family law. I thought it might be worthwhile to look back at the Throne Speech last year and find out what the previous government said about family law. All that they said was: "The reform of family law is a matter of high priority to my government. The recommendations of the Manitoba Law Reform Commission in its report on family law has been considered by a committee of the Legislative Assembly and legislation will be introduced." I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that that is much of a definition of what their intentions were and they, I am sure, did not know what their exact intentions were at that time just as we, just having received the final report last week from the Review Committee, have not yet had an opportunity to explicitly define and develop the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there were comments made in the House some few days ago by the Member for Wellington and I feel I have a duty, Mr. Speaker, to respond to those comments. On Page 57, he referred to official agents of candidates being appointed to certain positions. Mr. Speaker, it's exactly true, Mr. my official agent, Mr. Frank Allen' the past president of the Law Society and former member

of the Legal Aid Liaison Committee of the Legal Aid of the Law Society of Manitoba, has been appointed interim chairman of Legal Aid, as we all know, and I point out that it is interim, Mr. Speaker. We are fortunate to have a man of his ability accept that position, even on an interim basis. His practice is such that he is unable to continue on as a permanent chairman but we are fortunate to have him as interim chairman. I can only refer, Mr. Speaker, to Hansard of Friday, June 17th, 1977, and to the remarks of the previous Attorney-General, the Member for Selkirk, who said, "The past president of the Law Society, Mr. Frank Allen, who I think is one of the most distinguished and well recognized lawyers in the Province of Manitoba," and I lay that matter to rest with those comments from the former Attorney-General, the Member for Selkirk, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Wellington went on to indicate that there had been a breach of the Election Act, that "receiving money from the Manitoba Hotel Association, the very body which he purports to regulate as Minister responsible for the Liquor Control Commission, a clear breach." Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the House and for the record in view of those allegations, that I consider any such remark like that a very serious one. I want to, Sir, point out that I thought I'd given very careful instructions to the people involved in raising finances in my campaign, that I did not learn of that donation or another one which was alleged to be suspect, one from another law firm in the city, from Messrs. D'Arcy and Deacon, until after the official agent's report had been filed and the report had been made to me from the Chief Clerk. I asked that those moneys be returned.

I wish to point out that in December, 1977, when there was a lot of public discussion about Election Act irregularities — and I think everyone is familiar with the long list of suspect irregularities, I'm not suggesting for a moment that there were any definite ones — that I did advise the First Minister that in my view and in view of the precedence that had been made in the past, that these kind of suggestions or allegations should be dealt with by an independent electoral authority.

Mr. Speaker, as this matter developed further and there was a suggestion that these two donations, among many others, could, under a broad interpretation of the Act, be in violation of the Act, I forwarded all of the information to the First Minister and advised him that I could not possibly be involved in making a decision with respect to this matter. But I pointed out a report which I had obtained from Mr. Reeves, Mr. Speaker, in which Mr. Reeves had indicated that he had forwarded a very substantial report to the previous government and had made a number of comments, including the fact that this particular section referring to donations was very ambiguous because it appears to distinguish between donations made during the election and donations made at any other time.

Mr. Speaker, there is no validity whatsoever to differentiating between a donation of \$500 made by Messrs. Pollock and Nurgitz to the Member for Selkirk in May of 1977, than to one made by Messrs. Darcy and Deacon to me during the election writ. There is, in my view, no rationale for differentiating between those two donations. The Premier did make a decision that there would be no prosecutions, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that as we, over the coming years, are able to develop some legislation two main principles will be contained in that legislation. One, I think, disclosure and the second, I think, that is required is an independent electoral commission because I don't think any politician, any Attorney-General of any political party should be placed in the position of making these kinds of decisions. Independent electoral commissions have worked out well in other provinces — I believe in Ontario and I believe in Alberta — and I think they could be made to work here and would much improve the system. We intend to act on the report that we've received from the Chief Electoral Officer and hopefully in the next year or so, bring forth some legislation for for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make one comment. One day when I was listening to one of the members opposite, he was criticizing the Minister of Education. He was criticizing him with respect to remarks that he had made in addressing, I believe, the Manitoba Association of School Trustees. It was pointed out in the Throne Speech, there was a reference to education that there would be an examination of the structure of school programs to ensure that the learning process is systematic and calculated to meet the needs of our young people under current conditions. I want to point out to members opposite that that is a very significant statement in the minds of many of the citizens and residents of the Province of Manitoba. There has been much concern, Mr. Speaker, with our educational system. There has to be a greater direction from the Department of Education.

I noted throughout the election campaign concern that there was this lack of direction in the school system. It was not really a return to the basics, but just some direction so that there can be some knowledge of where our kids are going in school, and there can be some kind of determination as to how well they are doing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I concur whole-heartedly with those remarks that have been made in the Throne Speech. I believe they are widely anticipated and will be well-received I know in the constituency of Osborne and I believe right across the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I notice lately the Leader of the Opposition and other members of the Opposition Parties have seen fit to lay the blame for the state of the economy of this province upon the shoulders of this administration. They have attempted throughout the course of the Throne Speech to give us, on this side of the House, an education in economic principles.

I'd like to refresh the minds of the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, and indeed the public, of the financial state of affairs we found when we inherited the role of government on October 11th of last year. There had been, Mr. Speaker, substantial growth in the Manitoba Civil Service in the eight years of the previous government. There had been a tremendous growth in government expenditures — in other words the participation of the government in our economy.

There had been in those years, current expenditures of the previous government increased well over three-fold while the estimated gross provincial product increased two-fold, and represented as

a percentage of the provincial expenditure in the gross provincial product — that percentage increased from close to 11 to over 15 percent, an increase of nearly 50 percent involvement in the economy of this province.

Let's turn to the question, Mr. Speaker, of deficits. The Opposition has indicated that we were worrying ourselves silly over debts and deficits. We are concerned, Mr. Speaker, for a very real reason. There was three times as much government debt existed when we took office as there was when they took office over eight years ago. These statistics, Mr. Speaker, are the reality that our government has been forced to face up to, and a reality that the Opposition members are blaming this administration for. We are engaged in a painful process of re-establishing some semblance of control over this government — something that the previous government did not recognize as necessary, but obviously recognized by the people on October 11th of last year that it was necessary.

In an attempt, Mr. Speaker, to get government back under control, it is clear that there are some things that a government may directly affect, and others which it can at best facilitate only indirectly by establishing conditions for a healthy and prosperous activity on the part of the private sector. I believe that an assumption that government must be responsible for all facets of a society shows a lack of regard and respect for the private sector. There is no question that we live in a time where we must recognize that a mixed economy is a necessity, however there is no doubt we have come to a point where there must be some reassessment of the role of government.

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Manitoba have been the victims of long, unfolding historical forces which have affected both economic reality and the perception of that reality. During the post-war year periods, from 1945 to 1965, this nation and this province produced the most rapid increase of wealth in history. With rising productivity and increasing demand the world and this nation and this province moved toward full employment.

However, the depression of the 1930s had left society with a low set of expectations. In other words, this rapid economic wealth was not taken for granted by the public nor by government. They exercised prudence and balance between consumption, savings and investments. In combination, this low level of social expectation and rapid growth resulted in a high level of satisfaction. Most groups felt that they had, indeed, participated in this rising level of wealth and standard of living, but as wealth expanded the role of government also expanded, Mr. Speaker.

As the production and wealth of society increased, government benefited through the tax system. Government shares of taxes as a result increased faster than the rest of society, so that its role in the economy expanded greatly. With more resources at their disposal, government used this opportunity to expand itself, and redistribute its wealth to many groups of society. The result of this expanded government was the creation and expansion of social programs of all kinds. Because the wealth was growing faster than the legacy of the 1930s had led people to expect, people perceived themselves as rich and getting richer, and consequently felt they could afford the cost of these programs and increased social service programs. Subtle changes, I think, began to take place in the 1960s in our society as a new generation began to enter the work-force. These people had not felt the effects of the 1930 depression and had been through two decades of a rising standard of wealth of living, and had been accustomed to this. This perception of the economic condition was one factor, another perception, the belief that the main engine of prosperity was government and not the private sector, became the other misconception. Government came to be perceived, in my view Mr. Speaker, as the generator of prosperity. It came to be believed that the way government was supposed to maintain this prosperity was through the maintenance of consumer demand. Maintenance of a high level of consumption became the high economic goal of this province. But this is a false assumption, Mr. Speaker, I suggest — consumption is not the prime mover behind the rising standard of living. Rather, consumption is a result of the wealth-generating process.

Along with these changes in the perception of the way the economy was looked at, there were other changes that had an accumulative effect on our economy. Productivity declined, as it did in other industrialized states and nations of this world. It was not acceptable for this province but there were many factors: the lack of major technological changes, lack of suitable climate for investment, structural changes in the economy. The government sector, which had grown so rapidly because of the economic forces during the 1960s, continued to grow because of the institutional forces: the bureaucracy, the mentality of the government at that particular time. What began to happen, Sir, I believe, was that the growth of the private sector share of production of wealth began to grow more slowly than demands which were put upon it, demands which previously were expected and not considered gratuitous. People demanded as rights certain environmental, social and welfare programs, however, these became and have become no longer affordable out of discretionary income and what was once a satisfied society, Mr. Speaker, because of the growth of government, now feel themselves shortchanged.

Sir, I would suggest that the response to this problem has not been a realistic one. Government, in the past, has chosen to ignore this problem, believing it to be only a short-term difficulty which can be alleviated by the influence of the public sector. Sir, I would indicate that this problem will not go away and will not be solved by grandiose government-sponsored plans and programs. It was clearly indicated by the former administration's willingness to continue expanding programs by living off past accumulated wealth.

Mr. Speaker, during the 1960s and I have indicated during a time when increasing wealth was the norm, it wasn't unusual for a government to run a deficit budget. Borrowing on the future at that time was considered to be an investment in the future. However, in changing economic conditions, Mr. Speaker, government can no longer afford to borrow on the future to support current consumption.

We have been borrowing on the future long enough, Mr. Speaker. The feeling is that our line of credit is running out and the bill is becoming enormous. It appears that we were successful in convincing the people of Manitoba that our credit has run out and that the bill has become large enough. The evidence is staggering, Mr. Speaker.

I would suggest that it is the feeling in the minds of Manitobans that is the essence of investor and business fear which hinders their investment. Borrowing on the future to finance current needs has worked towards pushing out investment.

During the years after 1968, Mr. Speaker, we had a social structure in Manitoba, a government structure with welfare and social security system in place and in motion. This became a burden which had to be legally borne, however, the government did not recognize the need for a change in its structure in the face of new economic conditions. I would indicate to members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that their government attempted to cover up the real economic problem by creating the illusion of wealth. They did so by rapidly expanding credit and borrowing on the future.

In a recent Time Magazine Special Report on Socialism — Trials and Errors, the article went into some depth in explaining the trends of Socialism today, Mr. Speaker. I quote from that article: "What gives Socialist rhetoric much of its current appeal is the economic battering the world's economy has taken in the 1970s. Against the back-drop of seemingly incurable inflation, unemployment, industrial stagnation, and volatile currencies a clarion for an economic restructuring sounds attractive. Socialist states have not solved, only hidden or ameliorated these problems. Ironically, at the very moment of its spectacular advances, Socialism faces profound new crises of its own. At the same time Socialism has become a word appropriated by so many different champions and causes that it threatens to become meaningless and a new effort is needed to sort it out."

They went on in that article, Mr. Speaker, to state that Socialism has spurred western democracies to examine the inadequacies of the capital system, but today the record of socialism deserves even more careful scrutiny than that of capitalism. In whatever forms, socialism makes far greater claims and far more sweeping promises than capitalism does which is a major reason for its wide appeal.

Sir, I would guess that the rhetoric we have heard from members opposite is very similar to the nature of the rhetoric that is referred to in this article. It was interesting to follow the Prime Minister's speech in Ottawa, where he echoed virtually similar thoughts. Mr. Charles Lynch, in a summary of Mr. Trudeau's speech, stated that the social measures that were put in place during good times when the private sector was generating revenues that filled public coffers, were supposed to cushion hard-times if not render them obsolete. With hard times upon us the cushion feels lumpy, and even the New Democrats, the pilot fish of the welfare state, bemoan the futility of massive Unemployment Insurance payments and the folly of paying money to people who aren't producing anything. He went on to say that growth having faltered, Trudeau now finds that, in part, we have become the victims of our own success.

Rapid increases in real income led not surprisingly to our expectations that such increases could continue indefinitely. Canadians lost sight of reality. Trudeau's speech in New York was, in part, a confession of his own sins. I acknowledge, he said, that we moved too far too fast. He made only the briefest plea for mercy before voicing his repentance. Given the civilizing direction of much of the growth of government expenditures, I believe that the critical reaction to this growth can be overdone. Then he told American business leaders what they apparently wanted to hear — he would restrain the growth of government, he would restate all his policies, he would reduce bureaucratic intrusions. He would cement good relations with the United States, he would allow rising energy prices to constrain demand and stimulate new supply.

Mr. Speaker, in September of this year, the then Premier of the province called a provincial election, and our party campaigned on a platform of economic restraint and indicated to the people of Manitoba that we would face a very difficult task of gaining control over government bureaucracy, and putting our economy back on the right track.

Sir, when we took office on October 24th of last year, we began to realize that the problems we thought existed during the NDP administration were far worse than our greatest expectations.

Sir, I have heard a lot from members opposite about what they regard as inhuman and irrational methods by which we have approached this problem. I would say, Sir, that any member opposite would be foolish to believe that any one on this side of the House takes any particular joy or happiness in the cutbacks that we have been forced to make. However, they have left us no alternative, Mr. Speaker. When we campaigned in September and October of last year we indicated to the people of Manitoba that the decisions that had to be made were not going to be easy or pleasant ones. We campaigned on the basis that we would have the strength that would be required to face those most difficult decisions. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that in many circles the actions of this government are not going to be popular in the short-run. However, it is equally clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that those steps are urgently necessary and will result in benefits in the future.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it is easy for a government to follow the historical trends of growth in the face of a new economic reality, but it is not easy for a government to make those decisions which will get a government into line with what an economic reality of a society is.

Sir, if the members opposite wish to criticize us for facing the truth or facing an economic reality that they were afraid not to, I am proud to face those criticisms.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the member he has five minutes left.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, there was reference by the Member for Selkirk and I apologize if I am referring too often to the Member for Selkirk, but he just happened to precede me so his remarks are fresh in my mind. But he did refer, Sir, to the plight of the handicapped and I want to indicate to him that this government will not forget the plight of the handicapped. I had occasion, in fact, this morning, Sir, to meet with the President of the Manitoba League for Physically Handicapped and another gentleman, Mr. Alan Simpson from the League, whom I knew very well in the development of the concept of Handi Transit in the city — which is to the credit of the previous government, they agreed to participate in funding — and certainly is a program that I have indicated to the city is one that we would not allow to be cut back because it has been so successful in improving the mobility of handicapped people.

In the same way, Sir, I would suggest that members opposite do not have a monopoly on social conscience. I know that has been said a number of times before by a number of other speakers, but I think our philosophy of government is such, Mr. Speaker, that we will endeavour and do everything possible that we can particularly to care for and assist those people who have difficulty in caring for themselves. And the difficulty in an economy that we find ourselves in is to examine carefully, in my view, the universal programs where money is spent on people who don't really need it and to develop a proper system of priorities to assist people like the handicapped. I look forward, Mr. Speaker, after the discussion with the representatives of the League for Physically Handicapped, to our government very shortly forming a close role of consultation with them, to do whatever we can to assist them within the financial restraints that we find ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, you were not present at the beginning. Let me personally extend to you my congratulations on your election as Speaker, and I look forward to participating in debates with you throughout this session of the Legislature. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Selkirk have a question?

MR. PAWLEY: Yes. I wonder if the honourable member would agree to accept a question now. Would the honourable member agree that the amount of funds made available from the Province of Manitoba regarding unconditional grants to municipalities has been reduced directly as a result of the reduction in the income tax and corporation tax rates, as were announced in this Legislature last December, and that this will reduce the amount of flow in such grants growth tax?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, that has not been my information to date, that it has no bearing to that, but I will look into that matter and have it examined, and advise the Member for Selkirk if that is in fact correct. But I believe it is more a result of a loss of federal revenue, but I will examine and advise him of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.
Does the Honourable Member for Wellington have a question?

MR. CORRIN: Yes, if the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs would entertain it, Mr. Speaker. My question, Mr. Speaker, is directed at the financing arrangements made with the City of Winnipeg. I am wondering whether the Honourable Minister could advise, in view of his remarks, about those arrangements — (Interjection) — I am not being flippant, I am very sincere — in response to the Honourable Member from Selkirk, whether or not he could advise us whether he feels which manner of financing urban services is more equitable; either through an increased proportion of growth tax and transfers in that respect or an increased levy of property taxes?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to the question is obvious to anyone that taxes by way of income tax are more equitable than those imposed by real property tax, and that is one reason why our government will be reducing or limiting education tax from lower and middle-income senior citizens. But unfortunately there comes a point in time when a provincial government has to operate under financial restraints, that we also have to ask other organizations to operate under similar financial restraints. As all members are aware, that has been requested of a number of institutions throughout the Province of Manitoba and in my view municipalities have done a reasonably fair job in the past and I think will live up to the demands or requests that are being placed upon them in this current year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: A supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker. If the Honourable Minister would agree that the municipalities, and I presume that includes the urban municipalities, have done a reasonably good job of preparing their budgets and have exercised due restraint in view of the policies that now prevail throughout this province in this respect, then I would ask him whether he feels, in view of his statement as to the relative equity of the two different means of raising revenue, whether it wouldn't be fair in this respect for the province to

provide a larger proportion of growth tax transfers as opposed to asking the municipalities affected to levy a greater proportion of an inequitable tax, namely property taxes?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point or order.

HON. WARNER JORGENSON (Morris): Before the Minister replies I want to raise a point of order, and I think that the honourable member should receive some instructions on this particular phase of our proceedings. We have deliberately placed a prohibition in the Rules of members asking questions during the course of the Budget or the Throne Speech Debate after a Minister has completed the time allotted to him. That time has expired and the only condition upon which the honourable member can ask a question is with the unanimous consent of the House. He never asked for it. I know he wasn't aware of that rule, but I want to make him aware of that rule because he seems to have a capacity for abusing rules.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe the honourable member is correct. The only part of his submission that I am not certain of is that you announced that the Minister's time has expired. I don't know whether that was so announced.

MR. SPEAKER: I have to inform the members that I did not inform the member that his time expired. I did inform him some seven minutes ago that he had five minutes left.

The Honourable Attorney-General, if the House gives unanimous consent, can answer the question.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to answer the question in a fairly general way at this time.

I think obviously one of the disadvantages of being elected in October and forming a government in late October is that the total budget process is so far advanced at that particular time and especially when you have to have a special session of the Legislature, that there has not been sufficient opportunity to have a look at the fundamental concept of revenue sharing as it has been referred to or growth tax sharing for municipalities, and I would hope that over the next year, the balance of the year, we will have that opportunity to look at that whole question very seriously. Unfortunately this year it is a question of financial restraint for every institution in the Province of Manitoba and the city is no exception.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would welcome this opportunity to enter the Throne Speech Debate. I was beginning to wonder there for a moment if I was going to have the opportunity or not today.

I would like to begin my speech, Sir, with a recollection and it is a recollection of the first speech I made before this House, and during that speech, Sir, I think I made note that from time to time, during the course of my tenure here, I would have to rely upon your wisdom, rely upon your patience and your guidance, Sir, if I should inadvertently stray from the rules. Well, Sir, I have on occasion, inadvertently I assure you, strayed from those rules, and I have appreciated your direction at those times, and I have appreciated it, as I am well assured that the rest of the members of this House have appreciated it, is your fairness in your service to this House.

I would also like to offer congratulations to the Deputy Speaker, the Member from Radisson, and I am sure that he must feel comfortable in his new role in that he is able to draw upon a vast well of experience that he has honestly earned on the gridiron, that will comfort him during his tenure as Deputy Speaker. And while this gridiron, Sir, may not be as physical, I can assure him that it will be no less heated at times, and I sincerely wish him well. I wish him unflinching eyesight; I wish him keen hearing and most important I wish him a quick wit tempered by patience.

I would be remiss, Sir, not to offer congratulations at this time also to the Mover, the Member from Crescentwood, and the Seconder, the Member from Portage la Prairie, on their speeches before this House. Their efforts did not go unappreciated for theirs, Sir, was a hard chore. It was a difficult task. Sir, if I might draw a little parallel, an analogy or a story, it was as if they were asked by their colleagues to put icing on a cake, that cake, Sir, being the Throne Speech. They had expected an offering put before them of some substance as a Speech from the Throne, as a legislative blueprint, Sir, should be. So they prepare. They go to their respective offices and they prepare this icing, what they consider to be, Sir, a sufficient coating for that Speech. They work hard at that chore, but they prepare an icing that they have designed to compliment the Throne Speech, an offering that they rightfully expected, only to find, Sir, not this beautiful three-layered cake put before them of some substance and some beauty and some dignity, but to find one small cupcake placed before them in that Throne Speech. But, Sir, to their honour they iced the cake as best they could under the circumstance, and I think, Sir, this is probably one of the first times that the icing is better than the cake.

Sir, it seems as if a bird mentality, almost a bird fetish, has descended on the province in the past couple of years, and it has descended on both sides of this House and on both sides of the political

spectrum. It all started, Sir, with the little red rooster that came about a few years ago and ran about extolling the virtues of free enterprise, extolling the virtues of capitalism. It appeared on all our TV screens and in ads, etc. And then we had the white dove that went around the province during the election saying, "Free Manitoba, free Manitoba." This little bird flying around, "Free Manitoba, free Manitoba", flying over our heads, Sir. —(Interjection)— What about the Hydro rates?

The First Minister the other evening made reference to the birds again, Sir. He referred to this side as a group of vultures or he said that asking us to do certain things would be like asking a vulture to say grace at dinner.

My own leader, the Leader of the Opposition, has frequently referred to birds in the past few days. In his own speech he mentioned the chickens, and indeed, Sir, the chickens have come home to roost.

And the Member from Fort Rouge went on, the lone Liberal in this House, Sir, spoke not of the chickens, but of the roosters that have come home to roost.

Sir, I could not break with such a fine tradition or fetish as the case may be. I would like to present for the entertainment and for the edification of my colleagues an Indian legend about birds, Sir, that was told to me in my last visit to the constituency as I sat having dinner on the Gardenhill Reserve with one of my constituents. It's a story, Sir, of the goose and the raven, the goose being known in that person's language as the Nisku, and the raven being known as the Kakaquel.

It seems, Sir, that not too many summers ago the goose and the raven began a strange relationship. They had both left their own respective flocks during the course of the summer when the goose was summering in the far north, and they had begun to converse and enjoy each other's company. And as things will, Sir, the summer passed by far too quickly for them, and they learned to rely upon each other, to enjoy the company of each other. And when the cold north winds started to blow down during the fall season, Sir, the goose went up to the raven, his new-found friend, and said, "I must go back to my brothers and sisters now. I must go back to my flock and fly south." And the raven says, "Why?" And the goose says, "If I stay here when the lakes ice over, when the snows come, I will surely freeze to death."

And if one had been watching the raven closely at that time, Sir, they would have seen a twitch, a little movement in the eye, that indicated that perhaps the raven was thinking more than the raven was saying. And the raven immediately said to the goose, "Well, I'll tell you what, would you mind if I flew south with you this year?" And the goose said, "Well, no, but we must leave because it is going to grow cold, and it is going to grow dangerous for me."

So the raven says, "Well, you know, I've never flown south before, so I'm going to have to take care of a few technicalities, a few small matters. Can you wait a day or two?" Well, the goose, wanting the company of the raven, said, "Sure, I'll be willing to wait a day or two, but remember if we dwell too long in the north country I will surely freeze to death." And the raven said, "Have no worry." And the raven flew off and attended his business.

And the next day the raven flew back over the lake where the goose was swimming, popped down on the shore and said to the goose, "Things are moving very well. A few more days and we're able to leave." The goose looked down as he swam into the shore and noticed the ice was beginning to form, as it will along the edges of the shore. And he said, "You see that ice, raven? If that ice forms along the whole lake I will no longer be able to swim out there. I will freeze to death."

So the raven said, "Have no fear because I've never done this before, I've never left my home country before, and I have to get prepared. I have to say goodbye to all my relatives, but it won't take that long."

And this process, Sir, went on day after day after day after day for a matter of weeks. And finally the ice had grown so that there was just a small patch in the middle of the lake and the goose was sort of swimming furtively around in circles. And already his flock had left him. His flock had flown south and he was alone in the north except for his friend, the raven.

And the raven came, flew over and landed down next to the ice, and the goose said, "This is it. Look at this ice. I've got three feet to swim in. I have to leave."

And the raven said to him, "Well, I've got just a couple more matters to take care of — a little luggage, perhaps, some friends to see, some letters to write, got to clear up my bank account, what have you, and then we're going to take off down south."

"Well, Sir," the goose said, "I'm going to freeze to death in this little pond."

The raven said, "Fly over to this stream there, by the rapids, where it's always flowing, and you won't freeze to death. It won't ice over there."

So the goose flapped its wings and took a little bit of a run, as much as it can in a little three foot puddle, Sir, scraped its belly on the ice as it got up, got up, flew the mile, a mile and a half, over to the stream by the rapids, and settled in where there was no ice.

But, Sir, because the rapids were fast-moving no ice had formed there. But just down the rapids, Sir, just down the rapids the ice was forming with sharp jagged edges, and the goose, to stay away from that ice forming there, had to swim against the current constantly. And so all the rest of that day it swam against the current waiting for its friend, the raven, to return.

And the raven came the next morning and the goose says, "We've got to go. I can't keep this up. I'm growing weary. I'm growing tired. My strength is going to fail me and I'm going to float down to the ice and be iced in."

The raven said, Sir, "One more day, and I'll be ready to go," looking at the goose and sort of taking a quick check on the health and the condition of the goose. "One more day," he said.

Well, that night, Sir, as will happen in the fall season in the north, there was a strong north wind

and a terrible winter storm. And the snow dropped and dropped and dropped to the ground, and the goose swam and swam and swam, unable to sleep because if it slept for one minute, Sir, it would be cast down upon that ice.

It didn't make it through the night, Sir. The sad story is the goose did not make it through the night, and it expired on that spot, Sir, and it flowed down to where the ice was. And the next morning when the raven flew over he looked down and he saw his friend, the goose, with a little thin shell of ice starting to form around him. And he knew, Sir, that that goose was dead. And with that same twinkle that I mentioned earlier, Sir, that same bit of insight in his eye, the raven hopped down, went over to the goose, and began to enjoy his winter goose dinner. The goose had been set up, Sir. The goose had been set up by the raven.

And, Sir, if a legend, an Indian legend like that, is to have any substance, it has to be timeliness, it has to be eloquently put, and I'm sorry that I cannot put it as eloquently to you as it has been put to me from a person who heard it from his grandfather, and his father who heard it from his grandfather and father. But I think the story of human behavior that is contained within, Sir, is timeless.

And the test, Sir, is it applicable today? Can we substitute characters for the raven and the goose, and will it stand true today? Well, Sir, I think it is applicable, and I think that Indian legend, that Indian story, is being replayed all over Manitoba today.

Let's take a look. Let's make Bill Jackson, president of a large government union, the goose for the moment. Let's make the First Minister of this province the raven. Does the story hold true? I would submit to you, Sir, that the story would hold true.

Let's make the northerners — and at this point, Sir, I'd like to say, in Thompson itself, as sort of an advertising logo, that raven is known as the Thompson turkey. Let's place, in place of the goose, Sir, put the northerners, and in the place of the raven or the Thompson turkey or the raveners, let's put the Minister of Northern Affairs. They too, Sir, are being led down that same golden path. And, Sir, before four years are up all Manitoba will have learned, and will have learned well, the story that is contained within that legend.

And the story, Sir, quite frankly is don't trust the raven, don't trust the Thompson turkey, don't trust the new Tory Government.

Sir, much has been said about the Throne Speech, probably more has been said about the Throne Speech than has been said in the Throne Speech, and I'm not going to rehash and go through it bit by bit, but I would limit my comments to one statement contained within that Throne Speech, Sir. And that statement, Sir, is a statement of economic intent. It reads, "My ministers recognize a dependence on a growing private sector in our mixed economy." Sir, in a province endowed with great natural wealth, with great natural wealth there for the picking, Sir, to rely upon the dependence of the private sector to create that wealth, to generate that wealth, is to sell out the people and to sell out the resources of this province.

And another analogy, another example that has been used frequently, and was used just by the Attorney-General in his speech, is that the private sector must be the engine, the engine that drives the economy train, Sir. Well, that's an interesting concept — the private sector as an engine — because, Sir, if the private sector is the engine it leads one immediately to the question, who is the engineer? —(Interjection)— And provides the fuel. Of course. Well, Sir, if the private sector is the engine as our honourable members would have us believe, then the corporate elite must be the engineers. And that, Sir, is where I'm in basic disagreement with them, because I think that the people of this province, Sir, the people of Manitoba, are capable of engineering their own future. I think that they should, Sir, engineer their own future.

And I think, Sir, I could not stand before you unless I honestly and sincerely believe that they will engineer their own future. To encourage dependence, Sir, on a private sector, to allow that private sector complete and absolute control over the economy train is to sell out the people of this province. It's to sell them out to Inco. It's to sell them out to Great-West Life. It is to sell them out to Toronto Insurance companies, to Greb Shoes, to Hooker Chemicals, and the list goes on and on.

And that dependence, that sell out, Sir, is a dangerous course, for if we were to look back into history for historical example we could look back to my own constituency, the constituency of Churchill, we could look back to the north in general, because in the north, Sir, that dependence on the private sector has been traditionally nurtured, it has been carefully created, and it has been intentionally implemented. And I speak, Sir, from no less an authority than Governor George Simpson who, in 1822 wrote, and I would quote him, Sir, "I've made it my study to examine the nature and the character of the Indians, and however repugnant it may be to our feelings, I am convinced they must be ruled with a rod of iron to bring and to keep them in the proper state of subordination, and the most certain way to effect this is by letting them feel their dependence upon us. In the woods and the northern barren grounds this measure ought to be pursued rigidly next year. If they do not improve" — and that's improve under Hudson's Bay standards — "if they do not improve then no credit, not so much as a load of ammunition given to them until they exhibit an inclination to renew their habits of industry. In the plains, however, this system will not do, and as they can live independent of us, and by withholding ammunition, tobacco and spirits, the staple articles of trade for one year, they will recover the use of their bows and spears and lose sight of their smoking and drinking habits."

Sir, when Hudson Bay Company first came to Manitoba in 1680 and established their first permanent trading post in what is now the area comprised by Manitoba — and coincidentally, Sir,

that was established in my own constituency of Churchill — what met them? Sir, an independent nation met them, a nation of native people surviving quite handily on their own, and quite happily I might add. And how did the private sector greet that independent nation? They consciously created an environment of dependence because it served their purpose, Sir, it served their purpose to have that native population, previously independent, now dependent upon them. It served in their quest for their profit.

One would have to question Hudson Bay Company's methods in this enlightened age. But one would also have to question their motives because why did they do such a thing, Sir? Did they do so, did they create this dependence for the benefit of Manitobans, for the benefit of the independent nation that met them? No, Sir, they did not, and that's not my opinion, Sir, that is fact. That is what they said. Samuel Hearne, a Hudson Bay Company agent, and a very prominent and famous Hudson Bay Company agent, in 1771 wrote: "It is undoubtedly the duty of every one of the company's servants" — that means employees, Sir, it's an interesting concept, servants as employees. But we'll go into that further, I'm sure. "It is the duty of every one of the company's servants to encourage a spirit of industry among the natives and to use every means in their power to induce them to furs and other commodities for trade." That "every means" is by creating the dependence, Sir. Well, he goes on. He says, "But I must at the same time confess that such conduct is by no means for the real benefit of the poor Indians. It has been well known that those who have the least intercourse with the factories are by far the happiest."

So, Sir, they did not create that atmosphere or environment of dependence for the benefit of the people of Manitoba, for the native population. They created it because they did not want an independent labor force because an independent labor force, Sir, is hard to control. They wanted that labor force dependent. They wanted the people, the people of Manitoba at that time, dependent upon the private sector because it served the private sector.

And this is the type of dependence, this is the Tory style of dependence, that they refer to, Sir, in the Throne Speech. It implies it's a Tory economic strategy for the next four years. But, Sir, that Tory economic strategy has a sordid past and if they implement it again, Sir, it will have a sordid future, a sordid future for all the people of Manitoba.

And that is the vision, Sir, that they talk about. It is the vision that the First Minister talks about. It's a different sort of vision, Sir. You and I don't have it, I assume. It's, in medical terms, Sir — and I hope I pronounce the word right — in medical terms it's called dyslexia — dyslexia vision, the Tory vision. In plain terms, Sir, what it means is that when people see something, they see it backwards. And Sir, I think that if we try to create an economy in this province totally dependent upon the private sector we can only look backwards. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this opportunity to first of all congratulate you on being chosen the Speaker. I am certain that you will be doing a fair assessment of the situation and I am certain that you will be doing a good job.

I would also like to congratulate the Mover and the Seconder. In replying to the Speech from the Throne, they did an excellent job.

I would also like to congratulate the Deputy Speaker and the Chairman of Committee of the Whole. I believe that we have made some excellent choices.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse the Speech from the Throne. The government had no alternative but to go into a period of restraint. I endorse legislation to reduce personal and small business tax rates. This will help the consumer and allow small businesses to grow and employ more people. I am pleased that the low and middle-income senior citizen will get some relief from education taxes. This was long overdue and will greatly help them in their particular situation. I endorse the intention of the government to enter into a more comprehensive road building program. This certainly was needed in southern Manitoba and it certainly is going to help and facilitate those people who have to transfer products to markets.

I share in the government's concern of lower net returns for the farming community. The net income per farm now is down by about 40 percent since 1975 and this, Mr. Speaker, certainly is one of the reasons why we are facing the economic difficulties that we are facing at the present time. We really have three major industries in Canada. They are agriculture, mining and forestry and all three of them at the present time are in serious difficulties. It certainly proves once more that when agriculture is in difficulty, then all the other industries follow suit.

I applaud the government's intention, in spite of the restraint program that was forced upon them, to expand health facilities within this province and I hope that in future years more money will be available to further much needed facilities pertaining to the Department of Health, especially in personal care homes and housing for senior citizens.

Much time was spent compiling the Speech from the Throne and I certainly want to congratulate the First Minister for a job well done under very difficult circumstances. It is very easy, Mr. Speaker, when you are going ahead with a ten percent increase every year to make up a Speech from the Throne or to make up your Estimates, but it is very difficult when you are trying to hold the cost and very careful evaluation has to be done of all departments and I am certain — and I know — that the Ministers are doing an excellent job.

We have heard much comment on elections, the recent elections that were held within this province. Various members are complaining about how they were treated by their worthy opponents.

I must say that in Rhineland we did not have those difficulties and I would like to congratulate the candidate for the NDP, Mr. Jake Heinrichs, and also the candidate for the Liberal Party, Mr. Ray Hamm, for running a clean fight. They certainly have gained my respect.

Now, the Member for St. Boniface keeps on referring to speeches and statements that I have made in the House regarding personal care homes, housing for the senior citizens, the need for better psychiatric facilities, especially for the young, and he is right on, Mr. Speaker. Those problems still exist. There still are long-term patients occupying acute hospital beds. There still is a shortage of senior citizens' housing and we still need psychiatric facilities for the young. The Member for St. Boniface is going to get no argument from this side when he is asking for that type of facility. I was very pleased the other day, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Health stated that these issues would receive priority and he would move in that direction as soon as he possibly could.

The problems with the elderly though, Mr. Speaker, are going to increase and these are good problems really because by the year 2000, one out of 5 people in Manitoba will be over the age of 65. This is because new medical knowledge has been able to retard the aging process. Now any government is going to find it extremely difficult to meet the housing demands that will be required by these elderly and the time has come for a realistic approach to that particular problem. We must ask ourselves what type of housing do we want when we will require these facilities?

Many senior citizens who cannot take care of themselves in their own homes and cannot find accommodation are saying that we have \$30,000 or \$50,000 that we would be only too glad to invest in some type of facility as long as we would be assured that we would be looked after. Now when we look at the condominium type of housing, this would be the type of housing, Mr. Speaker, that I feel would serve very adequately the requirements of our senior citizens. It would have to take the co-operation of the government. Maybe they would purchase about 25 percent of these units to lease back to people who don't want to or cannot afford to purchase their own unit but, by and large, I would say that 75 percent of the population in Manitoba would be able and would be willing to purchase their own units. Every community could decide what type of unit they would want. If people would want swimming pools, whirlpool or sauna in these units, then why not because they would be the people who would be paying for this. These units should have kitchens, they should have dining rooms, they should have recreation rooms, they should have a caretaker looking after them and space should be provided for a nurse or a nursing team, whatever is required. In that way light care and medium care patients now occupying beds in personal care homes could be looked after in their own apartments. This would free up many personal care home beds.

One of the main concerns of senior citizens is the loss of freedom when they are moved into senior citizens homes. This way they could maintain their freedom. In many of these institutions, when senior citizens are moved into them, they find that 5 o'clock in the morning is the time to get up and eat breakfast. That and that time you have lunch. Nine o'clock at night when the lights are out, that's when you go to bed and this is what's disturbing a lot of senior citizens. This is why they are so reluctant to enter into some of these institutions and they want to stay in their own home as long as they possibly can and even longer. In this way, we could ensure that they would still be masters of their own situation. Very little investment would be needed by the province if we were to go into that type of unit and it certainly would greatly reduce our home care program.

Now one of the major problems facing Manitoba and Canada is the serious unemployment situation. Labour is uneasy because of the ever-increasing cost of living. Labour feels that they must keep up with whatever percentage of increase we experience in the cost of living in Manitoba and indeed in Canada. I am sure that we are all sympathetic with labour in this concern.

I was prompted to speak on this topic, Mr. Speaker, by the Member for Logan who was asking for a higher minimum wage in Manitoba. I wish it were that simple, Mr. Speaker. If a higher minimum wage would cure all our ailments, cure our unemployment, then by all means, let's increase the minimum wage. But the fact is that roughly one-half of the unemployed people in Canada are between the age of 15 and 24, about 437,000 as of December 31st, 1977. Young people looking for their first job are finding it increasingly more difficult and one of the reasons is the minimum wage. Businesses, manufacturers and industries are reluctant to pay a high wage for someone who they know will take at least two or three or four months before he is going to produce. Now this training period usually involves high-priced help which must train these new recruits. As a result, employers would rather pay more for workers with experience.

Business and investment groups are very reluctant to invest in Canada at the present time. Investment in the United States will yield much larger returns. Employment in the manufacturing industry has actually decreased in Canada by 4.3 percent, meaning 87,000 fewer jobs. This is since 1974. The reason for this, of course, is that manufacturers are finding it increasingly more difficult to compete in the foreign market. Some of the reasons why manufacturers and industry find it difficult to compete is that in many instances, our wages are above those of the United States. Coupled with that, our productivity per person is roughly 20 percent lower than that of the United States. Now, whatever the reasons are for this, we must address ourselves to that problem. Only by being competitive can we hope to attract investment dollars into Canada, dollars that will provide jobs.

Last year, statistics indicated that some 48 percent of Canadians would never be able to afford their own homes, that is a single family dwelling. Now this is most disturbing. I am sure that all members find that very disturbing. Now surely we would wish that every Canadian, some time in his or her life, would be able to afford their own home. Now if this is the goal that we want to achieve, Mr. Speaker, then we will need much co-operation between labour and management.

It's interesting to note that in spite of the fact that our labour rates have been increasing, our

Tuesday, March 28, 1978

standard of living has been decreasing and I believe at the present time our standard of living is about tenth to the eleventh where we used to be. Ten years ago we used to be second. Now there must be a reason for this. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that rather than confrontation between management and labour, we need co-operation. I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will be the kind of government that will not feel that the only way that we can survive is by promoting confrontation between labour and management but rather that we will act as a catalyst between labour and management and achieve the kind of co-operation which is so desperately needed at this time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honorable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House would be agreeable to calling it 5:30?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: I am prepared to speak now if the honourable member wishes to speak tonight.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister has asked that it be called 5:30. If the House is not agreed to that, then we can have a vote on that. All those in favour of calling it 5:30? All those opposed? In my opinion, the ayes . . .

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe that there was no mover and seconder to such a motion and I am also under the believe that such a move by the House would need unanimous consent since our rules do call for a 5:30 adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, no problem whatsoever. I'll start right now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland with a point of privilege.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, I would like a ruling from you, Mr. Speaker, on the privilege of the course of the order of speakers in the House. I understand from the common practice of this House that when a member on the opposite side speaks, the Speaker would normally look to the other side of the House to see if someone on this side is prepared to follow that member. Now, if you are prepared to recognize the First Minister, I believe this is a preference that you may be showing, Sir, and I believe that if the common usage of this House, which has been normally that if a member of the government party is speaking, the next person to speak would be a member on the opposition side of the House. Now although that is not a rule, Mr. Speaker, it is not a rule which is in our Rule Book, but it is a practice which has been traditionally followed, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that stands almost as good, if not as good, as a rule of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is making a lot of fuss about nothing. You have recognized the First Minister, and the rule is as the Speaker of this Chamber determines. What my honourable friend seems to overlook is the fact that there are 33 members on this side of the House as opposed to 23 on that side of the House and normally that difference in the number of members is taken into consideration in the recognition of members on either side of the House. If my honourable friend is not prepared to live with that, that's too bad, but that's the way it operated when they were on this side of the House. It operated many times that way, and we had no objection to it. We take the position that the Speaker determines the order in which members will be recognized, and if the Speaker has recognized the First Minister, so be it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: On the point of order — the technical point of order — there is no question, Sir, that the order of speaking is as determined by who catches the Speaker's eye, and we don't expect you to be perfect, Sir. Quite seriously, it is open to anyone to speak who catches your eye. The Honourable Minister Without Portfolio, the House Leader, is, I believe, technically correct; I just take umbrage at his suggestion that we did not follow sequence. I don't believe we ever went out of sequence in terms of rotation of speakers. That, Sir, does not detract from the point of order which has been made which is that you determine the priority of speaking.

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

MR. GREEN: On the same point, Mr. Speaker, and I don't wish to belabour it. There is no question whatsoever that you are entitled to recognize whichever speaker catches your eye. I do say to the Member for Morris that for eight years, and I can tell him this, that we orchestrated it, we had to plan

Tuesday, March 28, 1978

times, but we never went out of sequence in terms of getting the Premier the right to speak on the Throne Speech, or on the Budget, we always had him follow an opposition member. If my honourable member wishes to check this, it's on the record, it's not something which I can deceive him about. I remember calculating the time and worrying about the speakers, but we always moved to alternate speakers.

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