



Second Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

26 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXV No. 4A

10:00 A.M. February 20, 1979

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

February 20, 1979

Time: 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

HON. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a question of House privilege affecting all of the members of the House and it is with respect, Mr. Speaker, to a situation that has arisen involving yourself, perhaps arising from some misunderstanding although I don't think there is room for a misunderstanding on this question, relating to the use of the television media in the Legislative Assembly.

It has come to my attention, Mr. Speaker, that the people who are operating the equipment have been advised by yourself, after the Question Period to withdraw the equipment from the Chamber. It has always been my understanding, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that it is substantially — not substantially, but entirely — confirmed by the record that once the physical question of location was determined that there was to be no editing, no limitation, no control whatsoever by the Assembly on how the television cameras would be used.

Yesterday, in the course of the speech being given by the Leader of the Opposition, the camera people were told to remove their camera and I understand that that direction came from yourself.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote from some paragraphs of the Committee meeting where this matter was dealt with and I think that you will see, Mr. Speaker, that it does not admit of two interpretations. For myself, on Page 1 of the Rules of the House Committee, Tuesday, April 25th, "I believe we should start from where we are and see whether there is any problem. My understanding is that the members of this Legislative Assembly, or of the Legislative Assembly, have agreed, and I don't know whether there has been any change in that, that we have no objections to the electronic media, the visual media, doing whatever journalistic work they want to do in the Legislative Assembly, that we have never expressed fears about editing, that we have never expressed fears about who they are going to televise and how much time they are going to give to other people. In that regard, we have said that they will be able to exercise the same type of journalistic wisdom, or lack of wisdom, as is done by the newspapers and radio and that we have no intention of trying to edit or limit their proceedings.

"What we have said is that they should get together and tell us how they intend, because of the equipment involved, to do this in the Assembly and at their expense. That is basically where the committee stands," and then I leave out a few words irrelevant, "As far as I am concerned they can film me when my feet are on the desk or wherever they are, and we have all, I think, unanimously come to that conclusion so there is no misunderstanding — the Legislative Assembly, the previous one — and I don't know that there is any change. The Speaker made that communication to the media, if I'm correct, that we have never expressed concern as to who is going to get the coverage, how they are going to be fair or whether they are going to take people in postures which are unflattering. That has never been a concern of members. What we were concerned with is how the equipment is going to get into the gallery."

And then, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Honourable House Leader whether his memory and mine coincide on this. And this was his reply, Mr. Speaker, "Mr. Chairman, one thing further to what Mr. Green has said. His memory is not faulty, that Mr. Jorgenson agreed in every respect with what I said," and said, Mr. Speaker, later in his remarks, "I'll tell them right now that as far as I am concerned, they pay for the cost of their own installations; we'll provide them with the physical facility and we want to know, as Mr. Green has suggested, what that will consist of. That's all we want to know." And further on, Mr. Speaker, "Yes, but, Mr. Chairman, just so that there is no misunderstanding about it, we did indicate that we were prepared to be televised, that the concern was where they were going to put the cameras in the gallery and the amount of heat. That there

was never, at least in the last five years, any opposition by the members of the Legislature to be covered journalistically by the media, that television in the same way as distinct from any other journalistic coverage." The same way as are the remarks that I've put in now.

And later, Mr. Speaker, just to further indicate that there was no question that the Speaker would not exercise an editing or limiting function, we had a further discussion of it and I indicated, "Can we accept the consensus of the committee? I want to see if I am properly stating it that we agree with the principle of permitting the television media to operate in the House providing it does not in any way require any installations or change in the atmosphere of the House, and provided that the Press Gallery can accommodate them and provided that they are able to prove, to the satisfaction of the Speaker, that there is no dispute as between the various television outlets, and there is no requirement of the government or other requirement of the government."

And then, Mr. Speaker, a member — not named — "A couple of days of Committee of the Supply and they'll take us off the air." Which indicated, Mr. Speaker, that there was to be no editing of the television media any more than there is editing of the other electronic media or of the newspapers. I say, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect to yourself, that the physical arrangement was made and that from thereon in, it is not up to the Speaker or any member of the House to request that one speaker or another be cut off and I regret particularly, Mr. Speaker, that this matter occurred — but it could have happened with regard to any of the other honourable members — with regard to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, apparently which there was some interest in live coverage on.

I only learned recently that it also happened last year when I was going to speak and that, Mr. Speaker, for vanity reasons alone, makes me even angrier. But nevertheless, it happened yesterday. I suggest to you that it should not have happened and I respectfully request, Mr. Speaker, that it not be repeated, that the physical arrangement has been made and from there on in, it's up to the media.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps a lot of this would be unnecessary if the member had asked for the speaker to give a reason why he asked for the camera to be removed. Yesterday, following the ordinary tradition that occurred in the past last year when the cameras televised the Question Period, after the Question Period, I looked around and there was a camera here completely unattended. I didn't know whether the camera was operating or not. I looked on two or three occasions, the camera was not attended. I asked the Assistant Clerk if he would ask the operator of the camera to remove the camera just in case this exit may be needed.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for that explanation and if this has been raised in this way due to an oversight, I am grateful that that is an oversight, but I now take it, Mr. Speaker, that from this point on, the question of physical arrangements having been settled, there will be no editing or limitation and my having advised you that what was done yesterday was a limitation, that it will not be repeated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to raise one point in connection with the Question of Privilege that has been raised by my honourable friend. It was my understanding that the application that was presented before the Rules Committee was for the filming of the Question Period only. Now if I am in error in that assumption . . . I have no evidence at the moment before me, because I do not have the application that was submitted in writing by the media. I think the clear understanding that was made was that anybody desiring to do any filming in this Chamber had to submit a written application before the Rules Committee, and once having had that application approved, then they were free to film and my recollection is that the only portion of the proceedings that the media had asked to film was the Question Period. —(Interjection)— Now if I'm wrong in that assumption then I will withdraw that, but it seems to me that was the application that was placed before the Rules Committee. Now, Sir, if the media choose to film more than that, I have no objections to that and I don't think anybody on this side of the House has any objections to that, but that should be contained as we had agreed upon earlier in a written application before the Rules Committee and approved by the Rules Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster on the Point of Privilege.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, despite your feeling that the point was unnecessary, it is now apparently more necessary than ever because of my learned friends' misunderstanding as to what the application was and what the Rules Committee decided. The application could have been, although

I am certain that it was not for the Question Period, they did want to film the Question Period. We said, the Rules Committee, despite what they said, said you can film whatever you want to and I show my honourable friend that that statement was made. He agreed with my recollection and one of the members said, a couple of days of Committee of Supply and they will take it off the air. We said, Mr. Speaker, that some were worried that they would take pictures of members who were perhaps yawning or bored. I said that it would be the audience who would be yawning and bored, not the members who were yawning and bored. But that they could take whatever they want. What had to be done in terms of the application to the Speaker and to make arrangements with the Speaker were the physical premises, physical facilities, because we didn't know where it would go. That has now been established, Mr. Speaker, and we regard the electronic media of television the same as the other journalistic media which is what the committee decided. I would, therefore, Mr. Speaker, respectfully request that the television media be entitled to film whatever parts of the proceedings that they want to and that was the ruling of the committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: May I suggest, Sir, that we do look at the record, that you do look at the record, and I will leave it in your hands. We have no objection on this side of the House as long as the record indicates very clearly that there has been an application to film all proceedings of the House and that is approved by the Rules Committee — so be it.

MR. SPEAKER: May I point out to all members of the House that the House is the master of its own rules. I am nothing more than the servant of the Assembly here.

I also point out to the honourable members that I would appreciate, if something has been passed by the Rules Committee and approved by the House, then it will be the policy that I will follow. To my knowledge, to my knowledge, what occurred at a Rules Committee meeting last year has not as yet been approved by the House.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish you would have quit when you were ahead. You said, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday's termination was an accident.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. GREEN: So be it. Let no more accidents occur.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall we proceed with the Orders of the Day? Presenting Petitions.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. CLERK: The Petition of the Les Reverends Peres Oblats praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Les Reverends Peres Oblats in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister Responsible for Crown Corporations. Can he confirm that he has met, as of this past Friday, with representatives of the Insurance Bureau of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate whether during that meeting with the Insurance Bureau of Canada there was a discussion as to the composition and terms of reference of the Review Committee that is to be established in order to examine the Manitoba Public Insurance

Corporation?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that the meeting which was held with representatives of the Insurance Bureau of Canada was one that was set up some months ago as a meeting which the Bureau wished to have with the new Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. It was not in any way related to the Throne Speech lines referring to the review which this government will undertake of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. There was no discussion of the kind of review committee that was to be established.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. Johns): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the House Leader, to ask him if he could justify his faith in the parliamentary system by seeing to it that his colleagues comply with the Addresses for Papers and Orders for Return which are still outstanding from the last session, numbering some 39 which have, to my knowledge, not yet been responded to by various ministers of the Crown. Could he undertake to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Could the House Leader also undertake to ensure that the Order Paper will show the outstanding Orders as in the past, I believe every two weeks. Under Rule 50, I believe, it is supposed to be recorded and I would like to receive his assurance that it will be done as from last year's unfulfilled undertakings into this year without the need for any new Orders to be approved by the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will do that, including, if my honourable friend chooses, we'll also include those from several years ago as well that my honourable friend did not see fit to enquire about.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable the Leader of the House would follow the rules without any need to bring in extraneous matters and in following the rules, see to it that his ministers comply with all the requirements of the rules, including the filing of Orders for Return that are outstanding and, according to the rules, have yet to be responded to. The fact that the NDP government agreed to change the rules to ensure that Orders for Return do not lapse at the end of a session is one which he has to comply with because he probably was a members of the rule committee that approved of that procedure.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, in the light of the practice of my honourable friends opposite when they were on this side of the House, we will endeavour to comply with the rules.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs. In view of a submission that was made a few months ago concerning the requirement to hold hearings when application is made to decontrol apartments, can the minister indicate whether he has now instructed the Rent Review Board to notify tenants when a decontrol application is in effect and that hearings would be held so that those tenants that may be affected could appear and make submissions or make their case known.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. JORGENSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, then as a supplementary, can the minister also indicate whether

the allegations that were made concerning outstanding rebates that weren't being paid has now been corrected and that the allocation of those rebates to tenants is now properly flowing and that there is no backlog of cases pending at the present time.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, as my honourable friend probably is aware, there are a number of those cases before the courts and we have no control over the manner in which the courts deal with them, and until they are completely settled by the courts, then it is not possible to rebate all of those that are outstanding, and we are taking action to ensure that they are brought and settled by the courts as quickly as possible.

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

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for that information. I wonder if he could also inform us whether he intends to submit to this House a half-yearly report on the way in which the decontrol program is operating considering that it went into effect October 1st and that within a month's time that will be half a year. Through his monitoring process to the Rent Review Board, will we be receiving information concerning the number of decontrol applications and the rent levels that have been ensued as a result of that?

MR. JORGENSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will endeavour to provide that information to my honourable friend but I think perhaps it may be more appropriate to give that information during the course of the estimates rather than on this particular occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism. Since the total eclipse on February 26th was known decades ago and the next one will not occur here in Manitoba until the year 2115, when was the departmental decision made not to fully publicize or promote the event?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I think I made it clear yesterday that our department studied the situation and we felt that the people who were interested enough were very well aware that the eclipse was taking place on February 26th. We did work with the Brandon Chamber of Commerce in getting out pieces of information as requested and we think that we have done enough and expended enough monies in that direction for the interest of anybody that would want to be coming to it.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the total government expenditure on this unique event was \$619.00 for the distribution of some 10,000 maps. I wonder if the Minister could explain how this massive thrust on behalf of the department, how these maps were then advertised or publicized and were they made available to people from outside the province?

MRS. PRICE: I'm not sure how the whole 10,000 maps were distributed, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to say that there's not much use doing any advertising when all the hotel rooms in the vicinities where the eclipse is going to be best viewed, there's not much use in doing any further advertising where there would be no place to house the people.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, since many of the ideal viewing spots for the eclipse are within a 100 mile radius of Winnipeg, did it not occur to the Minister or somebody in the department that they could promote the eclipse through a two to three day stay in a Winnipeg hotel or motel, and then if desired, that these interested parties could be bussed outside the province to an even more suitable location? Did that not occur to the Minister?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I believe it's the jobs of the advertising people in my department, in the marketing, to see what best way that we spend the taxpayers' moneys and this is the decision that we arrived at.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that the members of the Minimum Wage Board could not come to a consensus, can the Minister tell us whether the chairman of that board used his prerogative and made any recommendation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, the chairman of that particular board did an excellent job in 1976 when he got unanimous recommendation and it was chosen not to be acted on at that particular time by the government in power. Again in 1977, he used his prerogative again and brought in a unanimous recommendation and that again was not acted upon. At this particular time, he could not get the parties together. I have said publicly; I can say here quite as easily that there were two directly opposed views. I particularly met with him and he said that there was no real giving on either side and it was then left to myself to make a decision. We are reviewing both positions and I suppose I am going through the same process that the Board itself has gone through in years gone by.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the light of the answer, I wonder if the Minister would consider taking the two-year unanimous decision and using it as a formula to give the people who are on minimum wage a relief now.

MR. MacMASTER: I can only suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the unanimous recommendation for an increase in the minimum wage in Manitoba in 1976 and 1977 was given thorough consideration by the NDP administration at that time. They chose not to act upon it. I can appreciate their concern in 1978 and we also have a concern for it.

MR. FOX: I can appreciate the Minister's thoughts about what the NDP did. Does he also realize that there was going to be an increase which they cut off? —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before I recognize the Minister, may I point out that this is the time for questions not for statements. Does the Honourable Member for Kildonan wish to rephrase

MR. FOX: I did ask a question. I asked him whether he was aware that we had intended to increase it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, prior to October 1977, there were a lot of statements made by the NDP of their intentions. I'm not sure whether they intended to carry out any of them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. In the light of Statistics Canada figures which indicate a tremendous increase in the cost of living, which is hurting all Manitobans, can the Minister indicate to us if he is satisfied with the 7 to 10-cent bread price increases which occurred last month.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is very selective in pointing out that, or attempting to create the impression that the price increases are in Manitoba only. Those price increases are Canadian-wide, and I'm sure that he is aware of it. To answer the second part of his question, I am not satisfied that those prices are increasing at the rate that they are.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, on that basis, I am wondering whether in fact the Minister wants them to increase faster. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister, what is he going to do now if he is not satisfied that the bread price increases are justified. Will he, as I asked him over five weeks ago, establish an enquiry into bread prices under The Trade Practices Enquiry Act to determine whether these price increases are justified for an essential staple like bread?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat what the former Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs said when he was asked the same question. He said, "If I was sure that such an enquiry would bring down the price of bread, I would certainly initiate it."

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

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister to check into the record, if he would, and determine whether in fact in 1973 the New Democratic Party government did not in fact establish an enquiry and following the establishment of that enquiry, Mr. Speaker, the bread price, which was going to go up by about 7 cents a loaf, came down to 3 cents. Will the Minister check out that particular fact?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I have perhaps checked into that particular assertion on the part of my honourable friend a lot better than he has and I have discovered that although an enquiry was established, no such enquiry took place. The members were appointed; they never were asked to do anything. At the same time, the government opposite were in negotiation with the Federal Government, the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board at that time announced a subsidy on the price of bread which effectively forestalled an increase in the price of bread. Now, if my honourable friend wishes, I have a copy of a press release issued, not issued, but prepared, by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs at that time which announced: "Consumer and Corporate Affairs Ian Turnbull announced today that the province's three-member board of enquiry established to investigate bread prices and all aspects of pricing in the milling and baking industries would be suspended for the time-being in the light of assurances that bread prices would remain stable for six to twelve months." Then the prepared press release went on to point out that the reason for that was because of the subsidy that was initiated, or the subsidy that was paid out for flour to millers at that particular time.

So, you know, my honourable friend, to try to create the impression that the establishment of that enquiry, which did nothing, never even met, was the reason why prices did not increase at that time are absolutely false, and he knows it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the Minister of Consumer Affairs has done some research, would he also confirm that the major bread companies sat down with the members of the Cabinet of the New Democratic Party government and as a result of that meeting, there was an acknowledged reduction, or less acceleration, than appeared to be in the offing with respect to the price of bread, that there was a meeting and that the result of the meeting was that the price of bread did not go up in the intended amounts.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. JORGENSEN: The member obviously knows that I can't confirm that they sat down with the bakeries. —(Interjection)— Well, my honourable friend is now asserting that the result of that meeting was that the prices did not go up. I am more inclined to believe that the reason why the price did not go up was because of the subsidy which was paid out and which was removed this year.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question on a different subject to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there are tenants whose rents are largely in arrears in some of the Winnipeg housing development, and I am unable to justify or condemn or criticize the fact of the arrears, but that the city has announced that all of these tenants are going to be evicted unless they assign their income tax. In effect Family Allowances, which were supposed to go out to poor people — and we see how the non-universality of these programs worked, that it doesn't do equity, but that the city has announced that if this isn't done these tenants are going to be evicted, would the Minister of Consumer Affairs see what he can do with regards to the housing of these people — if they are evicted they will still have to pay rent and they will still have to live some place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. JORGENSEN: I will accept my honourable friend's question as something that could be looked into and I will certainly be prepared to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. Ben HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Education. In view of the fact that the federal government has increased the upper limit for student loans from \$1,800 to \$2,240 per annum, will the Minister also be increasing the upper limit of the bursary program?

MR. SPEAR: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to go into that in some detail when my estimates are before the House.

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My supplementary question is, we do not know when the Honourable Minister will be dealing with the estimates of his department, but the fact of the matter is that students are in the process of applying for next year and would the Minister see to it that prospective students for next year will know in ample time what level of assistance bursary-wise they can hope to receive.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, we will try to have that information out to prospective students as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN (Churchill): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labor. Can the Minister inform the House as to the current status of the Mining Safety Review Committee that has been appointed by his government to investigate the exceedingly high fatality and accident frequency rate in Manitoba's mining industry?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labor.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, to the Member for Churchill, they have completed their hearings I understand, and they are now going through the massive amount of documentation that was presented to them.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then can the Minister inform the House as to when we should expect the Mining Safety Review Committee to present its report and its recommendations to the government and to the House. **MR. MacMASTER:** I would have to guess at that, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the Member for Churchill as well as others are looking forward to the recommendations, but I don't think we should be in a position where we are going to rush this particular group into making quick assumptions. There was a tremendous amount of information that was relayed to them and I for one certainly want them to have a thorough look at that information and draw their conclusions.

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

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labor. In light of the fact that it has been announced by the government that the Commission of Inquiry into Manitoba Hydro is expected to make interim recommendations which may form the basis of possible legislation to be laid before the House, is the Minister prepared to direct the Mining Safety Review Committee to prepare interim recommendations for the possible purpose of laying before the House legislation in this regard?

MR. MacMASTER: I think the two situations are completely unrelated, Mr. Speaker. I am concerned about the recommendations coming forward and we are prepared to look at the possibility of legislation if it is necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington. **MR. BRIAN CORRIN (Wellington):** Mr.

Speaker, could the Minister of Finance refer me to the page in the Public Accounts Reports wherein he recited the advantages of retaining international firms for audit purposes. Last week during the Question Period he told me to read the record of those proceedings for the answer to that question. I have read them, I have given him notice I have read them and couldn't find them, could he please now refer me to the page.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think the question hardly has to be answered. I don't have page numbers registered with regards to when specific discussions took place but I wonder if the member, in the way he has put the question, is suggesting that he has found no indication of this topic being discussed in the Hansard record.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, it would be improper for me to make a response to that so perhaps I can respond with a question. I would ask the Minister whether he has read page 1,965 of the Report of the CFI Commission of Inquiry, wherein the international firm recently appointed by his government to audit Manitoba Hydro who has found — and I am reading from the record of the document that was tabled in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker — to not perform audit examinations with the care and comprehensiveness required to enable them to certify the financial statements of the Manitoba Development Fund. Was the Minister aware of this finding when he appointed this firm to audit Manitoba Hydro?

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

MR. CORRIN: A supplementary question to that. If the Minister hasn't directed himself to the last page of the inquiry report respecting CFI, I would direct him to become familiar with page 1,969, wherein the audit work of the international firm he has appointed to audit MHRC, was charitably described as less than comprehensive and subjected to the criticism. And I quote that it was due to their failure to investigate and report financial irregularities with respect to the affairs of CFI that such matters never came to the attention of the Manitoba Development Fund. Was the Minister aware of this finding when he appointed this firm to audit MHRC's account. ?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Member for Wellington will have plenty of opportunity to discuss these matters when the Auditor's Act is before the House. I must tell him that I did not have the page number not only for the Public Accounts Committee registered on my mind, I didn't have page 965 of the CFI Commission registered nor page 1,969 and I thank him for his information.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Health which refers to the internal review in his department of professional associations and professional acts. Can the Minister inform the House whether this review has been completed and if not when he would expect it to be completed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, the review has not been completed but I want to advise my honourable friend that I hope to be able to announce a course of action relative to that subject area during this session of the House.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Can the Minister then confirm that until such time as that review is completed or the Minister makes his statement that no bills having to do with professional associations or professional acts would be entertained or introduced by the government.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to go that far but there would certainly be reluctance on the part of the government to proceed until that basic question to which he is referring has been resolved. I hope to have that basic question resolved and an answer for him and other members of the House within the next very few weeks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Health and Social Development, and in the event he is not aware, to the Honourable Attorney-General. Are either of these honourable gentlemen aware of the fact that a resident of the Portage home for the retarded met an untimely death in the month of January of this year?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, I'm aware of that, Mr. Speaker, and like my honourable friend, I regret it.

MR. CORRIN: In view of the fact that there has been an expression of regret, has the Honourable Minister or the Honourable Attorney-General taken steps to have this matter investigated?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, not in the legal sense, to my knowledge, but certainly the school authorities and administration carried out a complete investigation and made a full report to me of the circumstances surrounding that particular tragedy.

MR. CORRIN: A supplementary to the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker. Has the Attorney-General received a coroner's report from the Provincial Coroner, Dr. Parker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the Attorney-General, will there be an inquest called pertaining to that untimely death at Portage la Prairie?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'll accept that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Does the Minister of Labour intend to bail out the Builders' Exchange who, unable to succeed in legitimate collective bargaining with regard to union security, have now sought the assistance of the state to help them impose what they were unable to achieve during free collective bargaining, that is, to remove union security that has been hard-fought and won for by unions over many years in the building trades?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: I think, Mr. Speaker, I'm just as aware of the rights that have been hard fought for with unions over the years as the Member for Inkster. I'm not sure if the Building Exchange or industries or unions really need my help to bail them out in any particular circumstances. I think industry and labour in this province are quite capable of looking after themselves in the majority of circumstances.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to hear that the Minister of Labour has knowledge in the area. Do I take it from his answer that he does not intend to legislate against what has been achieved by free collective bargaining, namely the right of the employees to decide with their employer who shall be employed by that employer?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, through you to the Member for Inkster, I propose no legislation in that particular area and I think the Premier of the Province of Manitoba has said such recently when we met with the MFL.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Education. Would he confirm that he is establishing a School of Aviary Medicine to assist his colleague, the Minister of Industrial Development, in delivering a most effective and efficient professional bird service program?

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. Can the Minister of Education inform the House whether he has been working closely with the Manitoba Teachers' Society in the production of a professional bill for teachers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, we have a revision of The School Act that will be placed before this House this session and at that time matters of this regard will be available to the House.

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question arises out of the monthly publication of the Teachers' Society which announces that a bill is being prepared giving professional status to teachers which will be considered at their annual meeting which, I believe, is upcoming in March. Now is this the bill that the Minister is referring to? Is it the Public Schools Act or is it a separate bill that is to be introduced?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, the member may be quite correct that the teachers are considering such a bill within their organization at this time. I have not seen that bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister of Labour inform the House as to when the last time the Advisory Committee for the Workplace Safety and Health Division met?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Not the exact date, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister of Labour then confirm that it has been nearly one full calendar year since the last meeting of the Workplace Safety and Health Advisory Committee?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, it could be possibly a year, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister then confirm that under the Act it is necessary for the committee to meet at least once in each full calendar year and that the Act is not being followed in this regard?

MR. MacMASTER: I can confirm that the Act says that they should be meeting once a year. I have said just seconds ago that I'm not sure if it was a complete year ago. I'm sure they'll meet before the calendar year is up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Education. In his discussions and in his dealings with the teachers in their proposed professional bill, will he encourage them to follow the Cattlemen's Association Bill as a model?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, a question for the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to Tribune reports, does the Honourable Attorney-General have a purported homosexual ring under investigation in the City of Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the Winnipeg Police Department this morning, I believe, held a brief news conference to indicate that their investigation has revealed that there is no homosexual ring but a number of individuals have been charged with a number of offences under the Criminal Code.

ORDERS OF THE DAY — THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Springfield and the proposed amendment by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise with some form of trepidation. I wasn't sure that I would have to be doing this again and therefore feel that it comes at me with . . . I'm also not sure, Mr. Speaker, whether they're going to pull the plug at any moment and I therefore would want to rush and get it all in before the decision was taken.

But I do want to provide for you, Mr. Speaker, my compliments and my acknowledgement of the courtesies that you have extended to me in the past and I hope will continue to be extended. I, in fact, would apply that extension of courtesy in the acknowledgement to other members of the House who take some recognition of the unique role that I'm sometimes required to play and therefore aid and abet me in some of my initiatives. I thank particularly, in this case, the Member for Kildonan for agreeing to have seconded my motion of adjournment yesterday. I hope that establishes a worthy precedent in this House that we may be able to call upon. I thank the Member for Kildonan. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a precedent that is worth noting.

I would like to also provide my compliments to the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker. They once again were able to initiate the debates in this House in fine form, but particularly wanted to provide my admiration for the Member for Radisson for his great capacity to express himself in both languages. I take it now, Mr. Speaker, that after he has proven the excellence of the federal language training programs, that he will be able to transmit those to his first ministers so that at the next Federal-Provincial Conference he may be somewhat more salutary in his comments about the effectiveness of language programs in this country and I hope the Member for Radisson is a living example of just how well they have worked in the past and we are certainly pleased to see that full expression in this House, Mr. Speaker.

I also welcome the new Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition regardless of party is a major force in influencing the style in terms of debate in this House and I, for one, feel full confidence that from past performances the new Leader of the Opposition will provide a major contribution both in content and in style and I for one, sort of welcome his appearance in his new role of responsibility and would compliment him in his initiation yesterday at which I think he was able to establish a very fine standard for the rest of us to try to attain during the rest of the four or five days.

I should also say, Mr. Speaker, that that in no way diminishes my admiration for his predecessor who has left us for other callings. If I may paraphrase the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg who has just recently commented upon some of the tricks that Grits play, that we are as interested in the relocation of railways as we are in the relocation of other political leaders in the province and we hope perhaps that whatever political benefits accrue from both those moves will be taken gratefully but I certainly admire and respect the Leader of the Opposition and look forward to working in some co-operation with him, not all the time, but in most respects during the course of this session.

Mr. Speaker I would also like to express to the Member for Brandon West my apologies for not being able to join he and other members as they attend the Brandon Games this afternoon. I was fortunate enough to attend those games earlier in the week when they first started and would hope that not only would he pass on my apologies for not being there but also pass on my very high high esteem to the people of Brandon and the organizing committee for the way in which they have conducted those games. It was certainly one of the most heartwarming events that I have attended in a long time. The opening night of the games, it was one of those rare events when you feel a certain spirit in the air which you could only capture in those unique opportunities and I hope the Member for Brandon West will carry with him for me those particular apologies. I think it was really one of the fine events of this province and I encourage other members if they haven't had a chance yet to attend the games that they will take advantage of it.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of the games I suppose I am in danger of almost setting a new record

which is the longest continuous response to opposition response to Speeches from the Throne. I only have to wait for the, I hope we don't have to wait too much longer, but I think only Jake Froese, the former member, sort of outdoes me in that sort of continuous length of responses to the Throne Speech. And you would think after that degree of time, one would become a little jaded and perhaps a little stale when looking at the various offerings of different governments as they pass by.

But it is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that in fact that is not the case, that each Throne Speech brings with it its own peculiar reflection of the moods and attitudes and feelings of the government of the day and in fact, in some ways perhaps reflects some of the changing senses of priorities and concerns that take place in the province. So that as each Throne Speech makes its appearance here in the mid-Winter months we're able to in effect catch a mirror or reflection of what is beginning to take place in this Province and begin to try to see the kind of changing kaleidoscope of interest and concerns that are being expressed. It's interesting how we have in my time in the House gone from the postures of the brave new world to what is, I guess could casually be called pocketbook politics, and that in itself is an indicator of the changing style and attitudes that are taking place in this province and in this country. I was thinking exactly how I would respond to this.

Last Sunday, Mr. Speaker, when my wife insisted I watch a program on television called Julius Caesar, I think the reason she insisted I watch is that all the politicians end up with an untimely death in the last act and that there might have been some moral in that story. Either that or in the second act they find an interesting way to get rid of a government, which I am not so sure that I would encourage us to follow. But what was interesting about the play, is that at the end of it there was a commentary by one of those almost unique English literary analysts called Dimbleby, who got on to tell us all about the ways and wiles of the political world. And as he was talking, he came up with what I thought was an interesting phrase. He said that politics is really the art of secrecy and salesmanship. I said to myself, "Oh, my God, he's read our Throne Speech." Not only has he read Julius Caesar but somehow he's got a copy of what happened here last Thursday. Because in fact, Mr. Speaker, I think that those two words really capture the essence of what was presented Thursday in terms of a style of government ' secrecy and salesmanship. And we have so very little to say, you try to keep hidden what you are not doing and sort of huckster what you are doing and package it all up in sort of high sounding phrases.

And I think Mr. Speaker, that is really what I regret most about this Throne Speech. That it is really sort of conjured up under those two headings and doesn't go much beyond that. Now I would remind you that it doesn't even take much time to get warmed up in those particular assertions. That usually Throne Speeches give themselves a couple of pages to sort of get into the act, but this particular Throne Speech sort of hits that particular theme right at the start because in the very opening page they begin with this whole idea that the critical issue of our time somehow is coming to grips with the constitutional requirements to hold this country together so it can be dealt with in a way that the people of Manitoba will in no way be involved in any way shape or form in that discussion.

They indicate that what we get to do is ratify the decisions after they are made, which is an interesting and curious way to conduct yourself in a democracy. Not, Mr. Speaker, that we don't have opportunities in this House to debate it, there have been occasions before, but in terms of establishing a firm mandate and a clear definition of the positions and programs that should be taken by this government. There has never really been the opportunity to bring that forth and certainly that didn't happen in the last election.

There was no effort made to sort of say here is where we intend to stand on certain issues. It has never been put forward in terms of kinds of consultative processes that are available to government, White Papers or Legislative Committees or whatever. We have never established any defined way in this province by which the people can make themselves heard. And yet we have, Mr. Speaker, the Minister, the First Minister in particular, engaging in some very curious practices. The last few days, I've asked him a couple of questions as to where does he stand in these issues. We read yesterday that the Federal Leader of the Conservative Party has indicated in Montreal, at least, that he, and he said, "Notable Conservatives including Premier Sterling Lyon agreed with the entrenchment of language rights in the Constitution." Well, what is good in Montreal obviously isn't good in Manitoba because when he got back here he said, "No, he had no interest whatsoever in that kind of commitment." He said he didn't agree with that at all. So all of a sudden, what we are saying is, is there a difference in two thousand miles, do we take different stands in these areas?

And when you ask him about the critical question of how do we start with the sharing on the issue of natural resources and how do we begin trying to establish some ability to share the wealth that is generated out of them. We asked the First Minister what is his what stand on that issue and he said, "Well, there will be lots of time to debate that. Let's not ask those kinds of questions.

Let's not deal with those kinds of issues." And yet, Mr. Speaker, it comes down as not a matter of academic or political point gaining, it comes down to crucial questions as to how much are we going to pay for energy resources in the future and at what point in time do we begin stating the case that the enormous sums of money being garnered in certain provinces should in some way be shared or utilized for national purposes.

So on critical questions like that when we ask the first minister to explain and put forward the positions of his government we find ourselves sort of being danced away and in fact being created with a degree of secrecy and perhaps just a little salesmanship.

Then we come with that classic statement in the Throne Speech which I thought really was one that we should put in some form of imbedded stone in this hall, and that is the clear obligation of this government to the aged and infirm and the economic disadvantage of the Province of Manitoba and ensuring that all Manitobans — and catch this — ensuring that all Manitobans may aspire to achieve the limits of their God-given talents. Well, Mr. Speaker, that particular statement will come as some surprise and some news to many of the Manitobans who have seen their services radically reduced over the past year and a half. The numbers of juveniles who are now being forced into adult court to enjoy sort of their God-given talents in the confines of Headingley and Stony Mountain because there isn't available the kind of psychiatric or juvenile treatment services in this province, according to a judge who made that statement. The number of young Manitobans who are having to exercise their God-given talents looking at the want ads of out-of-town newspapers in order to see where their first job might come from. Those are not the kinds of commitments and obligations which the Throne Speech aspires to which I think can really be held forth as having a degree of veracity or truth to it.

Then we come, Mr. Speaker, to the commitment on tax credit revenue reviews. If there is any a chilling phrase in that Throne Speech, it has to do with this government is going to start taking a look at the whole question of the rebates and tax credits that they will provide. Now that, I think, Mr. Speaker, and I say it with full assertion, was one of the more progressive moves that this province and other provinces have made in trying to make a gesture towards the redistribution of income in this province and particularly to try to make it in terms of assisting those who have some basic needs that they can't in any way afford because of the increasing inflationary pressures that we're under. We live in an affordability crisis in large parts of this province. The affordability crisis meaning that simply the requirement that there isn't enough income to maintain proper standards of housing and proper standards of care and yet this review of the tax credit rebate system seems to carry with it the portents that that system will be eroded, erased or in some way eliminated.

Then we come, Mr. Speaker, to perhaps what is one of the most surprising positions in the Throne Speech which is the commitment to farm diversification, helping the farmer, providing them with new water services. Well, it becomes a little unusual to think of how they're going to do that when they've just finished firing 50 or 60 people from the Department of Agriculture. How are they going to provide for a farm diversification and management program when something like 30 members of the Agricultural Department have received notice that their jobs are going to end on the 23rd of March. The agrologists, consultants and agricultural reps who have provided a major technical supplies and services to farmers throughout this province, particularly smaller farmers, won't have jobs any more. One of the real sort of historical highlights of the whole agricultural movement in this province has been the ability to provide an important connection between new developments in the technology of agriculture and to transmit it to the small farmers. We make a commitment in this Throne Speech but we've fired the people who are supposed to deliver it.

They make a commitment to the application of proper water services and yet we know last year that they wiped out the full Water Resources Board of the Department of Agriculture and when the employees of that department suggested they were prepared to buy it, because they thought they could even make a go of it, they were refused. But this privatization that the government is so proud about' about selling off unneeded parts of government to the private sector, they weren't even prepared to do that. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, there was more at stake than just getting rid of something. There seemed to be an ideological commitment against certain parts of the agricultural community and all this done without any notification, without any attempt to tell the farmers that this is going on.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we get to some interesting statements about the Public Service which I don't think anyone in this House can take much pride in what's been happening to the Public Service in this province. There were a number of gestures towards fuller integration of management of the Public Service for starts, and yet we have Cabinet memos available which show that while they say they're integrating they are in fact fragmenting, that they have now set up more political control through two Cabinet committees to ensure that they have full discretion over appointments. The trend that began under the last government with a certain degree of enthusiasm is continued with

unabated zeal now, which is to totally politicize the Civil Service and make them so intimidated and so cowed by their political masters that they are paralyzed in the conduct of their duties. Rather than sort of giving us sort of phrases about let's reintroduce the merit rating, they in fact are simply and once again sort of putting the Public Service Commission under a form of tutelage and not giving any kind of independence or discretion to ensure that there is a degree of autonomy and a degree of professionalism being able to be maintained. It is really one of the sad stories of our time that the principle of an independent Civil Service properly responsible to the politicians but still being able to maintain a degree of integrity, has casually and cavalierly been eroded in this province. We are going to pay a heavy price for that, Mr. Speaker. We are going to pay a heavy price because increasingly those of talent and ability and concern and commitment will no longer want to work for the Public Service of this province because they feel that they will be compromised, that they will not be able to approach it with the kind of professionalism that such duties require, that every time they turn around they're going to be asked, "What are your political beliefs?"

I think, Mr. Speaker, that rather than giving us these sort of gestures that we've received in the Throne Speech, there should be a very clear and unequivocal commitment that the Public Service Commission will be made more independent, that we will adopt, in part, some of the principles that exist on the federal level where the appointments are not made through the political side and that there is reporting to this House on its operation, and that much of the ministerial discretion in making appointments is eliminated. We have to start returning the Civil Service back into the kind of effective governmental instrument that it can and should be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we also find — I find at least — an interesting degree of irony in the Throne Speech when the government asserts that it really is going to go after those nasty federal guys — those nasty federal guys, by the way, who pay all the bills for their Economic Development Program — to really do something on the reserves about the problems of native people. Well, I think that's a worthy objective but it would have an awful lot more substance to it if at the same time they weren't firing all the native workers up north and eliminating the kind of community assistance programs that were available, that their commitments to pursue the interest of native people in northern communities would gain far more credibility and acceptance if at the same time they weren't dismantling and taking apart many of the structures that were put into place. How can on the one hand you say the Federal Government should be doing more while we are doing less? How do you make your case stick to anybody when you say, "It's all right for us to withdraw and retract, but we want you to come in and do more."? How do you, in all honesty, make that kind of case to anybody without being laughed out of court?

And then we come, Mr. Speaker, to some interesting statements about what we're going to do in the fields of Health and Social Development. When I first heard the Throne Speech and listened to the commitments made about the Year of the Child, I thought that that was a very worthy and honourable objective. Every legislature has been asked to address itself to issues of children in this society and this government said they were prepared to do it and they announced a couple of programs, the primary of which was the immunization of children against communicable diseases and yet you find that it's curious that while we're talking about immunization, we are ignoring many of the far more serious problems facing Manitoba children, that the cutbacks in the Health and Community Services Department will make it almost impossible to deal with.

There are far more children in this province affected by child abuse than by communicable diseases and yet we find out that the elimination of one of the important institutions, Osborne House, is being handled in a fairly casual, cavalier, almost secretive way. It's an interesting statistic that there are more deaths in the province due to suicide and accidents in this province than there is to communicable diseases; that 50 percent of the cases of handicapped in this province, according to statements made here last November in a conference, could be prevented by far more effective pre and post natal care provided for a range of community health clinics and other services' and yet those are the very services which we're threatening to cut back. The death rate for native children is about 10 times that of white children and the causes are not problems of immunization, they're problems of poor water, poor living conditions which are basic and environmental causes of those deaths and accidents and sicknesses.

Mr. Speaker, in this particular area where we've been talking about dealing with the Year of the Child, what we're really talking about is talking on the one hand and taking away on the other; that if the problem of children in our society is in many cases related to disadvantage, then how can you justify the elimination of educational programs in the central part of the city that were particularly geared to younger children? How can you deal with the problems of 15 percent unemployment amongst lower and unemployable working class in the province because it's those economic conditions caused by poor wages and poor working conditions that lead to their problems? How do you deal with the restrictions on welfare rates and the refusal to deal with private established across-the-board minimum welfare rates throughout the province when we know that one of the

serious problems of disparity is between the rural and urban areas? How can you, in honesty, talk about dealing with the problems of the children and ignore these kinds of issues? Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that what you do is you don't talk about them. You say, "We're going to deal with the Year of the Child," and you build up your balloon and send it floating and don't provide anything but hot air within it.

We also have an interesting commitment which I think is particularly curious, about the changes in the liquor laws in the Province of Manitoba. Members of this House were entertained by fulsome debate by many a Conservative backbencher last year reminding us of the evils of drink and how we were going to be scourged with the plague of widespread alcoholism, particularly amongst young people. I can see some of the members who made those speeches sitting across from me now. Unquestionably it is a problem and yet, at the same time, we have a First Minister announcing, with a great deal of pride and satisfaction, that one of the new bold initiatives of his government is to make liquor more accessible and available. A curious kind of problem. Where are going to be those Tory backbenchers when this debate occurs? Are they going to be standing up and saying, "All right, Mr. First Minister, you don't understand the problem. Read my speeches of last year. We're faced with this serious difficulty of alcoholism amongst young people while you're going to provide much wider distribution of it." An interesting, curious kind of contradiction that's contained in the Throne Speech. And at the same time that we're saying that, nothing has been done to repair the 10 or 15 percent cutbacks that took place in alcohol treatment and preventative programs in the budget last year. At the very same time that we are going to extend the supply and availability, we're cutting back the treatment and prevention. You know, less than one or two percent of the total revenues generated by alcohol revenues goes to any form of information or preventative programs in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I agree; I think we should look at the liquor laws, but let's look at the whole spectrum of them. Let's go from start to finish; let's talk about the marketing and distribution and ownership and the prevention and cure and information and treatment. Let's just not talk about how do we isolate one segment of that and say, "We're going to put it in the grocery stores." And particularly, Mr. Speaker, when there is no economic justification because study after study has shown that it is more efficient through the government monopoly. It's one of those cases where in fact the Crown corporation is a more efficient operator than distributing it through a multitude of private sources. I would suggest perhaps the only justification the First Minister could possibly develop for that particular initiative is that it's one way at getting back at those nasty guys that went on strike last summer — boy, we're going to show them; I mean, we're going to provide for a number of alternatives to them and make sure that they can't do that to us again.

Because, Mr. Speaker, other than that there really is no reason for it unless it's contained in a proper and full examination of the total problem of liquor and alcohol within this province. But it's not there. So, Mr. Speaker, you keep running across these kinds of statements of positive intent but when you pull back and begin to look behind the camouflage, you see that there are hidden meanings and a somewhat different agenda than perhaps first met the eye.

Let's come, Mr. Speaker, then to one that perhaps gives me some particular cause for concern, and that is the rationalization of services in the core area. You see, Mr. Speaker, I'm learning the new vocabulary of Conservatives, that they use words in an interesting way. Rationalization, I think, Mr. Speaker, becomes a euphemism for, again, elimination. The word that should be used in the central area of Winnipeg is not rationalization, Mr. Speaker, it should be investment. It should be an application of resources in an effective way because when we've looked at rationalization programs before this, we haven't seen really an addition or improvement or investment; we've seen retraction, shrinkage and reduction. We have to be very careful how words are being used in this Throne Speech.

And again, Mr. Speaker, when we asked the First Minister, "Okay, let's take that on face value; let's ask how are you going to conduct this rationalization? Who's going to be involved? Are you going to deal with the social agencies working down there? The community schools? The workers on the streets? The clients?" Oh, no, no, no. None of that. I mean, we don't want to get involved in that kind of consultation. It's going to be an inner-Cabinet committee of some kind conjuring up its own peculiar visions and fantasies of what is required in the central city. And yet, Mr. Speaker, there is no more area that requires a sensitivity and a delicacy and an effectiveness of approach, but you can't either come in and bludgeon it away with massive programs nor at the same time can you withdraw and retreat from the field in the dark of night. And yet we have no assurances or any commitments that the proposal that we are going to rationalize services will be done in any kind of open forum with any degree of involvement, or perhaps even any degree of requisition of the experiences and concerns and attributes of the people working and living in that part of the area. We have treated that area for so long, Mr. Speaker, as a colony, that we will do unto it in various ways. We will make decisions for it.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it's about time we learned that the basic principle is to allow people who live in that area to make decisions for themselves, to let them make the decisions about how they would restructure services or deal with economic problems or deal with the renewal, and yet constantly and consistently there is someone from the outside deciding how things are going to be done for people who live in the central part of Winnipeg. It is the extension of one of the most pernicious kinds of principles, a form of modern day colonialism of the worst kind.

Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that a government that had committed itself to principles of self-reliance and enterprise and individualism would have recognized that problem. They would have said, "Let's work with the people in the area to help them solve their problems; let's not decide for them." And yet very clearly, two days ago, we had the First Minister indicating, no, none of that, we're going to work in the time-honoured traditional ways of sort of hidden government, working behind closed doors, making its pronouncements about how you are going to affect the lives and fortunes and fates of people living in that part of the city.

Well, that's simply not fair, Mr. Speaker, and it shouldn't be allowed. And, Mr. Speaker, it would be certainly one of my concerns and objectives, to fight that particular kind of posture that is being taken.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are in a situation where secrecy and salesmanship are really the motifs of this particular Throne Speech, and unfortunately that really isn't good enough for the times we live in because I would guess that if there was any major malaise in this province and perhaps throughout the country, it is a growing disbelief on the parts of increasing numbers of people that government really is serious about what it is doing, that it really has a sense of direction of where it wants to go, that it really has an understanding of the kind of role that government can play in a creative way; that they simply don't want the gimmicks and the salesmanship and the propoganda and the advertising in which we now create in terms of a hyper form of government, that there is a yearning for a deeper kind of commitment from government, one that requires a much greater sense of direction and openness to it.

I would ask the question in this case, that if we don't receive this in the Throne Speech, then who will speak for it. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we don't have that kind of real debate about what the future is going to bring in this province. We are still dealing in this kind of piecemeal way, almost unfortunately locked — I think we have got ourselves tragically locked in a kind of combatant stance between the Conservatives and New Democrats which has now been going on for 10 years. It is like an old married couple who are repeating the same arguments, and the same attitudes have been going on, and if I could give any advice to the Leader of the Opposition who is the creator of the reform bill on family law, how do we separate this unholy wedlock that has so turgidly, so restricted and constipated this province in terms of not being able to sort of open up things and see where it should be going in this area.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that one of the roles that our party perhaps can play is to try to provide some standard or benchmark against which the decisions and debates can be measured about where the future is going. And I would start by establishing that the first fundamental benchmark is the openness of government. Now, I have made lots of speeches in this House in the past about ways of doing it, freedom of information and changing legislative committees. This simply comes down to one fundamental reason, that the more open the government is, the better the decisions will be, that as long as we fall into the trap of assuming that by keeping the doors closed and the files locked and the information sequestered that we will somehow be able to manage more effectively is just dead wrong, because experience demonstrates time and time again that the more open, accessible, available and accountable government is, ultimately the better the decisions will be, that they will simply therefore have to respond in a more responsible fashion.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that one of the directions that we should be setting for ourselves in this House, is how do we make our procedures more open and accessible? How do we use our legislative committees more effectively? How do we get better access to information? How do we ensure that the reports coming through from auditors and public service commissions and others are fully available? That would seem to be, Mr. Speaker, one of the ambitions that I thought was held by the Minister of Government Services and his colleagues when they talked about the reorganization of government. They made very bold statements in their Task Force Report, very few of which have been followed. We haven't adopted those measures or those techniques.

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

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So let's talk first about how we achieve openness of government in this province, and then secondly, let's talk about, once we achieve that, how do we provide for the partnership of government and the private sector in creating economic growth.

That part of that locked-in combatants is that on one hand we say government should do very little and the other is government should be doing too much. The question I would ask is how do we bring them together to work in some form of joint enterprise?

It was interesting, Mr. Speaker, I was listening to a speech by Bob Blair, the entrepreneur from Alberta a few weeks ago when he spoke to the University of Manitoba. And what he said was interesting, that the developments of the major resource capacities of that province didn't take place through the generation of free enterprise and all its glory, nor through state monopoly. It was in sitting down in 1972 and establishing a joint strategy for the development of a petrochemical industry, worked out in combination between government and business, each investing where it should, each cooperating where it should, that provided one of the major initiatives in that province.

He also said, Mr. Speaker, another interesting thing, that one of the real tragedies of what is going on in the major resource developments of Western Canada is that many of the abilities to manage and provide the professional services have to be borrowed from the Americans because the firms and consulting services and management services aren't big enough in Western Canada to handle it. Yet, at the same time, we know that there are engineers and architects and designers and management consultants in this province going broke for lack of work. It would seem to me that what is required is that strategy that brings people together in the private sector and provides the kind of investment to give the smaller business firms, through consortium and arrangements, the ability to start bidding and getting into that kind of action. But that takes a strategy; it takes an approach. It really raises a question of how do we become part of the western growth dynamic that is taking place. We have skills and talents and assets in this province, and yet the report of the Department of Regional Expansion says Winnipeg is now losing its preeminence as the urban centre for Western Canada and that many of the skills and talents are being drained off to other cities. Here is a major opportunity for a way of stimulating a new growth program in this province in which we are totally missing the opportunity.

We are also missing the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of establishing a commitment to young people in this province through direct job creation, that no matter how long and how hard the ideologues argue, the private sector simply can't handle certain kinds of unemployment, that we simply have to provide direct job creation in those key areas to keep our young, trained, talented people here working. And that will be one of our ambitions and aspirations, to provide the means and ways in which that kind of job creation can take place.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, we have to begin making investments of people in this province, investments that will enable them not only to assist in the development of their own problems, but also again provide a sense of ambition and a sense of hope. For the last month or so, I have been arguing in this city for the relocation of the CPR Railway. Why? Because that is one of the last opportunities we have in the city to stimulate the downtown centre, to open up a whole new area for industrial development, for housing, to create jobs and activity in this area. Now, it has fallen on deaf ears in City Council. We can't somehow seem to get through to them saying, look, this is the chance, this is the opportunity to do something exciting and creative in this province. But, Mr. Speaker, this province still has an opportunity to do that. They can still go and talk to the city and say, look, let's get serious about this problem. What can we do for the City of Winnipeg and the downtown area? Let's not talk about rationalizing services and all that other gimmickry. Let's do something creative and positive about it. Let's open up the opportunity in our downtown area, for a brand new centre, for a new town in the central part of the city that will give the employment opportunities for those who are unemployed in that area, that will bring work and factories and industrial progress back into the central part of our city. What an opportunity that we are missing and yet it is that kind of initiative and leadership that we require.

This government says we're going to keep funding of the arts at our same level. Big deal. That funding level is one of the lowest in the country. And yet we also know that one of the major assets of this province is the ability to attract people because of the heavy establishment of arts and cultural opportunities. Do you think people from Minnesota come to look at the Louis Riel statue? They come for a variety of reasons and racing is one of them, but also because there is a ballet and a symphony and arts concert. And yet what do we cut back? That's where we are cutting back and the Canada Council reported in a very very difficult report that we are in danger of losing our major cultural institutions within the next two or three years simply for lack of investment and the provincial government and the civic governments of this province have the lowest record of allocation of almost any jurisdiction within this country. And yet here is an asset. Let's not look upon it as somehow being a detriment or a liability; it is an asset that should be invested in, that should be promoted.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are those kinds of opportunities that are available to us, if we only saw that government should not be feared, government should not be limited, the reins should not be put on. It should be, how do we use it well and effectively? How do we make it into a creative

force? How do we use the ability to do things that that private sector can't do, not to supplant them or replace them, but to complement, to work with and to develop those sorts of positions and resources that the private sector isn't interested nor capable of dealing with. It is that basic kind of structure within this province that will provide some degree of future, some degree of opportunity.

So, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the role that I see myself playing in terms of speaking for our party, will be to remind this government of those kinds of opportunities, to be critical where I must and to be constructive where I can, saying let's not throw away the opportunities that we have because the future is too important, because even for the Minister of Transportation, he is going to have to live in the future just like the rest of us. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to add my contribution to the Throne Speech Debate and in following the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party and the reply from the Leader of the Opposition, the new leader, I would of course first, Mr. Speaker, like to offer my congratulations to you on your assumption again as the Speaker of this House. This is the third term and you have acquitted yourself very well during the past two and we are sure that you will carry on in the same impartial manner.

I would like to also offer my congratulations to the mover of the Throne Speech, the Member for Springfield, the seconder, the Member for Radisson, for his contribution. We always appreciate his humour. He has a very tactful way of putting his points across and we look forward to hearing him. He must have picked that up from the football field, I don't know. His French was very good too. I also found myself in the position that I wasn't able to follow it, but he seemed to know what he would be doing and he said at one point that he was going to do some more things in it, so I guess probably he understood what he was doing.

To the new Leader of the Opposition — I guess you call him an interim leader — I would also like to offer my congratulations. I have always enjoyed listening to the Leader during his debates in the House. He is not as dynamic possibly as what his competitor is going to be for the leadership. At one point in his speech, I kind of thought that maybe he liked us a little bit. I am quite sure that when the Member for Inkster follows with his contribution that we will have no hesitation in knowing where the attack is coming from or what his thoughts are.

However, we are looking forward to the inter-tribal warfare that I'm sure will go on across the way as they try to segregate themselves and establish points for the leadership.

I also would like to join with the other Manitobans in congratulating the former leader of the opposition and the former premier, Mr. Schreyer, on his appointment as Governor-General. We as Manitobans have to be proud of the fact that he has made a contribution all his life to the political field, albeit in a different philosophy than what we represent but I am sure that he will fulfill his job there with dignity and decorum as is required.

Now, to get to the speech, Mr. Speaker, it is quite a long speech. There is quite a lot in it. The Leader of the Opposition said yesterday that it was a hodgepodge of government press releases; we don't look at it that way at all. I feel that our government made election promises; they have kept many of them. The Throne Speech again reiterates the fact that this government is taking a very firm stand on the financial responsibility and accountability to the citizens of Manitoba. They recognize the fact that we can't spend more than we can tax unless taxes by \$83 million, we have done away with succession duty and gift tax and I think if the facts were known, the amount of money, Mr. Speaker, that was leaving this province through this particular tax, we being one of the only provinces left that were enforcing it, I think the last year that it was collected was roughly in the area of \$5 million. —(Interjection)— The succession duty tax.

Unemployment: Our statistics there though not as good as we would like to see them, haven't slipped in proportion to what our friends across the way try to insinuate. We still have the third lowest unemployment rate in Canada. There are 18,000 more Manitobans employed in November of 1978 than in November of 1977. The last year of the NDP, people graduating and looking for jobs, there were 29 jobs available for every 100, the first year of the PC there were 56 jobs for every 100.

I would also like to also point out, Mr. Speaker, that our financial position is in quite good shape considering the fact, Mr. Speaker, that as of last year we went through a period of probably the most prolonged strike period in the province's history. All of us here can recall that during the month of March when the session was coming in that there was a demonstration staged practically every day on the grounds. Just about everyone was involved.

The building trades was one that was very vocal. Apparently one-half of them were supposed to be unemployed because of the fact that the government cutback on public building spending,

etc. had created so much unemployment . But we found, Mr. Speaker, that on the first of May they went on strike, this one particular group and this wasn't a group that was suffering, they were being paid \$11.50, \$12.50 an hour or possibly more. I don't think there was really that much grounds for striking —(Interjection)— No, the issue of course was union hall hiring, you had to take whoever you wanted. But it was quite all right, Mr. Speaker, to close down the economy of the building trades for four months on a simple cause like this. —(Interjection)— But, Mr. Speaker, there is a perfect example of the irresponsibility of our labor unions to the degree that they were here complaining, then why do they go back to work on the first of October. Because they had to get 12 weeks in to collect their unemployment insurance. You know, it seems very strange . . . —(Interjection)— When your turn comes, Member for Inkster, you will have your opportunity, I won't heckle you.

Our record also, Mr. Speaker, has not been created by deficit financing and borrowing money to create jobs that are make-work projects as our predecessors did. We are also establishing some confidence in the business community, reversing the trends of government interference in the economy and we have had eight years of social experimentation in business. We found that everything practically was becoming so involved with red tape that there just was a throttle or a gag being put on any business attempts in the province. I'm not going to mention the business ventures that our honourable friends got into. Most of them didn't work including their land purchase policies but in any event we are attempting to get out of the business of government being in many of the ventures that our friends were in.

Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, although it is not bright — the outlook is not that bright, we may as well face up to that fact — our growth rate last year was 20 percent. I expect that most of this possibly was made up through the higher costs of beef. It wasn't made up through the higher returns on the main cereal grains. The oil seeds possibly were up a wee bit, but the basis of our agriculture economy is not in a very good position. We are attempting, this government is attempting to get out of the business of buying land. I could point out again that our honourable friend, the Minister of Agriculture, isn't here, but that they did purchase 200,000 acres at the cost of \$20 million over four years. This of course was prime agriculture there were the wildlife management areas. These supposedly were multi-purpose. There was a great deal of difficulty from people trying to obtain some pasture rights in these particular places. We have now instituted a program where it is feasible and where it is to the advantage , the red tape has been done away with and people are using this particular ground for multi-purpose.

We also have instituted a program whereby there is a free transfer of leases with the sale of what we refer to as a viable unit. Prior to this there was a great deal of problems but we did feel that if a unit was being transferred in the case of a quarter or half section with a half section lease on it, that there should be a free transfer of lease with that particular establishment if it was required to keep it viable.

We have attempted to establish — and we have I guess, — established a beef producers association. The election of officers will take place this month. This will of course — we hope and are sure — will give the cattlemen of this province a united voice, and will make it considerably easier to talk to and negotiate with on all segments as to what the beef industry requires.

We have to, I am afraid, mention at this time the Beef Income Insurance Program. It was a program that, probably one of the better ones that the Minister of Agriculture brought in. It was required. The unfortunate part of it is that we find that a lot of people signed a five-year contract . We find that that contract is very open-ended, that people were leaving it like rats leaving a sinking ship, with no obligation to the provincial treasury at all and for many other. . . It was one of the most sloppily drawn up contracts I think that I have ever seen, and unfortunately there are still those that are still involved and these people are going to be saddled I guess, with the fact that they have signed a contract. One-third were allowed out because they went into the federal program, and many went out because of the fact that they sold to different ones, pulled various methods of getting out of the program and circumventing the program and they were able to get out. I believe that when the Minister gave the option to some to opt out that it should have included all so that the program either . . . one program looked after the thing or it didn't, because as it stands now, it is a very unfair program for those who remained in. Some could even have left the provincial program, gone into the federal program, collected on it and had no obligation at all to pay back what they got from the province. — but it was

The Minister also made one of his no different than many of the other Ministers that went out — he made a marketing mission to Cuba. We find that that little jaunt cost us \$173,000 in the black bean loss —(Interjection)— In any event, we may have the opportunity of putting the onus back on our side of the fence. The Minister of Agriculture was to Mexico and I very fortunately was able to accompany him. There is a terrific market for our breeding stock there. There is a market for our oil seeds, and there also will be a market for our cereal grains. I think that the

people of Mexico have been underestimated a bit. There are 65 million people in that particular country. One-half of the population is under the age of 20 years old. They are also developing a very strong middle-class, and that they are getting oil onstream. I would suggest that within five years Mexico could become one of our biggest trading partners if we do the proper fieldwork to make it happen.

A MEMBER: Sam was right.

MR. FERGUSON: Sam was right, of course he was right except that he tried the wrong country.

I would also have to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the loss to the Department of Agriculture and senior staff, it became I guess you would say a one or a two-man operation. We find that most of the young people, the young natives, agriculture represent the people from whom you draw your strength and develop your department, either became disgusted and quit or just pulled the pin and became so frustrated with the directors, etc. that they no longer continued their services.

The Member for Fort Rouge made quite a to-do about the doing away with the programs of farm diversification and rural water services. This was of course an ARDA agreement over a five-year period. It was concluded on the 31st of December of 1978. Consequently the development is still going on, the winter classes. All farmers are still given the opportunity of agricultural training but they are not being paid for it. And during the winter months, I don't think that this is a requirement that has to happen. If the federal government has a treasury like that, that's fine, but we don't particularly feel that we want to carry on in this particular manner.

Water services of course, a program will be brought into effect here, whereby there will be assistance to carry this on.

I would like to point out to the leadership that our premier showed, and our Minister of Agriculture, during the calling of the federal-provincial conference on grain handling and transportation. This is something that I guess would have to be a first, and it's very credible to the province of Manitoba that we took the leadership and held it here. The reasons of course, Mr. Speaker, being for this conference was that as a rough estimate, the farmers of western Canada last year dropped \$460 million in revenue loss. The reasons being: first, demurrage; second, insufficient cars, boxcars, and too long a turn-around time on them. I would like to point out here also, Mr. Speaker, that the unloaders at the coast fluctuate from 200 to 700 cars per day. Now, I don't know just who you would hang this on again but I would expect that possibly there might be something along the line of labor being involved here again.

And another thing we can look at is what our labor problems were last year in the grain handling system. We had a strike at Churchill that cost the producers about \$12 million; we had a wildcat strike at Thunder Bay for ten days that cost \$100 million. That's responsibility; that wasn't due to union hiring either. That \$100 million was just because a little argument over driving a train 50 yards or something.

The third one would of course have to be Vancouver where we always have labor problems. Whether or not this can be overcome by a high through-put elevator at Prince Rupert, I don't know, but it will give us some surge capacity to take care of the fact that when ships are piled up, hopefully we will have some backlog of product that we can supply.

We can no longer afford the luxuries of strikes that are throttling our economy, are going to start losing us and are losing us customers.

I would also like to point out that this particular meeting was held in a non-political atmosphere which it had to be. All segments of the industry were involved and consequently I think that probably more progress was made here than at any particular time or at any place since we've started to talk about the rationalization, I guess as we call it, of grain handling.

A MEMBER: We're progressing.

MR. FERGUSON: I would also like to point out that the farmers have taken their obligation to the degree that through funds of the Canadian Wheat Board, they are contributing to the purchase of 500 to 2,000 cars up to a maximum of about \$90 million. All right. We're putting our money where our mouth is, but will labour put theirs? We can't afford to have \$460 million not coming into this country because of petty jealousies. No one is suffering at their work, I can assure you of that. The grain handlers have been the highest paid people in the labour force for many years and it certainly hasn't changed.

Highways? Of course, during the Throne Speech, I can recall the Member for Burrows saying, 'There's going to be in Tory constituencies. . . —(Interjection)— Well, I would like to point out to the Member for Burrows, in 1970, when the highway program came out, I had two very short

pieces of hardtop that were supposed to be done and I can remember walking over and asking the Minister of Highways in the NDP government when this particular work would take place

A MEMBER: The one that's in jail now or . . . ?

MR. FERGUSON: . . . and his reply, Mr. Speaker, well, he said, "You can go to hell. I'm looking after these guys first," and pointed down at his fellows. So let it be known, Mr. Speaker, that our party ' of course, is very non-political. We certainly will not be building roads in the constituencies that haven't had roads for eight years like myself but we may have some catching up to do, I hope.

Let it also be known, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Fort Rouge is no longer here but his particular party — and of course I don't want to insult the French language — but they are spending over \$350 million on bilingualism and they cut off a \$6 million grant on a cost-shared basis to the Province of Manitoba on Highways.

A MEMBER: And we got part of this money.

MR. FERGUSON: Hydro, of course, is still one of the things that is with us. Of course, the Tritschler report will bring forth what we hope — and we all hope — will be a rationalization here again of what has gone on. We don't have to go any further on that. Our bills speak for the mismanagement of our predecessors since 1969 to 1978. I think we have a pretty good idea of what went on.

Again, the Member for Fort Rouge is making quite an issue of the fact that the Throne Speech has said that there may be some changing in the vendor outlet in the liquor field. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that that is possibly an ongoing process, that if the private entrepreneurs can handle it better, possibly with more reliable method of doing it, we all know what the inconvenience of the strikes and just as sure as I'm standing here, Mr. Speaker, that you will not find the private vendor striking and you will not find the inconveniences that we went through twice during the course of the last year.

A MEMBER: Dry Manitoba.

A MEMBER: Safeways went on strike.

MR. FERGUSON: Well, certainly, certainly they went on strike. Why did they go back to work?

In any event, Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne, there are going to be some changes to the Planning Act. This has been one of the most frustrating things that we've run into. We're all aware of the fact, rurally and in all parts of the province, that so many different agencies have to clear before the final verdict is given on Planning. We feel that the Planning Act, as such, is a good thing, the planning districts, but we also feel — and it's now going to come about — that the municipal councils do have the say in what is going on in their own backyards and no one is better equipped than what they are to make those decisions.

Education, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to say too much about education. The property tax rebate is returning about \$110 million. There's an increase to the school grants of \$12.9 million. There is an examination going to be made. This will have to do with the high special levy tax on real property in the rural. We feel, or I feel, that land taxes should service the property; they shouldn't be used altogether for education. I think there should be some relief coming here. I certainly recognize the fact that we do not pay taxes on our buildings, that the money has to come from somewhere to carry our . . . but I do feel that it is a little bit too heavy as far as real property taxes go.

Another thing where quite a lot of pressure is being brought to bear is the university fees and, Mr. Speaker, I can't for the life of me see where the inconvenience is being caused here. I know that if I was a university student and I couldn't pick up the difference between the 1st of May and the 1st of , October that is being charged, I wouldn't want an education very badly.

A MEMBER: Give up one of your skiing weekends.

MR. FERGUSON: There's something that has to be done and I'm not saying that there are too many of those university students that aren't working but I'm also, just as sure as I'm standing here, that the opportunity is there to make their way if they want to.

And, of course, Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't be right if I didn't bring forth my usual little statements about hunting rights, etc. I would like to, Mr. Speaker, just draw your attention, and just for the record, of a ruling that was brought down in January or presented on January 29th. This is a

of it and, Mr. Speaker, where this ruling . . . This was given by a county court judge, and as I read it, and I'm not a lawyer, but the case would more or less say that Indians could hunt on provincial land, parks, wildlife management areas, community pastures, game refuges, recreational areas, just everywhere that they practically wanted to. I think the point is being lost, that there is anything afoot to take away from the Indians their rights under The Natural Resources Transfer Act. This, of course, sets out that they may hunt on unoccupied Crown land or land that was from Crown assets. These rights are to be protected and I'm all for that. But, Mr. Speaker, I certainly can't go along with a judgment of this type that it's going to turn over at least another 200,000 acres as unoccupied Crown land for this type of hunting. Now, are we creating two classes of people here or what are we doing? I know the people of rural Manitoba will not stand idly by and see this happen.

With those few words on that, Mr. Speaker, that would be all I would have on that matter but it is something that is of very grave concern to the people of Manitoba and well it may be. —(Interjection)— No, it doesn't particularly concern the people in the city but to quite a degree it does. I don't know how many hunting licenses there were sold this year but I expect it was in the area of . . . it would have to be 45,000 or 55,000 licenses. It's a recreational sport. As I say, the Indians have their rights; we're not tampering with them but those kind of decisions, court decisions, I would hope will be appealed because they are very unworkable.

Mr. Speaker, I haven't a great deal more to say on the Throne Speech. We find that we're very happy with the way things are going in the province. I'm quite sure that most of the people that voted Conservative haven't changed their minds. They kind of like the idea that government are using a bit of restraint. —(Interjection)— Well, it's always good to hear the Member for Inkster say that they're getting some but, you know, all you ever need is 51 percent and I'm quite sure that we're going to have that for quite a lot time.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few words, I would like to close and thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Mr. Abe Kovnats, The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, in 1851, an American journalist named John Sewell, coined the famous expression, "Go west, young man." And in 1979, a Manitoba Premier named Sterling Lyon delivered a Throne Speech with the infamous message, "Go west, young man, go west of Manitoba." I think that that is the message of this Throne Speech, that the opportunities for people in this province are non-existent or limited and that anyone reading the actions of this government and reading this document of the future for 1979 and beyond can only come to the conclusion that they should go to Regina, go to Calgary or Edmonton, or go to Vancouver or Victoria . . .

MR. GREEN: Or go to blazes.

MR. DOERN: . . . and take with them their skills and their tools, their university degrees, their hopes, their families and their friends, because the Province of Manitoba is stagnating under a government which only knows an economics that pre-dates the Depression and a social policy that is a century out of date.

There are few opportunities today in Manitoba under a Lyon government and I would like to say immediately to my friend from Gladstone, who is one of the more sensible members of the Conservative backbench, that the weakness in his argument about university students is simply that those students who are interested in working and saving money to attend university, a lot of them can't find employment. That has always been a problem but it is a more difficult problem in the past couple of years. Because the fact of the matter is that in Manitoba today there are two major problems as I see them and as most people see them and that is high unemployment coupled with high out-migration.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is the central problem or problems, and that is the main challenge facing any government in office in Manitoba today because we're experiencing one of the worst brain-drains in the history of Manitoba and we're exporting our unemployment by exporting our population. I mean, can you imagine the unemployment statistics in Western Canada if there was no inter-provincial migration? Right now, I guess the rates are somewhat similar in the west but when you consider it a fact that many Manitobans, some 10,000 probably in this calendar year, the last calendar year, or in the fiscal year that we're completing, approximately 9,000 to 10,000 Manitobans will be leaving for greener fields. If there wasn't that movement, you would have, of course, significantly higher unemployment in Manitoba and I suppose lower unemployment in the rest of the west but because of that, our rates are lower and their rates are higher and the boom is on, not only in Alberta with its vast oil reserves, and in B.C. with some pulp and paper which is selling like hot cakes, but in Saskatchewan, a socialist province, that has very intelligently exploited

its resources and the people of Manitoba, the people of Saskatchewan, I should say — are the beneficiaries of that government which has just recently been re-elected and which is booming like never before.

So, when we examine this Throne Speech, we see no solutions for the twin problems of unemployment and out-migration and no challenges, no fresh challenges, for the people of the province. What do we find? Mr. Speaker, I read the document several times; I listened to the Speech in the House; I studied it several times thereafter; read all the newspaper accounts; watched everything on television; tried to understand what the thrust of the Government of Manitoba is in 1979. And what it is basically is tinkering and tampering with Autopac and liquor. That is what I regard as the central thrust of the Lyon administration. They are going to fool around with MPIC and they are going to fool around with the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission. I think that is borne out, Mr. Speaker, by the media. The main headline in the Tribune on February 15 was "Autopac, Liquor Sale Review Set." That's the thrust of the Throne Speech as seen by the editorial writers and the headline writers in one of the two major newspapers in Winnipeg. So that is the major thrust.

And then there have been also some sinister suggestions coming from segments of the business community, talk about right-to-work legislation, and some talk from the doctors about flexible billing. These last two suggestions, Mr. Speaker, are, I think, encouraged and promoted by what I would regard as the lunatic fringe of the Conservative Party because the government has created a climate of thinking which allows for some of these old and outlandish proposals to be put forth. Whereas previous governments would have ridiculed them as silly and nonsensical, this government either implements them or studies them, giving some credence to them.

So now we have, first of all, an indication that MPIC will be reviewed in order to allow some of our large and prosperous insurance companies to compete. Well, there is nothing new here and that has already been pointed out by my leader and will undoubtedly be dealt with in some detail by some of my colleagues. It is the dismantling proposed of the Liquor Control Commission that I find most fascinating, because here is the MLCC, which has been successfully operating for decades, providing the provincial government with substantial revenues, and now out of the clear blue, out of the Tory clear blue, comes an original command: Let's kill the goose that laid the golden egg. Let's consider dismantling the MLCC. I don't know how many decades it has been operating up until now, Mr. Speaker, but I do know that in the last fiscal year, the profits from this enterprise were \$68 million. So the question is, why touch it? You know, what is the motivation behind the government in looking at what can only be described as a successful government public enterprise in the form of a monopoly. It could be patronage; I think that is a distinct possibility. But the suggestion has been made that if you allow private liquor stores to operate, this will mean, among other things, lower prices, longer hours and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I say that if you allow liquor to be sold in private stores across the province, as in the United States, there will be all kinds of useless expenditures on advertising, there will be useless expenditures on gimmicks, there will be useless expenditures on fancy fixtures, and the cost of all of those capital investments and operating investments will simply be passed on to the consumer. It will also mean lower revenues to the province. That is my main concern, that the revenues will undoubtedly fall and the question is, will the government then have still lower expenditures, these budget balancers, will they then have lower expenditures on social services and public investment in health and education? Because that is the way they go. They don't look to the budget as a device or an opportunity to stimulate the economy, as was suggested by some wayward Tory. I mean one Tory in Ottawa apparently realized there was some possibility there. I think his name was Sinclair Stevens, or was it Joe Clark? —(Interjection)— It was Joe Clark. He said something about a stimulative deficit. That didn't go over too well with the Premier of Manitoba, and now that same leader in Ottawa is saying something about entrenching language rights. That is not going over very well with the Premier of Manitoba but at least Mr. Clark, in a blinding flash, realized that a deficit is not necessarily bad at a time of high unemployment. But what worries me is that if the revenues of the province fall still further, they will then cut back still further on their expenditures, setting off another round of lower services and another round of higher unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, if the public of Manitoba is demanding, and I don't know if very much of a demand, but if they are demanding more liquor stores or newer liquor stores, it is possible for the government to build them. You know, if the government is going to give away new publicly-owned and operated liquor stores, I'll take one for my people in Elmwood. I know that one of the major achievements of the Minister of Health, now that he has some clout, now that he is no longer a Conservative in the wilderness, federally or provincially, is that he got his picture in the paper in January. There have been cutbacks and freezes on construction, Mr. Speaker. There has been very little going on in the area of public works; there have been cutbacks in housing, in hospitals, nursing homes

and so on, but the government found some money, through the Liquor Control Commission, to build a new liquor store and it is on Pembina Highway in the riding of Fort Garry. And here is a picture of the Attorney-General smiling away, looking at a bottle of liquor, and the Acting Chairman, Mr. Teillet, smiling away, and Mr. Sherman, who is also the MLA for Fort Garry, grinning away at this new needed, long desired liquor store in Fort Garry.

So, you know, he showed that by being a minister and by having a say that he can get a liquor store for his area. Now, I suppose that the other Tory ministers could do as well if they put their mind to it. Mr. Speaker, the point is this, that if this is what the public is demanding, it is possible for the government to expand the number of stores and the quality of stores and so on. We don't want those stores that we had for God knows how long in this province, those 1940 and pre-1940 styled stores where you went in and there is a warehouse effect and you asked for a bottle of liquor, felt that you were a criminal, picked up your bottle and went out the door. —(Interjection)— Yes, you had the forms and the special pencils and so on. So we have gone beyond that to self-serve stores and some improvements there.

If the public wants innovative marketing techniques, they want the odd sale, if this is what is urgently demanded and desired, it is possible for the government to provide that as well. If they have stock that isn't moving, they can put that on sale too.

But under the Tory proposal, we will have the elusion of fancy stores and lower prices, but the result will be lower revenues for the province, for certain, lower services for the public because of that, and probably higher taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier is quoted as saying that he hoped the government would main its revenues if they move in that direction. I say, "Not a chance." The other point is, if the government feels it is desirable to increase the sale of liquor, if that is one of their objectives, more stores, longer hours, fancy gimmicks, greater availability, higher sales through a public and private system of delivery, if that is their objective then I say, you know, that they should be concerned before they make a step in that direction, about possible increases in alcoholism. Because if liquor is more readily available and if it is cheaper, as they say it will be — I say it won't but they say it will — then it is possible there will be greater consumption and that there will be greater problems in regard to drunken driving, in regard to behaviour of certain people and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I am serving notice right now that I will be in the forefront of those who will oppose the dismantling of the Liquor Commission and the switch in any way, shape, or form through a distribution system that is privately-owned and operated. I asked the Premier the other day about MTS and Hydro. I said to him, what about private competition here? I mean, if you are going to look at Autopac, which is well-established and highly regarded, and you are going to look at the Liquor Control Commission, you should also logically be looking at the Telephone System and you should be looking at Hydro to see whether there aren't opportunities for the private sector there. It is called turning back the clock and, you know, we would like to know what is next.

When you look at the record of previous administrations and the record of this particular administration, I think it is clear that both Roblins, both Rodman P. Roblin and Dufferin Roblin, are too radical for the present government because it was in 1908 that Rodman Roblin took over the Bell Telephone System and established the Manitoba Telephone System. I would like to read for the benefit of my colleagues across the way what Rodman Roblin said in January 1908 when he introduced the new action, the new Throne Speech which outlined the fact that the government had bought out Bell and would establish maybe the first, or one of the first, government-owned and operated telephone system in North America. And the eyes of people around the United States and Canada were on Manitoba in that time, just as they were during the Autopac debates when our government was in power. The Premier said in his outline, in his address on the Speech from the Throne, that: "It is a venture along new lines, that it is so radical a departure from the beaten path, that the principle of government ownership of what are considered natural monopolies is recognized as a sound one. It is a cardinal principle of the Conservative Party of Canada." Well, we have gone a long way from that, Speaker, in this particular province. There is an interesting debate between the Liberals and the Conservatives in that period some 70 years ago as to who believed in that natural monopoly more. They were both trying to argue it was their party that believed in it more. What a far cry from this government which is now going into a pre-Rodman Roblin administration kind of thinking.

This is what Premier Roblin of that day said. He said: "The question whether the profits of a natural monopoly shall belong to the people and be used in their interests, or shall go into the pockets of the shareholders of a company who may have such a franchise, is so manifestly in favour of the former that I shall offer no argument to support that particular part of it."

He said it was a self-evident truth that a natural monopoly like telephones should be owned and operated by the people, for the people. I say that that is true and that applies equally, Mr. Speaker, to Hydro and it applies, I think, to automobile insurance and it applies to the Liquor

in Manitoba.

Then the Premier went on to say that he wanted this to be under an independent commission because he said he didn't want confidence to be undermined in the impartiality of that commission. He didn't want a charge of patronage laid at his doorstep. And he said, "We should use every precaution to avoid a mistake that will either impair the efficiency of the service or destroy public confidence in what might be called government ownership." Well, you know that sounds almost like he was a New Democrat in a hurry because he was speaking some seventy-one years ago at a time pre-dating our party but showing a futuristic slant.

So, Mr. Speaker, when I saw the Premier commenting on the proposed dismantling of Autopac and the Liquor Commission on television I was astonished. Because he talked about his concern with government monopolies and he said he was worried about them, he wanted some fresh innovations and he wanted to introduce some contemporary ideas. Mr. Speaker, Members of this Assembly, these proposals are as old as the hills. These aren't fresh proposals or new proposals these are old and stale proposals.

So the message of the Throne Speech is that it is open season on Public Utilities. That is the message, open season on Public Utilities. The Tories are about to destroy the public sector to build up the private sector and they will achieve neither. They will not deal with the problems of unemployment and out-migration, the main problems. And they will not solve our economic problems by breaking off chunks of the public sector and handing them over to the private sector for exploitation. This flies in the face of both history and common sense. My Leader refers to this as privateering. I refer to this as pirateering, Mr. Speaker. I think the sensible solution is to try to stimulate the economy to cause an expansion in both sectors, that is a worthy aim. Not a winding down and a grinding down of the public sector and a building up of the private sector but an expansion of both and a stimulation of both.

That's what they intend to do. That is their announced intention. The question is what have they done during their first, almost eighteen months in office. Well one of the things, Mr. Speaker, they have done is to come up with some endless series of re-organizations.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when I was the Minister of Public Works I recall one of our old timers in what is now is government services being given a large picture, a photograph of himself looking very forlorn with his hand against his head, obviously with a headache or worrying or thinking about something serious and underneath was the caption something like, "I've been through twenty-seven re-organizations."

Now we went through some re-organizations, the Roblin government went through them, the Weir government went through them, you're going through them, and future governments will go through them, but you know, how much is usually accomplished by that form of activity? There are some improvements to be made, you know. In the old days they had a Treasury Board and then the recommendation was, under Roblin and Weir, that we have a Management Committee and it just hit about the time we were coming into office and we put in a Management Committee. If they were in office at that time, they would have had a Management Committee. So we ran a Management Committee, it started under them, I'm sorry, so they did, in fact, go from Treasury Board to Management Committee. We perpetuated the Management Committee System, I thought it was a good system.

After we left office, they are now going back to a Treasury Board System. I mean, is this progress? It is certainly circulatory activity. So just re-organizing and announcing that this is some new thrust, another re-organization, changing Public Works to Government Services and giving various ministers new titles and breaking off this part of this department, throwing Urban Affairs into Municipal Affairs, this is not progress. Mr. Speaker, this is just activity, maybe it is paper shuffling. When you are shuffling a deck of fifty-two with no tangible results, what effect does this have on the people in the system? I say it has lower moral, lowering of moral, and lowering of efficiency in the Civil Service. A lot of it is wasted motion.

And then in the past year we heard a lot of talk about the so-called right-to-work legislation which is really union busting. A proposal to bust the unions under a different name. And this kind of battle was certainly fought sixty years ago in the time of the Winnipeg General Strike. That is partly what that strike was all about, to fight for collective bargaining and now we have a government that is thinking about that kind of activity.

The other thing they have been fooling around with, and I say this to my friend the Minister of Health, is flexible billing. Now you know, we know that is perfectly consistent with their philosophy. But that they don't have the guts to put that into effect, they have a failure of heart because in terms of their outlook, in terms of their mental process and their values, they want a winding down of Medicare, they want a system of deterrent fees, they want a pay-as-you-go policy, but they want something called flexible billing. Now you know that sounds terrific. If you ask a man on the street, "Do you want the right to work?" He'll say, "Yes." If you ask him, "Do you want flexible billing?"

he'll say, "Yes," but he's not sure what they are. It sounds good. It sounds like it's freedom, right of expression, it sounds that way, Mr. Speaker. It has that type of a ring.

But you know, if they implement flexible billing and the Minister of Health said he is in favour of that, he told the Head of the Manitoba Medical Association that he believed in that or he accepted the principle of flexible billing. And what would we have with that kind of a system in Manitoba. You would have a system whereby the government will provide the basic amount of money for Medicare and then those who have more money will pay that extra amount and every doctor will still be in, still be in the plan. Now that is a good system for the doctors, cause now they are either in or they are out. Under flexible billing they'll all be in and they'll all be out, so they will get their guaranteed payments from the government and then they will decide who can pay more. They will look at the way you dress, they'll presumably maybe have some sort of a rating system or maybe they will just adopt the simple practice of extra billing everybody and then finding out those who can't pay need not return.

Mr. Speaker, if we go in that direction it will mean the destruction of Medicare as we know it in this province, and in this country. You'll have two classes of patients, those who can pay, and those who can't pay. And some doctors will then only take those who can pay. The doctors who are busy, the doctors who are popular, the doctors who want a bigger income, they will very shortly limit their practice to the person who pays the extra amount and they will send the rest on their way to the newer doctors, to the immigrant doctors, to the doctors who are willing to handle people at the medical rate as set down by the government.

You know we had to push the Weir government kicking and screaming into the medical plan. It was the Federal Liberals that put in the plan stimulated by our Party for decades, they introduced the plan and then this government when it was the Weir government, this Party reluctantly went into the plan and figured it out, doctored it in a certain way so that people would pay high premiums. We attacked that from Day One and it was probably the first major action, the first radical innovative step of our Government was to eliminate those premiums.

I'm sorry, I thought you were rising, Mr. Speaker.

So I say that when you get to right-to-work legislation or union busting and you get to deterrent fees or flexible billing they shall not pass in this House because we will fight them to the bitter end and they know that. They know that if they move in either direction that they will meet stiff opposition from this Party and stiff opposition from the people from around the province. And they are afraid of that, Mr. Speaker, and that is why they are reluctant to move in those directions.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JORGENSEN: While my honorable friend is pausing, I wonder if he would like to conclude his remarks at this stage? We will be prepared to continue on until he has.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honorable Member for Elmwood has ten minutes.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, if I can continue for ten minutes imposing on the Members of the House, I will. I would prefer to finish, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the government should stop its tampering and tinkering and the smoke screens and the shuffling re-organizations and tackle the fundamental problems of the economy. All that they are doing now is balancing the budget. That's the watch word. —(Interjection)— Well, they are not even doing that, they are not succeeding. They're trying. I mean they are failing, but that's what they are trying to do. So if revenues go down they are going to try and cut expenditures. And they don't realize that by doing that they will help wind the economy down further and further due to what is called the multiplier effect. And that's the problem, Mr. Speaker, there isn't a single person on that side of the House who studies economics, who studied economics, who understands economics.

If I was to categorize their approach to government, it is an approach of an accountant. They are accountants but they are not economists and they have as their watch word, "A penny saved is a penny earned." You know, can you imagine them in wartime? Can you imagine if they were the government? It was the King government in 1939, who suddenly came up with a couple of billion dollars out of nowhere to mount a war effort, but can you imagine a Tory government in office in Canada in the Second World War or, God forbid, at any point in the future. There would be no bullets for the army, no shoes, no shirts, no gasoline. You know, can you imagine the Cabinet Meeting in crisis session to discuss an outbreak of wartime and the Prime Minister issues a public statement which says as follows, "In view of the dangers of deficit financing, we have decided in the interests of fiscal responsibility to surrender the country to the enemy." —(Interjection)— Well,

that's Tory thinking. Tory thinking.

You know, in retort to Canadians who would say to them, you know you have blown the ball game, the dogmatical Tories would say, "Well, we may have lost the war, but we balanced the budget." You know, Mr. Speaker, so this is this government, this is the kind of thinking that we have. You know I see my friend there, the Minister of Labour, and he has been having his problems lately. He's puzzled, they went to him for comments on unemployment, when its up one month, he says Manitoba is booming. The next month the statistics get worse and he says he doesn't know what's happening. They ask him about an out-migration, he sa. vs he's puzzled or perplexed. He should read my monities, "Guide for the Perplexed," it would do him well. It would give him some counsel.

And the Minister of Finance was bewildered. These are the kind of men who are leading this province, Mr. Speaker. What are you going to do about it? Here is the problem, thousands of people leaving. —(Interjection)— Right, the First Minister attacks the statistics; the Minister of Finance says he is bewildered; the Minister of Labour says he is perplexed. They are bewitched, bothered and bewildered, just like in the song. And they are worried. They are worried about negative intrusions in the economy, Mr. Speaker, just the way that Mr. Bennett, R. B. Bennett was worried and just the way that Herbert Hoover was worried.

At the same time, businesses in Manitoba, beloved of the Conservatives, businesses are going bankrupt, mortgages are being defaulted, as my colleague pointed out, plants have high unused capacity, and social needs and requirements are unfulfilled. This is what we are facing. We need more public housing, Mr. Speaker, more hospitals, schools, courts, correctional facilities, recreational facilities. The list is endless. And what do they do? They only complete — their program is to complete the job that we began. They will finish the projects in many cases that we started, that were under construction, and then it will end. The only thing that they can do, Mr. Speaker, is build highways. You know, I never underestimate my friend who is now sitting in the Premier's chair. I never underestimate him because he is able, he is somehow or other smarter than all of his colleagues. Now imagine that, Mr. Speaker, that is frightening because he is able to get his programs through. —(Interjection)— Staggering is right, when he staggers into Cabinet and staggers out of Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, last year, the first fiscal year of this government, Highways — and I'll stand corrected on this when my honourable friend speaks — but Highways, I believe, got the highest increase in absolute terms, the most millions of dollars increase of any department. That was the number one priority of this government. This year, as outlined in a speech by my honourable friend just, I think, a few days ago, a week ago, he said again that there was going to be — what is it — a 9 percent increase, is this what he was intimating, in Highways. .

This doesn't include what is going on in the private sector, Mr. Speaker. Don't forget Jarmoc's road. There is also some private road construction going on in Manitoba, not to mention that. It is quite obvious that the Tory dictum on matters like this is, if it moves, pave it. That is the slogan of the Minister of Highways. And if I were to refine it, I would say it goes as follows: Wherever there is a Tory riding outside of the City of Winnipeg, it shall be paved. That is the direction in which they are going.

Mr. Speaker, I am running out of time so I will conclude with a few remarks on the Cabinet. I am sorry that the Member for Fort Rouge isn't here because I wanted to address some remarks to him. He is the man who killed the \$4 million government grant for the McGregor-Sherbrook Overpass and this will now cost the taxpayers of Manitoba another \$2 million and the taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg another \$2 million. So, you know, here is a man who by sticking his nose into an urban affair, has come up with a \$4 million target deficit for the people to make up. Mr. Speaker, I have heard of the \$6 million man, but here is the man with the \$4 million nose.

In terms of the rest of the Cabinet, the rest of the members of the illustrious group opposite, we have the Member for Virden who is now starring in Hawaii Five-O; the Minister of Government Services who is the best-selling author of Letters to the Premier; we have the Minister of Education of private and parchial schools; the Attorney-General who has four departments. We know that one is in a shambles and probably the others are. We have the Minister of Health who is still acting like he is the host of the Bud Sherman show in the 1960s. Then we have the man who unfortunately isn't here, who came up with the birdbrain scheme, the new Minister of Industry and Commerce. And finally, the Minister of Labour who is suffering, Mr. Speaker, from the foot and mouth disease. He is having trouble with right-to-work; he is the man who attacked Dick Martin, the President of the Federation of Labour; he is the man who is perplexed by out-migration. I can only say one thing in conclusion, Mr. Speaker: Norma, you are beginning to look better all the time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Telephones.

February 20, 1979

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 p.m. Wednesday.