

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, May 17, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have 45 students from Nordale School under the direction of Mr. Kazina. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

We have 60 students of Grade 5 standing from Lakewood School. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

We have 30 students of Grade 10, 11, and 12 standing from Pierre Radisson Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Barone. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you here today.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I have a brief statement to make with regard to the Tantalum Mining Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Government has decided to retain its 25 percent share position in Tanco, a company which mines Tantalum in Eastern Manitoba. The 50.1 percent of shares which were held by International Chemalloy were sold by the receiver of the Clarkson Company of Toronto to the highest bidder, which was Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting.

The other partner in the Company is Kawecki-Berylco Industries Inc., who hold 24.9 percent of the shares.

While the tantalum deposits presently being mined is expected to be completely exhausted by 1982, the mine site is believed to have one of the largest lithium deposits in North America.

The fact that the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Co. Limited have decided to invest substantial sums of money in this operation indicates there is some confidence in the prospects of lithium. They have had a long and productive history in Manitoba and are one of the province's major employers. They have been, and are active in the mining industry in the province.

The proposed association of Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company Limited and Kawecki-Berylco should expedite the development of tantalum and lithium by competent mining people with resulting benefits to the province through royalties, taxes and employment both in construction and mining operations.

The province purchased its 25 percent interest in Tantalum in 1972 at a cost of \$1.5 million and up to the present time has not received any return on its investment. It is anticipated, however, that the company will start paying dividends in the very near future. For that reason, and after considering, in detail, the reports of different consultants, a decision was reached that it would be in the greater, longer term interest of the people of Manitoba to retain our share interest in Tantalum and not accept the offer of Kawecki-Berylco to purchase our shares for \$3.25 million, a price negotiated and recommended by the Manitoba Development Corporation Board to the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am, for possibly the first time in my political life somewhat pleased that I have been finessed by the honourable member because I had before, Your Honour, a motion asking that this House adjourn on a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the impending disposition of the people of the Province of Manitoba of their shareholdings in the Tantalum Mining Corporation Limited, and the resulting increase in foreign ownership of mineral

resources in our province that are comparatively rare and have been declared strategic by the Government of Canada, and other matters, to follow up the motion.

I was very much afraid, when I walked into this Chamber, that the Cabinet would, in furtherance of their tendency to do so and their ideological doctrinairism and embarrassment at being involved in anything successful, Mr. Speaker, that they were going to dispossess the people of this province of its shareholdings.

I am to that extent, Mr. Speaker, to the extent that I am still today a shareholder with my fellow people partners in this province, of that corporation, I am grateful that the Minister did not bring in the announcement that I was very worried that he would have brought in.

I do, Mr. Speaker, indicate that I am not at all satisfied with the balance of his announcement. The fact is that the public of this province in 1972 saved what was a floundering private company with incompetent directors, private directors, and made that company a success in this province. The Minister who says that there has been no dividends on the \$1.5 million, Mr. Speaker, knows that with regard to the depletion allowances and the other features affecting mining companies, that the shares that we have have certainly paid a dividend. They've paid a dividend to the extent that somebody was willing to offer \$3.2 million for them at this time, Mr. Speaker.

The other interesting feature, Mr. Speaker, is that in all those years when we have earned this \$3.2 million — and that's most significant — in all of the years that we have earned \$3.2 million, we haven't received a penny of taxes from the Tantalum Mining Corporation because, Mr. Speaker, although they have made money and their shares have increased in value they have not shown a corporate profit or a royalty profit which would entitle us to get a royalty.

So when the Minister says that we are going to get royalties and taxes from this company, Mr. Speaker, I say don't hold your breath waiting. The way in which we would get our return on our investment, and this part of the announcement is what disappoints me, is that the people of this province represented by our government did not have the courage to pick up the balance of that shareholding which we had an option to purchase for the same price that Hudson Bay purchased it, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I give notice now to Hudson's Bay, I give notice now to Hudson Bay that when this party comes back into government which will be very soon, Mr. Speaker, that we will give Hudson's Bay not one cent more than what they have paid for this public resource in the Province of Manitoba and it will once again belong to the people of our province. Not one cent more, Mr. Speaker. They will get what they paid for it, they will get what they paid for it and a return on their investment, Mr. Speaker, but they will not get the benefit, the give-away benefits, Mr. Speaker, because Hudson's Bay didn't build it. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would you please let the honourable member complete his statement.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, Hudson Bay did not make this mine a success. Hudson Bay is a freeloader coming in on the success that was created by the people of the Province of Manitoba. As such we owe them nothing and when we come back into power I give notice that the public is going to take this back and Hudson Bay is going to get exactly what they paid for it, plus interest on their money and not a cent more. And that will be, Mr. Speaker, in the very near future.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am glad, you know we have a Manitoba Development Corporation that apparently is intimidated to the extent that they won't hold onto anything, that they're not given any moneys, any moneys and the Minister said they are not given any moneys to develop the lithium that's reserves and, therefore, they are going along with a government policy that dispossesses us of everything. But the government, Mr. Speaker, is more politically astute than the Manitoba Development Corporation and what they say is that the people of the Province of Manitoba would not stand for this, they will possibly accept a partner in Hudson's Bay, they will not stand for being dispossessed, Mr. Speaker, and I tell the Honourable Minister that to the extent that we can stop this Hudson Bay purchase because they have to go to the Foreign Review Takeovers in Ottawa and I'm going to make representations to Ottawa not to permit this takeover, Mr. Speaker, for two reasons.

One, because it is a foreign investment of what is now Canadian property and secondly, Mr. Speaker, the government in Canada has told the people of the province that they cannot sell caesium because it is a strategic resource, Mr. Speaker. If it is strategic resource it should be owned and controlled by the people of Canada and if the Manitoba government won't do it, then I'm going to ask the Canadian Development Corporation which is at least partly publicly owned. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Canadian Development Corporation which now holds Eldorado Mines for

Wednesday, May 17, 1978

the public of this country. In view of the fact that the Manitoba government has abdicated its responsibility, I will ask the Federal Government both to stop this foreign takeover and have the Canadian Development Corporation purchase the shares that are being given and dispossessed in a manner amounting to fraudulent conversion on the part of the Government of Manitoba to Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Corporation, who have done nothing to earn it.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further Ministerial statements or reports? Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. NORMA L. PRICE, Minister of Labour (Assiniboia) introduced Bill No. 30, An Act to Amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.

MR. GREEN: . . . I waive any parliamentary privileges for the statement that I have just made.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wish the Honourable Member for Inkster would not interrupt the Speaker when he is in the process of his business.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL, Minister of Consumer Affairs (Brandon West) introduced Bill No. 23, An Act to Amend The Securities Act; and Bill No. 24, An Act to Amend The Real Estate Brokers Act.

MRS. PRICE introduced Bill No. 28, An Act to Amend The Payment of Wages Act.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of personal privilege. It has to do, Mr. Speaker, with the introduction of Bill 25 —(Interjection)— that's right, and a question of privilege of the House, Mr. Speaker. It has to do with the introduction of Bill 25 on May 12, introduced by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and on Page 2115, members will note, and you, Sir, may note, that the Minister committed himself. First of all he indicated to the House that he had received 4,000 letters of support for Bill 25. Subsequent to that, he committed himself to supply a copy of those letters, one complete copy to the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I had an opportunity to discuss the provision of that material for our benefit in his office and he, yesterday, told us that he wasn't sure that he can supply it to us. Secondly, he indicated that he doesn't really have any letters but that these were part of campaign material that were sent in to a private association during the beef referendum last year. Mr. Speaker, normally when a Minister makes a statement and shows us a stack of evidence of support for his position, that that should not be questioned and normally, normally, Mr. Speaker, if one displays that kind of evidence, it is usually provided to the opposition which he agreed he would do. He has failed on both counts, Mr. Speaker, and I regret that he is not here this afternoon to indicate whether he is prepared to retract those remarks and apologize to the Legislative Assembly or whether he indeed has some mail of support that he has not so far provided us any evidence of.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that the Minister misled the House, that the only mail he has on the subject is in opposition to Bill 25 and he does not have any material to support the suggestion that he has massive endorsement by the beef producers of this province for Bill 25.

MR. SPEAKER: The matter referred to by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, in my opinion it would be very unfair for me to deal with it until the Minister of Agriculture has had an opportunity to make a statement so I will take the matter under advisement.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister to whom the Manitoba Development Corporation reports. Can the Minister advise me whether the purchase by Hudson's Bay Company of the 50 percent belonging to Chemalloy of the Tantalum shares has passed through the Foreign Review Commission in Ottawa?

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

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, as the member well knows, that once the official announcement is made by the Receiver, they will have to apply to FIRA for ratification and for permission to buy this share.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Tourism. Can he tell the House when the new positions relating to lifeguard and beach patrol service for the provincial parks will be made available to the parks, when they will be actually on the job?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the department is right now dealing with the Red Cross which provides the particular individuals to do the beach patrolling in our parks, the majority of which, I understand should be on patrol come the long weekend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Urban Affairs. With the announcement of the new Community Assistance Program indicating the appropriation of \$10.5 million for the Province of Manitoba, can the Minister indicate at this point in time what steps he is now taking to develop the priorities with which this community assistance money will be allocated to the municipalities inside the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, that matter has been under review for a few days now and staff are working, they have been instructed to work on a proposal but that has not yet been completed.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate to the House how he intends to involve the municipalities, particularly the City of Winnipeg, in a consultation so that their sense of priorities, determination of how the money should be allocated, can be included in this program before any decisions or announcements are made?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, it is too early to make any announcements with respect to that matter.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister was not when he intends to make an announcement, the question is: Does he intend to involve the City of Winnipeg elected and appointed officials in some form of consultation to agree upon the way in which the money will be allocated and the priorities which will be assigned to that money.

I would ask further whether the Minister will now commit that with this new designation of money, it will in no way detract from any of the Neighbourhood Improvement Programs or programs that are being allocated for renewal or improvement in the central part of the City of Winnipeg.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think one of the questions that has to be resolved is whether or not the Provincial Government should establish any priorities at all for use of the money by municipalities or whether that decision should be completely left up to the municipalities to spend the moneys in whatever way they deem most important and most necessary. When we've completed our review within the next few days, we will be in a position to meet with municipalities and discuss the matter further. The City of Winnipeg is not the only municipality involved, all municipalities in the province would be involved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Will the Minister of Labour inquire into the contract for building maintenance entered into between the Dauphin-Ochre School Division and Bee Clean Company of Brandon which was entered into without a call for tenders and which will put nine workers presently employed by the school division out of work?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I'll take it as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Can the Minister confirm that the Birds Hill day camp has been eliminated this year because of government cutbacks thereby denying approximately 800 underprivileged children between the ages of 6 and 13 to have a summer vacation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, that program has not been cut.

MR. EVANS: Could the Honourable Minister therefore indicate, to the extent that he can, approximately how many children will be in the program this year and how many persons will be employed to help supervise?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, this particular day camp starts in the beginning of July. I have instructed staff to talk to the director, the previous director, who was the director of that day camp for the last three years, in order to see exactly what level of staffing will be required to maintain this service to the children of Winnipeg and we hope to have a finalized situation within the next week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. In view of the recent announced price increases pertaining to wines by the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission, could the Attorney-General advise whether or not there has been any departure from the policy that had been pursued by the former chairman of the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission to cause wine prices to reflect the alcoholic content of the wines in question thus keeping wine prices low of wines of low alcoholic content?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I hope there have been a lot of departures from the policies of the previous chairman of the Liquor Control Commission. In this particular area, the increase in prices is mainly due to, in fact solely due, to the devaluation of the dollar, increased transportation costs and costs of the product from the producer.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I still haven't received an answer to the question that I posed. Do the price increases reflect any recognition of the alcoholic content of the wines involved?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the price increases reflect only the increased costs that have been passed on to the Liquor Control Commission. There has been no change in that previous policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs responsible for the Landlord and Tenant Act. I would ask him if he has received any requests to investigate the problem of intolerable heat conditions in several high-rise apartment buildings in the City of Winnipeg due to the reluctance or refusal of owners to turn on air conditioning, particularly in the upper floors where many older people may be suffering some problems as a result.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: No, Mr. Speaker, no message of that nature has yet reached my desk, if in fact there is one, from owners of high-rise apartments. I have not received any indication that there is a problem there.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If the Minister was to receive such inquiries in very short order, would he be prepared to act in such inquiries to determine, or at least to hold a meeting with those owners to determine whether they would be prepared to provide some relief at a sooner opportunity than June or July as they now indicate they will.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, it would be my normal course to wait until I received such message before I determine what kind of a course of action I would undertake.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 14th, the Member for Winnipeg Centre asked me if I would look into allegations made recently in the East on CBC, that private confidential police information is being leaked to private agencies. Mr. Speaker, officials in my department have confirmed with the RCMP, the Winnipeg Police Department and Brandon Police Department that it is not the policy of any of these forces in Manitoba to provide confidential police information to private detective agencies.

The member further asked if I was monitoring the MacDonald Commission as it affected policing in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I think I have previously indicated that this matter will be discussed at a meeting of provincial Attorney-Generals next month and that it is being monitored.

In answer to an other question from the Member for Selkirk, who inquired whether a lawyer was required to name his source within the senior ranks of the RCMP, Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is that the investigation has revealed that the explaining lawyer would not reveal the identity of his source but indicated it was another lawyer, who he wouldn't name, and was not a member of the RCMP.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD MCBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Highways and apologize for not being available when his Estimates were on. Perusing the Debates and Proceedings I could not find any mention of the Moose Lake road and I wonder if the member could tell me what is the disposal, what's going to happen with the Moose Lake road, or if he could refer me to the section of the debates where I could find that information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the Honourable Member for The Pas for not mentioning the Moose Lake road. Indeed, there may be some other roads that I failed to mention. I would only ask him to acquaint himself with the proposed highways reconstruction program that was distributed to all members, and he will have to ascertain for himself as to what works are to be done. I'll take the question as notice. I think there may be some particular work undertaken in that area but most of it is noted in the highways program that the member has received.

MR. MCBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate the Minister taking that as notice because I couldn't find any reference to that; of course it doesn't have any highway number at this time. I wonder if the Minister could also take as notice and let me know when tenders will be let for the completion of that road, which comes under the Northlands Agreement and is 60 percent shared by the Federal Government.

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Northern Affairs. I wonder if the Minister of Northern Affairs has received a letter from the fishermen at Moose Lake expressing their concern about the problem to their fisheries this year because of the Moose Lake road not being completed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MACMASTER: No, I haven't; it could be on the way or in the works but I haven't specifically read it yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Can he inform the House why the province did not accept the old Concordia Hospital site in January and allow the Kinsmen to proceed with the new cardiac Reh-Fit Centre?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, the Kinsmen are proceeding with the new cardiac Reh-fit Centre, but not on that site.

MR. DOERN: Is the Provincial Government making a contribution to the Reh-Fit Centre in River

Heights, and can the Minister indicate how much, what percentage of the contribution?

MR. SHERMAN: The Provincial Government, through funding available from the relevant lotteries trust account, is making, on behalf of the people of Manitoba, some funding assistance to the Reh-Fit Centre — not related in any way, necessarily, to the particular geographic location within the city.

The Member for Elmwood asked me how much, Mr. Speaker, it's a block grant of a quarter of a million dollars. There is also the question that is not entirely resolved yet with respect to some additional costs, but the basic block grant is \$250,000.00.

MR. DOERN: A final supplementary to the Minister. Would the province allow the Knights of Columbus to proceed with a new recreation centre on the old Concordia site pending a resolution of the conflict or disagreement between the city and the province?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he ask actual questions rather than hypothetical ones.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, this is not a hypothetical question. There has been an approach, according to the Free Press, an approach made by the Knights of Columbus to lease a portion of the site. That's what I am referring to. So I ask the Minister — I am talking now of the old Concordia site — would the province be willing to make an agreement with the City to allow the Knights of Columbus to proceed with their project for the old Concordia site, pending a resolution of the disagreement between the city and the province. That's what is holding it up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. You were perfectly correct, Sir, in ruling the question out of order on the grounds that it was hypothetical but, secondly, the Estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development are before the Chamber now and I wonder why my honourable friend can't contain himself long enough to ask that question when the Estimates are up.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the question is relevant to the Department of Health and Social Development. The question about the Reh-Fit Centre is, because that is a project that is being supported out of funds in a lottery trust account that really comes under the aegis of the Fitness and Amateur Sport Branch and thus is related to my department. But the question that the honourable member now is asking is not related to it.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: On the same point of order, the Minister is absolutely wrong; it has something to do with the department because it was and it is a request that was made, and it was for a centre for the well elderly. And my friend is certainly responsible, and his department is responsible. He says "no"; well, then, he is paying a lot of lip service and making a lot of announcements about the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that that is not a point of order. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to redirect that question to the Minister of Urban Affairs, where I started, and I would like to ask him whether he would be prepared to work out an agreement with the City to allow the Knights of Columbus to proceed with their recreation project on the old Concordia site, pending a resolution of the bigger problem about who owns the site and hospital shared-costs and historic debate? Would he be prepared to work something out to allow the Knights of Columbus to proceed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if and when such a request were to come from the City, it would be seriously considered.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Tourism. Since the

government would have a right to acquire Jarmoc's road in the agreement that his department signed with Jarmoc, the developer of the condominium in the Whiteshell, have his officials checked out the quality of road construction by Jarmoc, to ensure that the province would be getting a properly constructed road, which it would have to maintain?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary question. I'd like to ask the Minister of Mines whether in fact Mr. Jarmoc paid the government for the gravel and sand that he took from the government borrow pit when he constructed that road?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. PARASIUK: A final supplementary. If in fact Jarmoc did pay any royalty, could the Minister also take as notice the question of finding out what type of royalty he paid, exactly what amount he paid.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Speaker, by the way the honourable member has phrased the question, it's clearly hypothetical.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Tourism in relation to the Jarmoc deal which his department made. Will he be tabling that report in the House this week?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Yes, I hope to, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, through you to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for Housing. About two months ago, I asked him about land MHRC owns and which is now totally serviced, about making that land available for housing. He said that no decision has been made. Given that the building season is on us, and given that the building lots would be between \$4,000 and \$6,000 less than the comparable lots in the area, can the Minister advise the House how soon those lots will be made available to people who desire to build housing within Winnipeg at very competitive rates compared to the private sector.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister Responsible for Housing.

HON. FRANK J. JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say I remember the honourable member's question about a month ago regarding that property and I said at that time that it would have to be done very soon as he mentions because the building season is here, and if those lots are not sold or houses aren't on them, we'll have to carry it another season. I would like to tell the honourable member that within the next week I will be announcing the policy on that project.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for Housing. Can the Minister advise the House as to whether or not plans are in the works to announce the payment by tenants in public housing units of their own utility bills directly, rather than through their rent.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I thought I answered the Member for Brandon East yesterday on that question. There has been no change in the policy of the MHRC regarding the utilities in the public housing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: I'd like to ask the Minister of Urban Affairs whether he has yet had an opportunity

to look into the question of the request by the City of Brandon pertaining to Handi-Transit for physically handicapped. I believe he indicated last week that he would provide an answer in a few days and it's about a week now and I wonder if he could advise the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have made a recommendation on that to Management Committee and I believe it will be very shortly dealt with. As soon as it is by the Management Committee I'll advise the member.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Minister of Health when he may be able to provide answers to my written questions. There are two on today's Order Paper. One is inadvertently omitted. There are three written questions submitted many many weeks ago. They're very short questions and I wonder if he could indicate when that information might be forthcoming because it is pertinent for the debates of his Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, very shortly, Mr. Speaker, and I'll try to speed the process. I was rereading the honourable member's questions today and I know my department is at work on the answers and I'll attempt to speed up the process.

MR. EVANS: Yes, just in case the Honourable Minister didn't hear me, there is one other pertaining to the Brandon Correctional Institute which was inadvertently omitted so there are three outstanding. So I'd appreciate it if he would look into that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, again to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for Housing, given the statement he made a few days ago that all MHRC elderly person housing would now be paying the municipal tax for education, the education portion. Will that same requirement hold true with regard to non-profit organizations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I believe and I'm informed by my department that non-profit senior citizen housing is not required to pay school taxes. This does not mean that that doesn't change. We are just saying that the MHRC owned senior citizen housing will be paying their school taxes.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the Minister said that the non-profits are not required. They're not required because the Minister waives their requirement. He has waived the requirement regarding the MHRC operated elderly persons housing, I ask whether he's going to treat the non-profit housing in the same way he is now treating MHRC owned elderly person housing.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's question, if I take his question correctly, is, am I going to require the : non-profits to pay? In other words, say that they have to, no I am not.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, then I think it would be fair to ask then whether in fact the Minister is saying that as far as MHRC is concerned they 'll be put in a different category than all other non-profit senior citizen housing in Manitoba.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would answer that this way but I'd qualify it first of all by saying I'd like to check with my department as to the technicalities you're speaking of here regarding the payments. As the Minister knows, we receive 50 percent of the funds from the Federal Government and we are allowed to include school taxes in that on MHRC. Now, I would like to ask the member if I could just do some checking to further answer his question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation and ask the Honourable Minister whether he can advise the House whether there's been any change in the policy of MHRC respecting land banking by that corporation outside of the City of Winnipeg in communities such as Portage and Brandon, and whether

it is the government's intention to proceed with the development of such land banks or is there a change in the program direction.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the policy of MHRC in the government is, at the present time we will not buy any more land unless it's a piece of property that would enhance the piece we have now which would be necessary to make it more available. We are not going to be the biggest landowners in Manitoba.

MR. EVANS: Well can the Honourable Minister advise the House whether it is his intention to develop the land-holdings that the corporation now possesses in the City of Brandon. There is a fair amount of property. Is it the intention of MHRC to proceed with the development of this, or is the intention to sell such land?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the policies as to selling lands, MHRC lands will be a recommendation of the board which will have to be approved by myself or Cabinet. I believe that there is a piece of land in Brandon that is being considered for possibly sale, no decision has been made on it. As I said to the Member for Fort Rouge yesterday, the properties that we own will either have housing on it by us or somebody else or any profits from that land will be used for housing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: In the decision regarding the utilization of the land bank in the City of Brandon, would the Honourable Minister not wish to take into account the particular demand for housing in the area and the ability that the corporation might have to keep prices of housing down in that particular city? And that the decision to sell or to develop that property or land holdings will have a bearing in the future on the increasing costs of housing for new residents in the city.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it's never been demonstrated to me at any time, since I've had the portfolio, that MHRC has been able to keep the cost of housing down in Manitoba at any time.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Acting First Minister. Can the Acting First Minister inform the House what steps the government of Manitoba would take to mark the Queen's birthday next week?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting First Minister.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, the first and most important thing we're going to do along with many other Manitobans, is take a holiday. If there are any other announcements, Mr. Speaker, they'll be forthcoming. I have nothing to announce at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Northern Affairs. Can the Honourable Minister inform the House as to the results of his department's efforts to sell the Pakwagan operation in Wabowden?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: There's been an extension to Tuesday, the 23rd at noon, on that particular proposal.

MR. COWAN: I would assume then that that extension would be to accept bids, is that correct?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, to accept the proposals, it's been extended to the noon of the 23rd.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is the Minister in a position to indicate who the successful bidder is on Morden Fine Foods?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: No, Speaker, I haven't got anything back from the MDC on that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Meer for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the most recent answer given by the Minister without Portfolio responsible for Housing, is the Minister saying that the lands developed by MHRC in the northwest Winnipeg will not be at least \$4,000 to \$6,000 lower per building lot than the private sector?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I don't recall saying that at all. I don't know that I made that reference when I answered the Member for Brandon East.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to apologize, but I understood the Minister to say — and he can correct me — did he not say that he knows of no cases where land banking did not bring about a drop in price for housing, a lowering of price?

MR. JOHNSTON: No. I think I said, Mr. Speaker, that it hasn't been demonstrated to me since I've been Minister that the policies of MHRC has kept prices down in housing in Manitoba, or words to that effect.

MR. MILLER: Then I have to ask the Minister again. Is he therefore denying that the building lots, which can be made available like tomorrow, will be at least \$4,000 to \$6,000 less than the private sector in the immediate adjacent area? \$4,000 to \$6,000 less per building lot.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to confirm or deny that statement at the present time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY — ORDERS FOR RETURN

ORDER NO. 54: On Motion of Mr. Evans.

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return of:

1. The name of each advertising and/or public relations agency or company retained by the Government of Manitoba, and the Departments, Boards, Commission or Crown Agency as of May 1st, 1978 to which each such firm provides advertising service.

2. The budgeted expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1979 for each advertising and/or public relations firm, broken down by each provincial department, board, commission or crown agency for which it provides services.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, with regard to this Order for Return, there's no difficulty with No. 1 part, giving the names of the agencies, and so on, because it deals with May 1, 1978 date which is now a matter of the past and the member has, of course, full right and privilege to ask for it.

I would, though, comment with regard to No. 2, that there's some difficulty with Part 2, because this information is still forthcoming in the Estimates, and of course he has the full right and privilege to obtain that sort of information during the course of the examination of the Estimates.

So it would be our position to accept Part 1 of the Order, but we cannot accept Part 2, based on that principle, not that the information would not be available, but it's information that is presently being presented to the Legislature and which I think he should obtain by that particular mechanism, namely the Estimates examination.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, that provides me with some difficulty because many departments have already been passed through the Estimates process and these questions, I believe, were not asked at that time by my colleagues or other members of the House.

In addition, there may be some difficulty for myself, personally, to be in both committees at the same time, asking such questions. So I would wonder if the Honourable Minister of Finance would not reconsider and table this, even if it may take an extra amount of time. I think his position was that because we hadn't reviewed the Estimates of some departments, he wouldn't want to have this material released at this time. But I am sure the government appreciates that there is no time limit on which they have to provide the Return to this particular Order.

MR. CRAIK: Given these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the member leave Part

2 of his Order until the Estimates are finished and if he has information that is missing, that he then request the information that he has not been provided with during the course of his examination of the Estimates.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Honourable Minister and the government could provide this. It's going to make it very difficult for any individual member to try to obtain this, as I said, particularly since our process is to have two committees go at the same time. It's almost physically impossible to do this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance, anything further?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, my only further comment would be one that we haven't made on any of the Orders for Return this year, but which he, as a Minister before and his former government, used quite frequently was the cost of putting all of these things together, cannot be ignored. We're in effect applying or inviting a double cost here when this sort of information is available through the Estimates examination, and a second cost to compile it by a secondary means. So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest on that basis that if there is information that is missing after the Estimates are through, then the member should consider then applying it. Other than that, Mr. Speaker, you will have to refer it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Then, Mr. Speaker, I would move that this matter be referred for debate.

MR. SPEAKER: It's been moved by the Honourable Member for Brandon East, seconded by the Member for Lac du Bonnet, that it be transferred for debate.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might, on another matter, ask the indulgence of the House to make comment that on an Order for Return filed by the Member for St. Johns that has been referred for debate, that upon examination of it I have looked into the matter and I would be prepared to undertake to provide this information that has been requested here, and make it available to the members of the House, and therefore would ask the House, presumably the Member for St. Johns might ask the House, by unanimous consent, to have it withdrawn from the debate.

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

MR. PETER FOX: I believe we're dealing with one Order for Return first; can we settle the issue in respect to that? I believe the rules provide that if the order is acceptable, there is no debate and it goes through, but if the order will not be provided for, therefore it is transferred automatically by you for debate upon request, and it's been requested so, and there is no motion necessary to transfer it.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I on a point of order thank the Honourable the Minister of Finance, and at the suitable occasion I will ask to withdraw the Order for Return standing in my name.

But further on the point of order already raised, Mr. Speaker, Rule 49 (1) reads that where a debate arises on the motion for an Order for Return, the motion shall be transferred by the Clerk to the items of Orders for Return on the subsequent order papers for debate at the next sitting at which Orders for Return take precedence. So automatically, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, if there is disagreement as to the order being accepted or rejected, the Clerk automatically transfers it.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable members for their advice.
The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following information:

(1) Since October 24, 1977, how many trips have been made on official Government of Manitoba business, broken down by department?

(2) Names of individuals on each trip made.

(3) Destination of each trip.

- (4) Nature of official business of each trip.
- (5) Total cost of travelling for each trip.
- (6) The other expenses relating to each trip.

Mr. Speaker, there's one addition I wish to make, and that is that this is trips within the province and without the province but not necessarily within the City of Winnipeg.hg.\$

MR. SPEAKER: I have looked at the Order for Return submitted by the Honourable Member for Kildonan and it is my opinion that the Order for Return might possibly be out of order in that there is no definite date for the completion of this; this could be a very open-ended type of . . . Had the member asked for a specific date I think that we could clear that up.

MR. FOX: . . . date, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreeable, then? Do you want from October 24 to May 17?
The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would not want to reword the order so that it's a little bit more precise. If he would care to do that perhaps he could have it back in the House in a couple of days. The order is not one that is acceptable in its present form, because there is no way of determining just what kind of information my honourable friend wants. If he would put that information down in a proper Order for Return, we would be prepared to accept it, so we know precisely what he's asking for.

MR. FOX: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the House Leader is not prepared to give the Order for Return in this fashion, I'm prepared to debate it the way it is. But all I'm asking for is government trips, out or in the province, and if he doesn't wish to return that order, that's fine.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, this is not the stage at which we normally debate these matters. I have told my honourable friend that we are prepared to provide him with the information providing that the Order for Return spells out specifically the information that he seeks, and until that is done we can't accept it.

MR. FOX: If the Honourable House Leader will communicate with me privately, I'll hold it over till tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreeable?

GOVERNMENT BILLS — SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would call Bill No. 14 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface?

BILL NO. 14 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE INCOME TAX ACT (MANITOBA)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface, Bill No. 14, An Act to Amend The Income Tax Act.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe that I rose following the Member for Pembina on this bill, and we were looking at the overall effect. We were playing the rule games of the Honourable Member for Pembina, and he was talking about the long-range planning and the free enterprises and tax, and so on. And I think that first of all, Sir, the most important thing is look at the different ideologies of the two different parties; the party that is governing the province and the one in opposition. I think that every citizen of Manitoba certainly has a right to be represented, no matter what party is in power or who forms the government.

Now, I think it's getting more obvious all the time that the Conservative Party might be a little more interested in the upper-middle class and the upper class. Not saying that they're not interested in anybody else, but I think that this is the priority; it's obvious. And on the same thing, I think that you can say that the New Democratic Party seem to be more concerned with working people and underprivileged people. I personally feel that the important thing is to look at all the people of Manitoba. I think that I am interested — I'm not going to be told that I'm not interested in free enterprise — I'm going to do my own talking. I do believe in a fair profit, in fact, as good a profit as possible, for anybody living in Manitoba, any corporation living in Manitoba. I have no hesitation in saying that at all, Mr. Speaker, but I also believe in a minimum of security for the people of

Manitoba, a minimum of services, of social services, of health services. I believe in that and I think that this is the priority. I think that our people should be in good health; in fact, what I'm saying is, people first. This is the point that I have tried to make.

We are told about progress; everything is done in the name of progress at this time, and I don't agree with that. Now, what I don't like about this government, and this has been said many, many times, that they have certain ideology, they believe in certain things, but they seem to be a little concerned about what the people of Manitoba will say, so they need a scapegoat, they need a reason. So they say that there were all kinds of horror stories and that the province was left in a mess. And we find out that this is not the case at all. This is not the case at all. We've gone to every department so far, we've asked, "Where is the mismanagement?" I've asked the Minister of Health where is the mismanagement, what was he talking about? "No, no, you were a good manager," he says, "It's not that, everything was going fine, it's not that, but collectively it is what the situation, the present situation." And that is supposed to be the most important thing, the situation.

Well, what is the situation? I daresay that the people that I've talked to . . . everybody complains anyway, no matter what party is in power, people aren't satisfied. One of the main amusement or entertainment of people is criticizing governments and politicians, there is no doubt about that. But, I mean, let's look back and let's look when your parents were youngsters and so on and is it that hard to live in this beautiful Province of Manitoba? Would you have the people believe that it's a bloody mess, that things are awful, that you can't live in Manitoba? And was it that bad to live just last year and the year before in Manitoba when there was another party in power? No, Sir, I don't believe that . . . well, it's obvious that there are no horror stories, it's obvious that there is nothing like that at all. I certainly don't think that we have to draw the line and call each other Fascists and Communists. I think that there's a happy medium somewhere. I am not that concerned because certain people have started saying and it's been repeated so many times, and taken by the people that financially, the people that count because they control the purse string of this province and of this country and they say that it's a mess. Well, we've got a better medicare plan than probably any country in the world; we had, at least, some of the best social services than probably many in the world. There hasn't been that much, I think there hasn't been that much exaggeration in these programs, there hasn't been much of that. Oh, I know, there's always been that fear that this is what the NDP will do, not what they've done, but this they will do. You know, this is what we heard for eight years.

Now I say that at least the government should have the guts to stand up and say, "What we believe is this: that we've got to let the people fend for themselves a little more, "and then we'll be able to argue exactly the difference between the two sides of the House because that's exactly what it is. But the government, to try to have it both ways, and say, "Well, we would love to give you more home care, we would love to give you more of that but it's a mess and we can't do that." This is the part that I don't like.

I think that finally, yesterday, in this House, the difference between the two parties became very clear, Mr. Speaker. If you read today's paper, I think it's the — I don't know if it's the Free Press or Trib — anyway the heading is "Cost First, Then Need." Is that yours? It's the Trib. I certainly think that the Tribune should, if it's in the Tribune, should get the credit for that because I think that finally this is the difference between the two parties, "Cost First, Then Need. Expansion of health facilities throughout the province will be determined first on the basis of cost and second on the basis of need, Health Minister Bud Sherman said Tuesday." And that's exactly it. That's where the debate is and that's where the debate should be, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday, during the introduction remarks of the Minister, he talked about the sad situation and he would like to have that and so on, then he finished, you know, blaming — exactly the story and I'm going to credit the right person — the House Leader for that about the different envelopes. It was blame the government, the former government, and blame the Feds. Well, that was so obvious in yesterday's speech.

Then we talked about block funding and it was the Federal Government's fault and they were lining it up, they were letting the people think that there would be all kinds of services because there would be new money but then there was the block funding and the province would be saddled with that. A lot of that is true, I said that before when I was responsible, I certainly don't fault this government for that, it was a foregone conclusion. I think that the government is rather happy. I kind of suspect from the reports that I have that the Minister of Finance is quite happy that they've changed this to a block funding although the Minister of Health might have some concerns because he is responsible for programs that he won't be able to deliver. It's true, I'm not blaming the

for that. I don't think there is anything. . . because I fought it and I fought it as hard as I could and there was nothing that I could do. The Federal Government had decided. But why had they decided? Not because the Federal Government had changed their minds, because it was boycotted, because it was that the suggestion that they had, the program that they had was killed by Ontario and Alberta, Conservative provinces that didn't want any of that at all, that don't believe in those programs. That is the only reason. But the Minister was saying, "Don't blame us, we haven't got the money," and he was criticizing the Federal Government and on the other hand the Minister of Finance and his colleagues were saying that the Federal Government spent too much money. If the Federal Government is going to cut down in the same area where this government is, what's the matter? They're doing exactly what you want. Then, what are you doing with the municipalities? You're doing exactly . . . the municipalities, the hospitals, what are you saying? Exactly what you are accusing the Federal Government of doing ' exactly, nothing else but that.

So, Sir, what does that mean? Cost first, then need. That means taxes first, because the cost, that has to be paid by taxes, and then the need. What does that mean when you reduce taxes like here ? And if there was any doubt — and there might have been doubt when this was first introduced to see what I would do — but I certainly can't support that now because it is quite obvious we are cutting down these taxes so there will be more profit for corporations. Oh, I should be fair, I should mention that there will also be some reduction in personal income tax to the tune, let's say, of \$13.00 for a family of four getting a revenue of \$10,000.00. Of course, they won't be able to buy this wine but that's the average of the increase on certain wines. About two bottles of wine would cover that, the increase, because I think there is a \$7.00 increase on certain wines, that would cover it. —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon? Twenty-five cents a week. And this is the service that we are going to cut.

Now, Sir, this is the part that I think . . . you know, we've had some name-calling across and so on, but I think this is exactly the thing. There is no difference. The main difference is that this group is interested mainly in corporations and it's clear, it's very clear, but it hasn't got the same interest in people. My honourable friend is, you know, he thinks I'm being political or partisan. I ask him to read the Tribune of today where it says, "Cost First, Then Need." What does that mean to my honourable friend? Cost first, then need. If that isn't placing corporations and the people in the upper bracket, if that is not placing these people ahead of people, I don't know what is. And that's exactly what this government is doing.

Now, we've talked about people leaving the province and it was so bad when I was sitting out there and I was responsible for the Department of Health, I was called every name under the sun and I was fighting with the doctors, I was doing everything and now the nurses are leaving — you see the nurses are not quite in the same financial bracket as the doctors — and what did we hear yesterday? "Well, we can't build a wall around Manitoba; we can't build a wall." And this government thinks that they're saving money. Boy, are they going to have a rude awakening, are they going to have a rude awakening. Because what is happening? Not too long ago under a former government, a Conservative government, we had to have a task force because we couldn't find the nurses, we couldn't train the nurses. That task force, it was the Whitney Report, they brought in certain suggestions.

There was a change in government and even with the New Democratic Party in government we still didn't have enough nurses until they started organizing, until there were some changes and the nurses were better paid, and then we got quite a few nurses.

Now, in the name of restraint, we are cutting down. there is no room for these people, and we will be sorry because they are being recruited, they are leaving; they are good Manitoba citizens that would spend money, that would help Manitoba improve. And where are they going? They are going to the States, and so on; we are losing them. And we think that this is going to save some money.

At least if the government was right by cutting all these programs in that that was going to save money. I made the statement yesterday that we have had the best man in the toughest department, when it comes to restraint — the Department of Health and Social Development — we had a person that was trained as a PR man and was doing an excellent job as a PR man, and that is needed for any Cabinet Minister of a department. But there is something other than that. Mind you, he was the first man to complain if we asked a question. He said, "Right after the question, you run outside and talk with the press and get your name in the paper." Well, he can't accuse me of doing that, because I have asked very few questions. And after he made that statement I went home and tried to keep anything that has to do with the department that I was mostly

for, and in about six months his picture was in the paper 30 times. I won't exaggerate; it was 29 times that I counted — of just the clippings that I kept — 29 times. And what did he do? He made a big thing — yesterday we found out it was a fizzle — about volunteers. That was going to be a great thing. And he said this former government discouraged volunteers — I could show him chapter and verse, the quotation that I made when I was the Minister and you can find that in Hansard.

But he talked about volunteers. I asked him yesterday, "Well, where will we discuss that? Where is the amount for it?" "Well, there is no amount. There is no money." It's just a biased statement. That's what it is, and it's practically a press conference. He is going every day and making these announcements.

Now, the main thing that he was interested in was prevention — programs that would prevent. He said today, "Don't ask me." Now that we're all set to have the Knights of Columbus run a centre for the well elderly in conjunction with a good Reh-Fit Centre where there was room, where there would have been a track outside, where it would have been a good centre, that was abandoned as soon as they came in. They kept the amount of money that they said we would pay for Reh-Fit out of lottery. They didn't cancel that. But this was the kind of program — and this was done by a Minister that wants to be very careful about prevention.

Then there were centres that were announced — centres for testing the hearing for children. It's a very, very important thing. All the experts will tell you that a lot of kids are told, or their parents are told, "Sorry, they are not doing well in school; they are retarded." They're not retarded at all; they are deaf. They are deaf. That is exactly what it is. The Minister said it's a good program, but is he saying cost first, then need. That is the difference and that is the fight that I have with this government. You know, I never was one to worry too much about political parties, to follow one to my grave or anything like that. I don't believe in that. I believe that parties change so much. I remember the Roblin government, who was a Liberal government. I remember the Campbell government, who was an arch Conservative government. I remember all that. So it doesn't matter to me. I just want to give every sufferer an even break; that's what I would like to see. We're not doing this in this province at all, and this is the thing that gripes me. And furthermore we are tired of the devious way of misinforming the people and telling them that it's the fault of the other people.

We were told that there are so many civil servants, for instance. Well, I have looked at the figures that the Minister gave me yesterday of the staff man years that I had approved last year — and I did fill all these positions — comparing them with those that he wants to have approved this year, which is around 3,000 or 4,000; there is a difference of about two or three. And we haven't filled all these positions. Now, mind you, neither has this government, in all fairness, but he was requesting the same thing.

We are told that there was mismanagement, that there were, you know, horror stories. Are they in that department? Where are they? Where are all these excess people? Where are they? Where are they, I'd like to ask? The Minister is still saying, "I did not cut." He is arguing with us that he did not cut. He didn't cut day care; he didn't cut home care; he didn't cut any of these programs but he says, "We are not advancing any more. We are keeping the programs." He said, "There is only one program." And he repeated that many times yesterday. Mind you, I am interested — collectively I am responsible — but it wasn't in this department at the time, because it was in Corrections. Mind you, there is no change; it is still two departments; he is responsible for two departments. But the department that I had, that was the only one. He agrees with everything else, he says. But we didn't go any further. We would like to have — and this is where he said two things: Cost first, then need.

In other words, what he is saying there, and nobody can go around that, "before I knew what this department was all about, before I even look at the reviews, and so on, of the programs, we had decided because it was a commitment we had to lower corporation taxes; we had to lower the income tax."

All right, this is the first priority. We had to take the succession duty tax off; I understand that's a priority. I don't blame the government for saying, "This is what we want to do; this is the kind of party we have; this is our ideology." But I blame the people for saying that comes first, then need.

You know, you chuckled a bit last week when I compared this to a family — a family where the old man, the breadwinner, is probably getting laid off or he is getting a reduction in his pay. So he calls the family together and he says: There is going to be restraint. There is going to be restraint, because we can't afford it; we are left in a mess — all kinds of stories. But he goes to his favourite golf course. Mind you, it costs him a little more now because that has gone up. He has gone out. He will still buy his bottle of booze, and that has gone up. So where is there left to be able to

go on with this? He might knock off a bottle of milk a week for the kids to start with — something like this. That is fair; he can always say to the kids, "I was left in a mess; I have lost money and I have no other alternative. I cannot give you this because we must . . . You were spoiled rotten. You were spoiled rotten; we have got to tighten the belt and that's the way to do it." You're sorry, but your drink . . . Put a little water in the milk. You know, go a little further and go a little longer and just put one slice of balogna instead of two slices of balogna. And this is exactly the difference. This is what gripes me, Mr. Speaker. This is what gripes me.

The same Minister made a big thing about day care. He made an announcement in the House. My goodness, everybody was going to faint. I don't blame the poor guy, he has so little to announce. So he announced it. But the argument has been since then: I didn't cut. Now, when he was sitting on this side not too long ago, about a year ago, he said that all this government was doing was paying lip-service to day care; it was an important program and needed more money; it had to have more facilities. Well, he froze the spaces. That's exactly what it is; there is not one more space than there was last year. He did allow a little more money for the increase in the inflation but there is no advancement. And you don't sit back; you either go in one direction or the other. You go forward or backwards, because you don't sit still and do nothing. And that is exactly what was being done.

All right, that was day care. Then, in different speeches that he made . . . Well, I have covered it. I have said that he made a big announcement about volunteers, but there is nothing there at all. And then this prevention — exactly what the Federal Government did last year . . . They don't have to pay. But these pious statements. I'm not saying that they're not sincere but that's like everybody's, the same as apple pie and motherhood.

Well, there should be less accidents if you have the safety belt. That's one thing that they go for. And prevention, prevention is going to save all kinds of money. What have we got for prevention? What did we find in this department? What is there for prevention? You know, they have cut down centres for hearing — centres to test the ears of youngsters. Now I am anxious to see what they are going to do for the dental program. I think they are going to queer that. Their main thing is to surrender to the doctors — no matter what — surrender it to the medical profession.

Last week when I started this speech I said, "What did we do? What are the people that are getting \$30,000 revenue, what are they doing?" You know, they are always talking about restraint; what are they doing themselves? Well, one fellow said, "I took a reduction of pay as an MLA because it was frozen. That's one big thing." Well, the government pretty well had to do that so the backbenchers could say, when they were asked, "Well, we didn't get any increase." And the other one was, the Minister congratulated the medical profession and they had had so many good discussions. They have the same damn confrontation that I did, because the government, which is their mandate, had decided that this was the maximum they were going to have and they waited. What time? There is no agreement signed and we are what? — May something. There was no agreement signed when I was the Minister on January 6th — six days; six days I allowed it to go without a signature. There was a big meeting. They were going to withdraw service from the government, but they never worked for the government, they worked for the people. They were always at this patient-doctor relationship, but then there was this confrontation. It was always confrontation. That was no confrontation. The government had decided, especially in a period of the AIB group, that we had no control over it anyway. But I am not too sure, and I am going to watch very carefully because I think this government is ready to surrender to a special group, a privileged group in society. I am not criticizing them at all in their work but they should not be a privileged group — that's the medical profession — if you allow assignment, because you are definitely going to kill the medicare plan. Because there is no incentive to opt in, all of them will opt out; that means that they will extra-bill. That means that they will extra-bill. And if they extra-bill you can say all you want that there are no premiums, it is the same as premiums. Because my honourable friend said, "What does that mean, where the money comes from?" That's right: What are they paying for and where does it come from? It comes from their pocket, and if now they have to pay to the doctor that's a premium as far as they are concerned. It is exactly the same thing. And then there is going to be extra billing, because it will be easy. The big free enterprising government will guarantee a certain privilege class to collect their bills and pay their bills, and then they will be able to extra-bill after that. So you will have the same as a premium and you will have an increase in medical costs forever.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is up.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I believe that I wasn't quite finished but I know

the rules of the House so I will have a chance to finish later on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Selkirk, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member for Logan is prepared to go on Bill No. 11. If he is, we will call Bill No. 11.

MR. JENKINS: Could I have this matter stand? But if any member wishes to speak on it, I would . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Call Bill No. 20.

BILL NO. 20 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE GARAGE KEEPERS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 20, An Act to amend The Garage Keepers Act. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Brandon East isn't present. I believe that the Member for Brandon East probably stood it over for myself, so I am prepared to proceed with the bill this afternoon. Possibly I could speak and leave it in the name of the Member for Brandon East . . .

MR. SPEAKER: We will leave it standing in the name of the Member for Brandon East. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there is very little that one can really contribute to a discussion of this particular bill. It is not a bill which provides for wide changes, insofar as The Garage Keepers Act, but reflects changes which are introduced as a result of the new form of personal property registration, which is to take effect shortly, a program which was initiated several years ago under the initiative of the previous government, a program which has been gradually developed to the point that within months, the personal property registration system will be in effect in Manitoba. And what this bill does is transfer registrations of liens under The Garage Keepers Act from The County Court Act to The Garage Keepers Act, and certainly one can have no basic argument with that; it is consistent and logical.

There is one point I would like to make, and I would like the Attorney-General, when we arrive at committee stage, to comment. I would hope, particularly with the heavy reliance by the present government on user's fees, that this is one area that they will assure themselves that the users will in fact pay their way, because the personal property registration system has been a costly one to introduce. I believe it will be worthwhile and beneficial to the commercial community in Manitoba, that such a system exists. but it is a system that ought to carry its weight and ought not to be a taxation burden upon the average taxpayer in the Province of Manitoba. I do not know exactly what that would mean by way of fees, but I would like some discussion, Mr. Speaker, when we reach committee stage, or, alternatively, during the Estimate review of the Attorney-General as to whether or not the personal property registration system will in fact carry its way through the user fees that will be charged, rather than be subsidized by the average taxpayers in the Province of Manitoba. I believe that it is important that we ascertain that at some point during our discussions.\$

So, with those few words, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to allow this bill to proceed to Committee, but in the meantime we could allow it to stand in the name of the Member for Brandon East, although I do not believe that he wishes to contribute to the debate, but in case he does, we can leave it in his name.

MR. SPEAKER: The bill will be allowed to stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

Bill No. 22; the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to stand that bill today.

BILL NO. 25 — THE CATTLE PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION ACT.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader, proceed with Bill 25?

Bill No. 25, The Cattle Producers Association Act; this bill is open. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. When the bill was introduced for first reading and subsequently distributed in printed form, this was not one of the bills that I rushed to read. My original impression was that it deals with — although it did strike me as rather strange why a government bill ought to be brought in to establish a private organization — but it didn't really worry me all that much. I thought that certainly the government will explain its rationale for it and hence this did not receive top priority. But upon reading it more closely, Mr. Speaker, I must admit that the content of this bill is indeed frightening to all the people of Manitoba.

I think that this bill, Mr. Speaker, does demonstrate this government's true colours. You will recall a number of years ago when the Honourable Minister of Health was sitting on this side as Member for Fort Garry, and when he made reference to the muffled sound of jackboots. Mr. Speaker, in this bill the people of Manitoba do hear the muffled sound of jackboots very loudly and clearly. They have started off as muffled and I'm afraid that they'll become louder and clearer and more distinct as time goes by. —(Interjection)—

The Honourable Member for Emerson wants me to explain. Yes, I'll be most happy to, because, Mr. Speaker, this bill is an absolute example of the true colours of this government, its intent to move toward a form of capitalist dictatorship, and that's what this bill is all about. Of tyrannical control and tyrannical enforcement of the laws; that's what this bill is all about. It deals with freedom; it concerns not only the farmer, it concerns each and every person in the Province of Manitoba as it relates to farmers, as it relates to beef producers, a form of capitalist dictatorship, where 14,000 producers will be dictated to by 14 to commence with and then ranging between 12 and 15 after; but 14 initially appointed by government — most likely not the poorest, but those to whom the Minister may feel politically indebted. Could include the processors, we don't know, because in the case of a vertically integrated operation, there might be a processor involved in the raising of cattle and he could be one of the 14 who will be calling the shots, who will be determining whether the Honourable Member for Emerson will go to jail tomorrow or not. He may be one of them. —(Interjection)—

The Honourable Member for Emerson says, I don't know the cattle boys. I know a hell of a lot of people in the Province of Manitoba who are afraid of this type of legislation, of this type of tyranny, of this under the guise of an independent, voluntary organization, Mr. Speaker, giving an independent organization, not accountable to us, the right to send people to jail; that's what frightens the one million people in the Province of Manitoba, and that is why this bill, Mr. Speaker, not only concerns the beef producer, but is a matter of concern to every worker, every farmer, every teacher, every doctor, lawyer, every fisherman, every person in this province.

You know, I suppose there are many things that this government has done in the seven months that it's been in existence, and although reluctantly and perhaps on many occasions with some feeling of pain, the people are prepared to suffer with for the next four years or hopefully, less but this bill, Mr. Speaker, this bill has instilled a fear in the minds of each and every individual. The kind of fear that most Manitobans have only read about, that was being experienced elsewhere in this world; the kind of fear that has been experienced by some Manitobans who came here from other countries wherein a similar state of affairs had existed, and came here in search of freedom, in search of freedom and protection of human rights, and which they find is being taken away from them. And the notice is there, Mr. Speaker, because there is no way that the government will be able to avoid having taken this step, having set this precedent, there is no way that other Ministers will be able to avoid responding to similar requests from other groups in our province. And I would hope that the colleagues of the Honourable Minister for Agriculture will consider very seriously the ramifications of this bill, as they may affect their departments.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the relationship is between the Minister of Education and the Manitoba Teachers' Society and the Manitoba Association of School Trustees. I have no reason to doubt that it's likely a good one. But there may be something about the Teachers' Society that the Minister may not like, or there might be some group of teachers, or anyone in the Province of Manitoba that may not like something that the Teachers' Society does, and that group, as the three groups that approached the Minister of Agriculture — who, by his own admission, in his interview with Frances Russell — you know, when he said that he states that the idea for the legislation came to him from three organizations: the Farm Bureau, Beef Growers' Association and

the Cow-Calf Producers' Association. Some group may come to the Minister of Education and say to the Minister of Education, "Look, the way we could take care of all these problems that we feel that we have is by establishing a Teachers' Association Act, or an Educators' Association Act," or whatever else — call it what you wish — and set it up in similar fashion to this bill, giving them the powers that this bill gives this group of cattle producers, to run the affairs of the Teachers' Society. Or the Minister of Health may find himself in a similar predicament, or the Minister of Industry and Commerce with the businessmen; a dozen or so businessmen on Portage Avenue may want to take control of the operations of our economy in this province, and they would want a similar organization set up. They too would want an organization set up; they would want to have the power to send people to jail if they don't toe the line; if they don't do as they're told, as this organization gives 14 men the power to do, to send people to jail. And every Minister may be subjected to that type of pressure, and every Minister may feel that he has a political debt to pay, and even if he doesn't, how is that Minister going to say "No" to that group when the people will wave the Cattle Producers' Association Act there, and say, "But look, the Minister of Agriculture, he brought in this bill, and look at the powers that he gave them. Why should you want to discriminate against us? We want exactly the same power that this group has." And that is the predicament that the Ministers are going to find themselves in, Mr. Speaker.

You know, I would also say to the Minister of Agriculture — he may think I'm speaking somewhat facetiously at this point, but really, it's not that far-fetched. Everybody grows a little plant somewhere, even the apartment block dweller grows an African violet or something in the window, you know, may receive a plant as a gift, Mother's Day, Christmas, birthday. Well, being in possession of a plant, you know, that may classify the individual as a horticulturist and the Minister of Agriculture may want to establish a horticulturists' association along similar lines and giving 12 horticulturists the powers — or 14 — the powers to send people to jail if they don't comply with whatever procedures that group of 12 or 14 wise men may decide upon.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's take a close look at this bill. This association really is not an association of 14,000 beef producers that the Honourable Minister for Agriculture makes reference to in a Tribune story that appeared in today's paper. It's not an association of 14,000 beef producers; it's an association of 12 to 15 beef producers — 12 to 15 — at the present time constituting a group of provisional members, 14, appointed by Lieutenant-Governor in Council, 14 appointed by government. Who will be appointed by government? Well, Mr. Speaker, I would rather suspect that it will be those to whom this government, or that Minister, feels to be politically indebted. Those will be the ones appointed.

Now, let's take a look at their responsibilities. Of this provisional board, Mr. Speaker — and I would hope that the Honourable Member for Pembina would also take a close look at the duties and responsibilities of that provisional board. You know, Mr. Speaker, in the structure of any organization there is provision for a provisional board, and normally, Mr. Speaker, the powers of the provisional board aren't all that extensive. Really, they consist of doing very little more than the initial basic organizational work to allow the membership to elect their executive, their board, whatever — calling a meeting, arranging for a place of meeting, and perhaps making some preliminary banking arrangements, and that type of thing, and other related duties to simply get the organization on its way.

But Mr. Speaker, if you read this bill carefully you will find that this provisional board of necessity will have to do much more than that; it will have to set out in detail the full range of responsibilities of this board and how it will operate. Why, Mr. Speaker? Despite the fact that the Minister said in his press statement on Friday that he hopes that a permanent — well they don't refer to it as a board they refer to them as members — that the members will be elected within six months or so, but nevertheless the legislation does indicate that the organization will have time until the end of 1979, until December of 1979, 19 or 20 months, to elect their permanent members and even if those permanent members were elected within 6 months the Act specifically states that within 3 months, Mr. Speaker, within 3 months these provisional members will have to approve an administration bylaw, an administration by law, number one, and the Minister himself had indicated that the promoters of this bill are very anxious to institute a checkoff plan immediately. No doubt they would bring in a check off plan to enable the organization to proceed with its checkoff practically immediately.

That, Mr. Speaker, is going to be done by a provisional board and I'm sorry if the honourable Member for Pembina who prides himself in having received a post-secondary education at the expense of the taxpayers of Manitoba didn't learn to read sufficiently well to understand that within the bill. It is regrettable, it is regrettable and I would hope the hell that he would read it sometime before the debate on this bill is completed. —(Interjection)— Now that this provisional board will have to do. Responsible to us? No, no, responsible to the Minister, no, responsible to no one, Mr. Speaker.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I look at what the administration bylaw is to contain. It starts off, I'm not going to make specific reference to sections but it starts off by dealing with general provisions such as registration of producers and election of members of the association, the usual and so forth, —(Interjection)— and we will come to that in a minute too. And, yes, I will deal with that, I will deal with that in about three minutes if the Honourable Member for Pembina will be patient. Then, looking at the section that the Honourable Member for Pembina is so concerned about and reading that in the light of the section that sets out what the administration bylaw is to contain, the administration bylaw or bylaw regulation or whatever the correct term is, administration bylaw. It is to establish rules to determine those producers who are eligible to vote for the purpose of electing the members of the association and to vote at meetings of registered producers. So this group of 14 they may say that only producers of Charlais cattle, only producers of exotic breeds can vote, only owners of herds of a certain size can vote, only owners of herds of a certain size of a certain breed of cattle can be elected members and so forth. —(Interjection)— Only Conservatives could be elected, only Conservatives could be elected, so, Mr. Speaker, when you look at that section of the Act, when you look at that section of the Act then the opting out section becomes complete garbage and meaningless.

Now, of course, some honourable members will say, "Ah, yes but there is provision for amending the Administration By like law." Well, Mr. Speaker, I would you to consider that how the Administration Bylaw can be amended, and it starts off by saying, you know, it sounds very nice it can be repealed, amended, reenacted, all sorts of things by 60 percent vote of those voting at any annual or special general meeting. All right so far, so good, but let's keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that we don't know, at this point in time we don't know which of the 14,000 producers will be allowed to vote. We don't know that. The group of 14 wise men, that gang is going to tell us, that gang is going to tell us who's going to be eligible to vote, who's going to be eligible to run for office.

Now and then of course, Mr. Speaker, there might be a matter of concern to a producer who's a non-registered producer and it might be a matter of concern to him because he's being nailed as two bits a head or whatever they're going to charge him every time he sells an animal, and they might pass some other regulation. They might send an RCMP officer down to his place to demand his books and open his mail and so forth, so it might be of great concern to him but he's a non-registered producer because perhaps he had opted out, but nevertheless he has to opt out every year perhaps, we don't know what the opting out procedure is going to be. So the association may want to pass a very type of regulation that's going to affect that non-registered producer Mr. Speaker, at the point prior to his opting out because we don't know. We don't know what provision will be made for opting out and neither does the Member for Pembina. —(Interjection)— Perhaps he should check, I don't know whether he would qualify for membership in here or not, I know that the Member for Wolseley does because from time to time he may be in possession of cattle as a bailiff and that makes him eligible for membership, so if he doesn't qualify let him check with the Member for Wolseley.

You know there's also another strange provision. Suppose the association wants to make some change that they know may meet with the disapproval of a large number of the non-registered producers. How do they do it? The secretary does not send out a notice, he phones a few people and they come to the meeting because it says, "But where required notice of an amendment of an administration bylaw has not been given, that unanimous vote of those voting on such resolution is required to approve the amendment," so he calls those that he knows will support the amendment, they meet. A quorum of them meets and the secretary says, "Gee I'm sorry, I'm sorry, ladies and gentlemen but I have forgotten to send out the notice." And they say to him, "You needn't apologize, Mr. Secretary, because what we're proposing to do has our unanimous consent anyway." And it's done, without the knowledge of the producers, Mr. Speaker, without the knowledge of the producers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so that, Mr. Speaker, I consider to be the ultimate example of a dictatorship, that is the ultimate example of a dictatorship. Giving the power to an independent organization, accountable to no one, to put people in jail which is the power they have. Now, it's true it says that no judge shall convict anyone unless, and there's a section there that says, unless the registration was filed under the Regulations Act. Mr. Speaker, how many of the 14,000 producers, of those who may not be registered producers, are going to sit on the doorstep of wherever the office is where regulations are being filed to check from day to day to find out if there is or is not a regulation that adversely affects them. That's nonsense.

And then the other, now this really is crazy, "Or it is satisfied that the accused had actual notice of the regulation prior to the commission of the offense". Well, that's easy to do. Some member

will, you know, I don't know what constitutes notice, I suppose. . . —(Interjection)— well maybe, maybe not, maybe just overhearing some gossip in the local general store may constitute notice, we don't know, we don't know.

Well, Mr. Speaker, before 4:30 I also want to touch upon . . . but I'm going to come to that later because I'm tempted to say that the Minister of Agriculture lied, I'm tempted to say that but I'm very much tempted to say it, but what I am going to say is that the Minister misled the House and I'm going to deal with that, I'm going to deal with that on Friday and I'm going to point out to the Honourable Minister how he misled the House by saying that this legislation is similar to that in other provinces, British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario, and I will demonstrate to the Honourable Minister that the difference between this legislation and that in Saskatchewan passed by the Thatcher Government, by the Thatcher government in 1970, is about as different as day is from night. I will show it to him that in Saskatchewan the board appointed there does not have the right to send people to jail, however, I will come to that later. The organization is not of the same kind because it is accountable to the Legislature through the Minister of Agriculture. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, when that Minister simmers down a bit I would like to continue and I hope that you will not penalize me for the time taken up by him.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, paves the way to provide for a take-over of the beef producing industry by the big operators despite the restriction contained in here, or stated in here that's not to engage in marketing, but it can do that in a variety of other ways. This bill provides for the establishment of an organization which will be nothing more than a front for a publicly involuntarily funded political pressure group, for a group that would serve as a means of political payoff to supporters, because after all. Mr. Speaker, the bill says that it's object is to concern itself with the economic well-being of the cattle and beef industry. They may decide that it would be in their interests to kick out the NDP and to fund election campaigns to defeat the NDP, there's nothing to prevent them from doing that, and this under the blessings of a government bill. The Member for Roblin should be ashamed of saying that. To provide funds for small wealthy groups who cannot find funding for their purposes elsewhere. So therefore they say, well look the Minister says well look you can't fund your operations, but we'll impose a scheme that'll tax the 14,000 beef producers in Manitoba, with the exception of those who will opt out, but you will have all kinds of funds under government legislation to do the things that you want to do to support the Canadian Cattlemen's Association. You can send all the funds that you want to them, no control in here, we don't know whether the funds are going to be used in Manitoba or to support the CCA, that we don't know, Mr. Speaker.

Now that brings me to the point that I wanted to deal with in the few minutes that I have remaining. I believe that I will have some more time when the bill is called next. Now the Honourable Member for Pembina is nattering away about Section 7.(2). Well, Mr. Speaker, you know that on second reading we cannot make specific references to sections of the bill. But you will also recall, Mr. Speaker, that in my debate earlier I told him that the opting out section in the bill, or the provision for opting out in the bill is meaningless when you read it in the full context of the bill, it's a refund and not opting out. But as I've said, despite the education the Honourable Minister received at the expense of the people of Manitoba, obviously it didn't serve him well enough to enable him to understand that.

So, that brings me to dealing with the comparison between the Manitoba bill and the legislation of other provinces.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, the hour being 4:30 p.m. we are now going into Private Members' Hour, I want to tell the Honourable Member he has 14 minutes left when this matter next comes up.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The first item for business on the Private Members' Hour, I believe has been handled by the Member for St. Johns.

ORDER FOR RETURN NO. 55

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I guess it should be, the Honourable the Minister of Finance indicated that he would accept this Order for Return, and I said that in that case I would ask for approval to withdraw it, however, I discussed it with the Deputy Clerk and with the House Leader and I think the proper procedure would be to place it on the record that the Order for Return as submitted — and I can move it again if necessary — has been accepted and, therefore, it shall stand as an Order for Return, accepted.

MR. SPEAKER: It seems to me that perhaps the honourable member should withdraw his motion that it be transferred for debate.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I will comply with any suggestion that puts it on record that this Order for Return has been accepted and on that basis I will technically withdraw the request that it be transferred for debate and it stands then as accepted by the government.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that then agreeable? (Agreed)

RESOLUTION NO. 2 — EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

MR. SPEAKER: On the Proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Brandon East, the Member for Churchill has 20 minutes.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like today to address myself not so much to the overall resolution and the impact that it has on the Manitoba economy but I'd like to speak to this resolution in what I would term "parochial" terms. Unemployment is a large problem and it's too large to even attempt to define in the 20 short minutes that are allotted on a resolution such as this. So, today rather than do that, rather than to confront the overall problem, I would prefer to speak in terms of what is happening in northern Manitoba at this time. I would like, not so much to talk about the solutions in this debate today, because there will be time enough for that in the near future in this House for the government is building increasing unemployment into the economy with their antiquated dogma and their shortsighted perspective of economics. They are ensuring that we will have, in the years to come, much opportunity to discuss the unemployment problem not only in northern Manitoba but in all of Manitoba.

I'd like to talk about the problem specifically though, Sir, in the north of this province, north of the 53rd, in fairly explicit terms so that we, as members of the House, realize the extent of the unemployment problem in that part of the province and so that we confront the needs, the needs that exist today for positive action and so that we can move to fill those needs in long-term, Sir, long-term solutions with far-reaching solutions.

Now the government is not, obviously not, entirely to blame for the high rates of unemployment that face us in Manitoba today, in northern Manitoba but I feel that they are to blame for aggravating the situation, Sir. The situation that confronted them last October was not of their making, it is a worldwide situation, it is a nation wide situation. But they did aggravate it and I'd like to talk about how they aggravated it, I'd like to speak on how they aggravated it in the north because in the north, Sir, the need is great and because the need is so great they have failed so miserably in answering that need.

First, they failed to answer the challenge created by the layoffs from International Nickel and. Sir, they were forced into failing to meet that challenge, they could do not otherwise, because theirs, as they have mentioned many times in the House, they mention it in their speeches, they have mentioned in their Throne Speech, theirs is a philosophy of dependence upon the private sector, upon private enterprise. It is a very pragmatic fact, Mr. Speaker, that when you depend on someone or when you depend on something you have to take what those people offer you. They were forced into taking what Inco had to offer and what Inco had to offer them as a new government who were staking their reputation on private enterprise, what Inco had to offer them was layoffs and mine closures. They, in turn, had to accept it and they, in turn, had to apologize for their friends at Inco, which they did. They were doomed to inaction, Mr. Speaker, by their own philosophy. Perhaps we could forgive them their subservience to private enterprise because it is their philosophy, it is their dogma, and we could perhaps forgive that if they had turned around at that point and tried to use their influence in government and try to use their powers to revitalize the economy that had been struck that blow last October in northern Manitoba. Had they attempted to buffer the negative impact that Inco's actions would have on the north, then we could be, Sir, perhaps forgiving of their apologizing for the actions of Inco. But they didn't do that, Sir, they did not attempt to buffer, they did not make any attempt to revitalize the economy. In turn, they aggravated the situation.

They cut back, Sir, in Hydro operations. They turned a town in my constituency, Sundance, which was a growing viable booming town, they turned it into a ghost town, Mr. Speaker. Last October, when they became the government, October of 1977, 894 skilled tradespeople were working in the Long Spruce-Limestone area of the province near Sundance. I checked just today with one of the representatives from the Allied Hydro Council and he informed me, Sir, that as of the last week in April, which are their last figures, there were 225 skilled tradespeople on the same site. A little fast arithmetic tells us about 669 skilled tradespeople had left the Sundance area in the eight short

months that this government had been in power. These, Sir, were boilermakers, electricians, operating engineers, carpenters, experienced labourers, people who were, by their skills, having positive influence and impact on Manitoba's economy. What happens to those people that are forced to leave the Limestone-Long Spruce sites, the Sundance area, Mr. Speaker? Well, some of them go on unemployment insurance and as governments we are forced to support them while waiting for another job. The more mobile ones, Mr. Speaker, the ones that don't have families to tie them down, the ones that are used to travelling around, leave the province and what we have in that case, Sir, is an exodus of our skilled tradespeople.

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, which is one of the prime suppliers of skilled tradespeople to the Hydro construction sites, normally has approximately 40 of their Manitoba on what they call travellers' permits. What that means, Sir, is that they are on a permit given to them by the union to allow them to work outside of the province on other jobs, to take their skills outside of the province, to aid and to have positive impact on other provincial economies. They now have about 100 members on travellers' permits so in that one union alone, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, we have driven 60 skilled electricians, 60 skilled workers, out of this province by this government's actions, by this government's cutbacks in Hydro production and they, Sir, will be reluctant to return if this government ever decides to revitalize the economy in the north by Hydro projects. They will not want to return to this province because once driven away, they will have moved, they will have settled down, they will have put roots into other provinces and they will not want to come back to Manitoba that so callously turned them away just a few short months ago.

While the government, Mr. Speaker, has failed the industrial communities in the north by its lack of action on one hand and by its shortsighted stupidity on the other, they have done that basically, Sir, I believe out of ignorance. But their treatment of the permanent residents of the traditional communities of the north, Sir, that, Mr. Speaker, has bordered on economic racism. They have attacked the job creating opportunities for northern people with a vengeance not seen for many long decades in this province, Sir. They have cut back job creating opportunities for native people; they have dismantled job creating opportunities for native people; they have disestablished — to use their word — job creating opportunities for native people, so they've done everything but the right thing for the native people of this province in northern Manitoba.

If the situation in the industrial communities was deteriorating when they took office the situation in the traditional communities was deplorable, Sir. I say that standing here knowing full well that we were the government previous to them. In eight short years the New Democratic government was unable to erase the effects of hundreds of years of neglect but we tried and we were still trying in October and we intend to keep on trying when we become the government again in a few short years. It's a long, it's an uphill, and it's a hard battle but we were making progress, Mr. Speaker. We were going forward with programs like Pakwagan Logging operation in Wabowden, the Churchill Prefab Plant, the Minago Contractors, all programs designed to give the opportunity for native people to participate in a wage economy if they so wished and to allow them to enter at their own pace, because they were coming, Sir, from a different economy, a traditional economy. They were coming from a different culture and the impact that met them when they entered the wage economy was sometimes too much to expect anyone to overcome so we developed programs that allowed them to step in to that wage economy at their own pace. We did that because we recognized, Sir, the disservice that had been done to them throughout the centuries before and we wanted to correct it. That was an honest intention on our part, we wanted to correct, we wanted to make up for that disservice that had been done to them at the hands of private enterprise.

We were unable to do that, Mr. Speaker, in eight short years and, as understandable as that is, because it was a problem of tremendous magnitude that faced us, as understandable as it was that we were unable to do it in eight short years, it is also unfortunate. It is most unfortunate in light of what is happening in northern Manitoba today, Sir, because that government, Sir, in eight short months, as a result of their vengeful attack, have undone what I would consider to be eight years of honest effort to correct some of the injustices that existed when we became the government, that existed when they became the government and that will no doubt, because of their lack of any sort of farsighted policies, will exist when we become the government again.

What did they do, Mr. Speaker, in the northern communities that were relying on these programs to allow their members, to allow their residents to enter into the wage economy? Well, we talked this afternoon about the Pakwagan program. The Pakwagan program operating first out of Jenpeg and most recently out of Wabowden was employing five people as nilling logs — not a large number, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps — and I'm using an estimate here — perhaps ten people cutting logs to supply that mill with the logs for building prefab cabins, a total of 15 people. They callously,

Sir, one day said, "That program will no longer exist." I happened to be driving through Wabowden and I did not know of their actions at that time, I had no idea, and I stopped at the Pakwagan plant because I wanted to see how they were progressing under this new government. I went up to one of the workers there who I know and I said to him, "How are things going? How are orders?" — just sort of general talk — How do you do?" "Fine." "W what's the weather like?" — and he said, "Jay, they're closing us down tomorrow." I said, "What do you mean, they're closing you down tomorrow?" He said, "Exactly what I say, we won't be operating after tomorrow." I said, "Well what's going to happen with these logs that you have on hand?" He says, "I don't know," he said, "They didn't tell us what they were going to do in the future, they just told us they were going to close us down." Well, I said to my friend, "Well, what are you going to do?" He said, "I've had a job for 27 years; I've never been without a job for 27 years," he said, "but I'm going on unemployment insurance now." I was sort of taken aback by that and I said to him, "Well, why don't you go out and get another job?" He said, "There aren't any." I said, "What do you mean, there aren't any?" He said, "Look around you. There just aren't any more jobs in the north." That man today is on unemployment, that's how he's existing. Here is a person who had a work ethic, Sir, who had that work ethic driven out of him by the actions of that government.

The Churchill Prefab Plant — another example, Sir. When CBC announced that they were withdrawing their station from Churchill the Minister of Northern Affairs was one of the first to react and he sent out a news release saying how he felt that the action of them withdrawing their services from this town of Churchill — that meant, Sir, laying off ten people or taking ten people out of the economy — he thought that those actions were at cross-purposes with the future of a viable and growing Churchill so he made an intervention. Yet, when the time came to close down the Churchill Prefab Plant, he didn't experience any of those same feelings, Mr. Speaker, and that, Sir, created layoffs numbering about 75 people in that community, approximately 25 at the plant itself and approximately 50 support workers, private contractors in the community, mostly native people, Mr. Speaker.

They did the same thing at the Prefab Plant in Cranberry Portage, another 15 people lost to the economy in northern Manitoba. Minago Contractors, it's another topic that has come up quite frequently and quite often in this House in recent days. Thirty people, Sir, who are no longer working productive jobs because of the actions of that government. —(Interjection)— Free Manitoba, one of my colleagues tells me, free Manitoba from the drudgery of an honest day's work I guess it should have been, because these people, Sir, are people who want to work. They are people who have proven that they want to work by their past work records and they cannot work today because there are no jobs available. They cannot work today because this government will not live up to its responsibility, will not live up to the responsibility to northern Manitoba in particular, Sir, in specific, and to all of Manitoba in general.

A record like they have managed to create in eight short months, Sir, can only give cause to some very legitimate alarm, to some very legitimate concerns as to what they are going to do to the economy in the near future because they refuse to live up to that responsibility.

Sir, in the Indian Reserves in Manitoba, on the reserves themselves, over 43 percent of the people over 15 years of age have never worked in a wage-economy job. That is a startling statistic. And for all the efforts and the money and the time and the dedication that we pumped in to try to create an opportunity for those people to work, if they so desired, for all those efforts, Sir, still today 43 percent of people over 15 years of age have not worked for wages on Indian reserves in Manitoba. We were able to improve them a bit, Sir, but not as much as we would have liked to. But what this government has done in the eight short months is ensured that that 43 percent will not stay the same. They've ensured that it will not improve. They, by their actions, or by their lack of actions, have ensured that that number will grow and that the problems that result from those people not being able to find productive work will increase.

In 1972 and 1973 the per capita income, Sir, of Canada as a whole was \$3,839, and in Manitoba we were just a bit below that with \$3,594.00. In the north we were a bit below that with \$2,950 per year. But in the 10 urban centres in the north Sir, the per capita income was \$4,019; and in the 46 traditional communities, Metis communities, reserve communities, Sir, the per capita income was \$793, and a third of that came from transfers from government funds.

Those per capita figures, Sir, are close to the per capita figures of Chile and Mexico. They're close to many third-world countries. Mr. Speaker, they demand immediate, comprehensive and far-reaching solutions, solutions that unfortunately I haven't been able to see come forth from this government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

Mr. Speaker, over this winter it is unfortunate that many communities have had to rely on the Federal Government Winter Works Programs, the Job Creation Programs, the LIP Programs, in order to keep themselves off welfare. Mr. Speaker, the people in northern Manitoba do not want to be dependent on welfare, they have made that very clear to the government, they have made that very clear to anyone who would listen to them.

Mr. Speaker, maybe members will recall a few years ago when the fisheries had to be closed in certain places because of mercury pollution. We were faced with the problem there of making some payments directly to the people that had been fishing or to making payments to draw up projects so that those fishermen could have employment. We, of course, took the latter process because having to go on welfare is a very humiliating experience; having to deal with welfare is a humiliating experience and nobody wants to be in that situation. People are only in that situation when they are forced to, when the economy is such; when government policies and programs are such that they really have no choice and end up having to accept welfare, end up having to go on Unemployment Insurance, as my colleague has said.

Mr. Speaker, I think we could stand here and clearly list the numerous policies, the numerous programs, that have caused unemployment in northern Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, in those communities where the community has some spirit, where they feel they want to do something, where they want to accomplish something, the members opposite have criticized, "Oh, that was a Make-Work Program," or "This was a Make-Work Program." Well, Mr. Speaker, when somebody's been unemployed, when somebody has had to get down on their hands and knees to welfare, a Make-Work Program can be a very important thing for some of the people in that community. When a project was approved to create a recreation area in a community, yes, it was a make-work project.

But the men and women who were out of work, who had to rely on welfare, were very pleased to have that kind of work, that kind of opportunity:

1. To do something productive and worthwhile for their own community, and
2. To be able to support themselves because in our society, Mr. Speaker, that is our ethic, that is the morality of our society; that is our approach, that a person has to work, that a person has to be able to support himself; and the meaning of being a person in our society is that you're able to support yourself. The people of northern Manitoba want to be in that position, want to be able to support themselves and want to have the opportunity for employment.

Mr. Speaker, this unemployment now has affected the urban centres through INCO layoffs, affecting the urban centres through a complicated program and policy that deserve discussion, the computerization of telephone services, where many telephone operators in Thompson, The Pas, Selkirk, will be laid off because of this approach. This approach was started when we were in government. I personally wasn't aware of it. The Premier of the day had some concern about it and expressed it to telephone system people, that in rural and northern areas they might be moving too fast and creating unemployment at an unreasonable rate in the way they were operating.

According to the people that I talked to in The Pas, the telephone operators at The Pas, the service will not be improved. What it will basically do is make a more efficient service because they'll be able to reduce the number of people, and if you reduce the number of people, then there is some cost savings to you in the long run. Although, when a province is short of capital or we put capital and current together, it doesn't make that much sense, and it doesn't make that much sense from an overall point of view, when people become unemployed because of government policy and programs, or policy and programs of Crown corporations, then have to receive funds from another source of the government anyway. So that the savings that are saved by Manitoba Telephone System could easily be lost to the Province of Manitoba through other kinds of transfer payments.

Mr. Speaker, this is the point that I have always argued in terms of northern Manitoba, especially in terms of remote northern Manitoba, that in fact that it's more wise to spend some money, to stimulate the economy. In some cases, even wiser to spend some money in subsidizing a project, subsidizing an economic development and employment program because it's cheaper to the people of Manitoba in the long run. When people are employed the whole community atmosphere changes; the social problems decline but when people are unemployed then you have a problem — the court costs go up, the police costs go up, the welfare costs go up, all the other costs that the Province of Manitoba and the Government of Canada must bear, increase. So, in effect, the people are losing money in their effort to save money. That is the policy, that is the program that this government has undertaken. That is their approach to development. In a couple of cases they've even realized that — they kept the Youth Employment Program going although at a reduced level. Mr. Speaker, I used to have some problems with that program. In some communities where there were a large number of adults unemployed, it didn't make that much sense to get some students summer employment when adults were out of work and dependent upon welfare or other kind of transfer payments.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments on this Resolution and maybe add a little bit to what my colleague from Churchill constituency has said in regard to the effect of unemployment in the northern part of our province. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, as he said, the northern area of our province has been probably the hardest hit in the remote areas and even now in the industrial centres in northern Manitoba, and they've been directly hit by the government, by their policies and programs and the cutbacks of this present existing government in the Province of Manitoba.

But in most of the communities there was that kind of development; there were opportunities for employment and when there were those opportunities the adults took advantage of them. Now we even have a reduction in the Youth Employment section. At the same time, most of those students will get a job under the Youth Employment Program, but their parents will not have work. So it doesn't make that much sense. It doesn't make any logical sense at all from an economic point of view or from a people point of view.

The Meer for Churchill mentioned some of the projects but, Mr. Speaker, some of them were necessary, ongoing and continuing kind of programs. MHRC had a number of small plants where they provided housing under the Rural and Native Housing Program. It is my understanding that those plants have been closed down by MHRC; that those people are now thrown out of work because of that step.

In the community of Easterville, we had an operation called Easterville Harvesting and, Mr. Speaker, that operation was losing some funds. The government had to subsidize or make up the difference in the ongoing cost of that operation. That operation employed up to 20 people at the low period and up to 60 people when the fishermen were off the lakes, and rather than the fishermen going on Unemployment Insurance they would go work at the cutting operation. So that created employment to that community, an opportunity and hope in that community. That program was cut almost the day that this government took office. They were told that there would be no more assistance for that program, that that program would be coming to an end. A month ago there was a big meeting in the community of Easterville asking for increased police protection because of the increase in crime, the increase in drinking in that community, especially amongst the young people who would have had an opportunity to learn how to cut wood, to learn how to cut fence posts and cut pulpwood, had the Easterville Harvesting continued. So that community can directly receive the results of this government's policy and this government's program of creating unemployment in northern Manitoba.

And Mr. Speaker, maybe there's a little bit of logic when you say -- and I'm not sure that there is -- but maybe in the City of Winnipeg there's a little bit of logic, "Well, maybe somehow if we stimulate industry that'll create the jobs," but it is not a very good argument in the City of Winnipeg and it is a ridiculous argument when you come into northern Manitoba where the private sector is not going to venture because of the high cost of locating in that region. They're going to locate in the City of Winnipeg if they're going to locate and produce in Manitoba at all. So what we have is a dependency on the mining companies, and we are increasing that dependency under this government where we are at their whim. But what happens to the north -- it doesn't matter what happens in this building here; what happens in this building here and in the city of Thompson is almost irrelevant; what happens in New York and Toronto is more important, what decisions are made there about layoffs, investment in money in Indonesia or Guatemala or other countries create employment in those countries with money earned in Canada, lay off people in Canada. So we are at the mercy, in northern Manitoba, of those outside interests.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is some problem having a job creation program or a program that is a make-work program, but it's a darn sight better than having people unemployed; it's a darn sight better than having people on welfare. And Mr. Speaker, many of the programs that have been cut, that have been sabotaged, that have been done away with by this government, were self-sustaining programs; Minago Construction, able to pay its own way, able to earn this government a profit which they'll now return into General Revenue in the Province of Manitoba. Up to a million dollars will go into General Revenue and they'll say, "Look how well we've managed the economy; we've got another million dollars in revenue." In the meantime we have 30 to 40 people unemployed in northern Manitoba because of their action. And their action reaches into many communities that are just starting to get off the ground.

The fact that Northern Affairs has reduced its support program, its assistance programs for those communities to launch their project, that that program has been cut, that in fact they've left the money in there in some cases for the salaries of the civil servants to carry on that program, and no funds to do anything. So, when the President of the Manitoba-Metis Federation criticizes — in today's paper he was quoted as criticizing the Northlands Agreement — that criticism becomes more and more valid because in fact we now do have some civil servants who are on a fairly good salary who have nothing to do because everything they were doing has been cut off by this government, so they are people with very little opportunity to carry on the job they were hired to do and you have people collecting a salary and not really having to work for that salary.

So that's the situation we are faced with, and it's a serious problem in northern Manitoba, and it's an especially serious problem amongst the native people, the Indian and Metis people in northern Manitoba, where projects were just getting under way and where there was some government support and government backup required, and the rug has been pulled out from under those programs. The government will start to see those costs; they'll start to see those costs in the court costs when the bills come in from the Attorney-General's department, they'll start to see those costs from the Welfare Department when the welfare rates increase in northern Manitoba. They'll start to see the money they saved going out in a less productive way, in a less meaningful way.

Besides the native people, Mr. Speaker, another group that is very seriously affected by unemployment are the women in Manitoba, in Canada, and in northern Manitoba. In many of the make-work projects, in some of the pulp cutting projects where the communities were able to make their own way with technical support and backup and some additional transitional or bridge financing from the government, many of the people on those jobs were women in the communities affected, a number of them were. And it was very encouraging to see, for example, in my constituency in the small community of Umperville, where the women took the leadership, applied for assistance, got the recreation grant, hired some women, and they hired a few men as well, to make this recreation area become a reality in their community and provide themselves with meaningful employment and worthwhile community activities. There's some general feeling, Mr. Speaker, that somehow the women aren't seriously affected by unemployment, and all the statistics show that this is not correct because much of the unemployment in Manitoba, much of the unemployment in Canada, is hidden unemployment; people that just give up looking for work. And in the statistics for males in our labour force, the males give up looking for work often in the winter time when they know they can't find any; females often give up, they just give up completely, year round, because they know there is not work available for women within the Manitoba economy, within the Canadian economy.

And this is even more serious, Mr. Speaker, for young women who are under 25 years who just don't have the opportunity to get into the labour force and to establish a work record so that they're able to continue with their employment and be able to look after themselves. There is a feeling around, I suppose, or a myth around, that many women do not have to work, do not have to have employment. And Mr. Speaker, this is not correct because the majority of women in the labour force are either single women who are in the labour force, they are women who are in sole support of their families or family heads, and they are women who are in a family where the total income of the family is at the poverty level, or under the poverty level. So the women in Canada and Manitoba do need to work and the high unemployment is more seriously affecting them than anybody else, and it's more seriously affecting the younger people and the younger women.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's not as if we weren't addressing ourselves to a very serious and very important problem. I know that the present Minister of Northern Affairs, during his election campaign in northern Manitoba, he talked about unemployment. He said that a Conservative government would somehow do something about unemployment and they have, Mr. Speaker, they have done something. They've increased the unemployment in northern Manitoba very drastically; that's what they've done about unemployment, in spite of their promises, in spite of their commitments. And Mr. Speaker, the members opposite who like to comment from their seats all the time —(Interjection)— The Member for Pembina likes to comment from the First Minister's seat; he's getting himself ready, although the Member for St. Matthews is copying the First Minister much more than the Member for Pembina in the hopes that someday he might occupy that particular chair.

But Mr. Speaker, if the community of Morden, or the community of Winkler had an unemployment rate the same as some of the unemployment rates in northern Manitoba, then the member would know there was a crisis; the member would know there was a real problem. If the community of Swan River had an unemployment rate like some of the remote communities the member for there would know there was a real problem. Or if the community of Dauphin had even a quarter of the unemployment rate in many of the remote communities then the member from there would know there was a problem. And this unemployment in northern Manitoba is a serious problem; it's been

increased, it's been added to by this government, by the policies and programs of this government, and it's about time that this government realized that and started taking some positive and definite action, some positive and definite action to assist to recreate some of the employment, some of the economic development that had been taking place in the northern part of our province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East will be closing the debate. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In closing the debate on this resolution I am gratified at the interest of the members of the House in this particular resolution on a very vital and urgent matter of alleviating unemployment. I am pleased at the large participation of members and I was particularly pleased and somewhat surprised at the support provided and given by members of the government side, albeit very reluctant support, but nevertheless even they recognize the seriousness of the situation and have rather reluctantly and perhaps grudgingly given their support. I'm not sure whether all members opposite agree, but some of those who spoke did say that they would support this particular resolution because they realize the seriousness of the situation.

One reason that was given, Mr. Speaker, for support of the resolution was that we're only going to consider the feasibility thereof. Well, for the information of the new members of the House, this is the only way any private member can submit a resolution of this kind which could have some implication for government spending. All you can do in any kind of resolution of this type is to suggest that the government consider the advisability of, and so therefore, for anyone who is suggesting or inferring that we are taking a very weak approach to this, they should know that we are bound by the rules not to be more positive than we would like to be. What we are saying, of course, in this resolution is that the government should move in this fashion, should accelerate construction of housing, should accelerate municipal works as the City of Winnipeg wants to do, for example, should accelerate provincial works and should engage in other job-creating activities.

The statements made from the other side, albeit very interesting in some cases, but in many cases they were simply not true or not correct. I noted yesterday or the day before, the MLA, the Member for Roblin, said while he could support the resolution government simply must cut spending because it's causing inflation. Well, Mr. Speaker, at this stage of the business cycle that we are now experiencing, cutting government spending will do nothing to alleviate inflation. As a matter of fact, if we increase government inflation at this point in time it would not make the inflation situation worse, and I'm suggesting that because we have a great deal of under-capacity in our economy. All that is happening is by cutting back on government spending we are creating unemployment, we are allowing idle resources to be realized, we are allowing resources to stay idle and not be utilized, so government spending, a cut in government spending, will not do anything to alleviate inflation. And the Member for Roblin made that assertion, if I heard him correctly, and I want to say that he is simply not correct.

The Minister of Mines and Resources indicated that the key to our solution is improved productivity, among other things he talked about improved productivity. But I ask, Mr. Speaker, just how do we improve our productivity? There are ways to improve productivity of industry to be more competitive. It includes some pretty fundamental measures such as improving technology, but again, how do you do that? How do you bring that about? That is one key to improving productivity. Another way to improve productivity is to have larger markets so that industries can have larger runs of their production therefore bringing the average cost of production down. But that is not simply done; you don't create larger markets overnight.

So the point is, while we can all agree that a long-run solution is important, is necessary, the fact is that we're dealing with a cyclical situation, we're dealing with a business cycle that at the moment is in the valley, you might say, we're in the depths of the recession or depression, whatever term you like to use, and while we can agree that we would like to see some long-run improvement, long-term improvement in our economy, we do have some serious difficulties to overcome in the shorter or in the medium-term run. And therefore what we need, Mr. Speaker, are some very clear, very positive anti-cyclical policies by government; fiscal policies that will fight and beat back a recession. And Mr. Speaker, we cannot rely on the private sector to get us out of this depression. We cannot rely on the private sector to begin to accelerate investment if the demand for the goods and services provided by the private sector is falling off, as it is falling off. There is excess capacity and the private sector is not going to expand at this point or create more jobs. And therefore we must rely on government to prime the pump, if you will, or to stimulate the economy. And that reliance on government spending need not be anti-business or anti-private sector; far from it. But there seems to be some feeling on the opposite side, Mr. Speaker, that for government to take

initiative is somehow or other not in the best interests of the private sector. Well, that is simply hogwash; it is simply not true. The fact is that an increase in government spending can indeed be very beneficial and will indeed be very beneficial to the private sector; it is not a conflict here. As a matter of fact, it will certainly improve business conditions for private enterprise.

We are, unfortunately, in the views of many economists, we are going to see some very, very sluggish growth in the Province of Manitoba over the next two years. The Royal Bank of Canada issued a forecast recently and it was reported in the *Globe and Mail* of May 11th of this year, just a few days ago, that "Manitoba is expected to grow at a slower rate than the country as a whole over the next two years." They go on and pinpoint farm income, "Farm income which dropped 9.5 percent last year," — I'm quoting from the article — "is expected to decline again this year and the mining sector is depressed. Those two factors in turn make for a gloomy investment picture for the next few years. The picture is not helped by the fact that excess capacity has forced Manitoba Hydro to postpone further work on its Nelson River projects."

So, it is recognized by the Royal Bank of Canada that Manitoba will have a very sluggish economy for two years, so therefore it is incumbent upon the Provincial Government to do something to alleviate the situation. The problem is deficiency of demand; we need to stimulate the economy and we can do that through these measures of public works' spending, municipal, provincial works, housing construction and other job creating programs.

For some reason or other, Mr. Speaker, the Lyon administration of this province, the Premier of this province and his Cabinet, somehow or other seem to be very much afraid of deficit financing. The word deficit is a dirty word in their vocabulary; it's a no-no, it's something that has to be avoided at all cost. But whether we like it or not, governments do engage in deficit financing, in fact they are forced to engage in deficit financing at times of sluggish economy, it happens automatically. On the federal scene, for example, looking at the national economy, the fact is that the economy has slowed down, reducing tax revenues and causing government payments of unemployment insurance to rise. These two factors together automatically make for deficits. They are also at work on the provincial scale. The fact is that if the economy slows down, revenues diminish, the rate of revenue return, revenue received by government diminishes and very often it's very difficult to quickly cut back on government spending and you therefore automatically have a deficit situation.

But instead of getting away from the deficit, we shouldn't be afraid of it, in fact we should be prepared to enlarge it if necessary to counteract the situation. As a matter of fact, if we did eliminate deficits, we would definitely worsen the unemployment situation. As a matter of fact, this is what is happening now. The effort by the government to eliminate the deficit situation, to reduce it, is really adding to unemployment in the province. An estimate has been made by Dr. John McCallum, an economist, as reported in the *Financial Post* of May 13th, on what would happen in Canada if the Federal Government today balanced its budget. In the year 1977, if the Federal Government had balanced its budget instead of having a large deficit, the gross national product would be about \$15 billion lower than the actual level, that is a reduction of 7 percent. Unfortunately, the doctrine that seems to be imbedded in the minds of the government members is that government deficits somehow or other are destroying the economy, that if you remove the red ink, the economy will be returned to health. But this doctrine is simply incorrect and indeed disastrous. I suggest that if we remove the deficits federally, as has been estimated by this one economist, you would reduce the gross national product by \$15 billion, and what is happening in Manitoba by the restraint and cutback exercises of this government, we are actually reducing the gross provincial product.

I would like to remind honourable members that there is one very prominent Conservative politician in Canada who is not afraid of deficit spending. As a matter of fact, his particular administration was noted for vast deficits. This particular person was one-time Prime Minister of Canada and, of course, I'm talking about the Right Honourable John D. Diefenbaker who was Prime Minister, I believe, from the years 1957 to 1964, well, they were 1957 to what? — 1963? 1963. All right. In that period of time, Mr. Diefenbaker was the Prime Minister, he led one of the first Conservative administrations that this country realized or experienced since the 1930s. In the period of Mr. Diefenbaker, we experienced a very very heavy deficit in the years 1957 to 1964. Now that goes beyond Mr. Diefenbaker's period but essentially covers the Conservative years. The Government of Canada experienced a deficit year after year after year, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, and 1964, that entire period was a period characterized by very heavy deficits in the large by the Federal Government. Why did Mr. Diefenbaker go in for heavy deficit spending? Because the economy of Canada experienced a very bad economic recession as I believe this province is experiencing today, and he was forced to go into that whether he liked it or not. This is the point that I'm making. But thank goodness he did go into this deficit spending because the economic

situation in Canada would be a lot worse than it was if that hadn't occurred.

You say, well, where will it all stop? You know, we can't go on spending forever. Well, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that if you take all governments in Canada, federal and provincial, from the year 1964 right through to the year 1974, there were surpluses continuously, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, and until 1974 there was a surplus if you take the federal and provincial governments together. While we had years of deficits, we have years of surpluses, and I suggest this is the time for deficit financing, this is the time for government to spend more in order to accelerate the economy. The important thing, of course, is not just to look at the deficit *per se* but to relate the size of the deficit to the gross national product or to the gross provincial product, or what have you. —(Interjection)— Sorry? Well, the Member for Roblin says that it doesn't work. Mr. Speaker, it's very evident that it can and will work.

I know the job creation program that the NDP government brought in a couple of years ago was much maligned by my friends opposite, they were very critical of it. Last year our program was, I believe, \$32.5 million but we know that that money went toward creating thousands of jobs in this province that wouldn't have been created otherwise, not only employment for youth but employment for older people, employment in the north, employment in all the communities in Manitoba that saw fit to have various municipal projects, community association projects and so on.

I can relate one experience in my own constituency of the City of Brandon last year. A group engaged in respite care. This is a program to help parents who have mentally retarded and handicapped children, allow them to get away once in a while. They are hoping to keep their children at home, they don't want to institutionalize them; they are, therefore, saving the taxpayers' money but, from time to time, it is necessary for these people to get a break. Last year, through one of our job creation programs, there were some nursing assistants, licensed practical nurses, who were made available to help these people, and for the first time in many years, they had a break and, as a result, they were able to keep their children at home and out of institutions that much longer, to that greater degree. Therefore, it really, I believe, is a net saving; we put two or three people to work, we help people in a very worthwhile endeavour.

Well, you can repeat this type of story many times over, hundreds of times over, Mr. Speaker, by going through the listing of jobs that were created under the program with community associations, with municipalities, with school divisions, with private enterprise, or jobs in small business and so on. The fact is —(Interjection)— yes, they are short-term but better short-term than no employment whatsoever. I think that the greatest sin surely must be the unutilization of human resources. The greatest error that we can commit, the greatest mistake that we can make as a society is to allow human resources to go under-utilized. I think it's a shame that there are 5,000 or so young people in particular who want to get into our community colleges today but will not be accepted because the Department of Education believes that there will be no jobs for them at the other end; about 5,000 applications will be turned down. I think that this is sad; it's a condemnation of our economic situation; it's a condemnation of our society that we're not prepared to do something to give work to our young people and to people in the north, to people in disadvantaged situations and indeed to all people who are ready, willing and able to work. I think it's probably the greatest social sin in our society that is occurring right now, that we have thousands of people who are unemployed.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government take this matter seriously, reverse its position on deficit financing, be prepared to go out boldly and put the people of Manitoba to work. There are Manitobans who want to work, who are begging for jobs, who are saying, "Give us the opportunity to work," and I say that through this anti-cyclical way that we can at least alleviate the recession, stimulate the private sector and put thousands of people to work who would not be at work otherwise. So I commend this resolution to the members of the House for their support and I thank all the members for participating in the debate.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. EVANS: I was going to ask for Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, while we're calling in the members, could my honourable friend the Government Whip announce some changes for committees?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government Whip.

Wednesday, May 17, 1978

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Yes, Mr. Speaker, changes on Private Bills would be Mr. Domino for Mr. Blake, Mr. Wilson for Mr. Einarson and Mr. Gourlay for Mr. McGregor.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Axworthy, Cherniack, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Evans, Ferguson, Fox, Galbraith, Gourlay, Green, Hanuschak, Hyde, Johnston, Jorgenson, Kovnats, McBryde, McKenzie, Mercier, Miller, Parasiuk, Mrs. Price, Messr. Ransom.

NAYS: None.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 26, Nays 0.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the Motion carried. The hour being 5:30 p.m. the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 p.m. tomorrow afternoon. (Thursday)