

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

TIME: 8:00 p.m.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Opposition House Leader on a Point of Order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a matter of privilege affecting all of the members of the House. This afternoon the Minister of Tourism was asked with respect to a 200 condominium development in the Whiteshell and he indicated that such a development was not approved. Mr. Peter Warren of CJOB has given me a Development Agreement, Mr. Speaker, that purports to be signed by D. W. Gallagher for the Province of Manitoba indicating a developer agrees to construct, amongst other things, a road such as has been mentioned by the First Minister, over a period of five years from the signing of this Agreement, approximately 200 condominium units for recreational accommodation.

And in No. 4 of the item, "The Province agrees to permit the above described development and cooperate in the rapid processing of related documents."

Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister's answers, I felt that I should table this matter with the House so as to make sure that there hasn't been a signature signed by the Province of Manitoba which has not been properly placed there or has been placed there by someone who didn't have the authority to do so. It's signed by D. W. Gallagher for the Province of Manitoba, permitting a condominium development of 200 units in the area that was referred to this afternoon.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your continuance in office as the arbiter of this Chamber and the keeper of the rights and privileges of all members of this House and to wish you well in your endeavours in the future and also to welcome the election of the Honourable Member for Radisson to the position of Deputy Speaker and Chairman of House Committees. I wish him well in his endeavours and I have already assured him that I will try to abide by the rules and give him any help that I can in that respect. I am sure that he will do a good job as a former arbiter on the grid-iron. I'm sure that he will be able to call on the experience that he has had in many years of officiating in the Western Football Conference. This is not quite the same field of endeavour but I think that the experience that he has gained will stand him in good stead and, after all, much that goes to making your job easier is using your good common sense and judgment of fair play and I am sure that you will do that job to the best of your ability.

I wish also to congratulate the mover — I see he is not here this evening — and the seconder of the Reply to the Speech From the Throne.

It's a very difficult task, especially a Throne Speech that is so dearth of really anything very constructive, to say very many nice things about it. I guess the Honourable Member for Crescentwood and the member for Portage were hard-put to say anything nice about it but they attempted in their best manner and I congratulate them for that job.

This being the first regular session of the Legislature . . . The trial run that we had last Fall or the early winter was mainly dealing with five Bills and so we really have not had an opportunity, as members of the opposition and as a province, for the people of Manitoba to see what the present government is going to do.

We have now seen their Throne Speech and, as I've said before, the main salient feature of it is that it really doesn't say very much of anything except it preaches restraint, restraint, restraint, and while this may be all right I don't think this is exactly what the people of Manitoba bargained for on October 11th.

The unfortunate thing, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly, is that the government with their restraint programs, the people who are going to suffer most are those in our society who are the least able to defend themselves — nominally the aged, the infirm and the disadvantaged in our society. These are the people who will suffer the most.

It's too bad that the Minister of Health and Social Development is not here this evening because I've been bombarded with letters. I only happened to bring a couple here, which I will read. This is just one example of what the restraints and the threatened restraints are going to do.

These are constituents of mine, and I've had letters also from people who are not constituents of mine who are living in other constituencies. But here is one that is addressed to the Minister of Health, a copy to myself, a copy to the Premier, a copy also to the Leader of the Opposition. It is addressed to the Honourable Bud Sherman, Minister of Health and Social Development.

"Dear Mr. Bud Sherman: This letter is in regards to the child care policies being formulated at present by the government. I would like to express my concerns regarding these proposed policies. According to my salary I would not be able to afford an increase in my Day Care rates.

Another concern of mine is the quality of care that I receive at the Day Care my son is presently at and I wouldn't want to move him to another if this one was closed down.

I hope this sufficiently expresses my concern regarding this matter."

Another one that is signed Annabel Mercer . . . And for the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, I don't read letters into the record that are not signed; this letter is signed.

Another one here addressed to the Minister signed by a Miss Beverley Sadako. She is a single working parent of a two-year-old child. —(Interjection)— Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, that is just about the height of mentality that I would expect, the remark from the Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

This one is addressed, "Dear Sir," again to the Minister of Health and Social Development.

"I am a single working parent with a two-year old daughter who has attended the Knox Day Nursery. I have recently received a letter from the nursery stating that because your government is planning cutbacks in the area of child day care, the present nursery fee of \$6.00 a day may be raised.

This news is very distressing to me. The \$6.00 fee which I now pay adds up to quite a chunk of my monthly budget, as I must pay the full fee even on those days when my daughter was absent due to illness.

It is becoming increasingly difficult to bear the burden of this cost in addition to my other daily living expenses. Hearing that your government may not increase day care budgets at all from their last year's levels is disheartening indeed. It is very commendable that your government wishes to put an end to needless spending but the line must be drawn when it comes to necessities such as this.

There are countless numbers of persons in my position. If Day Care subsidies are denied and the fees are raised, a lot of us will give up trying to make ends meet and will have to quit our jobs and enroll on welfare." (Maybe that's what the government wants. I don't know.)

"If I can't have my child properly looked after when I'm at work the only recourse left for me is to stay at home myself and take care of her, job or no job. A few thousand more people swelling the welfare rolls would tend to negate any benefits from your cutback measures.

Don't penalize us. We are trying to earn a living on our own. Help us and you are helping the government strengthen its economy. Sincerely, Miss Beverley Sadako."

And I've had many many letters like this, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: So have I and they're all . . .

MR. JENKINS: The Member for Wolseley seems to be a bit pitching in and filling in for the Minister of Health who is not here this evening. Well, that's fine and dandy, he'll have his opportunity to make his contribution to the debate in this House.

So this is one of the areas, and one of the many areas, where we're seeing where the government is, with its policy of restraint, cutting back. And it is the people as I said before, least able to defend themselves in our society who will be the ones who will suffer the most, namely the people who have to have their children in Day Care Centres in order that they can go to work. These people have a lot of pride. They don't want to exist on welfare. They want to be able to try and make their way on their own. We certainly are not going to encourage that when we see the threat of raising the fees and cutting back the Day Care grant of \$500.00. All these things added up, Mr. Speaker, certainly do not augur well for the people of Manitoba.

And now we have here also cutbacks in the field of housing. Senior citizens' homes are being cut back. Low income housing is — talk of it disappearing — people will be able to go out and get private housing at a lower cost. And I also see on this evening's news an interview that there is talk of the Rent Controls disappearing and, of course, Mr. Silverman said, "Well, that's fine because if the people can't pay that they will find cheaper accommodation." Well there is no cheaper accommodation, that is the unfortunate thing. What are they going to live in? Tents and tepees, wigwams? That is what we are advocating. Well, that is pretty damn cold in the winter time I can assure you. —(Interjection)— Yes, I have been looking at cartoons and I can see quite a bunch of political cartoons over there. There is one unfortunate thing about political jokes, sometimes they become elected.

You know we are seeing where the public sector is being shunted aside and the First Minister is putting all his eggs in the private sector basket. He is hoping, hoping against hope, and I am making a prediction, he is going to be tough, going to be tough for a year, maybe two years, hoping against hope that somehow or other the economy is going to have an upswing and I can tell you that all the long-range indicators point the other way. And if Joe Clark or Joe Cluck, or whatever you call him in Ottawa, is elected we are going to see what is happening here in Manitoba happening on a national scale all across this country — unemployment.

You know the whole area of public confidence is being shaken by the actions of this government. Not only in the Civil Service, no. —(Interjection)— The civil servants are happy. Yeah, they are happy going to the guillotine. I wonder who is Madam LaFarge over there, knitting while the guillotine drops. —(Interjection)— The fellow with the long hair. Perhaps they don't know who Madam LaFarge was.

It is not only the Civil Service that is being affected. Fear and apprehension caused by the actions of this government is spreading all through this province. Every day you pick up the paper there is a restraint, there is a cut.

The Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Task Force says he is not worried about leaks. I don't think he is. In fact I think he is leaking those out himself. They are doing like they do in Ottawa, they float these trial balloons to see how the public reacts to them and if the reaction is too strong

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

then they will pull them back and modify them a bit and say well, look, we are not as bad as we were painted out to be. That is the little game that they are playing. You are doing that with the Civil Service, you're doing that with other fields of endeavour that the government has been engaged in in the past eight years.

You know we have been accused by the, I believe it was the Minister of Health and Social Development this afternoon and my honourable friend, the Member for Inkster, got quite uptight about it and I think quite rightly so, that when the Minister said that senior civil servants, not naming anybody just an anonymous senior civil servant, had told him that money was no object, spend it like it was going out of style when this party here was in government, and that is absolute rubbish. Absolute rubbish because I think of all the eight years that we were in office and I think the two former Ministers of Finance are here and can correct me if I am wrong, I think we didn't have more than three years in which we had a deficit and a very small deficit at that. A deficit when you look at the Province of Ontario and the provinces elsewhere, I think that the New Democratic Party when it was the government of this province managed the economics and the affairs of this province with prudence and with some justice and feeling of human kindness.

But that's what we don't have from these people over there, Mr. Speaker. We have a First Minister who says they are good breeders. I will say they are dandy breeders. Absolutely, they are breeders of unemployment. They are breeders of fear. They are breeders of dissension and apprehension all amongst the people of Manitoba. That is what they are breeders of. And breeders of contempt too. That is what they are. Excellent breeders of those. That is what they are good at. Absolutely.

The people who have unfortunately the control of the destiny of the people of Manitoba. You have it.

MR. FOX: Only temporarily.

MR. JENKINS: Just temporarily is right. My honourable friend, the Member for Kildonan, is quite right. It is only a temporary aberration in the political life of the Province of Manitoba but it will soon be corrected and when that day comes I can assure you that I hope we don't sink to the level of that government when it entered office on a determined witch hunt. The First Minister saying, "Anybody who has got an NDP card here is going to be fired." We had a witch hunt and there is still a witch hunt going on. —(Interjection)— When? He said that in this House. You people don't want to read. You don't want to read newspapers. You don't even want to read Hansard. I guess you believe Hansard doesn't tell the truth either. I believe the statement was made in this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, last fall the government called a special session, the session was to deal with namely, the Anti-Inflation Board legislation and as an afterthought they thought while they were at it they would throw in the Marital Property Act and the Family Maintenance Act, and they assured us that it was only just to look at and to dress it and clean it up a little bit. You know, Mr. Speaker, we never did get the terms of reference from the Attorney-General. We asked him on numerous occasions the terms of reference that he would give to the Committee that would be looking at this legislation. He didn't give it to us. He tabled this document in the House the other day and he said, "Well, it is not really our policy." But given the terms of reference, I mean these people must have had something, they just weren't thrown two bills and told, well here you look at them and see what you think about it and they come up with these recommendations. They must have been given some terms of reference. So it is your document until you say otherwise. It is your document until you tell us in this House and we see the legislation that you are not going to emasculate those bills, that you are going to allow unilateral opting out is what is recommended. That you are going to have fault as one of the conditions for family maintenance. Good godfathers we sat and argued and heard numerous briefs.

I know a lot of the new members, they weren't here, they never heard, they just heard a few here the last time that we had a last go around at it. We have got books, well they are this thick, of people who want these changes? We have got the government saying well, we have had this thing now going to Cabinet, going to Caucus, and given their silence last year, I will say this, that perhaps in their ignorance of what the bill was about, what the laws were about, that they couldn't maybe, the new backbenchers couldn't say too much about it. But I hope certainly, that between the last time this House met that you examined the bills and you examined the recommendations here, and surely, I hope . . . and I hope you prove me wrong, I hope you prove me absolutely wrong, because I think this is something that is beyond politics. These pieces of legislation dealing with the marital property act, family maintenance . . . you know, surely children should not be dependent upon political whim whether the father or the mother, whatever the case may be, is going to see that their welfare and upbringing is taken care of. You heard women tell you that they debated whether they should take the bus or whether they should walk because 10 cents, 15 cents or 25 cents as it is today, was too much. If they spent that 25 cents it was 25 cents that they couldn't put in their mouths or put on their backs. Surely, surely that is beyond the realm of partisan politics. Surely you are not so tied up with that private sector gang over there. GWL, Great West Life, Power Corporation of Montreal — call them what you like, they are all the same. They are probably the anonymous donors of your \$525,000 war kitty bank too.

These are the people who are going to suffer because the property managers over there don't want their property being shared.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I hope that you people over there prove me wrong, prove the Honourable Member for Selkirk wrong, prove the Honourable Member for St. Johns wrong, but I don't think you

will, because I think when we see that legislation it is going to be a real nice surgical job, and all I can say is that you can prepare yourselves for a long good hard battle when you introduce that legislation if that is the form that you are going to introduce it in.

The people of Manitoba, both male and female, have demonstrated that they want this legislation, notwithstanding what the First Minister said, that they were all NDP followers out there on the steps. At least we didn't have to give them half a day off like Great West Life to get a lobby outside this House during the 1970 Debate on Autopac.

Speaking about Autopac too, Mr. Speaker, we had the First Minister in answer to a question this afternoon from one of the honourable members over on this side, if he had met with the President of the Insurance Bureau of Canada. Well, you know the First Minister has a very convenient memory for forgetting things. He couldn't remember meeting — Mr. Harcourt is it — he wasn't introduced to Mr. Harcourt as the President of the Insurance Bureau of Canada. Yet I saw tonight John Robertson interviewing a Mr. Harcourt, and Mr. Harcourt said, yes, the First Minister and the Minister of Highways have met with him and they got a very favourable response. He is very optimistic.

A MEMBER: By the next license year?

MR. JENKINS: I guess by the next license year we will probably — maybe even before that, maybe late in this session we will get a bill dealing with Autopac, and notwithstanding what they said during the election, they were not going to touch Autopac, oh no, no, no, no way.

A MEMBER: Keep all the good things.

MR. JENKINS: Keep all the good things. You know I think what the First Minister is engaged in . . .

A MEMBER: You can't even read.

MR. JENKINS: Well, I think I listen as well as the Honourable Member for Lakeside, the Honourable Minister of Highways, and I listen very well and I read reasonably well, and understand reasonably well. That is not the message that I received. Perhaps I don't read Conservative propaganda in the same way that the Honourable Member for Lakeside does. Perhaps it has a two-edged meaning. You know, when he says "yes" he means "no," and when he says "no" he means "yes." Sort of a double standard. You know what I think really, the First Minister is a person who is drunk with political power and who is indulging in an ideological binge that is going to leave the Province of Manitoba with an economic hangover that is going to take many many years to cure. And the DT's as well. The Member for Fort Rouge I think said very well that the problems that you are going to cause and the distress and the upheaval in this province are not going to be your lot to clean up, it is going to be our lot.

It is going to be a tough one because given the record that you people are starting out with of restraint . . .

A MEMBER: We will have sixty more years.

MR. JENKINS: Sixty? Well, I have already heard people saying — and letters in the newspapers — "Good godfathers, we made a mistake, we didn't want those fellows, we didn't want them to do what they are doing" — (Interjections) — Oh, yes, I quite agree, but we are not engaged in a system of putting the people of Manitoba all out of work, or we weren't in 1969 to 1978. In fact, the economy of Manitoba was perhaps the second or third best in the whole country, with a province that doesn't have the abundance of natural resources that Alberta has, or even our sister province of Saskatchewan. I think it's remarkable the husbandry of the resources and the financial resources that was carried out by this Party when it was in Government, and we'll see how well you measure up in the next four years, and I think you're going to be very very far off the mark. — (Interjection) — Three years. Oh yes, three years, pardon me. They've already used up one, I'm sorry.

A MEMBER: Time is running out.

MR. JENKINS: Sometimes it seems like they've been here for forty years already because of the damage that they've done to the economy of Manitoba. And you know their favorite little slogan was, "Will the last business going out of Manitoba please turn out the lights." Well it's going to maybe be the last person going out of Manitoba please turn out the lights, period. Because I don't see any great rush of people coming to invest in this province. They're leaving, in fact. — (Interjection) — Oh, the insurance people, sure.

You know in the few minutes that I have remaining I would be remiss if I didn't deal a little bit with the Labour Portfolio, and we'll have more to say about the Minister of Labour when she's in the House. But, you know, it's funny, Mr. Speaker, that neither one of the two Ministers of Labour, and I'll say the two of them because they both sit side by side — the Minister of Industry and Commerce has the Minister of Labor in his pocket, not her in his pocket.

The Manitoba branch of the Canadian Manufacturers Association has called upon — this was in, I believe, today's Free Press: "C.M.A. urges labour law curbs, tax cuts, and holding the line on

minimum pay." And you know if there's anything despicable that he did, particularly despicable, to the people at the very low end of the scale, we're not organized. "Hold the line, can't have a raise, keep them at \$2.95." You know, it's very interesting, in the 16 page brief that was presented to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the honourable member, and the Association sent a copy as an afterthought to the Minister of Labor. The Association has argued its case for compulsory overtime. My friend from Inkster will like that one — compulsory overtime, reduction in the discretionary powers of the Labour Board, clarification of the Workplace and Safety and Health Act, and removal of strike rates for public employees in essential services. Ah, they're looking ahead, looking ahead for the MGEA. I guess that's what it is. The CMA has also said it has forwarded a copy to the Labour Minister, Norma Price, and documented cases where legal prohibition against compulsory overtime has been used by labour as a bargaining weapon, or a lever on issues quite unrelated to the matter of overtime. And, you know, they also state that the powers of the Labour Board should be curbed by amending the legislation to provide, for example, union certification by secret ballot, unlimited access to the courts.

The arbitration procedure right now is a joke because — and also they go to the courts to upset rulings of the Labour Board, and codification of picketing rules for all Parties. That is a dandy.

Who's going to draw up this codification? The CMA? The Honourable Minister of Labour? — (Interjection) — She doesn't like unions so I certainly wouldn't put too much credence in any code of rules that she drew up. Codification of picketing rules for all parties, and more automatic imposition. Automatic, never mind going to court, automatic penalties for breaches of law and for contract. Never mind the courts. That'll be for the workers, not for the employers. The employers — (Interjection) — Yes, they stay here, they want unlimited access to the court, but on the other hand they want codification of picketing rules and automatic imposition of penalties without ever going to the courts. Talk about a contradiction! It's almost like Alice Through the Looking Glass, everything's backward over there.

You know you people make, what's his name, oh, the chap in Arizona, the Arch-Conservative in the American — Barry Goldwater — you make him look like a raving Socialist. You people are gone, you're gone way way back — Hoover, Bennett, I think you've gone beyond Bennett, perhaps to Il Duce in Italy.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, it is a sad commentary on the scene in Manitoba that the unfortunate thing, what is happening with the restraints that are taking place are going to be placed, as I said at the beginning of my speech, are going to be placed on those people least able to defend themselves.

I can tell you when I was a member of the Winnipeg School Board we introduced pre-nursery school kindergarten. In fact, the Winnipeg School Division introduced nursery kindergartens long before the province because the province was so archaic in its thinking at that time. But the introduction of pre-kindergarten nursery schools was to help those in the disadvantaged areas and financially disadvantaged. And the cutbacks that you're proposing in the fields of law reform, employment standards, and various other things in the field of education, those people who can look after themselves, who understand the law and how to use it, do so very well, and that applied when I was a member of the school board when we introduced nursery kindergartens in the respect that I was speaking of. Those in the River Heights area and the wealthier areas of the City of Winnipeg all knew how to do it, but those in the core area didn't know how to do it, and we didn't have the money to go down there and educate them how to use the system, because those are the people who really need the help, and by cutting your programs, cutting, cutting, cutting, it's like a butcher shop over there with their slashing and packing away.

And the people who really need help as far as housing, legal matters, those things, those are the people who are going to suffer. Not the more affluent in our society. They've always been able to take care of themselves, and they'll always be able to, but it's those in our society and, unfortunately, their voice isn't as loud and strong as those who have the means to do so, and that is a terrible thing that you are perpetuating on to the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM(Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to be participating in debate for the first time. I understand that that is traditionally referred to as a maiden speech and I sincerely hope that there will be no sinister sexist connotation read into that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to belatedly offer my congratulations to you on your appointment and to commend you on the manner in which you have handled the House to date. I promise that you will have my full support in the duties that you have to perform.

I would also like to offer my congratulations to the Members for Radisson and Crescentwood on their respective appointments and to the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech.

I understand that the traditional procedure in a maiden speech such as this, Mr. Speaker, is to give you a verbal description of the constituency and that I would like to do. I would not propose to lecture the honourable members of this Chamber, but I would like to make a few observations with respect to some of the comments that have been made on the Throne Speech.

First of all, I should acknowledge my immediate predecessor for Souris-Killarney, the gentleman who is now the First Minister of this province, and also the previous member for Souris-Killarney, the late Earl McKellar who many of you in this House knew and respected for the many years that he served here.

I would like to put the Constituency of Souris-Killarney in perspective for the House — I know that

that is not required for some of the honourable gentlemen opposite who spent a considerable amount of time in Souris-Killarney during the by-election of 1976, but for the benefit of the rest of the members who were not able to spend as much time in the constituency there, I would like to tell you that perspectives on Souris-Killarney differ with the eyes of the beholder.

I was informed just recently by Mrs. Jenkins, the wife of the Honourable Member for Logan, that she considered Souris-Killarney to be a scenically beautiful constituency, and I am sure that the Premier of the Province sees Souris-Killarney to be a very friendly and enlightened constituency.

But Mr. Speaker, do you know how the Honourable Member for Brandon East sees Souris-Killarney? He sees it as a part of a sea of ignorance that surrounds an island of intelligence — the island of intelligence being Brandon East. Now I could assure the honourable member were he here that the people of Souris-Killarney and the people of south-western Manitoba will not readily forget that comment.

I think as most of you are probably aware that Souris-Killarney is located in the south-western part of the province. It's nestled up against the North Dakota boarder, and situated between the two friendly constituencies of Arthur on the west and Rock Lake on the east. It includes such progressive centres as Souris, Boissevain, Killarney, Wawanesa, Ninette, Belmont, Glenboro. Souris-Killarney has a particularly interesting geography which led to the particular type of development that that constituency has experienced. We have the Turtle Mountains on the southern edge of the constituency; the Brandon Hills on the north; the Carberry Sandhills on the very north-east and the Tiger Hills on the east side. The constituency is divided north and south by the Souris River entering from the west — from Arthur constituency; the northern part of the constituency is touched by the famous Assiniboine River and out of the east side runs the Pembina River whose head waters are in the Turtle Mountains. There are many beautiful and rather historic lakes in Souris-Killarney, including Killarney, Pelican, Whitewater and a myriad of smaller lakes in the Turtle Mountains.

Now under the original conditions, prior to settlement, the constituency had wooded areas and plains and wooded valleys, and that particular combination led to a great diversity of wild life there under natural conditions — bison, antelope, elk, grouse — many types of wild life that in turn resulted in providing the basis for the earliest inhabitants of the area who were first of all the Assiniboine Indians and later the Plains Sioux. There is a great deal of history associated with the area despite the short period since settlement by Europeans.

People such as LaVerendrye and Alexander Henry, Colonel Steele, Professor Hind and Pallisser all passed through Souris-Killarney constituency on their expeditions. The Metis, buffalo hunters from Fort Garry used to travel to the plains between the Souris River and Turtle Mountain to hunt buffalo there, and I think it's significant that the last herd of buffalo disappeared from the plains of the Souris as recently as 1867, and the last buffalo disappeared approximately 1885. A settlement began in that area about 1880 — which is of course less than a hundred years ago — rather a short period of time in development, particularly since I believe the first shipment of wheat from the prairies to Great Britain was made in 1877, just 101 years ago. In that short space of time the area has been developed to the point now where we have a solid agricultural economy based on mixed farming with the traditional course grains and flax and special crops such as rapeseed, mustard, sunflowers, potatoes; we have a considerable amount of forage and even silage corn being grown in the constituency now.

There are some very substantial numbers of cow-calf operations in the area, feed lots, hog operations and even dairy operations as well. Now in that short space of time as well as the agricultural basis that has developed, the towns have sprung up and developed in the area as well; the services that are associated with them, schools, the hospitals, the railways, hydro, telephone, highways, that sort of thing, all within that short space of less than 100 years. In that same space of time there have been industries that have come and gone, changed with the changing agricultural technology. We still have some substantial industries today in the form of Superior Cheese, D. . . Canada, Wawanesa Mutual, Keen Manufacturing — (Interjection)— there use to be some mines but they have given way to richer deposits. Keen Manufacturing is another farm equipment manufacturer that is located in Souris-Killarney and the interesting thing about all these industries is that they either are agricultural service industries now or they started basically as agricultural service industries. Again, I think that it is particularly important to realize that the development of that area has always been related to the resources that were there. No resources, no development. You know, that's something that my constituents understand. They understand that the level of spending that was carried on by the previous administration was greater than the resources could support. That's a fundamental truth that people in a constituency such as mine that is based on a substantial percentage of people being self-employed as farmers or in businesses, people like that, realize some of the basic truths.

Now they understand also that the complex theories referred to this afternoon by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge in trying to make the case that our approach is overly simplistic, my constituents would understand that those complex theories can basically all be boiled down into one simple theory that says there is no such thing as a free lunch.

I would also like to make a few observations about some of the allegations that our government has been cruel and lacking in compassion, the fact that we have terminated some contracts and some term employees and even some permanent employees. I want to assure the House that that is not an action that is undertaken lightly. As the First Minister has said, there is no joy in that type of thing. But

I would also like to relate a couple of experiences that I personally have had as an employee of government when the members opposite were that government. In the first case, the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet was Agriculture Minister at the time and I was employed on a contract basis and lo and behold they terminated the contract. The project evidently ended and the honourable gentlemen saw fit to terminate the contract, a fact that I did not particularly object to. I recognized that that was the proper course of action, very similar to — (Interjection) — Well, now, that is another matter that the honourable gentleman raises which I will come to in a moment.

But I also had one other experience with the former Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management, the Honourable Member for Inkster. On one occasion when I was employed on a contract basis by that department, it seems that I had spoken at a public meeting in what is now my constituency and had evidently embarrassed the government, at least that is what I was informed when I came to Winnipeg two days after the meeting. I was informed that I had embarrassed the government and that my services were no longer required.

Now, the honourable gentleman has raised the matter of party affiliation and I should like to assure this House that recently at least there has not been anyone dismissed from my department because of their party affiliation. But again, I wish to tell you about a personal experience that I had because I used to work with government. Some years ago when the impact studies were being done on the Churchill-Nelson River, I was being contacted by the then study director to undertake a particular aspect of that impact study. Negotiations were proceeding apace to a point until I was informed that because of the political affiliation of a relative of mine, the Honourable Member for Roblin, that they could not award me a job in working with such a sensitive area.

MR. PAWLEY: Who told you that?

MR. RANSOM: The then Deputy Minister of the department. — (Interjection) — I said the then Deputy Minister of the department.

So you see, gentlemen, that politics in the Civil Service certainly have been — political considerations were part of the previous government's method of operation.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition made reference to the "broad axe method" that we were supposedly using in laying off members of the Civil Service and he said that such a procedure was simplistic. I would rather suggest that it is simplistic to take the view that the government is somehow able to be the employer of the unemployed. To give an example of how that sort of reasoning can be carried to a nonsensical conclusion, I was listening to a radio program a couple of mornings ago where an economic expert was being interviewed and he said that one person laid off in the Civil Service would result in one person being laid off in the service industries as well. Now, to carry that to its nonsensical conclusion would indicate that if 50 percent of the people were employed by government, presumably the other 50 percent would then be supported by them. Now that, to me, does indeed seem to be simplistic.

I should also like to make one reference to a quotation that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition made in his reply to the Speech from the Throne where he said, in reference to sales tax in various provinces, "I am referring to all provinces in Canada who are in similar economic condition and circumstances, with the exception of Alberta and Saskatchewan who are not in the same circumstances as any of the other eight provinces for reason only of oil and that's so elementary it hardly need be said." I would suggest that that is not the type of quotation that hardly need be said. It is indeed elementary but in my view it needs to be said again and again and again, because it is basic to the position that wealth is based upon resources. Without those resources, we cannot achieve a higher and higher level of spending because as I said before there is no such thing as a free lunch. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of the people of this province understand that type of reasoning and that is why we are in government and the gentlemen opposite are where they are.

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

MR. SAM USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to be back here in the Legislature after a few short weeks or short months rather of leisure and it is indeed nice to see that you, Sir are back in the position of chief arbiter of this Assembly.

I wanted to begin my comments this evening with very general observations but perhaps it might be better since the Member for Souris-Killarney is still in his seat that I might begin by dealing with some of the points that he has raised and in particular as it relates to his personal relationship with the Government of Manitoba during the period of time that we were the Government and that indeed I was his superior.

The Member for Souris-Killarney, the minister, alleges that he too had lost a position, Mr. Speaker, and that is perhaps to be expected but it does reflect very much the same kind of attitude on the outgoing government as it does of course on the in-coming government. And that is not correct, Mr. Speaker, because the member knows very well that we had had a very long term agreement with the Government of Canada pertaining to a massive study in that particular part of the province that he now represents. It was under an ARDA agreement, as I recollect it, I believe it was entered into even before our time as government and continued on for quite a period of time.

But I do recollect the incident, Mr. Speaker, very well, because I had received a delegation asking that those studies be continued. I remember that incident very well, and that delegation appeared

here in my office, the first floor of this building, pleading with me that we should not terminate those studies even though they were all complete, Mr. Speaker. I would like to point out for the benefit of the Member for Souris-Killarney, that at that point in time or up to when the study was completed, the Government of Canada was paying — I believe it was 90 percent of the cost of that study — and the province was putting up about 10 percent. And of course the Member for Souris-Killarney employed in that project derived most of his salary obviously from the Government of Canada, and only a small portion from the Province of Manitoba. But that agreement terminated with the Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker, and the proposition that I received was that the Province of Manitoba should then undertake to carry it forward at 100 cents on a dollar cost to the people of Manitoba.

Now Mr. Speaker, it might be of interest to indicate to the Assembly as to who the delegation was. Well it turned out to be the father of the minister. Mr. Speaker, I would not have wanted to indulge in that kind of thing if it was not for the comments of course of the member himself here this evening. Mr. Speaker, once the gauntlet is thrown, one has to respond, and I regret that I have to respond in a personal way, having such a vivid recollection of that particular chapter in the affairs of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it was more than weeks, I don't know if it was a week, but I learned subsequently — by the way, I didn't realize Mr. Speaker, that it indeed was the father of our minister here at the time. I found out later the connection. But that's neither here nor there. But it wasn't more than a week or perhaps a couple of weeks and the member could correct me because I am only speaking from memory that I found that he was indeed hired by the Department of Mines. So there was nothing wrong with that either, Mr. Speaker. Politics had nothing to do with it. — (Interjection) — Well then, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member suggests that he didn't suggest that politics had something to do with that particular event. Well then why raise the issue, Mr. Speaker? Why did he raise the issue in the first place?

Now Mr. Speaker, I don't know what transpired in the Department of Mines with respect to his employment thereafter, and of course I did not at the time from that he was hired by that department because I was led to believe that he was indeed a very competent individual in his field and it was quite proper that the department should have taken him on, given the fact that he had worked for the Department of Agriculture for a number of years in the study and had something to offer. There is nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know why at this stage the honourable member wants to raise such a mundane point.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate you again on your role, but at the same time I would like to suggest to you that I am unable to congratulate the people who drew up the Speech from the Throne. I think it is evident, Mr. Speaker, and it doesn't really matter where one travels within the province, indeed within the country, I think it is evident throughout the country that we now have in Canada the most reactionary Conservative administration that we have seen in decades, certainly in this province's history.

MR. GREEN: Why don't you say ever?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, they won't believe me if I say ever, because perhaps that might be stretching a point or two.

MR. ENNS: A hundred years.

MR. USKIW: In a hundred years. The Member for Lakeside. . . that's not bad, that's practically our total history here in Manitoba as a province.

The Conservative government of our day is implementing policies not based on rational reasoning but based on a hangup, on an ideological hangup, something that I thought we got rid of in all political parties many years ago. And of course I suppose from time to time, there is a resurrection of old ideas that have never worked before and perhaps this is the moment, Mr. Speaker, perhaps this is the moment. But I find that very difficult to understand, Mr. Speaker, in light of the position of the government when indeed they were in the opposition not so long ago. Because as I recall it, Mr. Speaker, in the four years preceding the election, that they were the champions of all causes, of any grievance, as a matter of fact, I can recall a major debate in this assembly on the question of whether it was right for the Department of Agriculture to reorganize its home economics program, or for the government and where two people weren't fired, I believe they were transferred to other regions. And there was a major debate about moving two people from one region to another. Compare that with the posture of the government of the moment, Mr. Speaker, in their callous disregard for the needs not only of the community, the province, but indeed of people in every level who have learned to expect a degree of honesty, a degree of sincerity and a degree of stability. Certainly there is no stability today, Mr. Speaker, because whether it is within the public service or outside of the public service, in everyone's mind is a giant question mark as to where this province is heading.

I said some time ago, Mr. Speaker, prior to the election that the . onservative opposition has embarked on C big the technique lie And you know when the former leader of the Liberal Party, a few years ago in this House suggested to us that politics was nothing but a great big con game I didn't really take him seriously, Mr. Speaker. This particular government has confirmed it.

MR. ENNS: Shame, shame, Sam.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, everyone in Manitoba can recall, because it is only a few short months, the attitude and position of this government when it was in opposition with respect to a whole host of programs and of course its current attitude, and how that contradicts. I think everyone is aware of that. I can recall the big debate here about the then government's philosophy of confrontation. You know, when we told the medical people a year ago and every year when we were discussing the fee schedule, that there is some need for restraint, in particular the last couple of years, the members opposite said to us that is confrontation, you are not treating the medical profession properly. Mr. Speaker, today it is suggested that that isn't confrontation, it is simply good management.

I raise one question, Mr. Speaker, and that is whether or not this good management approach is going to result in deterrent fees through the back door. Maybe that's what it is all about, I don't know, only time will tell. But perhaps that is really what it is.

A MEMBER: They don't use the scare technique, do they?

MR. USKIW: Because, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has indicated on more than one occasion that it is not their intent to tamper with premium free medicare, but perhaps maybe he will have some assistance in accomplishing those ends in any event to their policy of what they call good management and if it so happens that the medical people cannot enter into a new agreement with this government, it is very possible perhaps probable, that every doctor in Manitoba will decide to practice outside of the plan and therefore every person, every patient will receive an extra bill which in effect will be a deterrent fee. I would hope that that does not take place, but I am sort of trying to read between the lines, Mr. Speaker.

I think the other area that has become very obvious is in the field of labour relations and I have to say for the moment that I suppose one cannot expect the new ministers in the government to sort of know their way about the system on day one, but certainly if there was some leadership in the government, certainly there should have not been any intervention in the court proceedings in Brandon. I think that was indeed a very grave error on the part of one minister of the Crown amongst a number of other errors that perhaps were not so grave.

A MEMBER: The leader has to assume responsibility. . .

MR. USKIW: And Mr. Speaker, that is right, the Member for Selkirk is absolutely correct, the ultimate responsibility does lie indeed on the leader of the government, the premier of this province.

Mr. Speaker, we were led to believe during the election campaign that we are going to have a much freer Manitoba. That was the theme song of the Conservative Party, that we are going to have a free Manitoba.

I would like to pose a number of questions to a number of ministers perhaps. I would like them to advise me perhaps in the course of their response, just where it is that we can find that new freedom, because I have been watching every day and looking for it, Mr. Speaker, and I don't recall in the last four or five months noticing any change that would be interpreted as a new found freedom for the people of Manitoba. I know that we might have more taxation at the municipal level, I don't know whether that means that they are freer to pay more municipal taxes.

MR. GREEN: At the provincial level too?

MR. USKIW: And perhaps even at the provincial level too, I don't know, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREEN: Two cents already.

MR. USKIW: That's right. The Member for Inkster has already suggested that we have two cents a gallon on gasoline as a new tax going into the Consolidated Fund. Perhaps the Minister of Highways might be in a position to clarify for us just what is happening to that particular two cents a gallon.

HON. HARRY ENNS (LAKESIDE): Who put it on?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside . . .

MR. ENNS: The Medicare wasn't a tax either.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. May I ask all Members of the House to allow a Member, when making his address to the Chamber please give him the courtesy of listening to him without a whole bunch of other side conversations going on. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the two cents a gallon was obviously part of the premium package which funded Autopac over the last couple of years, but in taking it away from that area and transferring it into Consolidated Revenues then it is an imposition of a tax, Mr. Speaker, because the government has already indicated, and indeed the Management of Autopac have indicated that there may be need for an increase in auto insurance premium rates next year.

Well, obviously if you take away 6 or \$7 million from their premium base, then obviously at some point in time they are going to have to catch up on their loss of revenues.

So, it would in essence amount to a net increase in taxation to the people of Manitoba. It happens, if it is implemented, to reflect perhaps a little more revenue than the loss of revenue through the elimination of succession duties and gift taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like members opposite, especially ministers from the other side, to point out to us just where these new freedoms are to be found, because I have been searching for many, many days now trying to find out whether the Minister of Agriculture has removed all of the regulations pertaining to restriction on production of agriculture commodities. I don't recall noticing any changes in that regard, Mr. Speaker. I don't recall any changes which allows any Manitoba citizen for the first time hopefully according to the philosophy of my friends opposite to engage in production of commodity of their choice without government restriction and interference.

Well, the Minister of Agriculture is suggesting to me that it is coming. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that when the Minister of Agriculture introduces his estimates, he will be in a position to give us some policy guidelines or statements in that regard, so that we would know precisely where we are at with respect to a number of commodities in this province, whether we are going to enter further into national agreements or whether we are dismantling the existing ones. Because to date, Mr. Speaker, despite all of the criticism from the other side when we were in government about all of these regulations, despite all of those criticisms, I have yet to see any change whatever with respect to any of those marketing structures, both provincial and national in scope.

Mr. Speaker, we have yet to learn what the Minister of Agriculture is going to do about the broiler industry in this province. I have been waiting with a great deal of interest on that one because that is another one of those restrictive pieces, Mr. Speaker, that is yet to be added to the list. If we are going to have a free Manitoba, freer than it was up until October 11th, then I couldn't quite believe that this Minister would follow through with the introduction of yet another Supply Management agreement. We will be waiting with a degree of patience, Mr. Speaker, but certainly with hope that the Minister is in a position to give us a statement on these areas as soon as possible, and hopefully, well, certainly it couldn't be any later than when he introduces the estimates of his department.

56-05

One of the sad moments so far with respect to the government's philosophy and policy towards rural Manitoba had to do, Mr. Speaker, with the callous disregard for people in need. I refer to the few areas of Manitoba who applied for some feed assistance last year and who didn't receive the benefit of the Minister's time, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to point out to the Minister, perhaps he is unaware, that in refusing that particular request that he also refused financial aid from the Government of Canada that has been forthcoming to this province and to all provinces in recent years under emergency situations, Mr. Speaker. Up until three or four years ago the Government of Canada didn't have a policy of assisting the provinces to meet those kinds of emergencies, but since that time they have had a fairly consistent policy in that regard and I would like to know whether our Minister had even bothered to approach the Federal Government with respect to a program that would bring relief to those communities.

I would also like to know, Mr. Speaker, whether this government has any policy with respect to encouraging assisting young people into the agriculture industry. To date we have not had any indication as to what philosophy or what policy or what program they are intending to follow.

We seem to be operating in a vacuum for the moment, and I would be terribly interested, Mr. Speaker, in learning from the Minister just what it is that he intends to do that would maintain in Manitoba the elite position next to Saskatchewan that we have maintained in the past few years with respect to new young entries into Agriculture.

A MEMBER: How many were there? The lead position, Mr. Speaker, for all of Canada, Manitoba and Saskatchewan had more young people enter the agriculture industry in the last few years than any other province in Canada.

There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite are indeed reverting to the policies of the 1960s, a policy of elimination, a policy of rural population decline. That is really what is taking place, Mr. Speaker, and no matter how they deny it, we are back to the position where this government believes that the way to solve some of the problems in rural Manitoba is to transfer the people out of there into the City. If they don't do it by intent they will do it by neglect, Mr. Speaker. I have yet to see a shred of evidence that will change my mind in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister suggested that we should look at the members on that side of the House. Well, I can assure you that if they come from rural Manitoba there will be fewer of them each year or every time we redistribute the ridings of this province through their policy, Mr. Speaker. I can assure the m, I can guarantee them, that every time we have redistribution there will be fewer of them coming in here with their policy. It has happened before. In the last five years, Mr. Speaker, we have had a degree of stability with respect to out-migration from rural Manitoba, but it was because of the efforts of federal and provincial governments, through a whole host of programs that encouraged people to develop a greater initiative and interest in maintaining a larger rural population base, both through the co-operation of municipalities, Regional Development Corporations, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I project on the basis of the philosophy of our present government, that all of that has already changed and we are on the decline. Mr. Speaker, as long as the dollar bill will determine who has the opportunities, then there is no other way but that we will have a very severe reduction in rural population numbers and in particular with respect to the number of farm people in rural Manitoba. As

long as the dollar bill determines the price of land, and as long as there is no other alternative, then there is no other way in which to see the evolution of our rural province other than into a severe decline. And that was the characteristic of rural Manitoba since the war years which we have succeeded in slowing down very dramatically through a number of programs and the members opposite are now in the process of dismantling a whole host of them. Mr. Speaker, even a successful program isn't acceptable to my friends opposite.

MR. GREEN: That's an embarrassment.

MR. USKIW: That's right. The Member for Inkster suggests that is an embarrassment to them, and perhaps that is the problem. But I question the Minister of Agriculture what it was that motivated them into dismantling the Rural Water Services Depot in Transcona, an agency that was providing a very useful service to many thousands of farm people, Mr. Speaker, at reduced costs for the installation of water systems, plumbing and so on, in order to assist the farm community in the upgrading of their homes and farmsteads. Well, the Minister suggests that that was not for inside the homes. Well, I have to admit that he hasn't been in office very long, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to take issue with him at this point. But I would like to tell him that it involved the bulk purchasing of motors, pipes, pumps, septic tanks, the whole field, Mr. Speaker, which has a lot to do with the quality of life in a farm household, and which was bought in bulk in order to pass on the savings of bulk buying to rural people so that they could have a standard of living, Mr. Speaker, more comparable to that that is available in urban centres.

Members opposite feel that that is perhaps not a good program, but you know, prior to 1969, and they know it, Mr. Speaker, they did a study on it, I was the beneficiary of that study, which indicated that about 60 percent of our farm people did not have sewer and water services prior to 1969. Mr. Speaker, through that program we facilitated, as I recall the figures, something in the order of 16,000 or 17,000 farms. —(Interjection)—

Well, I am guessing because I don't know what took place in the last several months, but it is in that order, Mr. Speaker. It was a self-sustaining program with respect to the operation of the depot. The mark-up was set at a level which was to carry the cost of stacking and warehousing. —(Interjection)— No, it did not lose money. Mr. Speaker, that program provided for many hundreds of thousands of dollars that represented savings to people who wished to install various systems. It has indeed helped change the character of farm living and the lifestyle in the farmyard to quite a degree. It was one of our, in my opinion at least, better programs, one of our success stories.

Mr. Speaker, there is another program that is very similar to that and I would be interested to know just what the government's intentions are, and that has to do with veterinary services because there too we have used the instrument of government to bulk purchase veterinary drugs in order to make them available at a lower cost to our vet service centres. Mr. Speaker, I would be interested to know whether that too is going to be thrown out. I would be interested to know, Mr. Speaker, whether the vet service clinics are going to be sold to private entrepreneurs. —(Interjection)— The Minister of Agriculture asked me who set it up. I think he knows the answer to that one, Mr. Speaker. He knows the answer to that one, Mr. Speaker.

These are the kinds of questions that I'm sure many Manitobans are asking and indeed are concerned about because the philosophy of this government as it has been enunciated over the last few months would suggest to any person with a degree of common sense that there is much to fear with respect to the process of decision-making on Broadway.

Mr. Speaker, on the question of the Throne Speech as it relates to the intended plan on the part of the Minister of Agriculture to establish a check-off. I would like him to examine the record, Mr. Speaker, because the record will show that we had a referendum on that same proposal drawn up by the Beef Growers Association of this province, Mr. Speaker, and that vote did not carry. There was an overwhelming opposition for that proposal. It is the identical proposal that is mentioned in the Throne Speech. So, Mr. Speaker, I don't know on what basis, since we have, Mr. Speaker, a freer Manitoba today, on what basis the Minister of Agriculture is prepared to introduce a compulsory program after a referendum having been held and the proposal being defeated, how he could introduce that kind of program without going back to the people. That is something that I can't understand, Mr. Speaker. In the name of a freer Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, it just doesn't add up.

The First Minister talked about whose responsibility it is to deal with the problems of unemployment, Mr. Speaker, and he shrugged his shoulders and said, "Well, really, we have unemployment insurance for people that find themselves out of work." Not quite the posture that they had several months ago. But, Mr. Speaker, he is now saying that that is a Federal responsibility, we don't have to do anything in the Province of Manitoba to stimulate employment, that unemployment insurance is going to do the job where there is a gap. I hope he appreciates the fact that when that runs out, that the next step is welfare, in which the province has to put up 50 percent, unless he intends to also cut that off so that we have a "no man's land" situation with respect to stability of income for our Manitoba citizens who find themselves from time to time out of work.

A MEMBER: That's free enterprise.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, perhaps that is but we haven't practised that kind of enterprise for many many decades, at least I don't believe in the history of this province. Not that kind of callous approach to the needs of our fellow human beings.

The First Minister also indicated on more than one occasion, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP does not have a monopoly on compassion, that even Conservatives know that there has to be a degree of compassion with respect to certain underprivileged groups.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. USKIW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like members opposite to reflect on any degree of compassion in all of the decisions having to do with our economy, having to do with staffing, having to do with the callous way in which people have been removed from the employment rolls of the Province of Manitoba. I'm not even questioning their right to do it, Mr. Speaker, I merely raise the question of how they went about to do it and how that reflects on the statement of the First Minister when he was in opposition that Conservatives too have some compassion. If they have it, Mr. Speaker, I think they must be sitting on it; that's where it is, it's not up here. If it's not here, it's got to be somewhat lower, Mr. Speaker, because I haven't seen a shred of evidence of it to date, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection)—

The Member for Rock Lake suggests to me that perhaps I am still in shock, Mr. Speaker. You know, after having been in opposition and in government and now back in opposition, nothing shocks me. I fully understand, Mr. Speaker, the political process and I fully understand that no matter which government is in power that from time to time people will want change and if things are relatively good, they will want them much better and they will try for something better. They may be disappointed in the process and I think many people are already disappointed in Manitoba today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the government, any government, has to be the catalyst in terms of our economic system. I don't believe there is a government in North America, I don't believe there is a government in the western world that doesn't act in this capacity from time to time in order to deal with economic problems, the problems of employment and so on. And I don't believe for a moment that their philosophy can succeed.

It will be interesting to watch and see how they squirm out of it when they find that it isn't working, Mr. Speaker, because it has been tried before and has always failed. The public of every part of the world has had to come to the rescue every time when they fell into economic crises, Mr. Speaker. History books are full of it. The public of every country, of every province, of every state from time to time has had to come in to rescue the situation. And the only reason it is so is because the public is capable of doing so. That is why. And they will do it through one form or another, either direct intervention or through forms of subsidy, incentive programs. They will have to do it, Mr. Speaker. They will be eating those words of philosophy that they have been enunciating over the last four or five months and we will be watching, Mr. Speaker, and pointing out from time to time, pointing out from time to time as the opportunity presents itself the contradictions of my friends opposite and the fact that they are unable to carry out their intentions, their programs and their philosophy.

So, Mr. Speaker, I know that my time is up and I want to simply end on the note that I would hope that members opposite take a little more seriously their responsibilities. They don't have to stage act forever. We have had a degree of that and I think that now they should get down to serious business and indicate to the people of Manitoba just where they are heading so that we can at least set our sights on what it is the objectives that they have set for themselves and determine whether they are in the public interest or not. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Dauphin.

MR. JIM GALBRAITH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this being my maiden speech, let me first congratulate you on your high office. Your good judgment and fairness to all members of this Assembly is greatly appreciated by all members, I am sure. At this time I would also like to congratulate the Member for Crescentwood and the Member for Portage for the manner in which they moved and seconded the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into the context of my address, I would like just to express my thanks to the Dauphin constituents for placing their trust in me. Since the election on October 11, I have been trying to work on behalf of all of the people of the Dauphin constituency. I have met with all the councils and many of the local boards and organizations to try to work on their behalf. I have tried to answer all individual calls in a likewise manner.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell this Assembly a little bit about the history and the present makeup of the Dauphin constituency. The Dauphin constituency is made up of three rural municipalities: Dauphin, Gilbert Plains, and Ochre River. Included within these boundaries are the Town of Dauphin, the Village of Gilbert Plains, and two smaller hamlets of Sifton and Ochre River, along with a number of smaller hamlets being namely Makinak, Ashville, Valley River and Venlaw.

The total population of the Dauphin constituency is nearly 16,000 people with approximately 12,500 voters, approximately 75 percent urban, 25 percent rural. The population is made up of basically two ethnic backgrounds which are fairly evenly split, the British Isles about 40 percent, the Slavic races including Ukrainian and Polish about another 40 percent, and the other 20 percent is made up of people of many ethnic backgrounds with German and French people being predominant. These people from all parts of the world have learned to live and work together, creating a strong

mosaic which is unique to much of Manitoba and Canada. I feel this actually applies to much of the North American continent. Mr. Speaker, let us hope that the Dauphin constituency, Manitoba, Canada and the U.S.A. can continue to set a good example of people of different parts of the world working, learning and living together in peace with one another.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed both a challenge and a pleasure to represent such a constituency as Dauphin.

The main industry of the Dauphin constituency is agriculture. We are blessed with some of the best land in the province, if not in the world, but we also have our share of the poorer types of soil. As a result, we have a well-diversified agriculture base. Many crops are grown, including wheat, oats, barley, rape, flax, mustard, alfalfa, clovers and grasses, as well as market gardens. Alfalfa is a very popular crop and as a result we have the Dauphin Alfalfa Products Limited, processing alfalfa for both local and foreign trade.

Dauphin constituency is also one of the major hay producing areas of Manitoba. Hay is usually a major export crop to the rest of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and even the U.S.A.

As a result of this mixed agriculture base, we also produce large quantities of beef cattle, hogs, dairy cattle and the products from them, plus flocks of poultry. Honey is also another major crop of the area.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the strategic location of the Town of Dauphin, situated on the main junctions of Highways 5, 10 and 20 and one of the main rail lines of the CNR, it has become one of the major distribution centres of the Parkland Region. All of the major farm machinery companies and five major lumber companies are located there. There are approximately 75 retail outlets serving a trading area with a population of approximately 40,000 people. Dauphin is also the focal point in a rural block shipping system inaugurated by the Canadian Wheat Board. The Dauphin block serves some 30 rural stations and approximately 100 elevators in Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

Through the years a number of industrial developments have taken place in Manitoba. They include Tym Limited, Ready-Mix Cement of Dauphin; Dauphin Alfalfa Products Limited, mentioned earlier; Parkland Feeds; a milk processing plant that includes the manufacturing of cheese, Manco Limited in Dauphin; Intermountain Meat Processors; and Mars Leisure World Products; plus many more smaller industrial developments.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that the constituents of Dauphin are soon going to feel the effects of some of the new government efforts to encourage the private sector, much to the dismay of the members opposite. We have a group of developers who propose to invest some \$5 ½ million in our fair constituency to develop a shopping centre mall comprising of a building of some 165,000 square feet, which will eventually employ some 320 people and add about \$150,000 to the property tax roll of the town of Dauphin. This private money has to be a great boost for the Dauphin constituency and the whole Parklands region.

Mr. Speaker, the Dauphin Constituency is in the heart of a paradise to thousands of vacationers and sportsmen who swarm to the area each year. We are bordered to the south by the Riding Mountain National Park; to the west, a short distance from our constituency are the provincial Duck Mountains, the Assiniboine River basin and the Saskatchewan border. A short distance to the north is Lake Winnipegosis and the many great fishing and hunting areas surrounding it. Number 10 and 20 highways are part of the gateway to the extreme north. On our eastern border is Lake Dauphin with its many beaches for swimming, fishing, sunbathing, camping and picnics. To accommodate this tourist influx, Dauphin constituency is well supplied with overnight accommodation. In the town of Dauphin, we have four motels and four hotels; Gilbert Plains, Sifton and Oak River each have one hotel. We are also blessed with two lovely golf courses in the Dauphin constituency — one at Dauphin Beach, some ten miles to the East of Dauphin, and another beautiful golf course at Gilbert Plains in the valley of the Valley River.

Also, at the village of Gilbert Plains we have a new recreation centre comprising of four sheets of artificial ice in a heated building. In the same complex is a hockey and skating arena. A bowling alley is also located at Gilbert Plains.

The Dauphin Constituency is also blessed with curling facilities at Ashville, Makinak, Oak River and Sifton. Sifton has one of the most popular curling bonspiels in the Parklands region. The town of Dauphin has many recreational facilities — curling, hockey, skating, bowling, tennis, swimming, parks, theatre, assembly halls, dining restaurants, plus a variety of cultural activities at the Dauphin Allied Art Centre.

The Dauphin constituents are proud to have produced the Manitoba Mixed Curling Champs this year in the persons of Ralph Wilson, and his teammates. Better luck next time, Ralph, in the Federal scene.

Mr. Speaker, Dauphin constituents are blessed by having two agriculture fairs within our boundaries; one at Gilbert Plains, which draws a lot of local competition. Dauphin's Agriculture Fair is a much larger drawing card and attracts competition from all over Manitoba and even Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, Dauphin still has one more major tourist attraction and that is Canada's National Ukrainian Festival held every year the first weekend in August. This event is truly a North American drawing card as people from all parts of Canada and the U.S.A. flock to this annual event, greatly swelling the town's population for a few days. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite all members of this Legislature to attend this great cultural event either this year or some time in the future. The eats — perogies, kolbasa, etc. are great, along with the great singing and dancing entertainment, the Dauphin Circa Dancers in particular. We hope to see you at the Ukrainian Festival.

Tuesday, March 21, 1978

Mr. Speaker, as you are probably aware, Dauphin is the host of Manitoba's Winter Games commencing on March 25th through April 1st. At this time, on behalf of the Winter Games' executive back in Dauphin, who have worked their hearts out to make these games a success, I would like to invite all Manitobans who may find it possible to take part in these games either as participants or spectators.

Mr. Speaker, the constituents of Dauphin are basically a quiet, mind-your-own-business type of people. However, we do have problems that we feel are relevant to all Manitobans. We are not happy with some of the steps taken by the Manitoba Telephone System. The November 1977 edition came out with such small print that one nearly needs a magnifying glass to read it. Now we hear that Rural Manitobans are to be split into three lots and the Dauphin Chamber of Commerce and many other individuals including myself are not happy with these steps being taken by the Manitoba Telephone System.

Mr. Speaker, another great concern to the Dauphin constituents is the capital tax imposed by the previous government. We feel that this is a very unfair tax and tends to discourage business as well as causing consumer goods to cost more as these nuisance taxes have to be passed on to the consumer.

We also have our concerns about roads in Manitoba and especially roads close to home. I would like to point out the two provincial roads — number 582 and 480 in particular — these two roads are in dire need of rebuilding, and in fact parts of PR road number 480 are impassable for many months of the year.

Mr. Speaker, the Dauphin constituents are also very concerned about the state of agriculture in Manitoba and Canada. We know that the state of agriculture in our great province and country has a very significant effect on the prosperity of our whole society. However, we feel that we can see the light at the end of the tunnel. We see better times ahead in the near future; cattle, hogs and rapeseed prices are some examples of that turnabout.

Mr. Speaker, on the positive side of our affairs, we are very happy with some of the moves already taken by this new government. The repeal of the estate tax and the mineral acreage tax are a relief to many. The lowering of personal income tax and corporate tax rates are a relief to all. Further relief of the school tax for our Senior Citizens is also very welcome.

Mr. Speaker, in my final wrap-up, I would like to say that the Dauphin constituents are generally very happy with steps taken by this new government. To try to control government spending and inflation; a return to a responsible, realistic government is very welcome. It is both a pleasure and a challenge to represent Dauphin constituency in this 31st Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: I would like to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Have you a seconder?

MR. DOERN: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: We have a motion from the Honourable Member for Elmwood that debate be adjourned. Does that meet with the approval of the House? (Agreed)

The Honourable Government House Leader, any further business at this time?

HON. WARNER JORGENSEN, Minister without Portfolio (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Mines and Resources that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon (Wednesday).