

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Labour Management Review Committee for the year ending December 31, 1979.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. NORMA PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Centennial Centre Corporation for the year ending March 31, 1979.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the Annual Report of the Pension Commission of Manitoba for the period ending January 1, 1979, to October 31, 1979.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the 56th Annual report of the Liquor Control Commission.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

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

Before we proceed with the Oral Question period, I'd like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my left, where we have 40 students of Grade VI standing from Ryerson School, under the direction of Mrs. Penty. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Health.

We also have 40 adults from the New Horizon Adult Club from the Steinbach/Niverville area. This group is from the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Yes, I have a question for the Attorney-General. Could the Attorney-General confirm that the court party in Hong Kong to which I yesterday made reference found no witnesses available to it on its first day of hearings, and it was required to adjourn, notwithstanding the fact that there had been a police officer from Manitoba in Hong Kong for several weeks prior to the opening of the hearings, as an advance person?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, as I explained to the Member for Rossmere yesterday, this matter will be heard in court next week. The Crown Attorney in charge is hoping that this matter can be brought on one week from today, and at that time, as I indicated yesterday, a full explanation of this matter will be made to the court, to the accused, to the counsel for the accused. If subsequent to that court hearing the Member for Rossmere has any further questions, Mr. Speaker, I would only be too glad to attempt to answer same, but until the matter is dealt with in court I would prefer not to deal with the matter here.

Thursday, 28 February 1980

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would point out that the questions I am asking have nothing to do with the final decision of the court. They deal with administrative matters, and therefore I would also ask the Minister to confirm that the court party was asked to leave the High Commissioner's Office . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that there has been a request made from the Attorney-General on this particular matter. While the member is perfectly free to ask whatever questions he wants, he must also understand that he doesn't necessarily have to receive an answer from any Minister.

The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand that I may not receive an answer. However, I would suggest that this is an area where the Minister can reply in view of the fact there was a report in the newspaper today indicating that a full report had been made to the Minister. Therefore, I ask the Minister, could he confirm that the court party was asked to leave the High Commissioner's Office after several days, and that thereupon the Japan Room of the Hong Kong Hilton was rented at some \$1,000 per day as a meeting place?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the question by the Honourable Member for Rossmere. Will the Attorney-General be making available a report to this Assembly based upon the information and report that will be made available to him as a result of this escapade in Hong Kong?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would have thought the former Attorney-General of this province would have had more respect for a court party than he has indicated in his comments, but I think that is indicative of the manner in which perhaps his party did and still does treat the administration of justice in this province. Mr. Speaker, I will certainly be prepared to answer questions more fully after this matter is heard in court. It is before the court, and should be dealt with there first before it is dealt with here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister confirm that there were only a total of nine witnesses called in this hearing, although there was a court party of eleven which went to Hong Kong?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I have to rule the question out of order.
The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Mr. Speaker, would you kindly elaborate on what point of order you ruled the question out, since the member was asking administrative things, not judicial things.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It has been indicated to me through the Attorney-General that the matter is before the courts and will be dealt with next week. I would suggest the questions dealing with that should be left so that there is no possibility of undue influence being placed on the court and its direction.

The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I am not asking any questions with respect to what happened inside any courtroom. I am asking questions of an administrative nature. There is a court hearing which was held in Hong Kong as opposed to Winnipeg, and the question that I asked dealt with that administrative area. And I repeat, I would like the Attorney-General to confirm that there were only nine witnesses called in Hong Kong, whereas there was a court party of eleven, including two prosecutors, who went from Winnipeg to Hong Kong.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

Thursday, 28 February 1980

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the Member for Rossmere, as a former employee of the Attorney-General's Department, as a student with that department hired by the former Attorney-General and Leader of the Opposition, probably does not understand, Mr. Speaker, the concept of subjudice. The Commission evidence that was taken in Hong Kong pursuant to charges laid in the city of Winnipeg is a matter before the courts, the taking of evidence that was done there is a matter that is still before the courts and will be dealt with next week, Mr. Speaker. After that, if there are any further questions, I will be pleased to attempt to deal with same.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. GARY FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines if there is any additional information on the potential interruption of gas supplies to Manitobans as a result of the rupture of the gas pipeline in Alberta yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Member for River Heights for his question on this important matter. The information that we have is that the temporary patch or additions by-pass to the line has been essentially completed and they expect that the supply will be at full capacity by midnight tonight, and therefore there will be no further interruptions on the interruptible following that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Attorney-General. Would the Minister consider supplying the House with a list of regulations and guidelines as to who qualifies for legal aid? I raise this concern because of a report in the Free Press that a Mr. John Clay and a Mr. Richard Thiessen signed a corporate contract in the Legal Aid office for \$25,000 a month payments, and I wonder if this type of individual, who runs a massage parlour, deserves legal aid.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: With respect to that matter, Mr. Speaker, I have received information that would indicate the Legal Aid lawyer involved in that matter was a relative of one of the parties to the contract. There was no Legal Aid certificate issued, but because of her relationship with the family, assisted in giving legal advice with respect to that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Attorney-General, I thank you for your comments with respect to my student days in the Attorney-General's Department. I would indicate, Mr. Speaker, that at that time we had one prosecutor prosecuting one offence. The question I have for the Minister is, can he confirm that the total cost of this escape in Hong Kong has been more than \$300,000 to the taxpayers of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the precise figure. I will be getting that figure. I can assure the Member for Rossmere that the parties involved were advised that the accounts would be scrutinized in the normal close way, but that his comment is typical of the exaggerations of comments of the other side. It is at least 1,000 - pardon me, my mathematics is not that good - but that figure of \$300,000 is such a gross exaggeration of the actual costs involved, it is unbelievable and typical of the manner in which members on the other side fish and attempt to create perceptions that are totally inaccurate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again to the Attorney-General, I thank him for answering the last question. Possibly he will now answer my next one. Is it true that there were five lawyers sent to Hong Kong, including three defence lawyers, two prosecutors and . . .

Thursday, 28 February 1980

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he heed the advice given to him by the Honourable Attorney-General and wait until the matter is handled by the courts before he continues in that line of questioning.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, are we to believe that you have ruled the last question by the Honourable Member for Rossmere out of order?

MR. SPEAKER: To the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I have suggested to the honourable member that he follow the advice of the Honourable Attorney-General.

The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Attorney-General. Again, I thank the Attorney-General for answering some of the questions. I don't understand why some of the questions about this activity are subjudice and he is not prepared to answer them, while others are not; and therefore I would ask him to answer the question with respect to the size of the court party and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he cannot ask the Minister to answer. He can ask his question, and whether or not the Minister answers or not is a different matter.

The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister confirm that the court party which left Winnipeg for Hong Kong included one judge, one court reporter, two prosecutors, three defence lawyers, three defendants and at least one police officer and a member of the Department of Immigration?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that the court party which travelled to Hong Kong was at least one-half the number of witnesses that would have been required to bring to Winnipeg in order to take the Commission evidence ordered by the court.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Elmwood asked a question yesterday that I should attempt to clarify. In his question, he is asking why the major issue, why the gas connectors that were determined to be condemned in 1961 were not dealt with until 1978. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the gas connectors were never condemned. So I thought for his enlightenment I should spell out that that particular term should not be applied to the situation in 1961.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the House Leader. We have had a division of the former Department of Health and Social Development or Community Services. I wonder if the Minister could see that we get a clear definition of the responsibilities of the former department. I say a detailed information, that is, if they could appear, all the responsibilities, as they did last year in the Estimates, and list them under the two different departments, it would be quite helpful.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice and consult with the Ministers involved in their respective departments.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if there's a need to take it as notice; I think he could take the time maybe to prepare, but I think we're entitled to this information.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the same Minister another question - especially that I can't direct my questions to you, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intention of the government to start a new tradition here, that is, that somebody who serves as Legislative Assistant to a Minister, is going to start asking questions of that Minister, when he shares the information? Because

Thursday, 28 February 1980

this is what my honourable friend from --(Interjection)-- why not? This is going to be great - Mr. Speaker, this is not correct. The Legislative Assistant of a certain Minister never asked any questions of his Minister; the information is in the office and it certainly could be shared.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I suppose the purpose of asking questions in the Legislature from any member is to seek information, seek the truth. Some are obviously better equipped to do that.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, if it's a question of truth, well then of course we'll waive all our objections, providing you start giving the truth in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, in order to assist you in responding to the facetious question put by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, perhaps I could remind him that every member in this House, regardless of where he sits in this House, is entitled to put questions at Question Period, and that practice will be followed by this government or by any other government. That's No. 1. No. 2, Mr. Speaker, perhaps my honourable friend from St. Boniface would like to remind you of the fact that when they graced this side of the House, one of their members who was the appointee to the Manitoba Hydro Board was consistently asking questions of the First Minister, who was the Minister in charge of Manitoba Hydro.. Did anyone take objection to that?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that any member can ask questions. But certainly the tradition, the Question Period has been to give a chance - there's a limit on the Question Period, and this is to give the chance to the opposition to ask questions of the government. That's the only chance that we have. And when you have somebody that sits in the same office, that has to come here and ask questions, you certainly can ask yourself if the questions are serious, or if there's another motive, Mr. Speaker. And then, when we were in office, Mr. Speaker, if somebody from Hydro is not an executive --(Interjection)-- I was asked to remind the Speaker, and I'm reminding him. I was asked by your honourable friend there, to remind the Speaker, and this is what I am doing, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I want to thank the Honourable Member for St. Boniface for his advice.

I now recognize the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Minister of Health. I wonder when we can expect an announcement from the Minister concerning the appointment of a Deputy Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): When the government takes that decision, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In keeping with the policy of open government referred to by the Honourable Minister of Finance the other day, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Co-Operative Development respecting the bids made for the purchase of McKenzie Seeds last summer. Will the Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development table the bids that were submitted for the purchase of McKenzie Seeds last summer, those same bids having been subsequently rejected?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Brandon East that information such as that may better be answered by form of Order for Return.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable minister would indicate yes or no, we could proceed from there. I am quite prepared to submit an Order for Return and accommodate us that way. That would be fine.

Thursday, 28 February 1980

I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development could advise the House specifically what advantages does Bohmer Box Limited, of Ontario, bring to the McKenzie Seeds operation - a small Ontario company, unknown, probably a smaller merchandising operation than McKenzie Seeds itself has. What specific advantages are there to McKenzie Seeds to have a very tiny unknown company come in and manage and operate McKenzie's.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the Member for Brandon East, as I mentioned yesterday, I don't think it will serve the best interests of McKenzie Seeds if this particular matter dealing with different proposals is dealt with in the public, just as it wasn't dealt with by the Member for Brandon East when he was Minister in charge of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister responsible for Co-operative Development. Can the Minister advise whether or not Bohmer Box has been advised as to the rejection of their offer pertaining to the purchase of McKenzie Seeds?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development.

MR. BANMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I should further point out that we are in the process still of looking at different proposals, and should there be something that could enhance this company and create more jobs in Brandon, that's what we want to do.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Co-operative Development then, in view of his response that discussions are apparently still under way with Bohmer Box, advise whether or not any equivalent opportunity is going to be provided to the employees of McKenzie Seed, who also bid last summer in respect to the purchase of McKenzie Seed, as he is prepared to undertake for Bohmer Box of Ontario?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the Leader of the Opposition, I guess one of the biggest problems that the gentlemen opposite have is that they don't realize that this company is a straight marketing company and requires certain techniques and marketing expertise to be brought in to make it more viable in Brandon. I have said yesterday, and I have said in the paper, and the chairman of the board has indicated a number of times, that we are looking for people to come forward with proposals. We will look at those proposals and weigh them.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Co-operative Development, can the Minister advise as to whether or not he has undertaken any enquiries pertaining to the bid by the employees to ascertain whether or not they would introduce some new marketing techniques to McKenzie Seed.

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned yesterday, if they are interested and have some revolutionary new ways in which they feel they can turn the company around without adding any other product lines, let them come forward with a proposal. But I would point out to the Minister that the company is facing serious marketing problems, and the loss this year will exceed \$1 million, so there will have to be sought ways and means to try and strengthen this company to ensure its operation in Brandon.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister. Is he then indicating and can he confirm that Bohmer Box has proposed to him some revolutionary new marketing techniques insofar as McKenzie Seeds are concerned?

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, if there are a group of individuals, whether it be Bohmer Box or somebody else, that is interested in making sure that this company stays in Brandon and can provide expanded job opportunities and not cost the taxpayer of Manitoba \$1 million to operate every year, definitely I think it is in the best interests of the people of Manitoba to try and find somebody like that.

Thursday, 28 February 1980

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister. He refers to individuals ensuring that McKenzie Seeds remains in Brandon. I would like specifically indication from him as to what undertakings, what effort, are under way on his part to ensure that McKenzie Seeds remains in Brandon, owned by the people of the Province of Manitoba rather than being exported outside the province of Manitoba to Ontario or elsewhere.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be an indication here that regardless of the cost to the province of Manitoba, the previous administration kept all the companies flourishing. I would point out to the Leader of the Opposition, what happened to Evergreen Peat Moss when you owned it? Some of the employees didn't get paid until a year later when you closed it down. What happened to William Clare? Mr. Speaker, we want this company to be a vibrant operation in Brandon, and to that end we are moving right now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Will the Honourable Minister reveal to the House or advise the House of the several years of substantial profits made by the McKenzie Seed Company? For many years. And Mr. Speaker, will the Honourable Minister please advise the House when this government is going to fulfill a commitment to the people of Brandon and to the McKenzie Seeds' employees and indeed to the province by forthwith refinancing the company known as McKenzie Seeds, which was implied by the first Premier of this province when he campaigned in the City of Brandon in 1977? Would you forthwith . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. That information is readily available to the honourable member if he wants to read his annual report.
The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I guess this is the problem that the members opposite have, they have a very short memory. In 1974 and 1975 that member who just asked that question was grappling with the same problem and couldn't convince his Cabinet colleagues at that time to do that. Now when he is sitting on the opposition side and has no responsibility with regards to this matter he makes all kinds of interesting statements. Mr. Speaker, that particular matter is under active review. We are making statement adjustments this year to reflect certain things that should have been cleaned up a long time ago when we knew that you were injecting monies that had already been lost. And, Mr. Speaker, the documentation is on the record and all the member has to do is go back and read his correspondence with the different people that he had at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: To the Minister of Co-operative Development. The Minister of Co-operative Development is interested in talking about the financial statement of 1974 and 1975. Can he confirm that he and his Leader were aware of the financial statements of 1974 and 1975 on October 10th, 1977 when his Leader promised the people of Brandon that McKenzie Seeds would remain a Crown corporation within Manitoba itself?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we have stated constantly is that we want to see that plant remain in Brandon and expand in Brandon. If that requires a partnership arrangement or an equity position with another company that is where we are headed, but you cannot close your eyes and hide your head in the sands when you are losing \$1 million a year. Unfortunately, some people can I guess.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Will the Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development confirm from the information that he has that preparations were made for the refinancing of McKenzie Seeds in 1976 and early 1977 by virtue of agreement with Brandon University, whereby that university agreed to amend the former agreement that had been made with it and whereby Mrs. Roberts, the daughter of the late Dr. A. A. McKenzie, agreed to give up her claim to certain equity? Will the Minister advise the House whether he has knowledge that those arrangements were made in preparation for the refinancing of McKenzie Seeds back in 1976-1977?

Thursday, 28 February 1980

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have information that goes back to 1974 where the Minister had correspondence with the previous Chairman, and indicated at that time that he would refinance it. That's 1974; he is talking about two or three years later, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. Would the First Minister undertake to ensure that his commitment, his pledge, made to the people of Brandon on October 10th, 1977, pertaining to McKenzie Seeds is retained and is kept and is honoured?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have done that on a number of occasions and I am happy to say that the people of Brandon have more respect for what is said on this side of the House than they have for what is heard from that side of the House.

MR. PAWLEY: A supplementary to the First Minister. Did the First Minister not commit himself to ensuring that McKenzie Seeds would remain a Crown corporation within Manitoba in the event of the election of his government?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, as I have said on many many occasions, what we said was that McKenzie Seeds was not one of the silly kind of ideological companies - if my honourable friends don't want the answer, Mr. Speaker, that's fine by me.

MR. CHERNIACK: We want the answer, not a speech.

MR. LYON: If my honourable friends are willing to listen, I am willing to speak; if they are not, I am willing to sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Education and ask him he can confirm that Winnipeg School Division No. 1 is planning to lay off 120 teachers this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question from the Member for St. Vital, I cannot confirm that particular figure. I have not received that information.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the same Minister. In the interests of seeing that there is no reduction in the quality of education for the students of that particular division, would the Minister undertake to find out the facts and report to the House?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I certainly will be receiving that information. I would merely suggest to the Member for St. Vital that in an era of declining enrollments we can expect in the natural course of events that there will be some diminution in the size of the teaching staff.

MR. WALDING: One further question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister advise the House as to the value of the Foundation Program to Winnipeg School Division No. 1 for this year?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I will be quite prepared to go into all of the details of the Foundation Program when I get to my Estimates. As the member realizes, the financing of education through the Foundation Program is a rather involved formula. Those details I would certainly address during my Estimates.

Thursday, 28 February 1980

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: MR. Speaker, my question flows from the response given by the Minister of Labour to my colleague from Elmwood. I would ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, whether he can confirm that the provincial judge presiding at the Ackland fatality inquiry stated in his written findings, and I quote, "evidence before me which seemed to confirm the decision by the CGA to condemn, underline the word condemn, the flexible connectors that had been used up to that time. Can he confirm that the inquest finding was that there was condemnation of the flexible connector?"

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm that. What I can confirm is what I said before, that in 1961, to the best of my knowledge, in all records available, that connector was not condemned. There was a newer, better type came on the market, and it was decided by the Department of Labour at that particular time that new construction could utilize a newer, better type. Period.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister also confirm that the judge, in his findings, referred to the Department of Labour's failure to inform the owners of the old style condemned equipment of the new specifications that had been approved, and can he confirm that such failure to notify the homeowners was found to have precluded them from re-testing or replacing the faulty connectors? And can he also in this regard confirm that the provincial judge found that the lack of communication between the Department of Labour and the public was the cause of the fatal incident?

And in that regard, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise us what he will do in order to assure the public that this sort of failure to communicate will not re-occur in the future?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, it's a fair amount of request for confirmation. I originally didn't confirm what the questioner had asked in the first place. I specifically said that it could not be confirmed. In fact, to the best of my knowledge, it was not a fact that 1961, those connectors were condemned. That seems to be the crux of the entire problem, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CORRIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I don't say this facetiously, and no ill will is intended. With all due respect, will the Minister assure the House that he will read the inquest judge's findings and report back to the House after he has done so?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware, or may I never be, exactly the reasoning for the particular type findings. What I am aware of is the facts and documentation that's available within the Department of Labour, and I don't think I need spell out what those facts are. I've said it twice now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Mines and Energy, or to the Minister responsible for that department in his absence. In light of the recent decision by British Columbia to impose a moratorium in regard to uranium exploration and mining in that province, and also in light of the fact that there is mention being made of northern Manitoba as being a potential area for uranium mining in the future, can the Minister indicate what procedures are in place to ensure that the public safety and health will be safeguarded adequately throughout any phase of uranium exploration and mining in the province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Mines and Energy, I would be happy to take that question as notice.

Thursday, 28 February 1980

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to address a question to the Minister responsible for winter roads construction. During a previous Question Period, the Minister indicated that negotiations were ongoing in regard to the construction of a winter road into the community of Red Sucker Lake. As it is late in the construction year, can the Minister indicate if that funding will be forthcoming, so that arrangements for construction may be made if the decision is positive in this regard?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. DON. ORCHARD (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, on a previous occasion, when the Member for Churchill asked about the Red Sucker Lake road, I indicated to him that that matter was under discussion and consideration. For some five weeks now I have been waiting for a reply to a letter to a gentleman in charge of construction of winter roads in that area. To this day, I haven't received a reply to that letter.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I've seen the other side of the coin. Those gentlemen tell me they have been waiting for answers from the Minister for quite some time. In that case, if I can act as an intermediary in this case, and arrange a meeting, is the Minister prepared to meet with representatives of that band and the Me-Ke-Si corporation in the near future in order to arrange a final decision on this matter?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the letter that I'm waiting on is of particular importance, because it indicates the level of federal commitment to that winter road, which is of importance, because it is a cost-shared program between the federal government and the provincial government. And when the Me-Ke-Si company avail me of the facts as to how much federal funding they have towards the construction of the winter road into Red Sucker Lake, we can certainly meet and negotiate whatever is necessary in lieu of the facts that they present.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Minister of Labour. Can he inform the House how much longer he is going to exempt Hooker and Simplot Chemical from the classifications of The Power Engineers Act in respect to the operation of that plant?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: I do not have a specific period of time in mind to carry on that exemption, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FOX: Will the Minister assure this House that it will be upon his onus in respect to the safety aspects in the operation of those two plants without qualified power engineers?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to take the responsibilities that Labour Ministers have to take when they issue exemptions.

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

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In respect to the answer that the Minister gave, I asked him whether he is prepared to accept the onus of safety that may be at hazard there.

My other question in respect to that, Mr. Speaker, is in regard to the fact that Simplot has had an in-house training program for a long period of time and has not been successful in getting any second-class engineers, does he not feel that he should put more pressure on Simplot to get on with finding a second-class engineer to operate its plant? Anywhere.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, we can all speak in degrees of success. There is an element of success that has taken place in relationship to their in-plant training. I understand that tests will be written very shortly for six particular individuals there that would be qualified in the higher classification than they are presently, and upon completion of that

Thursday, 28 February 1980

test, they tell me that the qualifications of these people are that great that they will carry on into the next phase of their training program.

MR. FOX: Would the Honourable Minister concur if Simplot was prepared to pay a better salary, it would be able to maintain second class engineers?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I can't concur with that particular situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation. I wonder if the Minister could advise the House why he announced the opening of the winter road to the Island Lake area before it was ready, causing a number of vehicles to get stranded on that road?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the winter road, when it was opened, was considered in fit shape to carry the loads that went in.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could explain then why 17 vehicles were stranded on that road?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, from the time that the winter road was opened up until those trucks reached a particular section in the road, it snowed some seven inches.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Question Period having expired and before we proceed with the Orders of the Day. . . The Honourable Government House Leader.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move with leave, seconded by the Minister of Government Services, that Morris McGregor, Esquire, member for the Electoral Division of Virden, be Deputy-Chairman of the Committees of the Whole House.

MR. SPEAKER: You've heard the motion of the Honourable Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, yes, I would have liked to talk myself out of that position, but really, through you, I would like to thank the members of this Chamber for the confidence expressed in me, and I hope I can live up to that expectation, knowing that there will be errors, and certainly I will be guided by that committee always.

But may I let all members know my strong feeling on after-midnight hours. I realize I am helpless in many ways, but I'm still capable, I think, of scheming a little bit, and I think in 20 Sessions I've seen so much ill feeling, mistakes made in those wee hours, that it will be my desire to control repetition, and in lieu of that, try not to run after midnight.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MOTION presented and carried.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River Heights on the amendment proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for Transcona has 23 minutes left.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I congratulated the Member for Morris yesterday in his absence from the House on his forthcoming election to the position of Chairman, and I concur very much with that election. I think his comments today reinforced

Thursday, 28 February 1980

— (Interjection)— I'm sorry, that's right, I agree, I think that there is an incredible difference in philosophy with respect to the House between those two members and I apologize to the Member for Virden for confusing him with the Member for Morris —(Interjection)— Indeed I think that his statements to us just now reflected, I think, an integrity with respect to the procedures of the House, and frankly, I think that your appointment to a position by your caucus, as I said yesterday, is long overdue - and congratulations.

Mr. Speaker, before adjournment yesterday, I was speaking on the difference in approach between New Democrats and Conservatives on the issue of foreign domination of our economy. The New Democrats firmly believe that the Canadian economy is too dominated by foreign multinationals who put international or international profit maximization ahead of national or provincial interests. And because the levers of economic power are controlled by forces outside this country, the important decisions affecting us - and I can name oil prices, I can name interest rates, I can name the price of consumer goods - those decisions that affect us are made not here in Manitoba, or not here in Canada, but rather in New York, Japan, or Saudi Arabia. We believe that situation is wrong and must be rectified.

Manitoba Conservatives, on the other hand, believe that even more direct foreign investment, as opposed to loans, is a good thing. The Premier went to the United States in November of 1979, begging for more foreign investment, and he pledged that he would have his colleagues in Ottawa at the time abolish the Foreign Investment Review Agency.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's a preposterous policy for Canada in the Eighties. Let me give you a concrete example of how shortsighted this reliance on foreign investment is, and how stupid it is, and how it affects Manitoba directly.

Remember Tantalum - the people of Manitoba, through the Manitoba Development Corporation, owned 25 percent of Tantalum Mines. We had the option, through the Manitoba Development Corporation, of acquiring 50 percent more of Tantalum Mines. And we didn't exercise that option last year. Indeed, we didn't have the courage to go ahead with a further investment in Tantalum Mines, and as a result, Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting - which really is a subsidiary of a South African firm called Anglo American - purchased Tantalum Mines for \$6 million. And the irony of this is that Tantalum Mines is not a loser. Tantalum Mines made a clear after-royalty, after-tax profit last year of \$2 million - \$2 million - and that is something that has been taken away from us as Manitobans. And really, Mr. Speaker, I was outraged by that. I think the people of Manitoba were outraged. We, in fact, were getting plucked because of this government.

And my outrage was intensified, Mr. Speaker, when I was reading the Financial Post. And the Financial Post is a big business magazine, it certainly isn't any type of left-wing paper. It's the September 29, 1979 edition of the Financial Post, and it's titled, "Harry Openheimer's Anglo American is Everywhere." And in this article, it says Harry Openheimer, who may or may not have the best personal cash flow in the world, was quite excited about his company's prospects - he's the chairman of Anglo American, which owns Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting - he was quite excited about what was taking place with his company. And he said, "We're the biggest in gold mines, diamonds, coal, heavy industry." Then, warming to the prospects, and I quote, "And there's never been a time of such investment opportunities."

And then he lists the great investments that his company has undertaken, and these are in order. He lists a new diamond mine in southern Botswana which will be one of the biggest in the world, then he talks about the immense coal projects in South Africa, and then he talks about the move by Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting to buy Tantalum Mining of Canada. That is his position and he sees it as a good move by them, and I ask myself why did we give that up? Why did we give up that profit from that mine when we had the opportunity to have it? It must be because of this tremendous drive on the part of the Conservatives to get out of anything successful that is publicly-owned or run.

Now the case of selling out our resource and our heritage to a multinational is only one of many. We have given up our options of gaining 50 percent of mines, and this is because of this Conservative madness. And, Mr. Speaker, the position of having an option or taking control in the mines is one that is becoming accepted right across the country. I think if we look next to us at the Province of Saskatchewan, we can appreciate the successes that they have accomplished by taking a fairly interventionist role with respect to resource development. They, in fact, are in a far better financial position than we are here in Manitoba, and their economic situation is far better than we are in Manitoba.

You know, when I raise Saskatchewan I think that what happens with members on the opposite side of the House, they say, "Oh yes, but that is Socialism. You know, we can't do that." And they start trotting out their tracks on totalitarianism.

Well, I ask them to consider the case of Newfoundland. You know, Newfoundland right now is going through a tremendous resource boom, quite the contrary to Manitoba. Again, I would like to quote from another article in The Financial Post. If I keep quoting from The

Thursday, 28 February 1980

Financial Post I am quite convinced that the Premier will start referring to it as a Socialist rag with the sycophants of the Left and the media who are staffing this particular --(Interjection)-- which are, in fact, staffing this particular paper.

And I would like to just quote here. It says, "Peckford and his colleagues have spent much time travelling to view the impact of offshore development in other areas, the North Sea in particular, and they have set out clear guidelines and regulations for the oil companies. These include a preference for Newfoundland controlled companies and offshore service work; requirements to employ local labour and carry out local trading; a demand that oil companies produce a comprehensive development plan before they commence production; and a provincial option to buy into 40 percent of oil production."

You must be scandalized by that. I mean, this is exactly what you abolished last year, because we had something like that in place. We could buy into 50 percent of mineral production, but you said this is wrong, this is going to hurt mining development. This will hurt resource development. But Newfoundland, on the other hand, with this provision, is experiencing the best boom it has ever experienced in its history, and finally may have some future to look forward to.

This article goes on to say, "Peckford's philosophy of government control and intervention makes it almost hard to believe that he is a Conservative Premier at all." And, of course, people opposite wouldn't include him in their ranks as a Conservative, given what I have heard in the House recently.

But he and his colleagues have grown up with the provincial experience that flies in the face of free market ideology. Concessions to the mining and forest industries have led, in Peckford's opinion, to Newfoundland being ripped off.

You know, it must be ironic to the Conservatives that the Newfoundland economy is having a boom, not because of the Manitoba Conservative brand of neo-Conservatism, but rather because of what we on this side of the House call good government.

Mr. Speaker, Peckford in Newfoundland has seen the light. Multinationals have ripped off Newfoundland; he is doing something about it, and they have some future. And here, Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Conservatives are begging the multinationals to come in and rip us off and we, ironically, Mr. Speaker, are becoming the old Newfoundland of Western Canada. We are becoming the poor cousin as a province in Confederation, and it is precisely because of their attitude and their approach.

And when I say that Peckford is fighting the multinationals, and when I say that we indeed are fighting the multinationals when it comes to our future in terms of our economy, I would like to quote another person who is quoted in this article, and it is Dorey Little, the President of Mobile Oil Canada Incorporated. Mobile is a subsidiary of Mobile of the United States. He says, and I quote, "At some point we will have to get right down on the mat and wrestle with them." Mr. Speaker, that is his attitude towards Brian Peckford and the Newfoundland government trying to increase the resource wealth of their country.

Mr. Speaker, if Truman Capote ever wrote a book about the Conservative Government in Manitoba similar to the book entitled "In Cold Blood", I am sure he would have to entitle this book about Manitoba Conservatives "Compulsion" or "Possessed". How else could you describe the completely unpopular drive to privatize and privateer, not only natural resources, but also anything else that is public. There is compulsion to privatize or mutualize Autopac, although this is incredibly unpopular, but the Conservatives are looking for some way of doing it.

We had a debate in Question Period today about the compulsion on the part of Conservatives to somehow privatize McKenzie Seeds. And let me tell you, the people of Brandon don't have the same faith in the integrity of the Premier that the Premier has in himself.

In the last Federal Election, you might be interested to know that the Conservatives lost both provincial parts of Brandon. The people of Brandon are turning against them, Mr. Speaker, and I think that they, in fact, have sowed their own seeds of destruction with their compulsion.

Mr. Speaker, when we turn to liquor sales - you know, liquor is sold by the public in Manitoba. Most people are in favour of that. Various polls that have been done show that most people are in favour of that type of approach, and yet we have this government appointing yet another commission to look into ways and means whereby liquor can be sold privately.

Thursday, 28 February 1980

Mr. Speaker, we as a province are wasting time, we are wasting money on studies which aren't necessary, to produce unpopular unnecessary destructive things like this, while the real problems are declining economy, outmigration, bankruptcies of small business - a number of small businesses putting up For Sale signs. You know, the last Federal Election I had the occasion to go through a lot of small rural communities, and I was amazed at the number of businesses that have For Sale signs on them. I mean, those people who were looking for some type of nirvana when the Conservatives came in are recognizing that that nirvana does not exist, that they in fact are suffering from rural depopulation in a massive way, and that some type of government intervention is necessary to counterbalance that. And it is not happening, Mr. Speaker, because we or this government will not define that as a problem, and is backing away from it.

We have inner-city decay and we have housing problems in the inner-city, and I am amazed that a Throne Speech like this would somehow have the audacity to put it in as a program an intention to deal with the housing problems of the inner-city just short months after Fil Filecchia, the Acting Chairman of the Board of Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, sent a letter to the City Council when City Council was debating whether, in fact, to establish a non-profit corporation, and in that letter he said the view of the province is that a non-profit housing corporation is not necessary, and he in fact pooh-pooed any housing problems in the inner-city.

Short months after that approach, which was an attempt by the Provincial Government or at least its agents - I assume that this official was acting on the instructions of his Minister, and if he wasn't he should be fired - short months after that attempt to sabotage the city's first tentative attempts to try and deal with inner-city housing programs, this government, I think somewhat scared after the federal election, tries to introduce some positive statements with respect to inner-city housing. Frankly, although I think that's a somewhat hypocritical approach, I'm glad that they've introduced that item into the Throne Speech, because we are going to put pressure on you to live up to your commitments, and we know that the people will not accept governments changing their promises. I think they showed John Crosbie that very clearly. And I think they're going to show this government that very clearly in two years as well.

We still have problems with respect to the elderly. We have tremendous waiting lists for senior citizens' housing; we have tremendous waiting lists for nursing homes; and yet, Mr. Speaker, instead of dealing directly with those fundamental issues facing us, we are somehow pursuing this drive which I call a compulsion of privatization.

Mr. Speaker, the government is really acting as if it's possessed. And obviously, this government, because it's possessed, needs an exorcist. And the exorcist will be the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. In fact they will be exorcising the Conservatives in a year or a year and a half, whenever the Conservatives do, in fact, get some courage to call an election.

Mr. Speaker, I have concentrated on the economy because I feel that the economy is, in fact, our greatest challenge of the 1980s. I'd like to spend a few of my remaining minutes on health. I'll expand on this in the Health Estimates, but Mr. Speaker, I think that the biggest threat to health care in Manitoba and Canada is the Conservative compulsion to privatize. Mr. Speaker, this government is shifting resources away from public practitioners of health care, to private practitioners of health care.

A concrete example is the shift in emphasis and funding of this government from non-proprietary personal care homes to private, profit-making personal care homes. Again, why? We have example after example of private profit-making nursing homes not doing a good job, not ever re-investing their profit into improving the facilities, but rather taking the money away and investing in land development and housing development and other activities, when in fact they should have been investing some of their profits back to improving the quality of those personal care homes.

And on the other hand, we have non-profit community and religious groups who are providing excellent personal care right now, virtually begging this government to do more, because they recognize that there is a tremendous need for personal care for senior citizens, and they have been consistently turned down by this government, which is has been favouring the private sector. And when the private sector hasn't produced, we have the weird situation of the Minister saying, I am going to give the private sector in personal care a special deal. I am going to give them special incentives. I'm going to give them either a special day rate, or subsidized funds, so that they in fact, can make more money. Mr. Speaker, we believe that the profit motive really cannot be allowed in the provision of health care.

Thursday, 28 February 1980

I think that any private group that wants to somehow squeeze an extra 20 percent out as their profit margin will logically provide worse care than a dedicated non-profit group that wants to provide that care, not for money, not for love of a buck, but because of love of humanity. And that is the difference in approach between ourselves and them. But it also undercuts the public health care system.

We are also having a bias towards privatization in Denticare, in higher doctors' fees. We have a situation where the institutions that service the private part of the medical care program are being enlarged, and I think the Minister will probably be announcing something very large for the Health Sciences Centre, while at the same time, Mount Carmel Clinic, which has done such an excellent job over the years on a community clinic basis, has been rejected in its appeal for funds to this government to expand its operation.

Mr. Speaker, this privatization is a tremendous danger to universal, socialized health care. And it's also stupidly expensive. The percentage of Canada's GNP spent on health care is about 6.8 percent to 7 percent. The percentage of the United States GNP spent on health care is about 8.6 percent, and which one is better? Which system of health care is better? A socialized, Canadian health care system, accessible to all, on a cost efficient basis, or a private, profit-oriented system of health care, accessible mainly to the rich that exist in the United States.

We, on this side of the House, choose, and want to protect the Canadian system. You on that side of the House are drifting towards the American model through your privatization. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to that debate. I look forward to the debate that the Minister is going to have with Monique Begin, who I hope will be appointed, the Minister of Health and Welfare, and I think that she is one Liberal who I respect. She has been principled on this issue consistently; one of the few, I must admit, because she was in opposition to her leader when her leader imposed that system of flexibility which allowed Conservative governments really to undermine Medicare right across the country. But I respect her and her position on this, and I firmly believe that she, indeed, will tackle the Minister and provide the accurate figures, and show in fact that there has been an undercutting of Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, this government does not want to govern. It is merely acting like a cork; it's bobbing on water and it's trying desperately to stay right side up while events like outmigration and a depressed economy overtake it.

Mr. Speaker, they're looking for some outside corporate force to save it, and there will be no outside corporate force to save it. The people left in Manitoba will remove it, and install in its place, a government with the will to govern. And Mr. Speaker, in the interim, the tragedy is that this government is weakening and even destroying effective instruments of government for the future. We on this side of the House are going to preserve these instruments so that a government acting in the name of Canadians and Manitobans and in the pursuit of economic and social justice, can meet the great challenges of the '80s. We, Mr. Speaker, are on our way to assuming that role.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My first words, on rising to participate in this Throne Speech Debate would be of congratulations to you and welcome to you, Sir, back to your position as arbiter of the debates in this Chamber, and protector of the interests of all members. I wish you well in the session ahead, and join with others who have already extended their respect to you for your conduct of the affairs in this Chamber in past sessions, Sir.

I also want to join with my colleagues and others on the other side of the House who have extended congratulations to the Mover and the Seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the Honourable Member for River Heights and the Honourable Member for Emerson, and of course add my warm welcome, again to the Honourable Member for River Heights, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge and the Honourable Member for Transcona --(Interjection)-- Rossmere, I'm sorry - the Honourable Member for Rossmere on their election to this Chamber, since last we met here in Legislative session.

Thursday, 28 February 1980

There have been a number of changes, of course, in the façade of the Chamber itself in terms of the personnel and positions occupied within it, not the least of those changes pertaining, Sir, to the addition of three fine, new Cabinet Ministers to the Government of Manitoba in the persons of the Minister of Highways, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and the Minister of Community Services. And with all members of the government caucus, and indeed all members of the House, for the record, Sir, I welcome them and look forward to the great contributions that they will make and are already making to the affairs of this province through their positions on the Executive Council.

I would also like to extend congratulations to the Leader of the Opposition, now officially confirmed in his position, and compliment him both in terms of his new responsibility, and his new appearance. Not merely an appearance of a leader who feels, Sir, that he has barricades that he has to storm and challenges that he has to meet, but I detect a subtle change in the physical appearance of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and I compliment him on his barber, Sir. I think it's an improvement that might well commend itself to many of us in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, and I don't exclude myself from that group. I, of course, do not have as much to work with as some members in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, but nor does the Leader of the Opposition, and his barber, or his hairstylist has done very well in covering up what defects he was heretofore forced to carry through life, in terms of public appearance, above his eyebrows.

I want also to extend my congratulations to the new opposition critics in their new roles. I must say that I'm sorry to see that on the other side of the House they split the Department of Health and Community Services, and I no longer will have as much shoulder-to-shoulder or eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation as in previous years with my friend, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, but no doubt he will be jumping in from time to time, into the debate, Mr. Speaker, with his pearls of wisdom in a bilingual perspective. There's no question that although he may have difficulty confounding me or confusing me in any criticisms directed at the Minister of Health and the field of health in English, he will have no difficulty confounding me or confusing me if he directs those barbs in French, and that may well be his tactic in the session ahead.

I look forward to continued competition with my friend, the Honourable Member for Transcona, who has been elevated to the seats of the mighty as the official opposition health critic in this Chamber, and with respect to whom I wish him good fortune in his career, but a short career, Sir.

I might say with respect to the Member for St. Boniface that I am delighted to see him restored to physical health, if not to Ministerial health. In the last session, the last time we met, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the Member for St. Boniface did experience some health difficulties which we all deplored, and it certainly is a welcome sight to see him back in full vigour.

Finally, may I offer my congratulations to my colleague, the Honourable Member for Virden, on his choice as Deputy Chairman of the Committees of the Whole House.

So Mr. Speaker, that's the lineup, and one that I wanted to recount, not only for the record, but because my remarks with respect to each and every one of those individuals and offices mentioned are offered in all sincerity, Sir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a word should be said about the impressive change that's taken place overall in the Chamber since the last time we met, and I refer, of course, to the New Look NDP.

Last session, the view from this side of the House, Sir, was of a spent and dispirited clutch of electoral refugees, victims of political shellshock, huddled over there amidst the wreckage of their rejected doctrines, mourning the departure to Ottawa of their once-great King, quarrelling among themselves in mediocre competition for the discarded mantle, and whimpering like a pack of vandals, Sir, around their night fires on the outskirts of Rome. At their tenuous, uncertain helm, Sir, a tenuous, uncertain interim Leader, who spoke tentatively, who performed deferentially, and who wore the mantle of temporary leadership with all the fame, bravura of a man who has just won a Liberal nomination in western Canada.

I think it's important to recall that canvas, Mr. Speaker, in order to appreciate the full grandeur of the scene that now greets us from this side of the Legislative Chamber, in the form of the New Look NDP. Since it's a year in Legislative terms since we last met, and since this is my first opportunity to comment on it, I feel I should, Sir, on behalf of my colleagues, extend tangible recognition of that change. What a difference, Sir, since the last session.

Thursday, 28 February 1980

Since then, of course, we've had the electrifying drama of an NDP leadership convention that riveted the attention of several dozen delegates and almost 100 television viewers for nearly half-an-hour last fall, confirming the leadership mantle on the assertive shoulders of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, propelling him in his own right to the head of the pack, and rekindling the spirits of the rest of the refugees yonder to the point, Sir, where they now they burn with new zeal, new ideas and new inspiration.

And all this, Sir, on the strength of a great outpouring of emotion and popular demand last fall, Sir, that rolled through a partly-filled room in the Winnipeg Convention Centre, spilled over onto one of the coat racks, and finally engulfed Manitobans in a frenzy of political ecstasy, Sir. Will anyone ever forget that convention - that magnificent competition - the creative, imaginative, incisive debates as the field of candidates pitted their intellects against each other. That great drama, Sir, has effected the change that confronts us today. It marked the rebirth, or so we were told, of the forces who sit opposite us in this Chamber, and so now, Sir, we come into this session with the New Look NDP. And what a remarkable transformation it is, Sir.

We have the confirmed Leader of the Opposition taking charge, shucking off the legacies of the Schreyer years - or so he has assured us through his press conferences - beginning the process of de-Schreyerization of the Manitoba New Democratic Party, the new Leader firmly in the saddle.

Down at the end of the row, unfortunately not in his seat at the moment but usually here, we have the redoubtable Member for Inkster, right out of the saddle. The magnificent volcano who sits there in rejection, surrounded by the Member for St. Boniface, smarting, Mr. Speaker, in self-imposed isolation, given a spot on the front benches only through the recognition afforded him by the Government House Leader and government members of the House, and you, in your wisdom and your office, Sir, but not by his erstwhile colleagues on the other side of the House.

Then on the other side of the confirmed new Leader of the Opposition we have, reborn, the Honourable Member for Brandon East, his stentorian economic theories now piercing this Chamber with more clarity and more vigor than ever, Sir. His hair and his voice taking on new tambour every day, offering his contributions to this Chamber.

And one could go on, Sir, one could go on, but that is the revitalized, reinvigorated, dynamic, inspiring picture of the New Look NDP, the feared crimson tide behind the new Leader from Selkirk, who are going to change politics in this province, change the conduct of the province's affairs and change the balance of power in this Chamber.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the showing to date - and I would concede that this session has some considerable distance to go yet - but the showing to date, Sir, could not be described in even the kindest terms as even mildly effectual or impressive. So we shall have to wait to see after the fanfare; after the grand convention; after the initial commentaries and speeches in this House by those on the opposite side who have participated in the Throne Speech Debate thus far; after all of the fawning adulation of some members of the Press - and I emphasize the word "some" because certainly not all of the Press is hoodwinked - but certain fawning sycophants, certain of those who slavishly and in doctrinaire fashion yearn for the return of the philosophies, either of the New Democrats or of the Liberals because of their resentment to the Conservative Party; after all of those great trumpets, and all of those great headlines, and all that great publicity, Mr. Speaker, what do we have? Not a bang, but a bunch of whimpers. So we will wait and see, Mr. Speaker, whether indeed the Chamber has changed integrally and fundamentally the way it has changed superficially in terms of the different titles and the different positions afforded to some members opposite.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't at this point in time want to take exception in particular to anything that has been said or suggested, either by the official Health critic for the Opposition or my erstwhile competitor, the official critic of Community Services for the Opposition, or indeed anybody else in the opposition caucus up to this point, because I think really enough of an absolutely astounding and incomprehensible nature has been said by the Leader of the Opposition to occupy one's attention and one's intentions in the limited amount of time one has to participate in this Throne Speech Debate. So in essence I am concerning myself with the position that the new Leader of the Opposition or the newly confirmed Leader of the Opposition has taken.

His amendment to the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely ludicrous, absolutely ludicrous, particularly insofar as its reference to the deterioration of health care. It is the kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition has become quite famous or infamous for in the last two years, the trumpeting of a scare headline with no provision of

facts or backup or documentation, because there are no such facts or backup or documentation. Anybody can glibly toss off headlines of the kind that he does about deteriorating health care and go about passing that off as a posture of his party's political efforts and position, but when he is called upon to produce evidence or facts to support that kind of headline he has not done it, he cannot do it and he will not be able to do it, because they simply, Mr. Speaker, are not there. For that reason I suggest to him in all kindness that his effort, which was a reasonably good one in the Throne Speech, was completely destroyed and completely rendered totally ludicrous by the amendment he offers in which he makes reference again to that catch-phrase "deterioration in comprehensive health care for Manitobans".

Mr. Speaker, the facts, the evidence, the record, the money, the budget, the estimates, and the consumers of health care, and the professionals and the position of our institutions demonstrate the precise opposite today, the precise opposite today. Whatever credibility the Leader of the Opposition hoped to be building goes right out the window with that kind of an amendment, Mr. Speaker. He is like the boy who cried wolf once too often, he has raised scare headlines in the past and he is raising them again and he is not able to deliver on any of them. He is walking dangerously close to undermining beyond recall his credibility as leader of his party if he persists in that kind of exercise. And I offer those comments to him in a friendly advisory way, we have been friendly rivals in this Chamber for some considerable years. The honourable gentleman would be off to a much better start, I suggest to him and to you, Mr. Speaker, if it weren't for his tendency to rely on his imagination for his facts.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition made reference in particular to the proposal under consideration by the government, which has also been referred to in recent moments by the Honourable Member for Transcona, to work out a formula whereby participation in the nursing home field is available to private operators, proprietary operators, as well as to non-profit and public operators. And the suggestion coming from the Honourable Member for Transcona but laid out first, well first in this Chamber - perhaps not first in the Debate because I think the Member for Transcona did criticize me in terms of a statement outside this Chamber, fairly - in a statement outside this Chamber a couple of weeks ago on this point, but first in this Chamber was the Leader of the Opposition to jump up and deplore the fact, hands ringing, that we were going to be subsidizing private nursing home operators out of the taxpayers' purse and that we were going to be pursuing a policy of recognizing and rewarding operations for profit in the medical and health field, and he said in righteous indignation that, "The New Democratic Party is not in favour of operations for profit in the medical and health field, the government is preventing non-profit corporations from building personal care homes while preparing to subsidize private operators with the taxpayers' money," or reasonably close to a direct quote.

Mr. Speaker, who does the Leader of the Opposition think he is kidding? We are trying to get personal care homes built and on stream in this province and personal care beds in place to meet the needs of those of our elderly who require them and deserve them, and there is a limited amount of money available, Mr. Speaker. The argument that the Leader of the Opposition takes and relies on is that there is cheap money around through CMHC that enables non-profit corporations to borrow at two percent. --(Interjection)-- No, well, but this is a fact. The Leader of the Opposition is quite correct, he didn't say this, but I am saying the position he takes is - perhaps I worded incorrectly, I should have said the position he takes is based on the fact, the reality, that non-profit builders, proprietors in the personal care home field are in, as a matter of fact in the care facility field, can borrow money through CMHC at approximately two percent while the private operator going into the field has to go into the market and borrow at anywhere from 12 to 15 percent.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that would be fine to go all the non-profit route if there was that much cheap money available. The fact of the matter, Sir, is that we will never, through the amount of money available for health care shelter, for health care facilities through CMHC, be able to supply and provide the personal care beds that we need. We need the private sector participating in this field in order to supply those beds.

Further to that, Sir, I suggest to you, and I know this will never be accepted on the other side, but I suggest to you that it is a disservice to many in the health field to suggest or imply that private operators have no place whatsoever in the nursing home field. There is something ugly and unsightly about that kind of sweeping denunciation. There are private operators, Mr. Speaker, in the health field that provide as much love and compassion and tender loving care as public operators do, and any professional will tell you that. The fact that there is in their operation an element, obviously, of cost efficiency geared to the

necessity of survival in the marketplace, in other words, some profit is an advantage in many ways, Sir, because it provides those of us in the area of responsibility, such as all of us in this Chamber hold, with a yardstick, a measuring stick, of facility against facility, method against method, program against program. If we were to go all - I wouldn't be in favour of going all non-profit; I wouldn't be in favour of going all proprietary; I wouldn't be in favour of going all proprietary operation in the personal care field, but I am not in favour either, Mr. Speaker --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Transcona wants to ask me a question, but I want to announce my capital program this afternoon and I have only got a few minutes left on the clock. Could I take the question at the end?

I wouldn't be in favour of going all proprietary, Mr. Speaker, but I suggest to you that we should not be in favour of going all non-profit either, because there is an advantage to having a scale of performance to measure another type of performance against. There is an advantage in terms of levels of staffing and nursing and medical care, of quality of diet, of quality of physical surroundings, and of cost efficiency in terms of the overall operation and if you can take a private operation and look at its record against a public operation's record you then, as a government or an opposition, are in a much better and healthier position to be able to say, "Well, this is the way it can be done and this is the way it should be done," and some kind of median form of funding or level of funding should be struck. I suggest that as only one argument for having private operations in the field. But the other two are the two that I have mentioned - the fact that the private operators in many cases have as much compassion and as much professionalism as public operators do. The public form of operation has no monopoly on love and compassion. The other point, that the cheap money isn't there anyway, Mr. Speaker. There is a limited amount of it available but not nearly enough to build the numbers of homes that we need.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge both expressed concern in their remarks that there was nothing in the Throne Speech in terms of health care. They both suggested that two or three items had been suggested several times and had been repeated again this year and that it was a rewarmed of old soup, so to speak.

They cited in particular the Seven Oaks Hospital, the reference to it, and the reference to the \$138 million regeneration of the Health Sciences Centre. Well, Mr. Speaker, they'd better get used to it, because those two items perhaps have been referred to seven times and they'll be referred to seven more times and more than seven more times because, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that every year the cash flow borrowing authority going into both of those projects which translates itself, as the Leader of the Opposition well knows, into a budgetary impact for Manitobans, one, two, three, four or how many years downstream.

The cash flow borrowing into those two projects is running in the neighbourhood of \$9 million and \$10 million a year and there is no harm whatsoever in reminding spendthrift Liberals and non-accountable New Democrats of the millions of dollars that are going into these projects every year.

I don't want any lessons from any Liberal. I don't want any lessons from any Liberal after sixteen years of the destruction of the economy of this country about references that should be made to building for capital projects in the health field or not. We don't need any lessons from the Liberals on that, Mr. Speaker. The record of the Canadian Commonwealth's near bankruptcy is vivid enough testimony of what the Liberals think about accountability of dollars and reminding people of what things cost.

So, I just want to say to the honourable lady that her reference is a reference that disappears on the wind, as far as I am concerned, because I will make reference every year, as long as I have the responsibility, to what is going into the Health Sciences Centre. There were fifteen years of frustration. And I know my honourable friend, the Member for St. Boniface, did his best to move and got some things moving with respect to the Health Sciences Centre. But I am not attaching blame to any particular government; I am saying there were fifteen years of frustration, and that embraces two governments.

There were fifteen years of frustration for the Health Sciences Centre, Mr. Speaker, and this government finally got it moving at \$138 million, and there is no harm whatsoever - in fact it would be folly to do otherwise - in reminding the Leader of the Opposition that those millions of dollars in whatever annual measurement it may be, \$9 million or \$10 million, is going into that budget every year.

Now, the Member for Fort Rouge said there is a desperate need, which was not addressed in the Throne Speech, for personal care facilities. Well the kindest thing one can say about that charge, Mr. Speaker, is that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge could not have been

Thursday, 28 February 1980

listening very closely to the Throne Speech. The Throne Speech made specific reference to the capital program coming up this year and specific reference to the component in that program having to do with construction of personal care homes. The paragraph in fact read, Mr. Speaker, "that in addition, my government" . . . This was a paragraph referring to hospital construction, and it said, "in addition my government will seek approval for the construction of a number of new personal care homes in Manitoba." Obviously the specific items weren't going to be laid out in the Throne Speech. They will be laid out now in the capital program as I present it to the House to demonstrate that this government is moving with all vigour, with all compassion, and with all responsibility, as quickly as we can, Sir, to meet the perceived needs in the health facility field for Manitobans in general.

Mr. Speaker, I take pride in announcing on behalf of my colleagues, both in Cabinet and in the government caucus generally, a \$50 million capital program of new construction and renovation of hospitals and personal care homes in Manitoba, to get under way immediately, Sir.

The 1980-81 program of the Manitoba Health Services Commission calls for the expenditure of \$32.5 million for major hospital replacement and renovation and more than \$16 million for new non-proprietary personal care homes.

The package also includes some \$2 million for repairs and renovations resulting from reports of the provincial Fire Commissioner to bring Manitoba health facilities up to current building code standards and other contingencies. So that's the total; actually it's slightly in excess of \$50 million, Mr. Speaker.

The hospital program includes extensive projects for Dauphin and Selkirk, renovations to the Municipal Hospitals in Winnipeg and to the Ste. Anne Hospital and a new 25-bed adolescent psychiatric unit to be constructed in Winnipeg. I'll be dealing with the projects item by item --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, I might say to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, who is asking about the adolescent psychiatric unit, I'll be coming to it in a moment. I'm referring to it in general terms at the moment as a new 25-bed adolescent psychiatric facility.

A total of \$16.4 million is designated to provide 255 additional non-proprietary personal care beds in Elkhorn, Hamiota, the Interlake Region, MacGregor, Reston, Rivers, Rosburn, and Winnipeg, plus renovations to affected hospitals and medical clinics in Gypsumville and Lundar.

Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite will keep it down for a minute. . . --(Interjection)-- I might explain to the Honourable Member for St. George, who has extreme difficulty comprehending the English language, Mr. Speaker, I am laying out the program of the Department and the Commission and I just said to him, through the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and through you, Sir, that I will deal with the projects project-by-project after I get through the layout of the overall program.

Mr. Speaker, the 255 new beds will consist of 165 in rural Manitoba and a 90 bed personal care home in Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. George on a point of order.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI (St. George): On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health indicated that I have extreme difficulty understanding the English language, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Health, when he was speaking to the Member from St. Boniface, was dealing directly with the new facility that he was speaking about in terms of construction. He was being asked about it. He was not dealing at all with the facilities that I spoke to him about, with the nursing homes in Eriksdale and Ashern.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The honourable member has not got a point of privilege in that respect.

The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to continue if I could. The 255 new beds will consist of 165 in rural Manitoba, and a 90-bed personal care home for Winnipeg to be built by the Oddfellows and Rebeccas in St. Vital. In addition, I am hopeful that proprietary operators in Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie, affected by closure or reduction in bed numbers in January 1978, will get into construction this year and will add a minimum of 282 additional personal care beds to the spectrum.

Thursday, 28 February 1980

Also in the proprietary field, a 104-bed personal care home has already been approved for construction in Selkirk to replace an existing 72-bed home that is time expired. If private construction in Selkirk proves impossible, a non-proprietary care home will get under way this year. The combination of confirmed non-proprietary nursing homes and proposed proprietary facilities would add a minimum of 569 personal care beds to the province's current supply of 7,480.

Mr. Speaker, I want to underline the combination of confirmed non-proprietary nursing homes and proposed proprietary facilities would add a minimum of 569 personal care beds to the provinces current supply of 7,480.

I want to underline, Mr. Speaker, the fact that this new \$50 million program is in addition to \$150 million worth of capital work on hospitals and personal care homes approved during the past two years by the government and already in various stages of progress, including the \$75 million first phase of redevelopment of the Health Sciences Centre and a score of rural Manitoba health projects.

Two other capital projects on the near horizon for the government involve renovation of Deer Lodge Hospital and Misericordia Hospital, but no immediate provision has been made for them in this year's capital program, pending further studies and discussions. The government wants close consultation with the Royal Canadian Legion before any decision is made on Deer Lodge, and we are awaiting the results of a role study before resuming discussions with Misericordia.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister has four minutes.

MR. SHERMAN: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the new facilities contained in our 1980-81 program will greatly enhance the range of health and social services available to Manitobans and will also provide great stimulation to the construction industry in the coming months.

The details of the new projects are as follows:

In Dauphin, replacement of the older portion of the Dauphin General Hospital and renovations to the newer section and a new diagnostic unit.

In Elkhorn, renovation of the hospital to provide personal care beds.

In Hamiota, hospital renovation with reduction in acute care beds to 21, from 25, with a new personal care home to be attached to the hospital.

In the Interlake Region, construction of a new free-standing personal care home at Lundar; a 20-bed personal care home to be attached to the Ashern Hospital; roof repairs to the Eriksdale Hospital, and the purchase of two clinics in Lundar and Gypsumville. I would emphasize also, Mr. Speaker, that this is phase one of a program to meet health facility needs throughout the Interlake.

In McGregor, a new 15-bed personal care home attached to the hospital and renovations to the hospital, reducing acute care beds to eight from twelve.

In Reston, a new personal care home for the community, the exact location and size of which is under discussion at the moment.

In Rivers, a new 20-bed personal care home attached to the hospital and renovations to the hospital, reducing acute care beds to 16 from 20.

In Rosburn, 20 new personal care beds and a new primary care unit with 10 holding beds and doctor's space.

In Ste. Anne, regeneration of the hospital, including new space for an improved diagnostic unit and out-patient services.

In Selkirk, a new 75-bed hospital to replace the existing 77-bed hospital.

In Winnipeg, the L.O.O.F. will build a new 90-bed personal care home in St. Vital and commence design work for a new facility to replace its home in Charleswood. Construction is approved for a 25 bed in-patient adolescent psychiatric facility in the city, the location of which now is being determined. At the Municipal Hospitals, there will be renovations to the hospitals to allow for improvement of programs, such as social services, day hospital, housekeeping, devices, workshop, etc. and this space, Sir, will permit expansion of departments in the hospitals that require more space, such as pharmacy, speech and occupational therapies, and the kitchen.

That, Mr. Speaker, with the concurrence and support of my colleagues in the Progressive Conservative government caucus, is the capital program through the Manitoba Health Services Commission of the Department of Health and the Government of Manitoba for 1980-81.

Thursday, 28 February 1980

That, combined, Sir, with the programs to which reference was made in the Throne Speech in terms of services that are being added and initiated through the Health Services Commission and other arms of the government and the department, will provide, we think, Mr. Speaker, an exciting and a dramatic expansion of services across the health care spectrum, across the medical spectrum for Manitobans. It is a reflection of the commitment of this government which was given in 1977-78 to try to get the fiscal capacity of the province in condition to move forward with new additions and new expansions and new services in the spectrum that will guarantee that Manitoba, which already has an enviable health care system, remains in the very forefront of that spectrum in North America.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER: Mr. Speaker, may I join with the others in congratulating you on your continued position in this House as the impartial arbitrator and order keeper, and I hope that you will, indeed, recognize that your responsibility is to both sides of the House and to treat both equally and fairly. As well, I'd like to join with other speakers who have spoken to welcome the Members from River Heights, Fort Rouge and Rossmere, who, I am sure will do their utmost to represent their constituents, and I'm sure they'll do it ably and well.

Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting listening to the Minister of Health, who now has the one portfolio and instead of two, and I wish him well on that because it was an onerous portfolio, as well I know, and a difficult one. I hope that in splitting it, however, they don't make the mistake of starting to treat people as if social services and health services are two totally separate services. One of the evils in our society has been that in attacking people problems we try to isolate them, we try to sort of specialize them to the extent that a person is treated by one agency for a particular problem and then the same person, for another problem, has to be treated somewhere else.

In those areas where the Health and Social Services were combined it was recognized that it was the well-being of the individual that had to be taken into account, and that the totality of resources had to be funneled in the same direction with the same sense of responsibility. And so there is a danger that in separating the two departments the tendency would be for the bureaucracies, for the administration, to each operate in its own way, and the loser is, in the final analysis, the individual who is the recipient of the services.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with great care to the Minister of Health, and he is in his usual form. He has a good sense of humour, he knows how to turn a phrase and sort of slip the needle in very gently but very sharply, very effectively, and he gets his laughs. That's fair game, he likes to do that and I suppose he enjoys it. And it's a way of wasting time but that's his problem.

But you know, I don't think I've ever heard a more self-congratulatory speech than I just heard. Does the Minister really expect that I and my colleagues here, or Manitobans generally, are going to stand up and say, Halleluia, look what he's doing! Mr. Speaker, they are the Government of Manitoba. They have a responsibility. Where have they been for the last 27 months? They are long overdue. He has taken out an old NDP program, approved, taken it out of drawer No. 3 at the bottom, he's dusted it off and he's just read it to us. Halleluia! Where have you been the last 27 months? I know where he's been, he's been up on cloud nine, and he really believed, as his First Minister believed, and as many on that side believed, that the least government is the best government. They believe it with their heart and soul. And I don't think they're cynical, I don't think that they are false, they honestly believe this, fundamentally. And there are people in this world that do, and they are of that ilk. --(Interjection)-- No, I think they're sincere people. They have a point of view and they believe it and they live it. But now they're in trouble, now they're in trouble.

You know last year, too, I recall that same Minister, I can't give him the page of Hansard, I don't know, but last year too, he said, you know the trouble is the opposition is not effective, that's the trouble. Well why, when we, the Conservatives, were in opposition we were an effective opposition; but the New Democratic Party opposition is not effective, it has no meaning. Well, you know, I wish for his sake that - no, I won't put it that way - for my sake I wish that we continue to be as effective this session and next session as we have been the last two. Because frankly what happened in the last two federal elections is a reflection on the attitudes that people have towards this government, and he can get on his feet and talk about \$50 million, or \$15 million or \$10 million, and rattle them off so fast that I didn't even try to take notes, I'll read them in Hansard, but I recognized many of the things he said as being our

Thursday, 28 February 1980

programs. And he can try to make hay on that, try to now imply with that message that somehow the Conservative government is meeting its obligations. Mr. Speaker, it's a - how will I put it? - it's a rebirth of a realization that they are here to serve people, that government is an instrument which is logically and correctly to be used to provide services to people, whether they be in the field of economic stimulation, whether they be in the field of people services, of which health is one of them.

So I frankly cannot become overawed by all this. There is nothing for him to feel so proud of. If he had maintained the timetable established then half of those projects that he announced so lively today would be well on the road, well on the road. He tells us, "I'm going to remind you of Seven Oaks." Mr. Speaker, every time that Minister gets up and talks about Seven Oaks I have to tell you I sit in my seat and I chortle, because that's the same Minister who was very doubtful about Seven Oaks. I think he referred to it as the biggest community clinic this side of Moscow. Now he's talking about the Seven Oaks Hospital, isn't that a terrific thing. Mr. Speaker, the reason why Seven Oaks Hospital is rising now, being built and it's going to open in October, is because it was so far down the pike he couldn't stop it. And if he's honest he'll admit it. And if he could have stopped it, he would have.

Now I'll tell you all a secret. They would have dropped \$10 million if they had tried to cancel that contract. --(Interjection)-- Now he says 15 - that's inflation for you, that's inflation for you. A year and a half ago it was 10. He never denied it, he never admitted it. He always was at arm's length. Well, it's here, Seven Oaks is here, and they can stand on their heads. Do you know how much credit you're going to get for Seven Oaks? Bingo. That's what you're going to get. Two goose eggs, two goose eggs.

Mr. Speaker, if that Minister of Health thinks he can get up here consistently and fool the public, he is wrong. And damn it all, doesn't he realize that people told him twice in nine months that they're not to be fooled, they're not to be taken for fools, that people have dignity, that they have sense, that they can analyze for themselves and not be taken in by a lot of hogwash, the kind that he likes to deliver in this House, with his pious little intonations and those smooth tender words, periodically with a bit of a shaft, the needle that he likes to give. --(Interjection)-- Oh, he's always smiling. I've referred to him often as our smiling Minister of Health.

He is smiling because he is enjoying his position and he's smiling because he thinks he can achieve what he wants to achieve in his term of office, which I predict will not go beyond 1981 if they call an election. If they don't call an election until 1982 he may be there until 1982, maybe in the same portfolio, maybe not.

But there's one other thing I'd like to mention with regard to his effort this afternoon. He talks about personal care homes, proprietary and non-proprietary, in other words, private profit-making or non-profit operated by organizations, municipalities; and he says, there's a great deal of money needed - and there's no doubt about it. And where's all this money going to come from? We have to go to the private sector. Mr. Speaker, the private sector, where do they go to? They go to the lending institutions. And you know something, Mr. Speaker, the credit rating of organizations, municipalities and the province, is as good and better than the credit rating of any private investor, and will get equally as good interest terms, and I suggest to you better interest terms than any private investor.

And so the per diem rate, which is established to repay that mortgage, that per diem rate will be lower if you're repaying a mortgage, financing costs, to a non-profit organization, whether it be municipal, provincial or an organization, it will be lower than the financing costs and the per diem rate required to pay off the debt on a private investment.

And what's more, five, ten years down the line when the private ones sell out to a new firm because it's a going concern, they're making money, the government's giving them a higher per diem, it's guaranteed, you can't go broke and they re-sell, and they re-sell at a profit, after all it's a private business. And so they sell good will with it, and the new buyer then has to get new financing, and he's got more interest that has to be paid to the lender. And who's going to be Santa Claus? The people of Manitoba are going to play Santa Claus to the private profit-making investor in the field of health, and I say it's a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, he says, after all it isn't right to say that the private sector lacks compassion; of course not. Mr. Speaker, they're paying at a lower rate. You can't get money at a bank at what the CMHC is providing; no way, no way. And Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health cannot borrow money - I can yell louder I've got the mike - he cannot borrow money cheaper than on the credit of the province of Manitoba or the credit of the federal government of Canada. No way, there isn't a private investor who can do it.

Thursday, 28 February 1980

Mr. Speaker, he talks about the fact that private people in business have compassion. Of course they have compassion. But, Mr. Speaker, they are in the business of operating a business. It is a business and they have to make money otherwise they can't stay in business. And he talks that they are just as compassionate, that they will care for people. There was a book published in the United States, Mr. Speaker, it was called Tender Loving Care --(Interjection)-- Is that the word? Oh, good. Maybe he read the book, although I don't think so or he couldn't have made the speech he made. That book called Tender Loving Care, which came out about three years ago, or four, was a study of what is going on in the United States in the personal care home field, the nursing home field; and Mr. Speaker, it was a disgrace to the point where the United States Senate held hearings on it. Because the operators are in the position where they are selling a commodity like anything else, they're out to make a buck. And they can make it on the food they serve, or on the level of help, or the number of people who are working in the facility, labour costs, or the laundry or services they render to people, that is where they make their money. That's the only way.

So when the Minister says, well the private sector will do it. And if he says to me, they will because they are just as compassionate, etc., etc., if he gives that reason I say to him they can be compassionate but they still have to have a bottom line and they have to show a figure which warrants an investment.

Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing in Manitoba is a privatization, and I ask the Minister, if he is that keen on privately-owned nursing homes, why isn't he standing up here saying we need a new hospital at the Health Science Centre. I am going to suggest to the House why doesn't he say this, that the Health Science Centre instead of being rebuilt at public expense and financed publicly, why don't we invite some major private hospital owner of the United States or anywhere, for that matter, to come in here and build us a spanking new hospital, and in order to induce them and in order to attract them, you know, we are going to be able to get his money, and all we have to do is guarantee him, guarantee him, that the money he puts in will be repaid with the interest rate covered and a profit on his operation. That is all we have got to guarantee him. Mr. Speaker, you will get lots of takers, you will get a lot of takers. Why doesn't he do that? It is the same thing.

But, Mr. Speaker, you know, there were a few private hospitals in Canada back in the Forties and even early Fifties. They all disappeared when hospitalization came in; all of them. And to think that here in Manitoba we are turning back the clock and we are allowing the private entrepreneur to come in and operate the personal care homes, nursing homes, which is a form of hospital. It may not be acute care, but it is a form of extended care, a level III hospital; you call it whatever you want but they are care institutions and to turn them over to the private sector so that they can make money on it, I think is a step backwards and it is a disgrace. To argue that we need their money is as phony an argument as I have ever heard, because they have to go to the lender for it, they have to pay higher interest rates than the government would have to pay, and all that is going to happen is that the public, the citizens of Manitoba, are going to be paying the higher interest rates than some private individual is going to be paying to the bank. --(Interjection)-- The Minister of Government Services can say, "Now, now, now" all he wants, but that is a fact; that is a fact.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is all I am going to comment on the performance of the Minister of Health. As I say, he read too quickly for me to try to take it down but I am sure it will be in Hansard, and also, of course, there will be the Estimates themselves, at which time he will again announce them. I am told they are in last year's press releases and I know that two weeks hence or three weeks hence, when the Estimates are tabled or when the Minister gets up to talk about his Estimates, he will announce it all over again, so I will have plenty of opportunity to deal with them again.

There are some other items that I would like to mention and one of the areas that I am concerned with, and I think that concern is shared by many people, and that is the raw deal that the city of Winnipeg and its citizens are getting from this government. Mr. Speaker, this government decided that the funds to the city should be made in the form of block grants, and I recall when it was done it was said that this was to give them greater autonomy, that this was going to give them greater autonomy and how was it -- greater flexibility, greater autonomy, and I am trying to think of the description I think the First Minister used - home rule, that's right, home rule.

You know, Mr. Speaker, what kind of nonsense is home rule? What is the city of Winnipeg? It is a creature of this Legislature. It has absolutely no other legal right to exist except what this Legislature granted it years ago and continues to grant today. It is not

Thursday, 28 February 1980

recognized anywhere, has no recognition federally, absolutely nothing. It is not known, not mentioned, doesn't exist in The British North America Act, nowhere. No city, no municipality, no village has any legality except what the Legislature grants it. So what kind of nonsense about home rule? What kind of nonsense about home rule? If you say home rule and you really mean it, then give them home rule in the full sense of the word. Let them raise whatever taxes they want, whether personal or corporate or any other kind, that is home rule, but we don't grant them that, of course we don't.

MR. GREEN: Don't give them health care either.

MR. MILLER: And we don't give them anything.

MR. GREEN: Or hospitalization.

MR. MILLER: You know that is home rule. It makes no sense. No, this is the First Minister talking about home rule. So I know this; you know that; they know it.

MR. ENNS: Sidney, you are not supposed to be coaching him any more. New rules, independent rules, no more coaching Sidney. Home rule, home rule.

MR. GREEN: Home rule. You know, that is about the level of understanding, I think, of what is going on, as witnessed by the Minister of Public Works.

So, Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the City of Winnipeg are now facing an impossible position. When the block funding system was announced, I recall in this House making the statement that I felt that I was shocked at the city's acceptance of it. I used the term "dunderheads" to describe their acceptance and I know the Mayor, when he next saw me, sort of clucked at me and said: You know, that is a pretty rough phrase, "dunderheads". And I said: Well, wait a year and we will see whether in fact I was being rough or not.

Now, what do you know, now suddenly the Chairman of Finance, Works and Operation and others are saying: Hey, this is nonsense. The base was too small to start with. The inflationary costs are killing us.

MR. FILMON: We are not arguing the concept.

MR. MILLER: The Member for River Heights says they are not arguing the concept. What the Member for River Heights is saying is this: You give us a lot more money and let us do with it as we will. Mr. Speaker, that doesn't happen anywhere, any place, nowhere; nobody gets a blank cheque, nobody, nobody.

When we said to them we will cover 50 percent of your transit deficit, that was a recognition that transit in this day and age, public transit, is an absolute essential.

You know, we hear about conservation, we hear Conservative speciality, extolling that great budget that was introduced by Mr. Crosbie, saying that it was a good budget, good tax because it will help to conserve the consumption of gas and oil. Mr. Speaker, you can help to conserve if you enhance your transit system. Don't force the city, as you have, to increase public transit from 25 cents to 35 cents, to 40 cents. I guess this year they will do nothing because it's an election year for them, so they are afraid to, but next year they will be roaring back, and they have no choice. You have choked them. You have choked them. You are forcing them to eliminate the DASH bus, and I know the Minister of Urban Affairs says that's their decision; that's their decision. You know, Winnipeg is autonomous - home rule - it is their decision.

Mr. Speaker, when the Minister announced block funding and the fact that the 50 percent transit, the arrangements for 50 percent of the payment of the deficit, I asked him what about Handi-Transit and he said, "No way, that stays." So you see, one will stay because he wishes it so, but DASH, he says, "Oh, that is their own decision."

Mr. Speaker, transit in a metropolitan area is essential. If we want to conserve gas and motor oil, then we have to come up with an alternative. I know there is another way of doing it and that is raise the price so much that people just can't afford it and hopefully those with less money will then be the greatest conservers. But if you want this city to survive, if you want the downtown area to grow, and for the blight to be stopped, and for the north side of Portage Avenue to perhaps become rejuvenated, you have got to have mass transit systems, and it has got to be attractive. The most attractive thing is if it is cheap and less costly, and everything this government has done has forced the city to move in the opposite direction.

Thursday, 28 February 1980

And so and again we have the problems that the city of Winnipeg faces and you know I think they have scoured everything they can. They have gone into every possible tax, every user fee that I think they can think of; they have already imposed higher dog licences, higher parking meter lots. They have raised the green fees on golf courses. You have forced them into nickel and dime people to death. But that isn't enough money, there's no way. There's no way that they can make do.

Now the City of Winnipeg has, for a number of years, been asking for a share in growth taxes and we, Mr. Speaker, gave them the first - and I think the first in Canada - share in the growth taxes. We made available to them two points, now it is 2.2 points of personal income tax and one point of corporate tax. You know, it is interesting to me that the moneys that those taxes yield are being used by the Minister of Urban Affairs to claim so much money is going to the City of Winnipeg this year. That is a statutory amount. He couldn't divert it if he tried. It is required. He would have to bring in legislation, and it goes directly; the province acts as a conduit. They have no control over the amount at all. They act as a conduit; they can juggle the figures somewhat, but the total amount has to go to all the municipalities, including the City of Winnipeg, and this year it is \$14 million, an increase, I believe, of close to \$3 million over last year, and it grows as the value of the tax points increases.

So, Mr. Speaker, the city is in dire need of getting financial support. They have stalled certain works. They have not done certain things. They have cut down on certain programs. They are faced with continuous pressure to maintain a level of service, and they are having difficulty doing it. And this government simply sits back and says, "Well, you know, don't look at us. After all, it is your baby. You got \$30 million last year and this year you are going to \$33 million plus \$4 million, which is a recognition for a 1979 capital works program." It is nothing to do with the base, it doesn't affect the base, nothing. It is 30 plus 3 and that's it. Next year it is going to be 33. Four million for last year's 1979 capital program. I acknowledge that, but I say to you that it has nothing to do with the base itself, the base from hereon in is 33.

Mr. Speaker, the City cannot continue on that basis; they just can't do it, and this government is kidding itself if they think they can get away with it. They have friends at City Hall, no question. There are people at City Hall . . . Maybe some of them plan to run in the next provincial election, I don't know, but they have very good friends there who are bending over backwards not to embarrass this government. They really are bending over backwards, but the day is coming when self-preservation is going to catch up on them and boy it is starting now. It is starting now. When the Chairman of Finance can make the statements he has been making lately, and fellows, watch it, watch it, because he is a good friend of yours, a good supporter. The Mayor is still hanging with you, but he is not going to hang alone, because that is a very uncomfortable spot to be. So you may find the heat is on you and with good reason, and a good reason because you have really turned your back on the major city in this province. Manitoba's unique. I don't think any other province, I'm sure there's no other province which has quite our situation of one major city and a considerable drop in population to the next largest city and then just a lot of small towns.

So this is where the large city is. This is the city from which the province generates most of its income, whether it be in the sale of liquor or in sales tax or in gasoline tax or in income tax or in corporate tax, the bulk of the money comes from residents in the City of Winnipeg. And you're not playing fair, not with the council and not with the school boards - school boards elsewhere and certainly not with the City of Winnipeg school board. The City of Winnipeg school board has unique problems, they are problems of a large urban area, they are problems of an inner core. You are paying lip service to them; you're giving them a few bucks and hoping that you can buy them off.

Mr. Speaker, you are simply perpetuating Winnipeg's problems and I am surprised that we somehow don't learn from past history. All you have to do is look to see what's happened in the United States. We know what happened, we see what happens when you try to either cover something over or push it away or ignore it. Eventually it blows up in your face and, Mr. Speaker, I predict that unless there is a change by this provincial government in its dealings with the City to make more funds available to both for school purposes, educational purposes and for municipal purposes there will be an explosion in Winnipeg within the next ten years and you will be responsible. People are not going to simply be held back or kept pushed down, expected to live in some cases slum conditions, horrible conditions, without resources because you're saying: Well let the City look after that, that's a City responsibility.

Thursday, 28 February 1980

You can't get away with it, not in this day and age. And where it's been tried the City has had its serious problem, its explosion and then the state has had to step in at a far greater cost than if you did it now, early on.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the City of Winnipeg and its residents are to continue to build in the City of Winnipeg a decent place to live a place where people want to move to and where business wants to move into, then you've got to do something to correct the imbalance that's created. You cannot have a Portage Avenue, or a north side of Portage Avenue, which is on the down turn constantly and getting worse. You cannot allow, you cannot simply adopt a position that's the City's responsibility - let them do something about it either through zoning or reassessment or this, that, the other. The City as I said earlier on is a creature of this government, of this Legislature, and surely in Manitoba we should have a partnership between the City and the Province where you build together. This isn't some group out there, Winnipegers, and we here are legislators. It's our province, it's our city, and either you build it together or it will be a failure.

The City Council needs the full support, not just with here's a cheque spend it as you will. That's not the answer. Even if that cheque was enough that's not the answer. It isn't enough but even if it was surely this Legislature, this government, and the City of Winnipeg should be working in close harmony in support of one another; help the City of Winnipeg to develop along healthy normal lines so that it is a city which we can be proud of, a city which is attractive, which is a city where because it's a city and because it attracts like a magnet people from the north, people from rural areas who need adjustments, who need assistance to integrate into the city, then we the Legislature should be willing to be that resource. You don't just give it to the City. I never did consider the City and its councillors as something out there, somebody out there, another group or another province or another God knows what. They are our citizens at another level of government; a level of government that is constrained by the powers of the Legislature. And this Legislature can, with a stroke of a pen, eliminate all and any of their powers just automatically. And the former mayor was right when he used to say: We are totally at your mercy. Well he used to like to exaggerate but legally he was right. And to suggest that somehow you've given them home rule and that you've given them autonomy. Autonomy is nothing . . .

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

MR. MILLER: Thank you. Autonomy is nothing and that's exactly what you give them, because autonomy without fiscal means to carry on their responsibility is not autonomy, it's nothing. It's a way of getting yourself off the hook and it's typical of what this government always does. You know, don't blame us, blame somebody else. If you're not happy with the educational system blame your school board; if you're not happy with service in the city blame the city, blame anybody but don't blame us.

So, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that this government has, from the very day it took office, decided that it had to convey to the public a picture that they are restraint minded, they are frugal, they are thrifty, they are savers of money. Mr. Speaker, what they have done is this. They have saved the provincial level of government money by passing it on to somebody else. Don't ask me to pay for it, let somebody else pay for it, with a user fee, tuition fees, transit fees, there's a whole host of them, let somebody else pay for it. And if somebody else pays for it well then the government can say: Look at us, by gosh look how thrifty we are, we are terrific managers. You know transit is running and we spent less than the old NDP government did. The universities are running and it's not costing as much - of course the fact that tuition fees have gone up one heck of a lot, that's of no account. Pharmacare is running - the fact that we diverted some federal funds into pharmacare that's something else but our bottom line is going to look good. Our bottom line will look good, the City's won't, the school boards won't, the user still pays the money because it isn't as if the problem went away or the actual costs are reduced, of course not. Inflation has affected all of these costs and so all the costs have gone up. But instead of the province pooling all their resources through taxes based on ability-to-pay or reflecting some attempt at ability-to-pay, instead of using the common resources of the total community, it simply said it's in your hands, it's in your lap, you worry about it, you try to figure it out for yourself. We have to look good for the electorate.

Mr. Speaker, the electorate are not fools. The electorate know darn well that costs to the individual has gone up, that all the talk about governments create inflation hasn't prevented inflation from growing in Manitoba in the last 27 months at all. Inflation has grown as much

Thursday, 28 February 1980

in Winnipeg or Manitoba as it has in other provinces, and the fact that they have, as they say, slowed down their growth of spending it hasn't affected inflation, and if they cut their budget in half, which they are not going to, but if they cut it in half inflation would not drop in Manitoba by one half of one percent, it wouldn't so this is nonsense. What they want to do is simply look good at everybody else's expense and hope that people are so stupid that they won't realize it. And I have news for them, the people of Manitoba twice in nine months have sent them a message. They read it all too well and they are waiting for the next provincial election.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all I would like to congratulate you on the capable manner in which you have so far this Session conducted yourself in the fair manner in which it takes to keep this House doing what I think is so important to an operation of a democratic system here in this country. I also would like to congratulate the Mover and the Seconder on the fine way in which they presented their support for the Throne Speech, put their best ideas forward in presenting to Manitoba what I think is a very positive document, one in which I as a government member am very proud to be a part of.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, we should look forward to working with the media, with the press. I look forward to working with the people who operate the system here in the Legislative Assembly and hope that we can have what is a most productive Session of the Manitoba Legislature.

But first of all I should just make a brief comment and really I think it is a most important comment to make particularly in light of what did happen on the 18th of February. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not at all ashamed of the performance of the past Conservative government, in fact, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I am very pleased to be a part of a government that had the backbone to tell the people of this country what really had to happen.

And, Mr. Speaker, I should just stop for a minute and make note of the newly elected members of the Manitoba Legislature, and my colleague the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources commented when he last spoke on the last Member for Fort Rouge who seemed to be the messenger from the what was then Federal Government in office. And let me say to the Member for Fort Rouge at this particular time that when we, and if we give her some particular advice, it isn't really the messenger that we are trying to get at but it is, in fact, the people that are preparing the medicine or the message. And I would have to also say that I challenge her to carry the message to Ottawa because the message which I heard for the farm people, the message which I heard come in the campaign, that there would be no excise tax on the farmers of this country and I would expect her to take that message to her colleagues, cohorts or whatever in Ottawa and that is one pledge that I challenge them to live up to, number one.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say I would also like to see them introduce the ability for farm people and small business people to write the income of their spouse off against their incomes. I challenge her, Mr. Speaker, to take that message to her friends in Ottawa.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, the Member from Interlake of course doesn't really understand too much about what that was all about but at least let me carry on with number three. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say the third one to allow the farmers who are retiring to be able to keep the money which they have invested in their farms by removing the capital gains off such as has been done by the Progressive Conservative government.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am very prepared and anxious to put my best foot forward, to have my department and our people work in a most objective way with the newly elected government in Ottawa and I pledge my working towards a confederation that works to the best interests of all of Canada. And I believe that the agricultural people can do that; they committed themselves to do that last July and that has not changed as far as I am concerned.

Let me carry on, Mr. Speaker, by just mentioning one or two of the items which I am very proud to say I am very proud of the still Minister of Transport, the Honourable Don Mazankowski. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mazankowski in his job as the western Minister responsible for the Wheat Board, for the transportation of this country, has done more in the seven months that he was the Minister than the Liberal government did for the farmers in western

Thursday, 28 February 1980

Canada in all their office. They did nothing more than tear out all the rail system in western Canada, and let them deny it. Let them deny it. Why are we now talking about rail line abandonment? That's why, Mr. Speaker, that's what the Liberals did for western Canada.

And Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say, the supplying of hopper cars, the needed hopper cars for this western grain movement was another essential item --(Interjections)-- Mr. Speaker, I will tell them where they are in about two minutes - the supplying of hopper cars to move the grains out of western Canada. And the appointment of a Grains Transportation Co-Ordinator, Mr. Speaker, recognizing the importance of the co-ordination of the grain industry, something, Mr. Speaker, that those people on the other side of the room do not understand, and that is co-ordination. I think there has been a true representation of unco-ordinated efforts over the last eight years in this province, and I will lead into that in my comments about what has happened in Manitoba.

I would also like to say that the work that has been done by the Co-ordinator, the work that was done by the federal Minister of both Agriculture and Transport should be commended and will be long remembered, even though they aren't able to carry it out. And I would hope that the present, or the elected government-to-be, has enough compassion for the farm people of western Canada, that they will continue on with the efforts that have been put forward in the last seven months.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition, and I'm sorry he's not in his chair because I should have -- I do see him there. I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that in the comments that he has made has proven to me just really how little he does understand about what makes the whole thing tick. And you know, Mr. Speaker, I should just say, because he seems to be one with tricky little phrases that he has been able to come up with and, of course, that to me has been his most positive input so far to this particular House. But I would like to say, from what I have seen of his performance and what I have heard over the past coming up to the federal election and what he has been saying of how the whole federal economy should run, I call it Pawley's Law of Socialism. Pawley's Law of Socialism means that all energy shortages, all shortages of goods and services, should be shared equally by the people who can least afford it. And you know what you get when you apply Pawley's Law of Socialism, you come up with Pawleyester. There are two meanings of Pawleyester - one is something that is synthetic, and I know there's part of him that's quite synthetic, or really not real; but what Pawleyester would mean to me is if he were to become government in this province it would be a disaster for the people of Manitoba, that's what Pawleyester is.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, the basic difference between the people on the opposite side of the House and our beliefs on this side is that we believe, Mr. Speaker, I believe, that government's responsibility is to create and to keep equal balance, to give everybody an equal opportunity through government. --(Interjection)-- But, Mr. Speaker, the man says "socialism". Socialism as far as I am concerned, the way they administer, is to regulate the wealth of the people, to equalize the people, not the opportunities for the people. And, Mr. Speaker, it speaks out so well, so well and it carries through very true when we read what the Leader of the Opposition has said recently about the milk price increases and this is how his applied socialism would work. And he really protests the fact that farmers, the farm people, of the province should be paid for what it costs to produce milk. And if they are not paid to produce milk --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, I will get into what he has just said, that I am not telling the truth, and I'm glad that he did because it brings me to the beef income, where he said it was removed from this province and that's why all the problems are around. A quote in the press that the beef income assurance program was removed by this government. It may be at some point, Mr. Speaker, but I am reading back to him what he has said to the people of this province. He doesn't like it, he doesn't like his own medicine.

But okay, the milk pricing system in this province is not providing the people of the province who are producing the product with enough money to produce. So what happens? The result is that there is not enough product for the people to consume, so the shortages are shared equally by everyone. That's what he believes should happen; we believe that the dairy farmers should have an opportunity to produce and be paid the same as everyone else that produces goods and services on the free market system.

I would also say, Mr. Speaker --(Interjection)-- the Leader of the Opposition is somewhat concerned, and he may even have to leave. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, because it's the kind of medicine that he has been spreading or the kind of propaganda, the myths that he has been putting around the province, of course my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources,

Thursday, 28 February 1980

nailed his hide to the wall, literally nailed it to the wall, he and the great economist from Brandon East. And what about the economist from Brandon East, and what about the things that have taken place over the past two and a half years, or 27 months, of a government under a man who is doing a tremendous job in the Premier of Sterling Lyon, a commonsense Premier.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health today introduced health care facilities for the people of Manitoba in excess of \$50 million. The Minister of Education is making improvements to the Assiniboine College in Brandon that will provide services for the people who want to be educated. But where are the priorities of the Member for Brandon East? Where are the priorities of the Member for Brandon East? Well, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you. In 1973 there were approximately two hundred and some thousand hogs moving freely from the province of Saskatchewan into Manitoba to be slaughtered and further processed in Manitoba, two hundred and some thousand hogs. But the NDP government of the day decided that it was better that those hogs did not come into Manitoba, that they put up a barrier. And what did that barrier do, Mr. Speaker? It, Mr. Speaker, removed the hog kill from the hog processing plant in Brandon, it took away the supplies that were needed to keep the packing house industry going in the city of Winnipeg; that, Mr. Speaker, is the result of the kinds of policies the Member for Brandon East supports. And here he is crying today because we aren't acting responsibly on McKenzie Seeds.

Let me tell the Member for Brandon East what the people of southwest Manitoba and western Manitoba are saying about his sniffing and quibbling attitude towards that whole self-orchestrated problem that's in that area. Mr. Speaker, the people of western Manitoba do want to see McKenzie Seeds go. They want to see it go and be strong on its own two feet. And, Mr. Speaker, that's what we are working towards, and I will say that's what we will accomplish through good, sound business management through the private sector and working through government.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that in the announcements today by the Minister of Health we have been able to do those things in the province of Manitoba, and at the same rate, reduce the percentage of spending of the total provincial product. Mr. Speaker, the government today is using less of the people's money after two years, two years, and providing more service. And you know, the amazing thing about those individuals across the way, you would think, to hear them talk, that they were the only people, the NDP were the only people that had a monopoly on providing health care or services to the people of Manitoba. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, it's so far from the truth it makes me choke. Because this government is committed to look after the people who are truly in need, need for health care. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we should be creating or trying make-work jobs for those people who are strong, healthy individuals quite capable of looking after themselves. And that is the basic difference, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it's also important, when we talk about the economy of Manitoba, particularly when we look at what is actually taking place in the agricultural sector; mething, Mr. Speaker, that I am very pleased to be able to be a part of, that the people of Manitoba in the agricultural community are responding to the challenges, responding to the opportunities, and putting together what I consider a sound base for the provincial economy and continuing to be a major part of it.

Now, I'll just read to you some of the StatsCanada and the Conference Board figures that have been released some time ago; and from the period - and I'll compare it to the Canadian average - from the period 1977 to 1979 - this is the net income, net increase for farm operators - the Canadian average went up by 29 percent. Ontario, for that same period, went up 12 percent, that's net income. Manitoba increased by 38 percent, with a projection of 8.1 for the coming year. Saskatchewan, 15 percent. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the farmers of Manitoba. I think they should be commended and congratulated for the way in which they have responded to the opportunities in agriculture.

Let us not forget, however, Mr. Speaker, we have to continue and work towards the strengthening of that community, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, some of the things that have taken place, some of the direction that has been given to agriculture, we are pleased and are seeing that it is being well received. And I will refer, Mr. Speaker, to our participation in the provision of some rolling stock for the movement of product out of this country.

In the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, we make mention that we will be continuing to work towards the development of the transportation system. But why, Mr. Speaker, do we have to become involved in this? Because, Mr. Speaker, the people of the country, particularly members opposite, did not want to and do not want to come to grips with the root problem;

Thursday, 28 February 1980

and that is the old Crow Rate and the statutory rate problem. Why, Mr. Speaker, do we as a government, why do the government of Canada or the governments of western Canada have to provide to that system what should be done through the railroad companies?

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a very simple fact that they are not getting paid a compensatory rate. And I, Mr. Speaker, and I say all the farm organizations, all the governments of western Canada have agreed that the railroads should be paid a compensatory rate. Yes, it should be paid by the federal government; and the argument is, should it be paid to the farmers, or should it be paid to the railroads? Mr. Speaker, my position is that the railroads have failed to this point, they have not been able to make the thing work. Why are we providing services, or rolling stock to the system? Simply because it has not worked, the federal government haven't been able to make it work.

Mr. Speaker, if the farmers receive that money from the federal government, they will grow cattle, they will grow hogs, they will grow rapeseed which will be processed in western Canada. The base for industrial development is moving west, Mr. Speaker, and we have to come to grips with it whether we want to or not. The heads in the sand attitude by the members opposite, as far as I am concerned, is such a hypocrisy that it's unbelievable. They stand up and they holler about the loss of jobs for Swift Canadian. Why have the people lost their jobs at Swift Canadian? Because we send our raw goods out of this country at a subsidized rate and we make everybody who produces value at it pay the full going rate. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they stand up and say, well all the processed goods should come under the same statutory rate. Mr. Speaker, again, again, what we have to do is remember who produces. It's the people that are doing the work that produce and have to pay what all it all takes of it. Governments can't pull money out of the sky. The federal government have a limited amount of money and I agree, Mr. Speaker, that we have to assure the farmers that their position, what they have benefited from the statutory rates, cannot be eroded. And we have said that if any change ever were to take place it would be put in the statutes of this country and make sure that they would not be - and I say "not" be - put in a position where it would hurt their production and their incomes.

But, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite want the best of two worlds. They want everybody in western Canada to have employment in the packing house industry and they want to retain the Crow rate. Well, Mr. Speaker, how long can they come out speaking out of both sides of their mouth, and particularly the Member from Ste. Rose, who doesn't have a clue about what the whole thing puts together, a man who represents a cattle community. There isn't any better cattle community in this country than the Ste. Rose area. And why, Mr. Speaker, won't he come to grips with it? Because he is dipped in the dogma of those individuals that are around him. I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, he will find out in about several months what the people of that community really are thinking, and I think they'll be thinking of different minds than they are today.

Let us just stop for a minute at the Member from St. George, who has left. You know he is a prime example of an individual who should be standing up and coming to grips with what has to be come to grips with, in the farm community. He produces other products other than grain and he wants to put himself in a position where he has an unfair advantage in this country. I cannot for the life of me understand, when a man wants to destroy his own business, why he should be representing farmers in any community because he wants to destroy them at the same time. Mr. Speaker, and the Member for Ste. Rose is no different.

Mr. Speaker, it's onward and upward in Manitoba, as far as agriculture is concerned. And how do we do that? We do it through the development of our Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. In eight months the land loans that went out of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation were in excess of \$17 million. For about one year, the first year of the New Democratic Party, for land purchase were \$800,000 in 1975 or '76. \$800,000 committed to the farm community, not as a loan to the farm people to help them, but to own that state farm.

Hearing the Member from Lac du Bonnet, the great socialist, the great state farmer of this country; he stood up in this House and said that all the oil companies. . . One company for all of Canada, doing the production and the processing. Mr. Speaker, he was the Minister of Agriculture. If that's what he thinks should happen to the oil companies, what were his ideas for the farm people? —(Interjection)— One farm, that's right, Mr. Speaker. And I want the people of Manitoba to know that if they vote for the Member from Ste. Rose, the Member from St. George, the Member from Lac du Bonnet, the Member from Brandon East, that their intent is to have one farm as they would have one oil company, providing all the food for everybody in the nation, a state farm program.

Thursday, 28 February 1980

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is also a very important point that we bring out that we have committed \$2 million to the leasing of hopper cars. Those cars, I hope, will be in the position to haul grain, Manitoba farmer's grain, within the period of opening of navigation. It is very important that the impact of those cars help the farmers today, because why do we have to help the farmers today? The cash flow in the farm community is very critical, very critical indeed.

Mr. Speaker, the interest charges the farmers have to pay aren't very easy to take either. But oh, I would think after we have the Liberal government in office that interest rates will drop way down, and I would hope the messenger, the dear messenger from Fort Rouge, would take that message to her cohorts in Ottawa. Those are the kinds of things . . . You know, it just reminds me; I have to stop and think about the last Member for Fort Rouge. You know he reminds me of a hired man we used to have on the farm one time. That hired man on the farm, in the summertime he used to tell us of how good of a hockey player he was and in the wintertime he used to tell us how good a baseball player he was. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the past member for Fort Rouge never really got into a ball game but he sure sat back on the sidelines and told everybody else how to play ball. But today the bat is in his hand. Let him prove his ability to the people of Canada whether he can hit a ball. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that there will be somewhat of a different kind of voice coming from that individual when he does have shoulder some responsibility in this country.

Mr. Speaker, it is again the privilege, of course, of working with a government, my colleagues, who recognize as the Minister of Health, the Minister of Education, who are announcing programs, again the hospital program that was announced today, the Minister of Education, who has committed himself to the development of the Assiniboine Community College in Brandon, and in that college will be, yes, Mr. Speaker, will be a farm machinery course to supply the people who the farm people need to service their equipment. Their equipment, Mr. Speaker, that is built in Manitoba; their equipment, Mr. Speaker, that is built right here by Versatile, with a \$26 million expansion in Manitoba.

Why don't we hear the members opposite talk about something positive? Again, where are the priorities from the Member for Brandon East? What are his priorities? The Member from Brandon East is very proud. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Brandon East has his priorities all screwed up. You know, he goes out and he goes and he builds a huge jail in Brandon. That is his monument to the people of western Manitoba. A jail --(Interjection)-- that's right, Mr. Speaker, a jail. What does the Minister of Education and the Minister for Brandon West do? They go out and build schools to educate those children so they don't have to have idle time and find themselves up in detention institutes. That, Mr. Speaker, is what our government believes in. Teach the people to become productive and do things for themselves, Mr. Speaker. But no, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Brandon East has everything all backwards. He wants to create the problem and then spend your and my money -- yes, spend your and my money to catch the problem after it's too late.

A MEMBER: What does the Minister of Government Services do about that?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Government Services will be the engineer of that building that will be built at Assiniboine Community College. He has the support of the Members for Brandon West, and I would have to say I am sure the machine dealers, as will the farmers of this great province, will be very happy when that program is in place in 1981. No, Mr. Speaker, it is started now; it's not started the year of an election like the promises we got from the people opposite. It started now to provide the services for the people when they need it.

Mr. Speaker, again we have to say that I think that the people of rural Manitoba are very happy, indeed, with a positive government. They are seeing things happen.

Mr. Speaker, I think we really have to say, at this particular time, one more policy, and these embers will burn in the seat of their pants, the Member for Ste. Rose, because I'll tell you, to this point, we have 1,300-and-some farmers not only wanting to lease land in this province, they want to buy that leased land. Mr. Speaker, something that, if they vote for the New Democratic Party in the next election, will be taken away from them because they want to hold that in their little bosoms. Mr. Speaker, that one farm concept, one farm party.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the people have responded. Yes, we promised that we would sell Crown land; we promised that we would sell that land to the people who are farming it. We will allow those leasees to continue on to lease, if they don't want to buy it. Mr. Speaker, the only bankrupt farmers that are in this province are the ones that are left with your programs hung around their necks.

Thursday, 28 February 1980

And let us just talk about some of the programs and why some of the people are in the position that they are in. You know why they're in that position? It's because, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster thought he would gather all the cattlemen into his bosom because he gave them \$40 million. Yes, Mr. Speaker, while he was a Member of the Treasury Bench that was part of it . . . He was a Member of the Treasury Bench that was part of it and he had a legal mind, and who ever saw a contract that was drawn up. My goodness, Mr. Speaker, the farm people, who have been in those contracts, have gone through literally the worst time of their life because the intent was not to help the people in the cattle business and give them money when times were tough. No, Mr. Speaker, it was to take control, to in fact have one big cattle herd to put on that one big farm. That, Mr. Speaker, was the intent of that government. Mr. Speaker, that is what they would get if they voted for the New Democratic Party the next time around.

Let me tell you though, Mr. Speaker, we aren't turning our deaf ear to those people. There's one basic principle that we believe has to be lived up to, and they happen to owe . . . They have a commitment to government to pay some of the money back. We stand very strongly on that.

But, Mr. Speaker, the future of the program is hurting the cattle industry in Manitoba. Manitoba shows a 4 percent reduction in the breeding herd in this province, compared to a no change or an increase in the rest of Canada. After \$40 billion to bring in the cattle business, to help the cattle men, the herds are reducing. We have to, Mr. Speaker, come to grips with that because it is hurting the feed grain market for the feed grain farmers. It's hurting the local communities that rely on the cattle industry, and I'm sure the Member for Ste. Rose knows that.

We know exactly the people who cannot afford to pay the money back and those are the people that are on totally the cattle industry, the diversified farmers of this province, and that proves that the diversification of this industry is essential. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, the feed grain market, if you have less cattle to feed, Mr. Speaker, you have less people feeding cattle. Mr. Speaker, I would think he would go to the economist from Brandon East, but you can see Brandon East has been teaching them all his economics course and it's really starting to penetrate.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say about the Beef Income Assurance Program, we have to assess, we have to assess the future of it.

I will continue my comments, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The hour being 5:30, I'm leaving the Chair, to return at 8:00 o'clock.