

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 p.m., Tuesday, February 24, 1976

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to inform the honourable members to diarize for themselves March 17th, from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. for my annual reception.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister for Resources.

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. HARVEY BOSTROM (Minister of Renewable Resources) (Rupert's Land): Mr. Speaker, I have the Annual Report for the Manitoba Government Air Division for the year ending March 31st, 1975.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Tabling of Reports?

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I have a further - the Annual Report of the Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management for the year ending March 31st, 1975; and I will say, Mr. Speaker, that this report includes the report on the Clean Environment Act, the Mines Act, the Watershed Conservation Districts Act, the Water Power Act and the Crown Lands Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Notices of Motion. The Honourable Minister for Public Works.

NOTICES OF MOTION

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit a Return to an Order of the House, dated May 30th, 1975, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Health.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development) (St. Boniface): I would like to submit an Order for Address No. 5 dated April 24th, on motion of the Honourable Member from Roblin.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Leader of Official Opposition) (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. It's in relation to the Press Release issued by Manitoba Hydro today. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the First Minister that in view that the Press Release states that the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro has informed a Legislature Standing Committee on Public Utilities on a number of occasions of such probable increases, I wonder if the First Minister would investigate why any increases suggested earlier by the Chairman of Hydro were well below those that were announced today by Manitoba Hydro.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that's correct. I would have to check the transcript of the committee hearings.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the seriousness of the size of the increase and also the short notice to consumers, whether the government might have a look at investigating both of these features before they're allowed to be approved by the unilateral decision of Manitoba Hydro.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, before agreeing to any reference to seriousness, I would agree only if it were agreed by my honourable friend opposite that in investigating that we would investigate as well all electrical utility rates across Canada,

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd)and in which case we would stand in a very favourable position indeed.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I repeat the question of last Friday, as to whether the government has no intent of controlling the rate of increase of Hydro more in line with the imposition of the government's restraints on wage and price controls in their co-operation with the Federal Government. Are they not prepared to apply the same restraint to a wholly controlled provincial utility?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, just to make reference once again to the fact that these things cannot be looked in simplistic isolation, I would suggest that the Anti-Inflation Board could well review in concert the rate situation here and the announced increase of rates proposed in Ontario of 22 to 26 percent and Calgary Light and Power which is also in that same order of magnitude.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. WARREN STEEN (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for Public Insurance. Will the Minister inform this House at some future date or as soon as he is in a position to regarding the reported multiple firings of adjusters from the Public Insurance Corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for the Public Insurance Corporation.

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Minister for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation) (St. George): Mr. Speaker, that isn't quite accurate. There were several adjusters that tendered their resignation, I believe there was one adjuster that was fired, several of them were suspended pending their resignations coming full force, and several were demoted.

MR. STEEN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister give me the exact figure? The figure I have had reported to me is that there were six persons involved.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member wants to file an Order for Return I'll give him the exact details and all the background involved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Health arising out of a statement that he made last Friday. The Minister stated that of the patients evacuated from the Health Sciences Centre during the recent strike of maintenance workers there, of the 413 patients moved, approximately 200 were discharged and did not even require home care. My question - in light of the current austerity program and budgetary restraints, could the Minister explain why there were indeed 200 patients in the Health Science Centre requiring no hospital care or not even home care?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think that it's all a definition of what emergency is; there is no doubt that there are some people in hospitals that do not necessarily need a bed in the hospital and on an occasion such as this they could be sent home earlier. I haven't a report on every single patient there but I think that's about the only answer I can give at this time to my honourable friend.

MR. ADAM: A supplementary to the same Minister. I wonder if he could undertake to investigate why there are that many patients in a hospital that do not require any care.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's fair to say that these people do not require care. --(Interjections)-- I beg your pardon? I don't know if this is a speech or if I'm in the bear pit, but I can't understand all those questions at once, so

MR. SPEAKER: If the Honourable Minister would answer the question, maybe

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm ready to debate any one with them, Mr. Speaker, but one at a time. I think it is fair to say that these people were receiving care, but again I repeat, it's all a question of emergency and degree and in the case of an emergency they were sent home and there's no danger to them. This is what I was trying to point

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) out at the time when I gave the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): My question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. I wonder if he's in a position to inform the House how many operations were postponed during the strike at the Health Science Centre and the Misericordia Hospital.

MR. DESJARDINS: There was no strike at the Misericordia Hospital.

MR. SPIVAK: I'm sorry. I'll correct it - during the evacuation of the patients at the Misericordia Hospital.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position. I doubt that anybody can - I don't know if they were all scheduled and so on. I could try to find out some information for you if you want.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether his department has determined whether the lives of some of the patients who were not able to be operated on were endangered as a result of the evacuation of Misericordia Hospital, and the strike at the Health Science Centre.

MR. DESJARDINS: There again, Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody can answer that, as far as all the human precautions that were taken. I've been informed that there was nobody in danger and that steps were taken to make sure that the people that had to stay in the hospital would stay there and that the hospital would remain open at all costs.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can inform the House whether he or his department received complaints from individuals who had relatives or friends who were scheduled for operations and had them postponed and who claimed that their lives were in danger.

MR. DESJARDIN: No, Mr. Speaker, not as far as I know.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the same Minister. Can the Minister tell this House whether they are going to demolish the King Edward and King George Hospitals?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: In due course, Mr. Speaker, if they don't fall apart before that.

MR. BROWN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister tell this House then where these people will be accommodated?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that question can be better utilized under the estimates. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker I have a question for the Attorney-General. I wonder if the Minister is in a position yet to respond to questions that were taken for notice last week? Mr. Speaker, . . . information that we wait on those particular issues, I wonder if the Attorney-General would be prepared to answer further questions. One is, was the Attorney-General himself aware of meetings between representatives of his department and representatives of the Law Society, and was he aware of the agreements that were reached between members of the Law Society and members of his department concerning the transference of information that was obtained from the wire taps that were authorized?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General; Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the general nature of meetings being held to discuss the presentation of particulars to the Law Society which might be relevant. As to the exact particulars, I'm not familiar with that, it has been I think properly handled. The Honourable Member is asking for nature of the discussions that took place and that's something I would have to take under advisement as to whether I could comply with this request.

MR. AXWORTHY: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Attorney-General tell us, was he in these discussions aware of the exact kind of information that was requested and the precise kind of information that was given by his department to the Law Society?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that I have answered that question previously, that the information requested was spelled out in a public request by the Law Society through the transmitting of a letter to myself, namely, particulars that would be relevant to membership by Mr. Pilutik in the Law Society of Manitoba. As to the allegations which were made available to the Law Society, some as I say had been available to them but there are other allegations of course that are not relevant to that membership, and in general I am familiar with the nature of the allegations that are referred to the Law Society and familiar with the nature of the allegations which of course would not be relevant to the Law Society.

MR. AXWORTHY: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney-General. Has he or anybody in his department issued any form of guidelines to members of the police departments in the Province of Manitoba or to officials of the Attorney-General's department that would set out the parameters within which wire taps should be authorized and by which information that is obtained from such taps would be used in different circumstances, and is there some sort of guidelines or parameters that they can work on or use to determine their actions in wire-tapping.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, neither the Attorney-General nor do members of the staff authorize any wire taps; authorization for a wire tap must be provided by way of an order from a Superior Court judge. A Superior Court judge usually indicates in that order the individual that he permits to be wire-tapped, and generally attached to that order would be some indication of the parameters to which the wire tape could be used. And of course insofar as the specific guidelines are concerned, the department certainly does have guidelines. It may be that those guidelines ought to be re-examined and updated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. What date has now been set aside for implementing the rent increase rollbacks under his Rent Control Program? What date?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Consumer Affairs.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I assume the Member for Wolseley is speaking about the date from which rents will be determined by legislation. Is that the date he's talking about? Mr. Speaker, it is usually the policy to introduce such details that will be contained in legislation when the legislation is brought before the House. Now that is a position that I have been maintaining now for some months and I intend to continue doing it.

MR. WILSON: Then to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Was the rent increased from \$90.00 a month to \$120 a month for public housing in the Evanson - Arlington properties October 1st, 1975.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Urban Affairs.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister for Urban Affairs) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, the homes referred to by the member are not public housing in that they are not under Section 43 of the National Housing Act. These homes were turned over to Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation, who in turn turned it over to the Winnipeg Regional Housing authority at the request of Public Works who had acquired the homes as part of the purchase of the old Grace Hospital, and they are not public housing. The increase was the first increase since 1972 and it took place, I believe, September 14th, 1975.

MR. WILSON: To the Minister of Urban Affairs. Then when is the empty lot on this Evanson site owned by Winnipeg Housing authority going to be turned over to the city for a much needed tot lot?

MR. MILLER: Well the member perhaps could answer that because it was offered to the City of Winnipeg, of which he was a member of Council, and which rejected it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for provincial transportation. Since the withdrawal of the province's application to the Air Transport Committee for a licence for Skywest to provide air service to Brandon and Dauphin regions, has the Minister received any firm proposal from

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) the federal authorities, the Minister of Transport, in respect to an alternative to the Skywest proposal?

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I wonder then if the Minister can indicate whether or not this proposal has been accepted in principle or rejected by the government.

MR. EVANS: There were many elements of this proposal that were not acceptable to the government and we have made counter proposals.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. With respect to an earlier application by Transair to provide jet service to the Westman area, has the Minister or his government taken any initiative up to this point to encourage the applicant to resubmit this application to the Air Transport Committee?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, we did support Transair in its application for a jet service, Prince Albert-Regina-Brandon-Toronto, when it was first made - I think it was about a year and a half or two years ago. But this should not of course be confused, as I know it is not confused in the member's mind, but it should be confused with the proposed commuter service that we have been talking about, usually referred to as the Prairie Air Service Demonstration project. We have had informal discussions with Transair, but we believe that the initiative must lie with the carrier, because I would point out to the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, that when that company applied previously just about every airline in Canada opposed it, including the City of Regina, the Province of Saskatchewan, Canadian Pacific Airlines, Air Canada, and if the company felt that it had a chance of obtaining that licence I'm sure it would apply again.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. I wonder if the Minister could confirm a figure that I believe he used to the media in Brandon over the weekend that the cost of the Skywest setting up and dismantling procedure was in the neighbourhood of \$158,000 to the province. Was that the figure that was used and is that an inclusive figure of all costs relating to this venture?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, we have stated on a number of occasions that a rough estimate may be around \$150,000, that's a preliminary rough calculation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Has the Minister's offer of his own services as mediator been accepted by either or both sides in the Winnipeg Transit strike as yet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the House the other day that I had forwarded a proposal to the disputants in the industrial dispute between the City of Winnipeg and the Transit Union and offered a proposal, that possibly because of the rejection of voluntary binding arbitration, mediation might be considered, and I requested the parties to give consideration to this by way of a letter delivered yesterday. I am now in receipt, Mr. Speaker, of communications from both the City of Winnipeg and the Transit Workers. I do not think that I can, without leave and agreement of you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of the Assembly, really elaborate on a reply unless I would have permission, at least to synopsise the replies that I have received from both the Union and the Deputy Mayor of the City of Winnipeg. If I have that approval by you, Mr. Speaker, with concurrence of the Assembly, I would be prepared to bring the members of the Assembly up to date, because I only received the reply from the City of Winnipeg just as I was entering into the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed) The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I received a communication this morning from the Business Agent of the Prairie Division 1505 of the Amalgamated Transit Union, Mr. T.E. Fick, and it generally states as follows: "In the dispute between the City of Winnipeg and Prairie Division 1505 of the Amalgamated Transit Union, we have considered your suggestion of the use of a mediator. While this matter has not been discussed with the Negotiating Committee of the City of Winnipeg, we would be receptive to the

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) Conciliation Officer which has been approved by your department in interceding in this matter and calling the parties together with a view of discussing your proposal of mediation."

As I entered the Chamber, I received a communication, Mr. Speaker, from the Deputy Mayor of the City of Winnipeg. Generally, the Deputy Mayor states - first of all, I would like to refer to the second paragraph of my letter which reads as follows:

"On January 28th I wrote a letter to the City of Winnipeg with a copy to the Union suggesting voluntary binding arbitration. This suggestion was, I understood, not acceptable to both parties". That was contained in the letter that I sent out yesterday.

Mr. Wolfe goes on to say: "The city did not act immediately on your suggestion as negotiations were still proceeding with the assistance of your Conciliation Officer." As a result the city's offer was increased to 11 percent, which to me is inconsequential, and that was rejected.

"Let me elaborate as to why the city feels that arbitration as originally suggested by you is preferable to mediation:

"First, and most important to the public, it would permit an immediate resumption of transit service while arbitration process was taking place; this would not be true in mediation." I would point out it would not be true insofar as arbitration is concerned either.

"Secondly, it would settle the issue, even though one or both parties might be unhappy with the result. Mediation would not necessarily produce a mutually acceptable outcome and thus at the conclusion of mediation proceedings we could quite conceivably be back where we started."

I gather from the letter I have received from the Deputy Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, that the City of Winnipeg rejects my offer of mediation where the Transit are not prepared to accept the suggestion made by the Minister of Labour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Honourable Minister for the information that he has conveyed to the House, and ask him whether he intends to take further steps in an effort to persuade the city to participate along the lines he has suggested.

MR. PAULLEY: I will continue to appeal to reason to both parties. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, in direct answer to my honourable friend, that is a very difficult job to undertake at this particular time in view of the replies that I have received from my offers of a week or so ago and the rejection of mediation that I have received from the Deputy Mayor of the City of Winnipeg today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Education. I wonder if the Minister of Education can indicate to the House if the Department of Education has any authority and any guidelines on health standards for outdoor activities in private schools such as St. John's Cathedral School.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister say it has no jurisdiction and no authority over activities in private schools?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of the School Attendance Act, which requires that all children of school age be enrolled in a public school; the only exemption is if they could show that they are attending another educational institution wherein an education program is being offered comparable to that offered in a public school. So to that extent, the Department of Education has authority over the operations of independent schools, just merely to satisfy ourselves that the educational program offered therein is comparable and equal to that which is offered in the public schools. But beyond that, health requirements, whatever, they're subject to the same laws of the land as everyone else is.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate to the House then what kind of protection is afforded to the children that do attend private

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) schools, particularly in this school, when part of their program is some strenuous outdoor activities. I'm asking the Minister again, are there any guidelines and any standards set?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, that's strictly a matter between the parents enrolling their children in a private school and the management and administration of the private school.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, I direct a question to the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister could indicate, in the light of the resolution that has been passed by the South Dakota State Legislature directing the state to take legal action to prevent the return flows from the Garrison Diversion Project to enter South Dakota waters, I wonder if the First Minister could indicate what Manitoba's position would be in regard to this resolution, a resolution which was passed in the Legislature of South Dakota by a vote of 60 to 3.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, one of the obvious differences is that the State of South Dakota does not have recourse to the International Joint Commission, since that problem is mutual to the States of South and North Dakota, both being part of the United States. Insofar as Manitoba is concerned, we therefore can take no real cognizance of that proposed litigation, and in any case we have already announced and reconfirmed on many occasions that we are putting our trust in the International Joint Commission in which Canada is formally represented on our behalf.

MR. WATT: A supplementary question. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the only alternative then would be for the waters of the project to be diverted into the Souris River and into the Province of Manitoba, is it the intention of the government to simply let the case rest with the IJC?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend can make some case why the International Joint Commission - and more particularly Canada's representation on it - is incompetent, unless he can do that, I see no point in duplicating effort.

MR. WATT: A supplementary question. Is the Minister indicating then, that if the project must go forward and the only alternative is Manitoba, that the Province of Manitoba is going to sit and let the case rest and that we are going to be polluted with the United States water, if the pollution is going to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is hypothetical. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I submitted an Order for Address No. 5 in April, 1974, and I get the answer today . . . nil.

MR. SPEAKER: Question, please.

MR. MCKENZIE: I'm wondering, is this the efficiency of the Honourable Minister in charge of Lotteries, or was my original Return lost or mislaid. I think two years is rather long, Mr. Speaker, to wait for an Order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Renewable Resources.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Honourable Member for Arthur, I have two answers to two questions that were directed to the Minister of Mines last week, and the first is: Is my information correct that the Manitoba-Saskatchewan Joint Commission Water Study on the Souris Basin will be complete by December, 1977? The answer is, the completion date for the Souris River Basin Study is December 31st, 1977.

A further question that was asked, Mr. Speaker: Is my information correct that the review of the Garrison Diversion Project by IJC will be completed five months hence or approximately five months hence? The answer, the International Joint Commission has been instructed to report to the Canadian and United States governments on the Garrison Diversion Project by October 31st, 1976.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Is the Minister indicating then that the IJC will not be taking cognizance or taking into consideration the commission report that we are waiting on

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. WATT cont'd) between Manitoba and Saskatchewan, that the report will go forward without the results of the report of the Manitoba-Saskatchewan Joint Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOSTROM: The information I have is that the review of the Garrison Diversion Project by JJC will be completed by October 31st, 1976. I assume that they will be cognizant of any information coming from the other report at the same time.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, will there be any report from the Manitoba-Saskatchewan Joint Commission on the Souris Basin Study?

MR. BOSTROM: I'll take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for Wellington, the Honourable Member for Morris.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the tradition of this House, I extend to you my congratulations for again resuming your duties as the presiding officer of this Chamber. I know that your problems are difficult ones from time to time. There are occasions when even with the greatest of care and vigilance, there are things that happen in this Chamber from time to time that do not catch your attention, and I know that as the House Leader on this side of the House it is my responsibility to draw to your attention when such infractions occur. Unfortunately I was not in the Chamber on Friday when the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs spoke here, and I could only presume that your attention must have been distracted at that particular point when he referred to another member in this Chamber in language that is prohibited, and he knows it. The tendency seems to be on the other side of the house from time to time that when they have a weak case and when they are about to be cornered, then they revert to that kind of tactic. I can assure you, Sir, that as long as I am on this side those matters will be drawn to your attention and I know that you will deal with them as severely as the rules provide.

I would also like to extend to the mover and seconder of the Address in reply my congratulations, and particularly to the Member for Churchill who, with feeling, described his vast empire that he reigns over and the particular problems that are associated and identified with that constituency. I can assure him that as far as members on this side of the House are concerned, we will do everything that we feel possible to relieve him of his responsibilities first of all; secondly, and in the meantime, to assist him with those responsibilities because it is a vast area to cover and there's a varied assortment of problems and difficulties that he has to deal with. We understand those things.

I should also like to welcome to the Chamber the Member for Crescentwood and the Member for Wolseley, both I feel will be able to make that kind of contribution that will do credit for themselves. Some reference was made to the Member for Wolseley last night by the Premier, and I want to deal with that perhaps a little bit later, but I want to say to the Member for Wolseley that I will do whatever I can to assist him in understanding the rules of this Chamber and the traditions that normally we attempt to follow in pursuing debate in the Manitoba Legislature.

During the course of this debate, Sir, it's been somewhat interesting. I haven't had an opportunity to listen to all of the debates - I attended another function last weekend and missed part of it - but I did have an opportunity to review some of the statement that had been made and I can't help but note and comment on some of the remarks that are being made, almost with dreadful repetition from members on the opposite side of the House; this dreary recital of the number of - well the amount of money that is being spent by the government and to make sure that they mentioned that it is government that is spending that money in each of their constituencies. No mention of course is made, Sir, of the people who are paying for all of those projects; one gets the impression that this recital of construction and projects that go on in each constituency is done without the benefit of having to extract that money from somebody at one time or another.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) I can tell my honourable friends opposite, the people of this province are beginning to catch on to that tactic on the part of this government, and it is going to be one of the responsibilities of members on this side of the House to point out to the honourable gentlemen opposite as well as to the people of this province that the inevitable result of greater and greater government involvement in their affairs can only lead to one end conclusion.

One other thing that you could not help but catch in the comments made from members on the other side of the House, and that is the general acceptance of the statements that were made by the Prime Minister in his musings on New Year's Eve. One thing that has become very clear, that honourable gentlemen opposite accept the Prime Minister's analysis of this economy and accept his rejection of the marketplace, and it's good to have that noted because it indicates a similarity of thinking on the part of honourable gentlemen opposite and the people in Ottawa who are responsible for the administration of government in that place.

So far as my friend from the Liberal Party is concerned, I couldn't help but note that the House Leader of the Liberal Party in this Chamber went to some pains to point out that socialism wasn't quite as bad as we try to make out it is. He came to a plaintive defence of the philosophy of socialism, and then asked the rhetorical questions about what would we do with such matters as unemployment insurance, such matters as hospitalization, medicare and pensions. Well, I'm going to answer my honourable friend, and I'm going to attempt to do it as briefly as possible because there are other matters that I would like to pursue. So far as the unemployment insurance is concerned, I tell my honourable friend, we are not opposed to unemployment insurance, but we are diametrically opposed to the mindless application of unemployment insurance without any regard to the principles of insurance. It is not an unemployment insurance program today, it is more a welfare program, and everybody's beginning to recognize that. We're not opposed to pensions, but we much favour people being afforded the opportunity of providing for their own pensions; there should be no detriment, there should be no road blocks placed in the way of anybody attempting to provide for his own future or the future of his own family. If the government would remove themselves as road blocks in preventing people from taking care of themselves they would be a lot happier.

Insofar as medicare and hospitalization is concerned, Sir, well I with some trepidation, I must say, attempt to use some figures; and before the First Minister gets violent in his reaction, let me assure him that these figures come from his last budget and the budget of the government at Ottawa. And maybe my arithmetic is bad, maybe there is some nuance that I have failed to take into consideration, but be that as it may, I discover that as late as 1968 or '69 I bought my last private hospital and medicare insurance premium. At that time I paid \$60.00 for it, and that covered me and my whole family. Not only that, but I had a choice, I had a choice of taking out a more expensive hospitalization and medicare program. I had three choices, I chose the one that I did because it best suited my particular needs and it gave me some comfort to know that I had a choice. Today we don't. You find that if you add up and pro rate on a per capita basis the amount of money that is being spent on hospitalization and medicare from Ottawa, and add that to the amount that is being spent in this province as illustrated in the estimates, in the budget, you will find that it is costing per man, woman and child in this province \$360.90.

Now Mr. Speaker, again I say that I am not opposed to hospitalization and I'm not opposed to medicare, but I think that the time has come when we have got to stop thinking that we can continue to go on this merry-go-round forever, when we've got to start recognizing that there can be only one end result to the continued inflation of our currency and the continued increased costs of everything that we are buying. \$360.90, and that's not counting municipal additions to hospitalization, where costs also would have to be added. I hesitate to do that because I presume they vary from municipality to municipality. But the federal and provincial contributions to those two programs work out on a per capita basis to \$360.90 per person, and let the First Minister try to turn those figures around. --(Interjection)-- Well, finally we get an admission from the Minister that those figures are valid. --(Interjection)-- You

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) know, the Minister is paranoiac on this particular subject. I never said that they weren't applied only to this province, but they do insofar as the provincial contribution is concerned; but not as far as the Federal contribution is concerned, because I pro rated it across the whole country. Now it may be a few dollars more or less from one province to another, I don't know, I haven't taken the trouble to determine that, but I thought that the First Minister would be interested in knowing just exactly how it applies to the Province of Manitoba.

Now then, the debate did have its highlights, Sir, and I along with a good many members of the House - and unfortunately I thought the press missed a good opportunity to report the kind of a debate that took place. That was last Wednesday, when the Member for Inkster, or the Minister of Mines and Resources and the Member for Lakeside engaged in a philosophical debate which was rejected of course by the Member for Fort Rouge who doesn't like to indulge in philosophical dissertations. And as the First Minister pointed out last night, it is no wonder, when you're dealing with philosophy you in essence are dealing with principles, and we all know that the Liberal Party have long abandoned any semblance of principles in their application of government in this country.

Well you know, Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the First Minister last night seemed to entertain and engage the members on that side of the House, he regaled them and they dutifully applauded and laughed at the appropriate moments. I don't intend to regale anybody, but I would like to draw to his attention some of the . . . I'm searching for the right word, Sir, I wouldn't want to use a word that is unparliamentary. But in his presentation, intentioned or otherwise - and I will leave that as an opportunity to provide myself for an escape hatch - there was a certain amount of deceit in his presentation, he keeps referring to members on this side of the House as using simplistic solutions to complex problems. The First Minister is guilty of that crime - if indeed it can be called a crime - himself, because on several occasions that is precisely what he did. His first comment, Sir, was the one on inflation, and then went to great pains to point out that inflation was not a phenomena that was peculiar to Manitoba, as if we ever said that. He set up his own straw man in that instance because inflation we know is not a provincial phenomena, it is more national in scope in some respects, in fact perhaps to a great extent it's international in scope. But as I pointed out during the budget debate last year, that does not prevent this government from playing a role in attempting to curb inflation by practicing what they are preaching. One looks with alarm at the federal budget which from all indications is going to be increasing by 18 percent this year; provincial budget according to a newspaper report - and I hasten to add that it's a newspaper report that I'm quoting from because we haven't seen the budget - that there is a possibility that our budget will be increasing by 16 percent. That is beyond the guidelines that the government themselves have indicated are going to be imposed on other sectors of the economy and other people in this province. --(Interjection)-- Well, I wait the budget then with eager anticipation because we are anxious to see if the government are going to live up to their own restrictions.

But, you know, he I think made a mistake in attempting to accuse this side of the House of using simplistic solutions and talking about inflation in isolation, because we haven't done such thing. The fact is that we recognize it's a national problem, but to a large extent if we can't blame members on that side of the House for its national implications, we can most certainly blame their colleagues in Ottawa for keeping the government in office as long as they did, during the time when inflation was running rampant. But the peculiar part about the First Minister is that he has a selective means of using his own arguments in a way that is best suited for him when he talks about inflation. But then he says that's a national thing, we can't do anything about that. I recall, and I made this comment on one other occasion - I'll make it again because I think it is appropriate to remind the First Minister - that when it comes to determining hog prices, then he doesn't mind taking the credit for establishing hog prices, not only within Canada but throughout the North American

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) market; as he did indeed, not only in a speech but in the words of the Speech from the Throne it was implied that because of the advent of the Hog Marketing Board in the Province of Manitoba suddenly prices across the North American market had risen. Now it wasn't said in that many words, but it was certainly implied. The First Minister became very indignant, Mr. Speaker, when reading from a brochure which was incorrectly reported in the paper that was sent out during the last by-election - and I don't accuse the First Minister of that, because I was following his remarks very carefully and that isn't really what he said - but he did take umbrage at the remarks that were contained in the brochure and indicated that they were somewhat out of line, that they bore no resemblance to the truth or to the facts. --(Interjection)-- He says 250 percent. But you know, Mr. Speaker, what the First Minister did was to try to imply that the statement that was made applied to that particular time. Let me read the wording of that particular line. It says: "By the time, with your help, we turf these 'socialists out of office' the current and capital debt from borrowing will be close to \$5 billion dollars." Well, Mr. Speaker, it's about \$2 billion dollars right now, and at the rate it's increasing the Member for Wolseley may be not all that far out. In any case, Sir, in any case, the statement that was made is not going to be any worse in its pessimism than the First Minister's remarks on Autopac were in their optimism a few years ago. We wonder, you know, just who is misleading who.

I do want to, however - I certainly want to tell my honourable friend from Wolseley that although he may be unduly pessimistic he is in fairly good company. I want to tell him I didn't take offence to that particular comment, but the last one is the one that bothered me and I want to draw it to his attention. He said, "It is my firm belief that government should be run by the people and not by the New Democratic caucus." Well that runs counter to my concept of responsible government, and I can see that I must take my honourable friend aside and perhaps give him a lesson or two on responsible government and tell him that by all means let this government take the responsibility for their actions because they are the government, and in due course that will change.

Mr. Speaker, during the course of --(Interjection)-- well, the First Minister says, and he gets these remarks on the record, you know, hoping that nobody hears him - six or eight years, at the rate that this province is going into debt that could well be next year that that figure is reached.

You know, he talked about housing, and here again he used his favourite technique of attempting to create the impression that false figures were used. He quoted from housing statistics - and I'm not going to deny it, I looked at the housing statistics and they're right. But then he applied what I will refer to - because it's his turn - a simplistic solution to something that appears to be accurate on the outside but when taken in its proper context is not as startling as the First Minister would like us to believe. --(Interjection)-- The First Minister asked why, and the answer is very simple and he knows it; of course he knows it as well as I do and as well as anybody else in this House, that the post-war baby boom came into the housing market just about 1969, and it was just about that time that the demand for houses began to accelerate. I would be surprised that in the face of that demand had there not been a doubling or a fairly substantial increase in the number of houses that were being built in this province; the fact was, sir, that during that period that he deplored so greatly, the housing demand was being met. There was no great shortage of houses. He tries to mislead the House into believing that something existed that really did not exist.

I recall another - and I don't know who does the Minister's research for him - I know that he has an army of people to support him, which is more than I have - but in the calculation of his estimates or his prognostications on housing he failed to take one other thing into consideration, and that is houses are built in response to a demand, and the implication that he left in his remarks was that whether the demand was there or not, whether the houses were being occupied or not, we should have been building ten to twenty thousand houses a year. It's almost as inane as the suggestion that I read in a newspaper by some friend of his - I forget his name now, but belonged to the

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) same party - that there was a great disparity in the provision of medical services between the urban areas and the rural areas. He was complaining bitterly because the number of people that were operated on in the rural areas was not as great as the number of people that were operated on in the city. It just could well be that, you know, they may be a healthier lot in the rural areas and don't need as many operations. But in the use of figures, without taking into consideration the actual facts related to and behind those figures, there may be an entirely different story. That, of course, is never taken by my dearest friends in the socialist party who are so high-bound, and they're the ones that continue to accuse us of living in the past, that they fail to take into consideration the real facts of any given situation. It's only the calculator complex on the part of those people - and that has come about very recently - that prevents them from seeing the real and the true facts as they are.

Now then, one thing that we learned from the First Minister last night was his complete endorsement of Mr. Trudeau's remarks with respect to the rejection of the marketplace, and he came back to that time and time again. We're glad to have that on the record, glad to have that on the record, because it indicates a preference for a controlled economy that we on this side of the House reject and I daresay that the majority of people in this country reject. It indicates that the Premier who is attempting to foster and project a moderate image in this country may not be quite as moderate as a lot of people believe, that he may be more of a wild-eyed socialist than the Minister of Mines and Resources who we often, I think mistakenly, accuse of being the wild-eyed one on that side. Not only that, he indicated an approval of the present Prime Minister and I'm sure that the voters of this country will be happy to have that bit of knowledge. --(Interjection)--

Now, Sir, I come to the reference that the First Minister made with respect to a remark that first appeared, or a phrase that first appeared in the Speech from the Throne . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister state his Matter of Privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes. My matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, since it is a matter of record, is that the Honourable the Member for Morris in his sweeping statement as to my attitude relative to the marketplace is not making the distinction which I always make, that I have no faith in the marketplace relative to energy supply, demand and pricing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, we're glad to have that clarification. Any time the Minister wants to extricate himself, we'll be happy to oblige him.

But I want to refer now to, as I said, a phrase that appeared first of all in the Speech from the Throne and it was mentioned by the Member for Riel. But the First Minister came back to it on several occasions last night, and notwithstanding the lack of sleep that I've had in the last few days, I couldn't help but ponder during the course of the night just what was meant by the phrase, "the planned application of human resources". Well, I frankly confess, Sir, that I fell asleep before I found the solution to that, but it's just as well that I gained the sleep because across my desk this morning I found something that gives me the answer that I was seeking. For the benefit of my honourable friends it's an address by Premier Bennett delivered on February 20th, 1976 and it's entitled "Where B.C. Stands".

MR. SHERMAN: Make sure that they don't think it's R.B. Bennett.

MR. JORGENSEN: It's an enlightening document, Sir, and I presume that although it's a public document, somebody on the other side of the House is going to want me to table it and I tell them that I'll do that with alacrity. But I would like to attach one or two conditions to the tabling of this document if I may - or one or two provisos - I can attach no conditions.

First of all, I'd like to see it appear in the publication that is put out regularly by the New Democratic Party. I think that members of that party would be interested in reading some of the material that's contained therein, and if our friend, the former Member for Crescentwood who publishes a magazine called Dimensions, I think we should

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) forward a copy on to him as well so that he could publicize that as well, because it's interesting reading, Sir, and it helps us understand what the First Minister means by the "planned application of human resources."

Among other things he says this: "Transit is a major item. Years ago a fund of \$27 million was established to help provide a third crossing of Berrard Inlet in Vancouver. That fund transferred to transit is completely spent. In this budget year capital expenditures for transit amounting to another \$42 million were committed without providing for that expenditure anywhere in the budget." That, Sir, is "the planned application of human resources."

Then he goes on to say: "A contract had been signed for buses that are on the way to us and there's no money budgeted to pay for them." Well, I'm going to tell the Premier of British Columbia he needn't worry, because if those buses are ordered from Manitoba they'll be delayed in coming and he'll be given an opportunity to raise the money. "In addition to this capital deficiency in the Transit Bureau, B.C. Hydro, which operate part of the bus system will have a transit operating loss of almost \$35 million by the end of March. A grant to cover this loss including promised transit subsidies of \$12 million has been made to B.C. Hydro this year out of government revenues." That, Sir, is the "planned application of human resources."

"Major provision had to be made for another Crown corporation, the British Columbia Railway. This railway for the twelve months ending December 31st, 1975 ran up an operating loss estimated at \$47 million." That, Sir, is the "planned application of human resources."

"Many of the funds established for special purposes that depend on capital funding by the government are short of cash or out of it altogether."

Then it goes on to say: "The sum total of what we've been told by the Clarkson-Gordon Report which I'm sharing with you tonight, is that this last year's government over-spent its planned program by over \$200 million and will take in about \$300 million less than estimated." That, Sir, is the "planned application of human resources."

"The Provincial Government deficit by March 31st, the end of this year's budget will be about \$541 million, well over half a billion dollars."

"For the first time since 1958 our tax dollars will have to go to pay for the cost of borrowed money. Your government will have to pass a bill at the coming session of the Legislature to allow for the borrowing of \$400 million. As a result we will have \$40 million of interest to pay next year alone. We will continue to bear this burden as long as we have the debt." That, Sir, is the "planned application of human resources."

"The biggest single contributor to the deficit faced by this government is ICBC. We must provide ICBC" - That, Sir, is the British Columbia version of Autopac - "with a subsidy of about \$175 million to pay for the accumulated debts on its short life." And we all know how short-lived it was. "The subsidy required to keep auto insurance premiums near last year's levels would have been greater than the total cost of mincome, pharmacare, day care and a number of educational programs." That, Sir, is the "planned application of human resources," by the Barrett Government.

Now, apart from the question of whether mending fenders is more important than building new hospitals, how can a government provide money from a cash box that is empty? Then Premier Bennett adds a postscript to this horror story that was contrived by the Barrett government in British Columbia in three short years. The only difference between what has happened down there, Sir, and what has happened here is that we haven't found out yet. The records are yet to be examined to determine just how bad off we really are. But Mr. Bennett adds a postscript to all this when he said: "Government and the people are faced tonight with a challenge. We must end waste and extravagance and shed our illusions that we can have something for nothing. We have been fooling ourselves long enough." I suggest, Sir, that what the First Minister is doing and what his colleagues on the other side of the House in their blind allegiance to an outdated philosophy that has demonstrated its incapacity to meet with present

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) conditions facing this country today are leading the people of this province down a blind alley; and, Sir, my great fear is that they're not doing it because they don't know any better. I'm convinced, Sir, that this government know exactly what they're doing. I am going to refer to some statements made by the Minister of Mines and Resources, because the Minister of Mines and Resources is one member on that side of the House that never attempts to conceal his true feelings, unlike the First Minister who tried to deceive the people of this province into believing that he is something that he really isn't. --(Interjection)-- Well, I've given the First Minister a few illustrations of how he's tried, but apparently he has chosen to ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, one other thing that the First Minister did insofar as practicing a little bit of deceit in the House last night was his reference to the Moody Investment ratings of the Province of Manitoba. I found out a few things about that organization. First of all, we discover that Moody Investment Service, which the First Minister places so much confidence in, gets its information about a province from the province itself. It's the Government Information Services that provide it, and I can well understand that it would be very optimistic. But there's one other thing, Sir, that may be it would be interesting to tell the people of this Chamber. They are the same people that gave a fairly good rating to the City of New York just a couple of years ago. Maybe we should take all of that with a grain of salt, because the First Minister knows full well, or at least he should have know, that somebody was going to check up on that. He must have known that. How did he expect to deceive people in this Chamber, for more than 24 hours anyway.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to --(Interjection)-- the First Minister now becomes agitated, and as is his normal habit, you know, when he sat --(Interjection)-- and now you see, he's using language from his seat, Sir, that is not parliamentary, and that's characteristic of him too. He's beginning to show through, that veneer that he has been portraying for so long is beginning to wear pretty thin. He is the kind of a person, Sir, that attempts to create an impression that is really not a true one, and sooner or later we're going to find out about him, and I think we're beginning to find out right now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister state his Point of Order.

MR. SCHREYER: Well I think it's a valid Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, to ascertain whether a statement is or is not unparliamentary. I will say it loudly so it can be heard: that he was demonstrating a despicable ignorance of a matter. I don't believe that's unparliamentary. I wasn't attributing that to his person.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris. Five minutes.

MR. JORGENSON: The First Minister, if he abided by the rules of this Chamber, would not have that difficulty he finds himself in from time to time. We sat here last night, and although we disagreed and knew that he was misleading this House, we at least had the courtesy to listen to him, which is more than he affords members on this side of the House. But I want to, in the few minutes that I have remaining, Sir, I want to just refer to a couple of comments that were made by the Minister of Mines and Resources. He said, "So the real issue, Mr. Speaker" - and this is found on Page 127 of this year's Hansard - "and the issue that Mr. Baer put is that the Progressive Conservative Party over there says there are certain energetic, chosen, talented" - --(Interjection)-- Well then it's misprinted here. I suppose he said, "elitist people who are capable of producing wealth for the rest of us and that we have to nourish and take care of and accommodate and induce to give incentives to these extra super talented people."

Mr. Speaker, the Minister himself is a living example of that very statement because he happens to be the most talented, the most able and the most competent person on that side of the House. Is he suggesting that he should suppress himself to the level of the lowest and the least able on that side of the House? No, he does not. He demonstrates his ability in this House day after day, time after time, and it's a good thing he does because otherwise we wouldn't know there was any talent on that side of the House at all.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd)

But the fact is, Sir, our economy is made up of people of the same calibre. From time to time you have a person who has the capability of taking a dollar and making two out of it, of taking an industry and turning it around and making it pay where it was losing money. You have a doctor with particular talents that saves lives. Is he to be subjecting his talents to a vote of the inmates of a hospital, of the nursing staff of the char staff? No. He uses his own God given ability and talents to help mankind. --(Interjection)-- No, I do not hold the others in contempt. The First Minister now is attempting to put words in my mouth that I have never uttered and again he displays an arrogance and a deceitful conduct that is characteristic of the Minister and which I maintain is showing through time and time again. Mr. Minister, the people of this province are going to find you out very shortly.

. continued on next page

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

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

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll extend the same formal greetings as other members have. I'm happy to see you again the Chair and although I know you will have your difficulties from time to time as members do tend to frequently break the rules, I for one shall attempt to restrain myself. That's always difficult because I am human like others and I break the rules. But I shall attempt to restrain myself. I would welcome the Deputy Speaker back to the House, back to his position as Deputy Speaker. I would like to congratulate the Mover and Secunder of the Speech from the Throne. I thought the former Minister, Unitarian Minister, former Minister of the Crown, from Wellington gave a very cute speech, a very amusing speech; and the Secunder, the Member for Churchill, spoke very movingly, very sincerely about his constituency and his people in the north and I enjoyed both of them.

I would welcome the new members from Wolseley and Crescentwood. I know that I have learned a great deal in my six years or seven years in this House and I trust that they will also learn a great deal in their 18 months in this House. I know that the Member for Wolseley has already learned a great deal in his short stay here. He's been just given a lecture on proper conduct in the House by his House Leader and I assume that the House Leader is also giving him lectures in caucus.

I would like to extend my best wishes to the Member for Souris-Killarney and I hope he is back in this House very shortly. Even though the member and I disagree very frequently on the matter of Autopac, I've always admired his fighting spirit and I've always enjoyed his very spirited, very vigorous attacks on the government and I hope he's back in the House very shortly.

The speech that was made by the Honourable Member for Riel, the Acting Leader of the Conservative Party, struck me as being a bit strange. That speech had an air of unreality; it had a dreamlike quality. It had a detachment from the real world. In some respects it seemed like a bit of a nutty dream. Seeing that this is the U.S. Bicentennial year it reminded me of a bit of American folklore about a man who fell asleep for many years and it seemed that this speech was written by a man who probably fell asleep during the Roblin years, many years ago, and who had just awoken. Judging by the quality of the speech, that man must have spent those years of sleep in the lounge of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and also judging by the quality of the speech, I think that during those years they must have been playing a non-stop endless record of Chamber of Commerce briefs for this gentleman. The result of course was the speech we got from the Honourable Member for Riel.

The Acting Leader of the Conservative Party moved a resolution, a motion of non-confidence which is well known to you and I'm not going to bother reading it but basically it's an attack on the economic management of this province by this government. I was rather amused by it. It attacks us for negligent administration, mismanagement, wasteful spending, poor husbandry, continual commitment to outdated and unworkable socialist doctrines and stated that this has caused serious prejudice to the stability of the social and economic order of Manitoba and its people and thereby to the public interest.

Now I think that there are some valid means; there are some meaningful measures by which we can judge the economic performance of this government and the First Minister yesterday used some of those economic measures. I think it's fair for example to contrast the economic performance of this government with the economic management of other provinces. The First Minister yesterday pointed out that this province has a lower per capita expenditure than any province in the country with the exception of Nova Scotia. Now I would like to just emphasize one point - I don't want to go through the figures that the First Minister used - but I'd like to emphasize the point that four of those provinces have Conservative governments and I think after listening to the litany of abuse poured upon the performance of the Bennett Government in B.C., I think it's fair for me to mention without any abuse the level of expenditure in the Tory provinces in this country. And what do we find?

We find that Tory Newfoundland, the poorest province in this country, has a much higher per capita expenditure than Manitoba. Tory New Brunswick, again a poorer

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) province, has a higher expenditure than Manitoba. Tory Ontario which is much richer than this province again has a higher per capita expenditure than this province and Tory Alberta, that paradise to which everyone was supposed to have fled many years ago, again has a higher per capita expenditure than Manitoba. Much higher. I don't blame them for that; I don't blame them for having higher expenditures. I think in the case of Newfoundland for example, that the only way that the majority of people in that province are going to have a better way of life is with a very active government intervention in their economy. So I don't blame them for that expenditure. But to have the Tories in this province posturing about the high level of expenditure here is ridiculous when we look at other provinces.

The Honourable Member for Morris just finished telling us about what a huge deficit British Columbia is in the process of running up because of the Barrett government. Now I would be interested in looking at those figures at another time because I think that some of them are very subject to question. But let's look at Tory Ontario which has a good Tory administration. Tory Ontario this year I gather has a deficit, budget deficit, of around a billion dollars. That's twice as much as B.C. That is the same amount as our entire provincial budget. --(Interjection)-- The Honourable Member for Morris isn't too anxious to listen; he is one who loves to talk but not so keen on listening.

But Tory Ontario has a budgetary deficit this year of around a billion dollars - equal to our budget. Tory Ontario has had deficits for a number of years, large deficits. Contrast that with the performance of this government. Over the seven years of our government we have had roughly a balanced budget. We have had surpluses in five years; we have had slight deficits in two and I include this year in that because there will be a slight deficit this year. So we have balanced the budget very closely in seven years. Now that's not a wild-eyed performance; that is a very conservative performance. I'm not praising it. All I'm saying is that when you call that wild-eyed expenditure, wild-eyed mismanagement of the economy, you're nuts. You make no sense. --(Interjection)-- Pardon me, I will withdraw that. By the way the Honourable Member for Morris who is the great authority on rules in this House along with the Minister of Mines, repeatedly used the term deceit. Mr. Speaker, if I am not mistaken, I think that is unparliamentary. If it is not unparliamentary it is certainly on the borderline. But I won't use that term.

The member also expanded at some length on the present cost of Medicare to the people of this province and that really struck me as being interesting. He cited the figure of \$360.90 per capita cost for medical services to each man, woman and child in this province. Now there are some implications to that statement. What is he suggesting? Is he suggesting that we do away with Medicare? I'll be interested in hearing from the Conservative Party because I am damn sure that there are a good number of backbenchers in that party who would abolish Medicare, who would take us back to the good old days when everyone had to pay for their own medical expenses. I'm going to be very interested in listening to the members opposite and in finding out what kind of policy they have in this area.

Are they going to follow the lead of their brothers and their colleagues in Ontario? Are they going to suggest for example that we close hospitals? The Tory Government in Ontario has just closed or is in the process of closing about ten hospitals and they've closed wards in many many others. Now is this what you're advocating? Are you going to close the hospital in your local area? Is this what you're going to advocate? Is this what you would do if you were in government? Would you use the lead boot policy of the Ontario Tory Government in order to cut down expenditures, in order to cut down the expense of giving people decent medical care? Is this what you want? I am interested in hearing from you on this matter. I know that the Member for River Heights wouldn't support this kind of policy but I know what kind of support the Member from River Heights has in that caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I think another legitimate measure of the truthfulness, the validity of the motion of non-confidence of the Tories is their performance when they were in government. After all they were in government for a decade. Many of the members who sit here were in that government. They assented to and were responsible for the

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) policies of that government. And I think it's valid to compare what they did when they were in office with what we're doing and see who is the good economic manager and who is not. I think it's a valid comparison also because the new leader of that party is not a new face. He's not a new face; he's not a young gentleman who has come from the ranks of the academic community or a man who has no political experience. He's one of the same old gang, one of the same old gang who ran this province during the Roblin and Weir days. He's a retread who's being brought back to this House and who is being presented as a shining new leader of the Conservative Party.

Of course it's interesting to compare the performance of the previous Tory governments with what we have done. When you look at this spending - and again I'm not saying that what they did was bad, I'm just contrasting what they did with what we are doing and what you are saying about what we are doing. When the Tories were in government the budget rose from roughly 80 million to about 350 million. Now that's over a 400 percent increase. I'm not saying that was bad because the Roblin Government modernized the highway system, built new hospitals and modernized hospitals, built new schools and modernized the educational system. But in order to provide those services which the people of Manitoba wanted, they had to spend more money. It is a matter of common sense as the Leader of the Conservative Party would say. They had to spend more money. They had to spend more than four times as much money to provide those services. Our budget has risen by roughly 300 percent, from 350 million to something over a billion, a 300 percent increase. And again we have been providing additional services and that has cost more money. We've also been subjected to a rate of inflation that didn't occur during the Roblin period. The rate of inflation is not a provincial phenomenon, it is a national phenomenon, a continental phenomenon and a world-wide one.

The matter of taxation. Gentlemen opposite say we spend money like drunken sailors and that we tax too heavily. What did they do when they were in office? The Tories imposed a five percent sales tax; they imposed a Medicare premium of \$204 per family; they imposed the highest personal income tax rate in Canada for many years and this is something that they tend to forget. I would simply like to remind them when you look at the figures from 1962 on you find that in 1962, 1963, 1964, Manitoba tied with Saskatchewan having the highest income tax rate in Canada. Again I don't say that's bad, but you say it's bad when we do it. But you did it, you had the highest income tax rate in those years. You were the second highest in 1965, '66, '67. In '68 you again were the highest; '69 you were the second highest. By the way I put a qualifier on that. Quebec has a different collection system, a different taxation system and its rate in reality, I am told, is probably higher than the other provinces.

Now I'm not criticizing the Tories for imposing those rates of taxation but since we have been government we have not increased the sales tax; we have abolished the Medicare premium and we have imposed the highest income tax in the country and we are proud of that fact. We have abolished the least equitable tax in the province levied by the Provincial Government, the Medicare premium, and we have raised the most equitable tax, the most equitable tax levied by the Provincial Government, the income tax, and we're proud of that fact.

If you look at Civil Service - and again I'm reciting a dreary list of facts for the Member for Morris. He may not like to hear them but if he wants to check the figures I can provide the sources for him. Under the Tories the Civil Service, he may be interested to learn, increased by about 50 percent. This was under these gentlemen who don't like government interference in the economy, who think that the word "bureaucrat" is a swear word. They hired 50 percent more of them, and again I don't fault them. But they should remember that they did it. We have hired about 33 percent more.

A few more points. The Leader of the Opposition stressed greatly the fact that government at the federal, provincial and local levels spend 45 percent of every dollar. Now his figures are wrong. According to the latest figures I have from Statistics Canada the figure is 39.1 but I'm not going to quarrel with that to any extent. I'm not going to quarrel because essentially this is a silly, stupid, meaningless argument. I

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JOHANNSSON cont'd) haven't used the word "deceit". It is a silly, stupid and meaningless argument, and it's silly stupid and meaningless because much of provincial expenditure is simply a transfer of money. For example, tax credits are collected through taxation and then transferred to individuals through the income tax mechanism; there are social assistance payments. But the major transfers are to the hospitals, the doctors and the school boards and those institutions spend the money. They spend it on services to individuals, on wages; they spend it buying the services of some corporations. I have noticed also that opposition members haven't criticized those greatly for not spending enough money on municipalities and school boards. In fact the complaint we regularly get from opposition members is that we are starving both the municipalities and school boards. In other words we are not transferring enough money to them.

Another point that the member made which I thought was amusing was capital investment. The Acting Leader of the Conservative Party claimed that the government now controls 33 percent - I think was the figure he used - one-third of the capital investment of this province which is largely utility new capital investment. He claimed that this was a very bad thing or at least he implied it was a very bad thing. I have checked back on the figures and again we find an amusing thing, Mr. Speaker. In 1959 private sector investment was 55 percent this is new capital investment in Manitoba - private sector investment 55 percent, government investment 45 percent. This is the first or second year of Tory rule in Manitoba. By 1968, at the end of the line for Tory Government, new capital investment in Manitoba, there was only 48 percent by the private sector, 52 percent by the public sector. Fifty-two percent, over half. And when you look at the year by year figures the amount of public capital investment during the Tory years was around 50 percent. Now if you want to dispute the figures my source is the Manitoba Budget Address and Economic Review by the Honourable Gurney Evans, 1969.

Again I don't criticize the Tories for having that level of capital investment. In fact one of the great improvements that the Tory Party made in Manitoba was a very fundamental change of policy in the capital investment area. The Campbell government basically believed in a pay-as-you-go policy; the Tory government believed in investing in the future of this province. --(Interjection)-- The Campbell government banked money I'm told. --(Interjection)-- Oh, and gave it to the Tory Government which spent it. Well I don't quarrel with that aspect of the Tory Government policy. I think that they were wise in what they did and I think that we have merely continued their good policy in this area. So when the Honourable Member for Riel starts expressing alarm at a 33 percent level of investment by the public sector I get worried, because I think that is too low. We're not even doing as well as the Tories did and that's terrible.

The sixth point on economic performance was touched on by the Honourable Member for Morris. He said that the Premier's statement and position on the question of housing was a simplistic one. I gather he was referring to the fact that the Premier stated that there were more private sector housing starts during our government than during their government, and that's accurate. When you look at the housing completion rate in the private sector during the Tory years in government they averaged around 5,000 a year. Now that's a very rough figure but they averaged around 5,000. Since we have been in government they have averaged around 10,000 and I'm claiming no credit for that. You're right when you say there was a baby boom around 1969; you're right when you say there is more demand which is producing this housing from the private sector. But that hardly implies that we have grossly mismanaged the economy, when the private sector in the housing field has done twice as well as it did during your years in office. Now I don't really attach much importance to that. You may, I don't.

I think that the critical problem in the housing area - and I'm going to touch very briefly on this - is the problem of the vast majority of people in this province being unable to afford housing. This is the problem that this government has really tried to grapple with: the problem of providing housing for people who can't afford decent housing in the private market. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has approximately 15 minutes.

MR. JOHANNSSON: Okay, I won't use it up. As I said, the real and crucial

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JOHANNSSON cont'd) problem is providing housing to people who can't afford it in the private market. This is an area where we have done very well in contrast to the Tories. Now I'm not saying we have done as well as we could have and I think our policy and our performance can be faulted in many respects. I fault it myself. But to claim that we are poor economic managers in this area is ludicrous because the Tories built about 600 housing units in 10 years in government; we have built something approaching 10,000. Now we haven't built enough. But we have built one hell of a lot more than the Tories ever did. I would also remind the Honourable Member for Morris that none of that has been built in my constituency. I am one member of the back bench that will not give you a recital of capital spending projects in his constituency because I haven't had any. I think that you may have but I haven't had them.

Mr. Speaker, I want now to touch on the field of education. I'm sorry I used up my time on this recital of facts because no one was listening to it with any great interest. --(Interjection)-- Yes, the Honourable Member not only knows what I'm going to say but he also probably agrees with what I'm going to say. The Honourable Member for Morris just praised the Mines Minister for speaking what he believes in and I'm afraid that I also have to speak what I believe in in the area of education.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris have a point of order?

MR. JORGENSON: Lest there be a misunderstanding of my remarks. I did not imply - simply because I praised the Mines Minister for saying what he was thinking - that did not carry with it the implication that the rest of the members on that side of the House did not.

MR. JOHANNSSON: Mr. Speaker, some days ago the Deputy Minister of Education made a statement before the Winnipeg School Board which was questioned in this House. He has apparently since then made a statement in Brandon and he has been on the Peter Warren show which I don't think is terribly wise on his part. Because when he does such a thing, when a public servant does such a thing he exposes himself to public debate. I don't think this is very wise on his part. I'm afraid that I'm going to have to very vehemently disagree with what he has been saying.

I have some difficulty in expressing my views on this because I like the Minister of Education; I have respect for his intelligence but I have no respect for his policy. I don't believe it. In this particular area I disagree fundamentally with the Minister, and I more than disagree, I am beginning to really feel a despair at what my own government is doing in the field of education. When I say that, I am not particularly complimenting the members opposite, because they started this trend. The Member for Riel was Minister of Education for a number of years and he contributed to this trend just as much as the present Minister is contributing to it.

I want to read to you a letter that was in the Winnipeg Tribune a couple of days ago. I want to read it, or excerpts from it because this letter is from Cy Gonick who was a member of this House from '69 to '73 and who in those days was a believer in free schools. Cy had very strong views on the necessity of getting rid of any kind of discipline and structure or at least minimizing discipline and structure within the school system. He was a supporter of free school, the Summerhill concept in education. It is really fascinating to see what a conversion has taken place with Cy Gonick and therefore I would like to read excerpts, or read the letter to the members. And I'm quoting:

"Editor, the Tribune. So the basic three R's are less essential nowadays. So sayeth Dr. Lionel Orlikow, Deputy Minister of Education. Some strange and even outrageous statements have come forth from these quarters in recent weeks. Yet there is something quite treacherous" - now that's a strong word - "something quite treacherous about the latest musings of the Deputy Minister. According to Orlikow children don't have to learn how to read so well because television has replaced the book. Nor do they have to bother much with writing or arithmetic. The pocket calculator we are told has replaced the need for basic math skills.

"People who are more in touch with the real world than Dr. Orlikow know that such statements are so much nonsense and dangerous nonsense at that. The three R's have been enough downgraded. Orlikow's school products would be intellectual cripples, quite

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) unprepared to function in the world of work nor prepared to partake in our cultural life. That may be just find for River Heights and Tuxedo children. They will pick up the basic skills at home. In any event wealth is a substitute for achievement in entering and completing University these days.

But what about the children of working class parents? They count on the public school system preparing them for decent work. The open classroom, stress on group decision-making and conflict resolution may be fun and games for the middle class but they are ill-considered as priorities for children of working people. Goodness knows the public school system could stand improving, but gadgetry, expensive hardware, and key grouping are no substitute for good education."

Our new Deputy Minister seems to have a perchon --(Interjection)-- Pardon me, I need some improved reading too - seems to have a penchant for trying out every new-fangled American innovation that crosses his desk. Besides being costly, they only divert the public schools from their proper task. Fine, Mr. Speaker.

Now this is a statement by a man who was a supporter of free schools, who was an opponent of discipline in the schools, who was an opponent of a more structured school system, who was an opponent of stressing the three Rs, and now he has changed - you're right, he is right. Now, my problem is that more of you agree with me than my own colleagues. But Cy Gonick hit the nail on the head, he is dead on in this article. In his isolation of the real effectiveness, he's right when he says that the middle class people, upper class people, people who have wealth won't really be affected by this. Their children will do well in spite of the fact that this public school system may be wrecked; it's the working class kids, the kids in my constituency, and here I'm really speaking for my constituency because I have a working class constituency. The kids in my constituency will not benefit from the kind of trends that are going on in the public school system now. The kids in my constituency if they are to have a good life, if they are to acquire the tools, the intellectual tools to survive in this society, to have a decent life in this society, need some basic skills - and television is no substitute for reading, that is the most ludicrous stupid statement that I have heard in many many a year.

Mr. Speaker, I had much much more to say on education, much much more to say on this topic, but --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside have a Point of Order?

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Well no, it's simply this, that we certainly would want to give the honourable member every opportunity to speak as long as he wants on this particular subject which I know lies deeply in his bosom and which we happen to think and agree with very much with on this side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The honourable member has three minutes.

MR. JOHANNSON: Now, I haven't got leave, so I'm going to have to cut it short. But I'll have another crack at this in the estimates, and I intend to.

This is not a simple area, it's a very complex area, and this is not a problem only in Manitoba. I think it is a problem that is prevalent throughout much of Canada, throughout much of North America. There is more and more concern, and a very honest concern among parents, among teachers and among politicians, among legislators, about the principles, the directions within our public school system. Now, I think that the debate that has developed on this subject has been a very intelligent debate. I think that the statement made by the Honourable Member for Brandon West was a very lucid and intelligent statement. I don't share the aversion that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge has to debate on principle. The Liberals may not know what principles are, they may have an aversion to debate on principles, but I think it is important, and I think that the debate has developed within the last couple of years about the principles that are being implemented within the Department of Education is one of the best debates that has developed for years in this Legislature and I intend to continue the debate even though I know that some of my colleagues will be disagreeing very violently with me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time, having seriously considered not entering the debate and certainly not entering the debate with the voice that I have today.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) But because the reply to the Speech from the Throne and the reply by members on both sides is more or less wide ranging in its opportunity to discuss a variety of subjects and because I thought it was rather appropriate to deal with certain items, I rise at this time.

I rise in this House, Mr. Speaker, to first congratulate you again on the assumption of your responsibilities and to wish you well the coming session. I would like to as well congratulate the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne. I would like to welcome the two new members who have joined this side of the House as a result of the by-elections last year.

I would like to as well, Mr. Speaker, express a word of gratitude to someone who had been mentioned by the former Minister of Finance, the Honourable Member for St. John, and that is the former Deputy Minister of Finance, Mr. Stu Anderson is retired from his position. He served several administrations, Mr. Speaker. He served them well, and I believe that it is to his credit and recognition of his service that the testimonial held on his behalf had as its representatives people from all walks of life, people from all sides of this House, and in turn reflected the very warm feeling for a civil servant who has performed exceedingly well in his responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, there have been several quotations that have been made from the Bible and I think it's rather appropriate to have to follow the Honourable Member for St. Matthews to quote from Proverbs 29, Verse 18, where it is written that, "Where there is no vision the people perish." Mr. Speaker, I think in dealing with what I intend to deal with today, I deal with what I consider is the fundamental problem with government today, the fundamental problem of all parties, and that is the question of leadership, leadership with respect to responsibility. I say that at a very appropriate time, Mr. Speaker, because I've returned as many of the members on this side from a convention that has elected a very young man to head our National Party, who is a progressive person; who is a person who is committed to social policy, who has recognized in his public statements in the House on the hustings and during the convention a responsibility to people, and has further recognized that government does have to become very much involved in different ways with respect to the conduct of our economy - but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, has recognized that the reassessment that we are making in this country of where government is going is a very valid reassessment and one that requires a lessening of the intensity within which those who have the powers of administration in this country use those levers of power to accomplish what they consider to be the most important social ends.

Mr. Speaker, governments today require a refresher course in basic economics and behaviour of people. We must remind ourselves of the resources made available to government by people, are entrusted to government for wide use, which means efficient and effective use in meeting the collective social needs of people. Well, Mr. Speaker, how well is the government of Manitoba performing in the exercising of this stewardship? Well, how well is it managing the people's business? What are its priorities in meeting the needs of the citizens of this province? What innovative techniques and methods is it employing? How are we able to gauge the needs of people for public goods and services? How well, Mr. Speaker, is it really responding to the public's needs? Are the resources that have been entrusted to government by individuals and by business enterprises through the payment of current high levels of taxation being used economically? Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the record of the present administration in responding to the needs of Manitobans through proper deployment of public resources has been a matter of continuing disenchantment, concern, and, Mr. Speaker, even anger to the people of this province for nearly seven years now.

Since October 1975 when the Prime Minister announced the broad outlines of the Federal Government's Anti-inflation Program, in terms of its guideline controls, Canadians in all provinces are caught in the midst of a widening circle of concern, uncertainty and even bewilderment. There is apprehension about the present state of the economy and a growing sense of uneasiness about the future direction of the economy. The provincial governments are being asked to play a key role in the national directed

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) Incomes and Prices policy. It is to the Government of Manitoba that the people of this province are looking for guidance in what are really difficult times; for guidance that affect them directly in their lives, at work and at home.

Mr. Speaker, what are the concerns of people today, because this is what we have to address ourselves to? What are the concerns of people? Higher prices for consumer goods; higher costs for home ownership; high rents for rented accommodation; the availability of essential public services and hospitals and even public transportation; incomes growing more slowly than the cost of living; job opportunities, particularly for those who are middle aged who have lost their jobs because of technology or because of the changes in business enterprises, problems of job opportunities for our young; Mr. Speaker, the high costs of governments, federal, provincial and municipal; and, Mr. Speaker, the apparent waste of money that characterizes all governments in their undertakings; the growth of bureaucracy which is frightening, Mr. Speaker, and which also frightens people as well; and the problems of pollution. These then, Mr. Speaker, are the concerns of people.

When the Prime Minister announced the Prices and Income policy at a time of unusually high inflation, at a time when the danger signals were apparent to him as well as to everyone else, the Premier made certain statements of support to the Federal Government guidelines and he has maintained that posture publicly although, Mr. Speaker, one has to question whether he really has the support of his Cabinet and caucus. And I say that because during the period of time that he was in India, there were certainly differences of opinion expressed by some of his Cabinet Ministers with respect to the policy and its implementation. And if one examines the Speech from the Throne, recognizing the period of time that passed from his first pronouncements through his own convention and the pressure that was exerted on him by those who are some of his supporters, one has to recognize that the Speech from the Throne is carefully written to indicate the ability to make decisions which would be really contrary to the avowed expressed intentions. Mr. Speaker, I think that this is one area that will require further debate in this House as the estimates are presented, as we examine closely what the government intends to do, with a whole range of public employees who will be coming up for negotiation in the next period of time requesting the government to vacate the guidelines and to negotiate in settlements that will be higher than that which has already been set by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I have to suggest to you that if the government continues in a pattern of accepting that there is justification for public employees to be in a position to negotiate beyond the guidelines because of the historical precedence and because in turn there is pressure put on them then, Mr. Speaker, the danger is that we will be living in an unstable condition and then the private sector will of course have to react to meet the same kind of standard, and out of this chaos will exist. So, Mr. Speaker, it will be with a great deal of concern that we examine in the period of time within this House, the attitude of the government with respect to the whole range of public employees and to understand correctly what the government intends to do. The Minister of Labour today in reading the statement from the Deputy Mayor of the City of Winnipeg when reference was made to the eleven percent offered by the City of Winnipeg, said it was inconsequential. Well, Mr. Speaker, he dismissed it. But I ask, who is he to dismiss it? I ask at this point if eleven percent is inconsequential, and it may be that the AIB Board would accept it to be inconsequential after they've made that evaluation, but if he accepts that, how can those in the private sector negotiate with their employees for anything less? And the kind of chaos that would exist in the society we have today based on the crisis we're living in, I believe will be critical to their ability to be able to bring the economy into a position that all the danger signs have indicated must be avoided if we are not to achieve what occurred in the '30s.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne states that there'll be stringent limits on increases in departmental expenditures. But, Mr. Speaker, it does not say that there will be decreases in the estimates, and I wait to see the government estimates, and I will not anticipate. But, Mr. Speaker, surely what we must be talking about is decreases

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) in government spending. Surely what we must be looking for is the ability to eliminate those programs that have no cost benefit. Surely what we must be concerned about is the ability to reduce from the estimates redundant programs and apply the moneys in tax savings and apply the moneys for the new programs that will be required for people. Because I accept that government is not static and I would hope that as we deal with the estimates we'll have that opportunity to understand correctly what is happening, and to be in a position to make the contributions that are necessary and that must be made in order for the people to understand the way in which again the government is handling the resources that have been placed with them.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are many on this side who would like to fight the government with the rhetoric of free enterprise and socialism and I know, Mr. Speaker, there are many who feel that that is a substitution for the attack that has to be made on government spending. While I believe that the House across the way will be blown down, not because of the rhetoric but because of the problems within its very foundation because of, I believe, the basic errors of judgment that make up the foundation upon which they have carried out their policy, and the squandering of money and the waste that has occurred, it would seem to me that for those who will be satisfied with that argument it is no substitute for the work that is necessary in detailing specifically, Mr. Speaker, where the government has failed. If we are going to get involved in the rhetoric then there has to be consistency and the consistency to me is not apparent. Because on the one hand in the reply to the Speech from the Throne there is a reference to the fact - in referring to the New Democratic Party and to the government - that they have little faith in the free and random decisions in the marketplace which would imply, Mr. Speaker, that there is on this side faith in that and then at the same time there is in the same reply an agreement that in today's climate there is little alternative to some mechanism of rent control or rent review.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we now have to deal in practical terms with the problems that we face. We have to now recognize that governments are going to have to act in the area of consumer protection and in the area of their involvement to at least try to correct some of the problems that we have. But that, Mr. Speaker, does not take away, nor am I suggesting in any way that it does take away from the failures of the present government to take hold of a government that essentially is still running wild, and to be prepared to accept their lumps for some failures but correct some of the areas of waste. Mr. Speaker, we can refer to the MDC and to the Crown corporations.

Mr. Speaker, the government has failed to recognize that they have been given the responsibility that I suggested earlier, and that they must put themselves into a position of taking hold of the reins of government, controlling their departments and doing the thing that I suggested, which is to allow the people to have more money in their hands to meet the growing cost of living, by reducing taxation in all its forms as a result of the reduction of government enterprises in a whole range of programs that have to be eliminated because in fact they accomplished limited social benefits if any social benefits at all and because of the basic law that exists within a bureaucracy of continual growth. Mr. Speaker, it involves all. The Honourable Member, the Minister for Agriculture says, "Which one?" I wonder now if I may just deal for a few moments with some areas, but only some, to give some indication of what I think is necessary and in turn to suggest some practical ways in which we on this side can assist the government as we review the Estimates and as we review the Provincial Auditor's report.

Mr. Speaker, between last year and this year's report of the Provincial Auditor we have some very specific indications of problem areas with government spending. We have, I believe, some indication at least, Mr. Speaker, that there are still some checks and balances operative within our parliamentary system to at least protect the public with respect to the use of their resources. But, Mr. Speaker, all I believe this suggests is the need for a much greater attention to the Provincial Auditor and a much greater ability for him to be able to present to this Legislature a continual analysis of government's programs. Because his report deals with many recommendations; it deals with specific undertakings to a large extent caused as a result of questions and statements and

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) information supplied in this House by the Opposition, and which demonstrates what I would suggest has been a severe lack of administrative discipline by the government in dealing with certain of its departments. Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Auditor has examples of waste and mismanagement. He has found, Mr. Speaker, that there are financial records in a state of disarray and he has also found, Mr. Speaker, that some moneys obviously were redirected for other than the purposes that they were given.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what is required now is not for us to go through the normal way in which the Committee on Public Accounts has operated in which we will deal with three or four sessions at which the Provincial Auditor will be present. We may or may not get to the Public Accounts section; we may or may not even finish his report. But to give us the opportunity for a wide ranging review with him of the report, of the recommendations of the Independent Review Committee which really is the Auditor-General's report along with the Provincial Auditor's, recommendations for inclusion in legislation and our ability to be able to then deal specifically in each department with the way in which government money has been handled; to deal with the whole area of grants that have been given by the provincial government to various agencies and to be able to see how that money was spent; to deal with the Crown corporations; to deal with the public enterprises that we have and to be in a position to understand specifically the literally millions of dollars that are spent that I think can be placed in question. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, to be in a position to accomplish the kind of thing that I suggested.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that this session should be one that should be devoted in the most severe analysis of the estimates of government. It is one that should be in a position to provide from the government the response that is necessary for the basic question the people are asking: why has our budget grown to the extent that it has? Why have departments grown to the extent that they have? Where really is my tax dollar going and really can you not put yourselves in a position to provide tax relief for us?

Now we know that governments have contributed to inflation by their spending; we know that there are other factors that are causes of inflation in this country that are not the responsibility of the Provincial Government. But, Mr. Speaker, I must say that our great concern has to be now for the action that the provincial governments throughout this country and this particular Provincial Government must do. And I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will be given the opportunity for the Provincial Auditor to be in a position to be before us for a sufficient period of time because I suggest to you that he has never been before us for enough time to be able to answer the kinds of questions that have to be asked today. I would hope that in dealing with the Estimates we are not going to be caught in the basic philosophical debate which is appealing to so many but which realistically will not accomplish very much in meeting what I sense is the real need of people. That is for the Opposition to tell the government, you answer us specifically why you cannot reduce government spending and reduce taxation in this province. That's what they want and that's what they're asking of us in opposition and that's what they're asking of the government. -(Interjection) - Well I understand that that's what we'll get. If the Honourable Member for Flin Flon is suggesting that we're going to get tax reduction in the Budget then I'm very happy. But unfortunately I read an article in which it seems that the Premier has suggested it may be the very opposite. Now maybe the newspapers were wrong.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to now deal with one other subject. I asked the Minister of Health and Social Development certain questions this afternoon and I did that deliberately because I wanted to be in a position to understand from him whether he was in a position to know whether any person's life had been affected as a result of the evacuation or the strike in the Health Sciences Centre. I guess that's a very difficult thing to determine and he indicated that to me. He indicated that he had received no complaints but I should suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I have received some complaints and I did some investigation of it to determine what the problems were. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we now are concerned or we are now dealing with an area that will be of great concern in the weeks and months to come.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)

The unions who were negotiating were small unions at the Health Sciences Centre. There are some major contracts to be negotiated in the health service field and, Mr. Speaker, we cannot go to the period of brinkmanship that we did in this particular situation with respect to the others. Because, Mr. Speaker, then we will, I believe, have the problem of people's lives being affected. I think it's important and I would suggest to the Minister that he determine whether the fact that people could not be operated on did in fact affect the possibility of their lives being affected or whether in fact, Mr. Speaker, there were dangers that were caused. I know that in talking in one particular case - and I want to cite this because I think this is typical - of someone who had to be removed from the hospital. The woman who phoned and said that her husband was being moved from the hospital said the doctor had said to her that he cannot be considered an emergency patient to remain but as soon as he gets home within two days he will become an emergency patient and he will have to be brought back. Mr. Speaker, we then contacted the doctor and the doctor said I'm in this position: he is not an emergency patient today but his condition is of such a nature that when he is removed home - and he was - that within 48 hours he will be back. And the danger that will be caused at that time or the position he will be in at that time is something that I cannot be sure of. Mr. Speaker, I put that as one specific case. I have others where operations were postponed.

In one case a child who was on antibiotics for a period of approximately six weeks because she could not be operated on because of the infection and the fever she had at the time, was scheduled for the operation and that operation was postponed. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, to the parents involved with a child, who understand the problems that the members opposite and others have in dealing with this, to those parents the fact that the child's operation would now be postponed probably for another four or five weeks, with the continuation of the medication and the possible consequences of the continuation of the medication, to those parents that was a very critical thing.

So, Mr. Speaker, we're getting to a point that it would seem to me that as much as the government would like to shy away from dealing in the area of essential services; in dealing with the problem areas of people whose lives could be affected as a result of what's happened there, there is going to have to be another solution proposed for the way in which we handle vital services. --(Interjection)-- Well the Honourable Member for St. Vital says tell us, you know, what to do. And I think I will.

I will try and give this by way of a suggestion to the members opposite. I would think that there is a necessity to define vital services and I would think it would be necessary, Mr. Speaker, to try and legislate so that vital services would have a protection, Mr. Speaker, for their negotiations but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, the public would be protected. I would throw out as a suggestion, Mr. Speaker - and I do this recognizing that it will not necessarily meet with the agreement of members of the opposite side - a kind of formula that I think can work and can be successful. I believe that if those in vital services, having been defined as vital services by a legislative body, would not have the final opportunity of withdrawing their services because of their effect on the lives of people, that they should, if negotiations break down, be entitled to an arbitration which would allow them to receive in their negotiation the average percentage increase of the several major union-management agreements that have been negotiated in that year in the major industries either in Canada or in Manitoba. Now I want to make that in a very specific way.

What I'm suggesting is that in those negotiations that take place in the major fields, and they can be identified, among the major unions, and they can be identified, that the average for any one year - if negotiations break down and cannot be concluded - that the average for that year would in fact be the final negotiated settlement in a vital service. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because in negotiating in other areas - while there are obviously historical differences and there are obviously going to be different situations - at least one could say that in trying to deal fairly in this situation which is really what I am attempting to propose, we are at least, Mr. Speaker, trying to accomplish a result which would be fair to all concerned. Surely if the major unions in any particular field whether

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) it be the packinghouse union, whether it be those involved in the forestry industry, surely if we take the average for that year and apply it as the formula then at least one would say that those in vital services are not being penalized because of their inability to be able to have the right that other workers have.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are in fact going to reach that point because one has to analyse what really took place with respect to the government to recognize the government's position of following the guidelines, to recognize that once a strike was called and evacuation started that in fact the Premier then announced that it was all right to go higher. Yes, Mr. Speaker. One has to recognize that there were limits placed on the hospitals in the negotiation by the Health Services Commission. It was indicated to them that there was a certain figure that had to be achieved, there was a maximum figure that would be allowable by the Health Services Commission. It was indicated to them that there was a certain figure that had to be achieved. It was the maximum figure that would be allowable by the Health Services Commission, and that any negotiations that would be completed would be on their own. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that's the case. --(Interjection)-- No, I'm referring to this. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, if I'm correct, the guidelines were to be followed. The guidelines had given them specific limits. Those limits were not to be exceeded. If they were exceeded they would be the hospital board's responsibility, and the hospital boards are broke anyway, there's no way in which they can negotiate it. Then when the strike occurred, then the government, Mr. Speaker, then announced that those guidelines could be exceeded. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe my chronology is fairly correct. I don't think that you can deal in the area of vital services in that way, and I believe that kind of suggestion that I've made is something that should be considered.

So, Mr. Speaker, in dealing now and in closing really my few remarks, may I say to the members opposite I guess that at this time more than any other time people are more concerned about government spending and about government failure. I'm not at this point going to try and deal, as I think one can, with the failures in the areas that have been discussed in the past; I think to a certain extent we'll have the opportunity as we review the Manitoba Development Corporation as we deal with the various estimates that will come forward. What I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is the recognition by the members opposite that this is not an ordinary time, that there is instability and that there is leadership that is required; and the leadership isn't the declaration of policies, it's seen in the action of the government and the actions of people. It's seen at a time when people want, particularly those in the private sector, want from the public sector some understanding of the direction that we must take. I suggest to you that to a large extent there is really confusion and a bewilderment of what really is happening, because settlements have now taken place higher than the guidelines. There appears to be a rhetoric which would say that there will be control of government spending but every indication would appear that government spending is going up, and although again there is - and I don't know this - there is the language of stringent efforts being taken to control estimates, no one appears to be talking about reduction of government spending. People know that their incomes are not rising enough to meet the cost of living and people are concerned about their ability to be able to afford some of the amenities of life that they've been able to enjoy, and for many, that they've only been able to enjoy in the last period of time.

So, Mr. Speaker, in the policies of the government which will come forward in the legislation to be introduced, which we have not seen, in the Estimates that will be presented which we've not seen, whether that kind of leadership will be shown is something we'll wait and see. I would remind the Honourable Minister of Labour that the presentation of the Estimates tonight is not the examination of the Estimates nor can we be sure of what is really taking place until that examination comes forward.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker - and I'm sorry the First Minister isn't here and I recognize --(Interjection)-- Well, I recognize he has a listener. I would say that he's to be congratulated in one sense on the very skillful wording of the Speech from the Throne. Because I think what he did is write a speech that can be interpreted by many

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) as meaning different things, but realistically, Mr. Mr. Speaker, allowed him a luxury that he publicly has declared would not be the luxury he had, of being able to void some of the pronouncements he has made with respect to tying government policy into the national incomes and prices policy that the Federal Government has set. One cannot be sure until we have the opportunity of dealing with the future legislation and dealing with the future presentations.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close with again the quotation that I made that where there's no vision the people will perish. At this point and understandably so there is nothing that has been indicated in the rebuttal to the reply to the Speech from the Throne by the First Minister - and I wasn't present but I read the newspaper write-ups and I have some sense of the thrust of his remarks - in what has been presented by the members opposite - and I have read the Hansards to cover the days that I was absent - there is nothing to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there's any particular vision on the part of the members opposite as to the problems of people and as to the role the government must play. Rather I have a sense and an apprehension which may prove to be untrue - and if it is I'll be the first one to congratulate the government - that their belief is that by not expanding programs, that that in itself is a solution to the problems of today; that by not appearing to take new initiatives, that's a substitution for dealing with today's problems; that by simply allowing government to continue on as it was before with a little bit here and a little bit there that that's all that's required. I suggest to you that the leadership that they're looking from the government is to deal with their problems.

When we talk about housing - and reference was made to housing - we'll see whether they are really dealing with that or whether they're going to be able to provide the shelter and encourage the shelter to be provided for the people in this province, or whether we're going to fall further behind in that. I would hope that we will be able to address ourselves in the way at least to deal with the problems that people face in our society today. I hope we will be able to deal in a pragmatic way with the solutions that have to be undertaken and I hope we will be able to make the assessment of whether the government is really adequately concerning itself with people's problems or whether they have simply settled on holding back on programs as being the solution which will mean that a lot of people who are in a position of becoming, or are becoming farther behind in the race in our society, will still be farther behind. Mr. Speaker, I think that's the fear at this time.--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking for myself and I would say to the honourable member opposite that I believe that most people in this province are concerned about knowing what government is going to be doing as it affects their specific needs. I've expressed some. We have no evidence yet that the government is in fact, responding to that. We'll wait and see.

If not that judgment will have to be made and will be made on election day. But that judgment as well will have to be made in this House and if the programs do not respond to it then I think it is necessary for a continual attack to be made on the members opposite and the Ministers, not in the rhetoric of a philosophy, but in the specific areas of responsibility that they have and their failures in meeting pragmatically today the needs of people and utilizing the levers of power in such a way that government will assist and help people at a period of time which is disillusioning, in which there is disillusionment which is bewildering and in which there is fear. Mr. Speaker, I close by suggesting that we live at a time where there is fear and the fear at this point is severe enough that government has to respond.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs.

HON. RENE TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I bid you continued best wishes for the upcoming session. I congratulate equally the Deputy Speaker and the Chairman of Committees. I, too, am happy to see our Deputy Speaker in good health. I bid best wishes to the ailing Member for Souris-Killarney. I do hope that he returns to us in as good form as he used to be when he was with us at the last session. I'd like to congratulate the Mover and the Seconder of the Speech from the Throne. I believe that that was a good mix. We got the Member from Churchill and the Honourable Member for Wellington, who both made good contributions to the Speech from the Throne.

I feel compelled to give my best wishes to the two newly elected members opposite, Wolseley and Crescentwood. I give those best wishes conditionally like one should from this side of the House. By all means do bring forward the problems, complaints, recommendations of your constituents to this House. I do hope that you will play your role as effectively as you possibly can as both the MLA for Wolseley and Crescentwood. I in turn being convinced of the political philosophy of this party will do my utmost to see that you are not re-elected at the next election. But that's understandable. The same thing is true of you if you believe in your political philosophy.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the tone that was taken during this debate to discuss political philosophy. Because I happen to believe that because of political philosophy governments across the world change and new things happen in different parts of Canada. I can turn to history and talk about philosophy of the Liberal and/or Conservative parties in this province for 100 years and indicate what I consider to be the major difference between those two philosophies. As early as a few days, we can say that they can meld together pretty closely when we see an individual like Mr. Hellyer attempting to become the Leader of the Conservative Party while just a few years before having been a contestant at the Liberal leadership. Those two basic philosophies to my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, like I've indicated last year, are so close that I could put them in the same bag and it wouldn't matter which one came out. The direction that the people would get by their philosophy as outlined in the programs that they would initiate for the people would be quite the same.

I don't happen to agree with my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that if I had to choose another party that I'd be a Conservative. God forbid. God forbid. If I had to for whatever reason not be a Social Democrat I would pull away and rather just wither away and die than be anything else but a Social Democrat. I would not want to be a Liberal and/or a Conservative. To me that is exactly the same. But I do agree with my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and the House Leader, in regards to what he believes to be socialism. And let's not be afraid of talking about socialism, capitalism, and whatever happens to fall in between. I do want to talk about what I believe falls between capitalism and socialism and extremes of both. --(Interjection)-- No, I don't agree with my colleague to my left, that in between capitalism and socialism we have the Liberal Party. No, I don't agree with that.

I'd like to refer honourable members, Mr. Speaker, to Page 124 of Hansard, February 18th, 1976, and I'd like to quote this again because it's worthwhile saying for those members who weren't in the House and did not have time or the interest to read what the honourable member indicated his thoughts on socialism and what socialism meant to him, and I'm quoting:

"Now, Mr. Speaker, let's take the issue of doctrinaire socialism. I'm going to tell you I can't tell you what it means to every member of this side of the House. But if one wishes to put to me that word socialist or if I had to start fighting on the basis of socialism, then I tell you that socialism essentially means two things to me." One. "It means an extension of political democracy in the realm of economic democracy." And I'll get back to this later in regards to the six years' experience that we've had in this province of a social democratic government. "I say that the right to select the people who will govern the country is a form of political democracy. The right for those elected representatives to make meaningful decisions as to what is happening in the

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) world of economics - which is the most important factor governing our existence - is an extension in economic democracy. And that is one of the things that socialism means to me." That was the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

"The second thing that it means to me, Mr. Speaker, is that through our collective efforts we can best provide for the basic urgent needs of education, medical care, old age security and other things which are basic to the life of human beings and which enable them to have the security which gives them the freedom - and I stress that - the freedom to enhance the talents that are in them to the best of their potential." I endorse that. I endorse that not only based on the declaration by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, I endorse that on the record that the province has from this Social Democratic government for the last six and a half years.

Now, if we look at the basic difference in philosophy between either the Conservative or Liberal Governments before our becoming the government on the 15th of July, 1969, and compare it from that time to now, what do we see as a basic difference? We do see an overwhelming control of the marketplace by either the Liberal or the Conservative administration in this province for 100 years, and that's undeniable. It's been known by many measures that have been taken by the Liberals for 22 years, by the Conservative Government for the last eleven years that I knew of. Our philosophy has been translated really on the fiscal reform, the social reform that reflects the needs of people, not based on means but based on needs of individuals. Our having the highest personal and corporate tax in Canada is a reflection of that philosophy.

Having abolished other forms of taxation - and we are accused of getting back to this quite often - but I think it's worthwhile mentioning we have abolished as you so well know the form of tax that was called the Medicare Tax, the hospitalization tax being \$17.00 a month, \$204.00 a year. That was a direct tax. What else did we do in increasing personal and corporate tax in this province? We allowed people like so many that I've known when I was in Health and Social Development, people that are now in my own Constituency of Springfield, to be able to be treated in regard to health care with a system that I can say without hesitation is the best health care delivery system in North America, the best health care delivery system in North America. We cover in some cases all of the services under certain levels of care and part of services, the financial burden, of six levels of care in this province which you can't find in any other province in Canada, which you can't find in the United States of America.

What does that do, Mr. Speaker? In regards to the delivery of health care which is basic, which is a right or should be a right of all individuals in the world, not based on means but based on need of an individual, we today will treat or have treated an individual that is in need of extensive care in a hospital bed and cover the whole amount. We'll cover to the greatest degree the other two levels in personal care only charging to that individual whenever that person can afford it, a per diem, which is considered to be board and room. The medical care itself is completely covered by the province.

What happened under the previous system that we had? If my grandfather lived today, he would tell you what he thinks of Conservatives and he wasn't a Social Democrat. He would tell you what he thinks of the philosophy of the Liberal Government in Ottawa, of the Liberal Governments that we have across Canada. My grandfather fortunately - he wasn't a learned person, he couldn't write or read but he was a good worker. He worked all through his life, was able to retire from the CNR at age 65, got two extensions, had a few dollars set aside. It was made possible because of his hard work and economies over a period of about 40 years that he felt quite self-sufficient, good free enterprise person. His wife, my grandmother, became ill. She was admitted into a personal care home. Do you know what the bills were for a person in a personal care home with extensive care being had? It was costing my grandfather \$405.62 a month for my grandmother. He did that for two years. My grandmother died. Then he became ill and he had to pay an amount even in excess of that to be cared for in a personal care home. The philosophy of the Conservative Party or the Liberal Party if we ever, God forbid, went back to that philosophy, allowed my grandfather to be a ward

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd)of the state before he died because of that philosophy.

Now we can ask the Conservatives, we can ask the Liberals, what will they do if they are again elected in 1977 or 1978? I don't have to ask them what they will do, I can look at history. They're not hypocrites, not in my eyes, they'll go back to the philosophy that they believe in and that's my message to the people of Springfield. I don't tell them lies. I don't have to. The record is there. All they have to do is look at the record for a period of 100 years and they'll go back to that.

Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to go back to the type of philosophy that we had in this province for 100 years: having the basic rights of individuals based on means. That means the right to health care, to education and not having to resort to lies. I will not go back and I'll come to that, I'll come to that after awhile. Not have to resort to lies in regards to the basic rights of individuals. Mr. Speaker, I will do everything in my power to see that in 1977-78 we don't go back to what we've seen for so long in this province prior to 1969. I'm happy, I'm happy to be able to discuss philosophy in this House, to discuss philosophy out on the hustings and have the people determine what they'd rather see in regards to their administration in the future, whether they want to have it controlled by what they've had for so many years or the type of administration we've had here in the province for six and a half years.

Now that doesn't mean that we as a party will be elected in 1977-78 only on what we've done or not done in the past eight years. But I feel sort of proud to be able to compare the six years that we've now had before us with even the 11 years that the Conservatives had prior to our becoming the administration, or even the 22 years of the Liberals before the Conservatives. And we can take it on many fronts and compare that.

We can talk about public housing and compare public housing, corporate housing - if you don't want to only talk about public housing - and how much corporate and public housing has been constructed in the last six years as compared to the 11 previous years of the Conservatives. I'll compare that any day, any day. Building hospitals, Mr. Speaker, is a statement of saying, yes we're willing to build facilities. But who, who was paying for these health care delivery facilities? Who was paying for the facilities that were being made possible in part by the previous administration? People like my grandfather had to pay for the health care that was being had in those facilities. That's who was paying. I was paying by a premium of so much a month - \$17.00 a month whether I was making \$2,000 a year or \$200,000 a year. Is that the type of philosophy that the people of Manitoba want in the future? No way, no way.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to mention some of the things that I believe the Speech from the Throne contains. It's very easy for a member of the Opposition, whether he be on that side of the House or on our side of the House, to criticize the Speech from the Throne. I believe that the Speech from the Throne, as indicated by the Honourable Member for River heights, is well written. It covers a lot of points.

One of the points that I'd like to touch upon is the desire of this government to attempt to co-operate with the Government of Canada in its anti-inflation program. Now if you read the Speech from the Throne you will see that this government gives its support conditionally. We haven't decided on the guidelines that the Federal Government has decided upon for their program on anti-inflation. If I had decided on part of the guidelines, I would have reversed say the first condition in regards to the controls for anti-inflation. They started I believe mainly with wages. They indicated that, yes they're going to attempt to control profits by attempting to control prices. I would have dealt with profits, and then dealt with wages. But we didn't write the guidelines; we didn't decide on the conditions that the anti-inflation measures would take in Canada.

We are deciding through the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs what measures will be taken here in regards to controlling rents. We did say very openly to the people of Manitoba that in regards to the guidelines, if they don't control profits by means of controlling prices that we will pull out as fast as we accepted to go in with the Federal Government in regards to the anti-inflation guidelines.

Mr. Speaker, I find it sort of strange that members from the Opposition choose to cackle while I speak, while I had I consider, the respect of staying in my seat and listening. It's more difficult I believe to sit down and listen, especially when you hear

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) things from that side of the House, than to cackle from your seat. I choose not to cackle from my seat. I choose to request permission to talk which I am doing now. I choose to ask a colleague if he's speaking if he'll allow me to pose a question. But obviously they don't decide to act in that fashion, but that's your role, Mr. Speaker. If they get out of hand use that hammer of yours to tramp them down.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne equally, on Page 2, indicates what we as a government intend to do pertaining to public housing in this province. We did mention a figure of \$70 million in 1976-77. That was a statement made openly by the Minister of Urban Affairs. That is to include public housing; that is to include co-operative housing that will be seen in 1976-77, \$70 million. I challenge any member of the Opposition, any member including the Member for Wolseley - I challenge any member of the Opposition to attempt to compare that amount for 1976-77 to the whole 11 years of the administration of the Conservative Party in this province pertaining to public housing. You haven't constructed in 11 years what we're contemplating to construct in one year. Now is that the type of administration, is that the type of philosophy that the people of Manitoba want to see after the next election? I'm asking my constituents that question and their answer is very clear. No, we don't want that type of administration, especially when the Member from St. Matthews indicated that last year, as compared to one of the years of the Conservative Party's administration, we had double the construction by private enterprise in the Province of Manitoba. And you mix that with what we do here pertaining to public housing. You can't touch it. You can't touch it and it's impossible under your type of philosophy to go ahead with such a program. For those members that believe that they can match what we intend to do only in the sector of public housing, come to this side of the House, we'll accommodate you.

Mr. Speaker, we see equally in the Speech from the Throne an input by the Minister of Agriculture and we saw the members of the opposition giving support to the livestock producers for a more equitable share of the economy of this province. How many members from that side of the House got up and congratulated the Minister for Agriculture? It's in here. How many did that? Nineteen million dollars, \$19 million, \$19 million of taxes of this province that the livestock producers need to have an equitable revenue in this province. Would that have happened with the Conservatives? No way. Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back at 8 o'clock and pursue some of these things.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The Honourable Minister will have the opportunity to have the floor after 8. I am now leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m.