

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY (Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the 37th Annual Report of the Manitoba Civil Service Superannuation Board.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Continuing Education.

**HONOURABLE BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Universities' Grants Commission for the year ending March 31st, 1976, and the Annual Report of the Manitoba Centennial Centre Corporation for the year ending March 31st, 1976.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? The Honourable Minister of Mines.

**HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, I have simply two copies of releases relative to the ground water conditions and runoff forecasting. There are other copies available. I just want them made available to the House, I'm not going to ask the House to listen to me read them.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

**HONOURABLE RUSSELL DOERN (Eimwood):** Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to draw to the attention of members and the general public a display on the history of parliament which is exhibited on the main floor in the Pool of the Black Star. It was sent to us by the British High Commission travelling across Canada and it will be here until the end of March. I would encourage members, as well as members of the general public, to have a look at it. It traces the history of parliament from the time of Alfred the Great to the present.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion;

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Public Works'

**HONOURABLE RUSSELL DOERN** introduced Bill No. 4, an Act to Amend The Land Acquisition Act, and Bill No. 5, an Act to Amend The Expropriation Act.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. STERLING LYON (Souris-Killarney):** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Honourable the Minister of Finance. In view of the widespread reports to the effect that the Federal Government is now in negotiation with various provinces concerning the beginning of the termination of the AIB controls, effective October 14, could the Minister or any of his colleagues advise the House if they have had direct or indirect communications with the federal government to this effect and when Manitobans generally may be favoured with an announcement, either from the federal or the provincial government, as to the expected termination date of the controls?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HONOURABLE SAUL A. MILLER (Seven Oaks):** Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of meetings with federal people, finance, the Ministers of Labour last week, Mr. Pepin and a group of federal officials and AIB members. who came to Winnipeg, I believe it was about ten days ago, it was a question of sharing our thoughts and finding out what the federal people had in mind, if anything, in a concrete way.

There was no specific hard and fast proposals suggested. It was more of an exchange of views and for us to try to get a reading on the federal position. Last I heard there was no firm federal position. They had indicated certain possibilities, the pros and cons of those possibilities, but no firm position was put forward by the federal government and to my knowledge there is no, as yet, firm position.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Can the Honourable, the Minister, advise the House as to whether or not the mooted date of October 14th has been engaged in the discussions, or has come up in the discussions, and whether that general time frame is what the discussions are now centering around.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Speaker, there is no set time. October 14th was one of the dates put forward. There was an immediate date, October 14th, January 1st, letting it run to the end of the third year —

that is December 31st, 1978, — they were all put forward in the same way, as possibilities, and what the problems would be if any of these dates were followed through on. So, the October 14th date, which apparently is now my honourable friend's question, is now in the newspapers, that was just one of a number of dates around which then pros and cons were developed.

**MR. LYON:** A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise whether a proposed date on or around the 14th of October of this year would carry the judgment of himself and his colleagues.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to say what would carry my judgment at this time.

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

**MR. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. I'd like to ask him that in view of the criticism of the black bean program, I believe by the Member for Lakeside, would the Minister of Agriculture stop the black bean program despite the fact that all the taxpayers subsidies for this program have gone to the farmers living . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. Order, please.

**MR. ADAM:** in the constituency of . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. The Honourable First Minister.

**HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, Premier (Rossmere):** Mr. Speaker, just in the nature of further detail with respect to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition a week ago, relative to the arrangements for a meeting at the International Peace Gardens on Thursday, I would inform honourable members such as are involved in this meeting that the arrangement is 9 o'clock departure from hangar 127, and I understand my honourable friend has a particular problem with respect to a prior engagement in Ottawa. Arrangements can be made for a small aircraft to take, I believe, two or three people at 10 to 10:30. It's flexible in the light of my honourable friend's schedule.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my honourable friend, the First Minister for the arrangements that are being made and for the special accommodation that is being made to convenience myself, returning, as I am, that morning from the east.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. BOB BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister in charge of Tourism and would ask him that, if in light of the recent U.S. tax law changes limiting the number of foreign conventions which may be claimed for tax purposes, has the government considered any changes in the tourism promotion strategy to encourage more groups to hold their conventions in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** I imagine on that issue, Mr. Chairman, we are sympathetic with other provinces of Canada but, as at this point in time, we're not aware of any cancellations of any American conventions scheduled to be held any place in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. DAVID BLAKE:** Mr. Speaker. My question, I don't know whether I should direct it to the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister in charge of Environmental Matters, it deals with the reported heavy infestation reported this year that we may experience from the tent caterpillar and discussions that I believe he has had with the national park people.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. BLAKE:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I should direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister in charge of Environmental matters. It deals with the reported heavy infestation reported this year that we may experience from the tent caterpillar and discussions that I believe he has had with the National Park people requesting, or the people around National Park requesting spraying in a buffer zone to prevent the spreading. I wonder if he might report to the House what preparations or what spraying plans he has for this

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HONORABLE SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet):** Mr. Speaker, I believe the member is referring to the National Park at Riding Mountain and I would be prepared to get the detail for him but I don't have the full knowledge of what has happened in that regard.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

**MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Development responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. Can the Minister indicate to the House if he has received any complaints from M.T.S. employees about the working conditions — I'm referring to the Manitoba Telephone Operators.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**MR. RENE TOUPIN (Springfield):** Well, again, Mr. Speaker, it depends from what section of the Manitoba Telephone System itself. I know of certain employees who are not totally satisfied with working conditions but I'm not sure which employees the honourable member is referring to. Some are very satisfied.

**MR. PATRICK:** Mr. Speaker, I'm referring to the Manitoba Telephone operators, and can the

Minister indicate if he has received any communication from the operators that management is monitoring conversation and where the telephone operators were instructed not to discuss any union business on the premises. Is that correct?

**MR. TOUPIN:** No, Mr. Speaker, I had not heard that. I had only received the report from the Telephone System manager itself that the wage settlement was not adequate but not the type of complaint that the honourable member is referring to.

**MR. PATRICK:** A supplementary. Can the Minister indicate to the House if any employees have been suspended at this date for discussing union matters on the premises and will the Minister have a — can he check that out?

**MR. TOUPIN:** Well not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, but I certainly will check it out and report back if need be.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable, the Minister of Labour, and it is carefully phrased in order to try to keep the answer within the area of the question. It has to do, Sir, not with Griffin Steel but with the weekend collapse of an arena roof in New Brunswick. In view of the fact that there was an incident similar to that which occupied the attention of this House some three years ago, I believe that . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Question, please.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I would ask the Minister whether since that time, whether inspection procedures have been carried out with a view to preventing a recurrence of that kind of incident in this province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. PAULLEY:** Mr. Speaker, in order that the Minister of Labour does not get himself into any difficulty as to what's happening in some other province, I suggest the honourable member make his own investigations.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well Mr. Speaker, may this opposition ask the Minister of Labour whether his commitment and his undertaking at that time some three or four years ago in view of the Powerview accident to ensure the proper sequence . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. I'm sure the honourable member will have an opportunity to do that under the Estimates. The Honourable Member for Virden.

**MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden):** Mr. Speaker, I would like consideration for a correction on Hansard, Thursday, February 24th, page 105, the ninth paragraph, first line, the word should have been "exploration" rather than "explanation" and also in the fourth line the word "to" should have been instead of "from."

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources.

**HONOURABLE HARVEY BOSTROM (Rupertsland):** Mr. Speaker, on Friday, I took as notice a question from the Honourable Member for Minnedosa with respect to the deer population in Manitoba. I would like to report that the deer surveys are not yet completed. However, the initial reports from the department indicated the deer population is quite stable and that the recent blizzard on the weekend has not had any significant impact on the population. .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Could he inform the House as to whether or not an industrial inquiry is being called with respect to the Griffin Foundry dispute?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. PAULLEY:** No, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Northern Affairs. Can he indicate to us whether he or members of his department have had any discussions with native groups in the north concerning the proposed Polar Gas Line, and whether there has been any assistance offered enabling such groups to study and assess the probable impact of that proposal.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Minister for Renewable Resources.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice and try to get an answer for my honourable friend.

### THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** Proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan and the amendment thereto by the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. GEORGE HENDERSON:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. On Friday evening just before closing time I had been speaking about the Anti-inflation Board and removing of its controls. I was just saying that it would have been better for the farmer if he had the controls because his price wouldn't have gone down as much as it did by not being affected by the controls. We are sure looking for better times ahead because the way expenses are going up it looks like as if the farmers could be in for a very

difficult time.

Also, just to summarize very quickly, I mentioned that the government was continuing with its policy of buying land up in the name of the government and not assisting farmers in the buying, and I thought that this was wrong, that the government should be encouraging the farmers to own their land and should be assisting in that program.

I am very glad to see that something is going to be done about succession dues this session. I really hope we get down to business and come up with some good legislation because what we have today is really something that is very very bad for Manitoba. I have a few examples here of where a single man whose estate might be worth \$300,000, if he moved to Alberta and took up residence, he would save succession dues of \$78,000. On top of that from then provided he invested his money when he went to Alberta and was getting 10 percent he would be getting \$30,000 a year in interest and the government's share of this would be \$3,310; that's provincial share. So if we have a succession duty policy that is so bad to the people, there is more people than the government knows about who are thinking of leaving the province and going to provinces like Alberta. Not only that but when they get there they are in a lower income tax rate for the province which is only 26 percent in Alberta and we have 42 ½ percent in Manitoba. So it means on the same amount of income that there would also be an income tax saving each year for the fellow that went over there of \$1,285 which is a considerable amount. I feel as we get into it during the session, there will be all sorts of examples that you will be able to show that we are losing good people and that by them taking their business and their estates out of this province that we are really turning out the loser because nobody knows when they are going to die and they will move out many years ahead and their money will be used in Alberta. So, while it doesn't seem very popular to try to defend the person who has been successful and has a good size estate, politically, there are a lot of people wouldn't feel sorry for him, but in reality it is a disadvantage to the province when they take a good solid look at it. And these are good men to have in the province here because they do a lot of good things and give a lot of employment.

I was glad to see that the government's going to put more money into helping with housing in Manitoba. I was hoping that they would come up with some sort of a plan though where they were doing more to encourage ownership because, I believe, this is by far the best way to be going with our housing problem. Because if people own their houses they will look after them better. They'll have a little bit more pride in them, and maybe they'll save a few more bucks if they're paying for them rather than if they are just living in them and they'll just spend it.

I think the Federal Government have come along with a system now where taxpayers or people paying income tax can put a thousand dollars — set it aside to pay on their first home. I think this is a very good policy but the way I understand it, and I think I understand it properly, they have to do it ahead of time and then can use it for the house and I think that we should be advocating to the Federal people that anybody that wants to use this program could buy a new home now, provided it was their first home, and that these deductions could be taken off in the next five years ahead if the person who is paying the tax could see his way clear to do it.

I was also glad to see that there was going to be some more spent on care homes in the rural areas because we really need these in the rural areas. There's an awful lot of, especially in the part of Manitoba that has been settled longer because we have more elderly people there than we have in, we'll say in areas like Thompson where the average age of the population is much lower than in an area that's been settled a long time and in my area we find that there's an awful lot of senior citizens have been there maybe a generation or two even in that area, but now they have to go to care homes and they really can't get in. I believe home care has a place but after awhile there's just no use in anybody thinking that care at home alone is good enough and they should be able to go to what we call a nursing home.

I was really very shocked to see that Hydro should be mentioned in the Throne Speech and that it should be given so much prominence and such a write-up as if we should be giving the government an awful lot of credit, because I feel that the government has gone ahead with a great deal of blundering and mismanagement in connection with our hydro. Our Premier, who has been on the Hydro Board — (Interjection) — I don't see why. I was reading in the headlines here just lately that he's thinking of joining the National Energy Board. Well the way he acted with Manitoba and its hydro I don't know why they'd want him on a National Energy Board. It also stated that he'd been talking with Trudeau — I don't see that helps him any — and stated that he, you know that Trudeau might want him in the Liberal Cabinet. Well it might be a good thing if he went but I don't know how he can go on the basis of what he did with hydro in Manitoba because this is the biggest blunder that Manitoba has ever had.

I also read in the paper there where he was keeping his options open, where he was keeping these options open and I was reading about that and I'll bet you he really is keeping these options open and giving it a lot of consideration because, with the problems he's getting into with the Hydro, not only that but with what problem the government has been having with Saunders and Flyer, as well as

Hydro, he must be wondering where he's going to stand himself in his own election, in his own seat, because he only had slightly over 500 majority last time and it wouldn't take much of a change and our Premier would be gone and I imagine any man in politics would like to leave while he's still credible and while the people were still thinking that he was doing a good job and I think if he sticks around he may be leaving with a very humble feeling. So I can easily see that he's keeping these options open and I think he's right in doing it and I think maybe he should consider these options well before the next election if he wants to leave while he's still credible, or while he looks credible.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. HENDERSON:** I really think that the Premier of the province and Mr. Bateman really must have trouble sleeping and that they must often wake up at night wondering if it's all been a bad dream.

**A MEMBER:** They turn their lights off a lot, George.

**MR. HENDERSON:** I know myself, at times I get kind of dreams or nightmares or nightmares and I almost thought when I woke up, "Well, gee whiz, I'm sure glad that's only a dream." But I think probably when he wakes up sometimes he's got to say, "Oh, God, this is real, happen." This is real, this did so I think that him and Mr. Bateman must really, really have nightmares about what happened in Hydro. When we think back of different things that were said, and I'd like to read what Mr. Campbell said, and he said, "Time will tell whether I'm right or wrong. I confidently await time's verdict, but I shudder to think of the unnecessary financial burden which will be forced on hydro users in the meantime, for all time to come." This was said back in 1971. Time will tell and time is telling because look what we have today, it surely looks as if what was called schoolboy arithmetic turned out to be the right kind and that the other studies that was done by people who were supposed to be knowledgeable, wasn't very good and they must really, when they think back over it, they just must have an awful feeling about it because it's the worst thing that's ever happened. I wonder if what happened — I've been reading this report in the Winnipeg Free Press that was written by Wally Dennison of a certain part that was written in one of the Task Force reports — it was written in the article on December 11th — where a certain portion of the first draft was omitted when the report was written up, and I'm referring in particular to the part where it said that there would be \$143,387,000 annually as revenue from this hydro project if it had been developed in the right sequence and that was at one cent per kilowatt. Well, right at present, we're up to about two cents per kilowatt and there's no doubt it's going higher and so that would be more like \$286 million annually that could have been developed if it was done the proper way. Instead of that, here we have Manitoba paying paying to import power and our own power costing us so much. When we think of what happened on Lake Winnipeg, spending \$300 million there, the interest on that costing us \$300,000 each year, three million each year . . . it's \$30 million and we could buy the power for so much cheaper.

**A MEMBER:** You just check and make sure you do that schoolboy arithmetic.

**MR. HENDERSON:** I wonder if some time when the Premier is talking if he won't tell us what happened to this earlier draft report because according to this write-up there was at least 14 of them and there isn't any of them available. If there is, why aren't they in the Hydro library because, according to this they're not there. I imagine that Mr. Dennison did check and that's what it states in this report and if he believes that these are all things that aren't true that's being said, why doesn't he go after the Free Press or sue them? It just seems to be that possibly he realizes the blunder and it's turned into a political thing, they're trying to talk the people out of it. Every time the subject of hydro is brought up before the Premier, he compares our rates with Nova Scotia and Quebec and the such like, which is really just trying to masquerade the whole thing to confuse the people because, in Manitoba, we had an abundance of water and we should have had cheap electricity for many many years to come and to compare them to Nova Scotia and Quebec and places like this, it's really just trying to dodge the issue. If you don't believe that these things are going up, you should just ask the people in the local areas who are paying hydro bills, whether they're in business, whether they're in residence or whether they're looking after the local curling rinks or churches or anything else and I called our local curling rink, which has four sheets of ice, and I asked them what their annual bill was last year and I asked them what their bill was in 1974.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable First Minister state his point of order.

**MR. SCHREYER:** A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member states that copies of the Engineering Reports are not available in the Manitoba Hydro library, that is a straightforward misstatement of fact. All of the engineering reports are available, not only in the Manitoba Hydro library, they are available there and also in the provincial library. Indeed, I wish the honourable member would read them.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Pembina.

**MR. HENDERSON:** I appreciate the statement that he's made, but I'm going by what's written in this here and you're saying that this statement is completely false? Because it says here that none of these draft reports, this earlier draft, is in the provincial library.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**NR. SCHREYER:** I happen to have a report on my desk and it is an engineering report, and it is stamped "Legislative Library", and it is available and that applies to all of the engineering reports.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please.

**MR. HENDERSON:** No, I hope there is no confusion but I will check this out, I will check this out.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I am going to request those members who have something to state to stand up on their feet. Some of the interjections are unparliamentary, I do not wish to hear them either from their seats or from those who are standing up. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. HENDERSON:** Well I must accept the Premier's statement but I intend to check it out. But in talking about the local hydro bills, which seems to be the real proof of whether there was blundering or not, they have really gone up something awful in this last number of years and we are told that there is another raise right now and another one to come yet this summer, in the hydro rates. So some awful blundering must have been done some place, and particularly when money is spent developing a place like Jenpeg where you are only going to get a small amount of power for the money spent, it really shows that it must have been a political decision which was made at that time and then they fittit it in around that, because it certainly wasn't a good investment at all.

But, talking about our hydro rates, for one month in 1974 our hydro bill for the rink was \$314 and now it's \$611.37, it is just about doubled. And referring to the whole bill for the whole year, in 1974 it was 1,775 and now it is \$3,339, just about double and that is just from '74 to '76 and it is going to go higher: So this is what is going on in the local areas and I hate to think about some of the people that went and put in electric heat into some of the business places because this was more or less promoted by the Hydro to quite an extent, and now we find them getting these awful big bills.

So Hydro has wasted millions and millions on hydro development in Manitoba, it is reason I would say alone that the government should be defeated in the next election. Not to mention having lost \$40 million on Saunders, and I just wonder how in the world anybody who are supposed to be businessmen or their advisors, could go ahead and spend that type of money for a plane that they couldn't even get a certificate for in the final analysis. What kind of judgment was it, you know, it just seems incredible to me, that would be one of the first things you would be thinking about, "Am I making a plane that is going to be licensed, or will it be able to be licensed?" Then they went into Flyer Coach and they've lost about \$30 million now and we hear they are going to lose \$3 million a year if they keep on manufacturing buses. It just goes to show that the government really can't run this type of business. The type of services they should be given is more in the way of drainage for areas and things that people can't do individually, they shouldn't be going into business.

And it was mentioned that I was talking about having help for a place like Carman, and they said that, "Well Carman, or our area believes in private enterprise and yet when we want help with something like this we want help from the government." Well I am telling you for sure that if it wasn't that we have a system like it is where we have to pay towards Saunders, we have to pay towards Flyer, where we have to pay for all these other things throughout the rest of the province, my area would be happy to pay for the things they want for themselves. But since they have to pay for everybody else's they don't believe they should have to go ahead alone.

I wouldn't say that the government hadn't done some things which were good because it is pretty well an accepted fact and probably right that we should have Medicare premiums abolished. And they have done quite a bit to help relieve the elderly people, the people in need, but I do want to say, at this time, I do believe there is a lot of the welfare programs that is still very poorly administrated.

It was mentioned by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, something about me having said that people who are on welfare should starve. Well I think if you would check back through the discussion, at that particular time, I said that people who are offered work and wouldn't take it that I would let them starve before I would look after them. And I still would, and I know darn well they wouldn't starve because they would go to work. I would just like to correct that because anybody who thinks that — I know there's people in need, the handicapped and the crippled who need help and I'm not opposed to that. It's the abuses in the system.

Our tax system has been going up and part of it's because of our capital spending in the province and it seems to me of our that what we seem to be so proud about is that we can go away and borrow more money all the time. Borrow more money. Our capital debt becoming more and more each year. I just wondered if anybody really figured that they could borrow themselves out of debt. Is this the answer? Can you borrow yourself out of debt? I think that the more you borrow, the harder it is to get out so I don't think that's such a big thing to your credit that you can borrow more money. To me, the fact that you can borrow more money is that the country must have been in pretty good shape when you took over. I don't know the government that comes along afterwards will maybe find it so easy to borrow because the way our capital debt has gone up, it's just . . .

**A MEMBER:** Just passing the debt onto the kids, George, that's all.

**MR. HENDERSON:** Well, this is really what it is. There's quite a debt being passed on and there's an awful lot of others will have to pay a lot on it too

We besides them. seem to be drifting towards a society as I said before, where we are more or less

encouraging people to do as little as they can and collect as much as they can. I know that the people who are the labouring people, they seem to think they are paid little enough and maybe they are considering all the government workers and civil servants and the sick people and there's so many people on his back as you could say, all the aged and the crippled and all this, that the working man has to pay a lot of tax but how in the world can we keep raising his wages continually and how can we keep on with this system and still compete in world markets. I really don't know; I just don't think it's possible. On top of that, it seems to me that productivity goes down even though wages are at a fairly good level and I know that out at Vancouver when the people were on strike there for a long time and then finally their wages were raised, and you know that their productivity went down with just the same type of facilities to work with. You can't blame this on the type of facilities because the output per man was less after the raise went through than before the raise.

So I just think that this government has done so policy; in its many things that it shouldn't in its land policy, Mineral Acreage Tax Act, where it's trying to get the mineral rights from people who are only getting a small amount of money; the way they're handling succession dues and those taxes; the way they wasted it on Saunders; the way they wasted it on Flyer Coach; their mismanagement of the Co-ops in the north, the Wabowden affair, we all can remember hearing that discussed, we know how much was lost there. It seems as if programs that seem reasonably good, they seem to be able to go in there and lose a whole lot of money with poor accountability and the such like. So, I feel that the whole thing is discouraging to the people of Manitoba and they've had enough of it.

I would just like to say something which maybe pertains to the federal scene a little bit more but I think I would like to say it anyway, is that I'm sorry that the metric system is coming in. I just wonder and I accept a certain amount of the blame for it myself, too because I probably should have been following it closer. It seems as if nobody seemed to be on the job provincially, locally, even other people who were advised it was coming, none of us did anything and now we have got something forced onto us where we have got to change all our wrenches, our tools, our machinery, the size of lumber, wrenches, land titles have to be described differently and fertilizers, sprays, the whole thing has to be talked about in a different way, and while United States is not on the metric system and it is our main trading partner, I just don't know why we ever went into that. I just think that we made a terrible mistake. I think that talking about world markets, it isn't that important, I'm sure that these countries that are buying grain from us, they don't care how it's worked out, in bushels and pounds and that. Whoever goes to do the negotiating, what they are concerned about is the price they are getting the grain at and there's no doubt that they'll know how to work that out, the people that are doing the negotiating. What they're interested in is the price they are getting the grain at and then they want deliveries made on time and they don't want to have strikes at the Coast and have to pay demurrage or us have to pay demurrage while they're waiting.

I only have one other little thing I'm going to add and it's a bit of a one-liner and I don't want to try to make it any worse but I don't know why we had to bother with the articles that were in French in the Throne Speech. I think that Manitoba's been getting along fine and I think we're trying to stir things up. —(Interjection)— Well we had a little bit more this year and then we have the Leader of the Liberal Party talking about bringing in more French this session and I just think it's something that we in Manitoba should just leave alone . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please.

**MR. HENDERSON:** That's all right. Nobody has been objecting to it in schools, I don't think but I think in Manitoba here by bringing French into it, whether we should have Hansard printed in French or whether we should be turning bilingual in Manitoba is all a bunch of nonsense and I think that anybody who talks that way is just trying to stir up problems in Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HONOURABLE LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface):**

Portion of speech given in French. No translation provided.

Mover and Seconder I also would like to congratulate the of the address read by His Honour in the Throne Speech and all of a sudden my friend, the Leader of the Opposition has gone, I was going to welcome him here today. I certainly join all the others that are very pleased to see him back. There is no doubt that it should make the debate in this Session much more interesting than what we've had over the last few years. He is without a doubt, an excellent debater. He is witty — he knows it, mind you — but he is witty and he's fast. Now he has trouble at times to try to stay factual on some of the statements that he's made. His speech, mind you, disappointed me. It didn't surprise me but it disappointed me. I thought that after eight years and that he's now going for the top spot in Manitoba here that he would be responsible and reasonable and that he would debate the issues. He was always known when he was the House Leader here that he always had a way to bring in a red herring, he was terrific at that. If he was ever attacked, the first thing you know you had your back against the

wall and you were defending yourself and it was a completely different ball game. Now he hasn't been too adverse to bringing in some misrepresentation at the time, some of them wild statements and accusation. Some of them have been, I guess you'd call them a little smart-aleck, Mr. Speaker.

Now eight years ago he had so much respect for the House and for your office. You could never criticize and you remember, those that were here before, that I did my share of criticism of the Speaker, but he was above that. No, you should never criticize somebody that sat in that Chair. But the session hadn't been on for hardly a week that he was out like a cry-baby and accusing you of playing favourites and coming from him, —(Interjection)— oh, yes, he sat in that chair and he, in fact, he stood up and accused the Speaker of playing favourites and especially those that were in the House when he was House Leader. —(Interjection)— Speaker, he did it earlier and I'll look it up in Hansard if you wish. —(Interjection)— This Speaker, this speaker. No, not his own Speaker. I remember Thelma wouldn't move without looking at him and waiting to get the signal from him, I know that. But now he wants to turn the leaf and he wants a new debate. Mind you, he wanted to have a little fun, I think he called it a little fun at the expense of myself and other people, just a parting shot before turning the leaf and starting something new in debating the issues.

He does not want to talk about the accomplishment of this government at all, he feels that, you know this is a different ballgame, you have no business talking about that. You've had a chance. We're looking at the future now. That's fine. That's just right. But he doesn't even want us to speak about that. More so, he doesn't want the public to remember any of these things at all. He feels that this is all water under the bridge.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not that simple. You must remember the people that were here, what they did in the past, their record and so on. This is important and it would be naive to think that the public will not be interested in that at all; will not look back to see the track record of some of these people. You know right now we are talking about all the bad investments that we've had, that this government has done, the increase in the hydro rates, the patronage. Well, let's stop there and talk about the patronage, because we remember what the Leader of the Opposition said, and this is a clipping from March 31st, 1967. Yes, 1967 — ten years ago exactly. And it was his former colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Thelma Forbes. And this is what she was saying then about patronage. And I quote from the Tribune of that day, "Speaking during the debate on her departments estimate Mrs. Forbes stoutly defended the government's choice of members for the Commission." I wish to tell you that they had five defeated Conservative candidates on the commission that was established; the one that we are talking about now. She singled out as a particular choice her predecessor, Robert, as Chairman. Said Mrs. Forbes, "A government of : the day is the choice. Governments at all levels have appointed people to Boards, Commissions and other posts in the public service as a matter of course. I wouldn't care to cast a reflection on any government or any individual chosen to serve. These people receive their appointments because of their ability and their experience. I am confident all the members of the commission will fulfill their duties with devotion."

All right, if we are going to debate the issues, and if we are going to talk about a group of people versus another group of people, let us not pretend that, you know, that you can point the finger at these people and they are the only ones doing that. This is something that's been going on probably from the first parliament, anywhere, and will probably go on forever. You can justify a lot of that. There is some abuse, there is no doubt about that and I would imagine that all government, it is not because you believe in a certain thing, it might be the leader that is there at the time and so on, but I don't think that this is a real issue that can be discussed during this time. If it is, well let's make the comparison because some of the people sitting there now were sitting across here and this is what happened then.

All right, let's talk about the issues and let's start on the same footing and talk about what other people would do if they were here. If this is going to be brought in. It wasn't brought in by us.

You know, there's other things we can talk about. The way we're ridiculed here, the Members of the Cabinet on this side, especially since the new leader has come on the scene. You know, we're all a bunch of misfits that can't administer anything. Well, we can go back to when he was a Minister, when the Leader of the Opposition was a Minister. I remember that they chose — mind you some of their members and I won't point at anybody in particular, some of them are sitting here now, they weren't very happy when the Cabinet decided to increase their pay. By the way we've never increased it since then, I think that was 1967 the same year that the then government brought in the sales tax, that was about the time, and mind you it wasn't done. You know all this thing of you've got to do things in the House, you've got to let the public know because this is what Order - we're elected for. This was done by an and there was an increase of, I think, from 12 to 15. and another \$3,000 expense account, over and above the normal expense account. I think that that was washed out because the members, to their credit, the backbenchers of the then government would not go along with that.

But that is what my friend, when he was a Cabinet Minister, did. And, of course, we can talk about the pension geared for the Minister at the time, and I'll come back to that. But these are some of the things that they've done.

Now, you know, we've talked about the errors that have cost the taxpayers of Manitoba so much money. Do we remember that in 1967, again, there was a tender that was forgiven by Hydro and it was \$7 million to an eastern syndicate headed by MacNamara Corporation Limited. Those that were in the House remember that. There was quite a bit of ink about that, too, a \$7 million error and that was given to this big Corporation. But that was all right, it was a big corporation. So, you know, they make mistakes too. They're human beings and they make mistakes and they encourage their friends and so on. So, you know, not this thing of everything is black on this side and everything is so perfect when Mr. Lyon, and so on, if and when he crosses . . . if he ever does, because he'll have the same temptation and he'll have the same problems, and so on. It won't be that easy.

forget, remember, can anybody Dalton Camp, and all the contracts that he got. And I think you know who Dalton Camp is. —(Interjection)—

No, I think I'll let the members on the other side discuss Dalton Camp. You know they change so fast on that I don't know what's going to happen.

And this famous hike on premiums and the hike on rates, somebody said today that was the worst thing that happened to the poor people of Manitoba, and so on, and don't compare to other provinces. That's supposed to be wrong. I don't know why. He's saying you're trying to mislead, to mix everybody up. Well, if the First Minister was trying to mix these people up, the Member from Pembina was utterly mixed up, I can tell you that. But, about that time, in 1968 again, there was an 80 per cent hospital premium increase to offset the hospital deficit — 80 per cent. So, remember, you know, these things were being done in those days when your leader, gentleman, when your leader was sitting on this side.

The CFI, well are we ever going to forget that? You know, we've talked about the CFI and we've talked about the money that they didn't pay, but let me tell you from day one, you know because I don't think some of you members are aware of that, what this deal was all about. It wasn't just the loan that you made to these people and here, and I'm quoting from a report in the newspaper this: "Monoca AG would pay no ground rent, fireguarding assessment, scaling charges or stumpage charges for boom timber, this along with a lower than normal stumpage fee and other concessions meant Manitoba was paying Monoca an annual subsidy of \$540 thousand. Other concessions such as Manitoba paying all the reforestation cost, half the cost of job-training for workers, half the cost of importing skilled workers and for training facilities for workers meant additional current subsidy of over \$700 thousand. A commitment by the province to supply aerial charts, free forest inventory, onehalf the cost of grid roads over the next twelve years, and maintenance of the roads for eight years after completion. So the capital subsidy will be in the neighborhood of \$4 million. And then the Town of The Pas then, also, was pretty rail-roaded by the government into making concessions. Monoca obligations consisted of posting \$100 thousand security bond and making a deposit of \$500 thousand." And even then they were only talking the speculation, that the rest of the \$50 million capital required would be borrowed from the Manitoba Development fund.

So, you know, I think that we have to remember, and if this government — and it might be, that's what democracy is all about — this government has been so bad, it's made so many mistakes, who is going to replace chance, us? The people that had their that were replaced because they went along with CFI and some of these things?

Now, I thought that one of the my honourable friend was a little below the waist, he tried to insinuate something on aid to private schools. I think he kind of insinuated or that maybe I wasn't so sincere when I was talking about aid to private schools. I can tell him that I still believe just as strongly in parental rights in education and in the equality of opportunity. And I can say my honourable friend, why we haven't got aid to private schools now, this group was divided yes, it was a free vote. It was a fight although the majority on this side certainly were approving aid to private schools and during the campaign — there are so many leadership campaigns for my friends from across but during the one that had the member from River Heights when he was chosen and the member from Lakeside, both of them very strongly came out in favour of aid to private schools. But then, they saw their chance. . . They had to be expedient during that vote. The members on this side, you, most of you are here today, you pull the whip on because you thought that Schreyer would resign and you would have a better chance to take over this party. This is where aid to private school was defeated. What did you do? You lost one of the best members you had who would not go along with the whip, and I'm talking about Gabe Girard. So this is what you achieve so at least let's be quiet on that. I'm ready to bring back. . . If there was a way that I could bring in a resolution any time on that and I would oppose and I would be opposed by my honourable friend but I'm not going have it said that I don't believe in the same principle that I did when I was on that side. If we haven't got it you can thank you people who tried to stick together for political reason and nothing else.

Now national unity, you know that's a joke. First the leader tried to cover all the points; a little word here and there. You know think of it want, the way you national unity. And he chastized our people because there was nothing in The Throne Speech. And when the Roblin government was here, what

do they say? "This is something that has to be decided in Ottawa. Nowhere else." They were even afraid to talk about French as a teaching language. It had to start in Ottawa and nowhere else.

If any party capitalized on the backlash that we had and encouraged it, it was the Conservative of the type of Walter Weir.

The French language — I was going to say something about that and all of a sudden we're told that there should be more French and you heard the Member from Pembina. The Leader of the Opposition, we'll have too much trouble. I don't want to add any more that will get into a fight with the Member from Pembina because there are a few members who are not too happy with him on that.

I'm not going to play games. We'll talk about the things that he had on his mind. He talked about my credibility and the members from across have had a lot of fun on that. I've changed party, that's right. I changed party because the main thing was to keep certain people with certain principles out of power, which I did but I can say that I kept up all my principles. And, it is funny from my honourable friend, that talked as if he never changed his mind. I remember during the 1967 Leadership Convention when he was found by his own backbenchers that he was too arrogant and too cocky and a city slicker and he was opposed by most of the members of his caucus during that time because he was a left wing and he was progressive. But when he lost he left his toys and went home. When he came back in 1976. Now he is a rural member. He is Conservative. When the call came he was there to knife one of his former colleagues, one of the only one's that had supported him during the previous try. Mind you, I'm not going to use the word "liar". I could maybe ask you if that applies to people before they were members. I don't know. But nevertheless, let me say that he was less than candid when he talked about the money that the party was paying him. And I don't know why? There is nothing wrong with that. There is nothing wrong with that but why don't we bring things in the open. So the people will remember that too.

Now let me quote, again from 1969, from the same leader, the Leader of the Opposition, who has never changed his mind. "Attorney-General Sterling Lyon is among those predicting another provincial general election in the relatively near future. I predict an early election because I don't think the majority of Manitobans want a socialist government." He said, "A coalition of anti-socialists inevitably was to come. That's what he said in 1969.

He also stressed, you know, even I know what the word stress means, that his retirement from active politics was permanent not just a rest as indicated in recent newspaper reports. So he changes his mind once in awhile also. When he couldn't get his way, when they wouldn't give in to him, he took his toys and went home and when he had the chance, as I say, when they were ready to knife another one, he came in, he was available and now he is the leader. So if he wants to talk about my credibility I certainly will talk about his credibility.

For instance, his role, if anybody remembers — and I know that some of them, I know there is a member that talked to me about that and I'm not going to embarrass him, he can say what he wants on that — I remember when the now Leader of the Opposition was pushing so much for the Pension Plan. It was a pension plan, yes — my friend is saying he is agreeing with me — it was a pension plan geared at the Ministers then. You know that is something that I have got quite a bit of record on anytime he wants to debate that because this is what he had to say at the time. He also lashed out at the St. Boniface MLA whose emotional attacks on government proposals have angered more than one member of the Roblin administration during the current session. It's just not good enough in this day and age, he told Mr. Desjardins, to stand up like a bull in a china shop going after every strawman in sight. You have to have some substance. Mr. Lyon said he was glad Mr. Desjardins had opposed the Pension Legislation as that is probably the best indication that the bill is right. That is exactly it. Anything that anybody else opposed that's an indication that he is right and you don't govern a province like that. Because anything that would be proposed by anybody else would be wrong. What happened? Thank God they had some backbenchers that revolted. Thank God that the leader at that time, the Premier, withdrew the bill because it was an awful bill.

You know his new rule now is, "That's not fair. Don't talk about the past. Don't talk about me." Mind you he want a few parting digs and shots before he turns the page but it's a new ball game. And as I say the people are not that naive. They want to know about the credibility of the people that they elect and they ask them to take their destiny and run their political affairs.

We have a vote of non-confidence here. Again it demonstrates the present leader. I'm sure that he prepared that. Excessive taxation, wasteful spending, sustained mismanagement, failure to understand or respond to the changing needs of Manitobans. To turn around during a speech and tell his people, well it's different I'm here now. Things are going to change. I know it all. And confidence and support of the people of Manitoba, he is saying that my leader hasn't got the confidence of the people of Manitoba. Well, that will never wash. That is a joke. I think that seldom have you had a leader, a Premier of a province, that is as respected, not only in this province but all across the country and outside this country. And I think that it is going to take an awful lot of changing for the Leader of the Opposition to change that. You know maybe we should have some kind of amendment, a vote of non-confidence confidence on the leader. You know, we could say something like for

instance, the same as he said, just as cocky, say "He is not fit to govern." He is less than candid in his answer because there are certain words we can't use in this House. I would say though that the people of Manitoba expect more from their Premier. He is an expert at misleading and wild statements. Mismanagement. Mismanagement what? And I will challenge him on every issue in my department. He felt that I had no business being there. Maybe he is right. But he is going to challenge, he is not going to make just wild statements like this and say we are wasting money. If we're doing this I want to know where? I want to know what programs he is going to cancel.

Even on Day Care they have always opposed. Now all of a sudden he is in favour of Day Care. And he is going to be dragged into that debate. He is going to be dragged into that debate on Day Care.

He is going to unite the country. He can't even unite his own people, his backbench; they are fighting. They are fighting. I think that they might go to court now, because there is a fight between. . . There is accusation of all kinds of wrongdoing, but at least I don't say that this is right there is no unity. There is no unity in their own caucus and in their own group and all of a sudden they're going to come here and say that we're going to unite the province because we're better than you are. That is not going to wash. That is not going to wash.

**A MEMBER:** Would you call that leadership or . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I would think that is being arrogant and self-centred which is what I would say. . Now, sure I think if we are going to have the repetition of the past, if we look at his past record, if he doesn't win that well then he'll quit and take his toys and go home again.

Now let me tell you another thing that some of the new members don't realize. You know, we talked about the north, my friend was the Commissioner for Northern Affairs when he was sitting here, and the former member from the north resigned, left the party and became an independent because there was no hope for the north under a Conservative government. Now he is telling us about the north, the former Commissioner of Northern Affairs is telling us about the north.

**A MEMBER:** What's Don McIvor telling you?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Well Don McIvor is not in this House and he's certainly not saying that he's going to support you. He is like any group, any pressure group, any group that want more and he wants to have his own people and he is absolutely right. — (Interjection) — That's right, but he is not supporting the Conservative government. But a man that was the Commissioner of the North, whose own member resigned because they weren't getting anything from the north, that's the message I'm And trying to give you. the MDF we heard so much about that, and we heard about, "Tell the public what it is all about." You know that it was about a year before the last election called by Weir when he was defeated, it was then that they made a big change because the Board had to report to the Cabinet, the Cabinet, nobody else, and before that they reported to no one. No one, it was all hidden. Sure this government is criticized for weaknesses, for mistakes, because everything is in the open, but before that everything was done behind closed doors and they had very few programs so they couldn't talk about day care, didn't know what happened in day care, there was no day care; there was no home care, but we will come back to those things. So these are some of the things that we could say, if we had an amendment to talk about the leader.

But he has a hangup, you know the word "socialist", and I must admit when I sat there, I might as well because they are going to repeat that to me, I had the same feeling. The Member from Sturgeon Creek, I kind of felt sorry for him last time because he said, and I know he's sincere, he and he's was so afraid talking about the . . . but what do they call themselves? Well I say, "What's in a name?" Certainly there's all kinds of people in Africa that are talking about socialism and they are exploiting their own people and they're living off the fat of the land, some of them, that's not socialism. All right, the word "socialism" I must admit did the same thing, I was brought up the same way, I came from the same group and the word socialism, I can't explain but it did something to me, it was a dirty word. I'll admit that and I want my friend to admit it because you know he's got a hangup. There's a very convenient way around it though. Whenever we have a program, anything that we bring in, it is socialism, we must fight it, we will not let them introduce it, when it's a policy, when we're fighting for something — socialism. But when it passes it becomes a program, we will keep your social reform, it's social reforms that they can accept. What is it? Is he in favour of Autopac, is he in favour of Medicare, reducing the premiums? You know the best way is to maybe go through the list and maybe find out what they are in favour of.

In 1969 the for a premium in Manitoba, family for both hospital and medicare was \$204, that was in '69, okay. And let me tell you something more, when they brought in this plan the premiums were high enough that through the premiums they were paying for the welfare recipient. Do you know what that means? You know, this compassion that he told us, we will do the same programs but with more compassion. Well the people, an unemployed person, a retired person, a senior citizen had his premium — and it wasn't the Consolidated Fund, it was through this premium that they were paying for the fellow on welfare. So that fellow, that poor fellow, that person that wasn't working, and we're talking about compassion, you know that's a joke — and we're talking about the taxes. The Minister, I

said earlier was an 80 percent increase because he's had a deficit in the hospitals but you don't call that taxes. You say you're the highest taxed people in Manitoba. Call it what you want but it is money that comes out of your pocket to the government, and that premium is the same.

Now in Ontario the family pays \$384, in Alberta \$238 and B.C. \$225. And let me tell you something else, that they have no personal care homes in there at all, that covers the personal care homes in Manitoba, no other provinces. And we've talked about the wild statement about the staff and the cost. All right I looked into that to see how right my honourable friend was, I looked at the Manitoba Health Services Commission. In December '69 they were 285 people employed there, December '70 - 473, that's not a bad increase. But let me tell you something, out of that 175 came in from MMS because that's the year that we had the medical, so actually we went from 285 to 298. In '71, and we're back to compare with the 473, was 485; in '72 - 642, and 175 people came from lab and X-ray that came under the Commission at the time, so that would be going down from 485 to 467; and then in '73 there were 661 compared with 642 and out of that there were 80 from the Cadman lab, but I must say from '73 and '74, during that year, that there was 100 people or so less because of no premium — I've got to present both sides of the story — so in '74 came 665. And this is not comparing me to anybody else, but he accused me personally. Well in '75 the first year that I was a Minister, we went down from 665 to 661 and this year to 647. And from that difference which is practically the same is personal care home, pharmacare, ambulance grants, new programs in hospitals, the staff pay scale and so on, so you know, we have less people now in comparison working in there, doing all that work than we had in '69 when we took over.

And I think that there is something that we should discuss once and for all, without getting mad, putting all the cards on the table, I'm glad to see the Member from Rhineland here — we'll talk about the professional, the medical profession we'll start with. I challenge any member of this House to show me one little piece of legislation, one line that did anything to control, that this government did to control the medical profession, where any statement by me would indicate that we want to take away the freedom of the doctors and the patient. I challenge you. So either you pick up the challenge or once and for all quit talking about the things that you know are not right.

Now, as an individual I have never said and we've never done anything to bring more people in as salaried doctors. We've had requests from different hospitals and from some groups of doctors, and in fact, there were statements made by the MMA that they agree that there should be some, but we haven't done one thing more since this government is in power to do anything to take anything away from . . . service, or the right to opt out. In fact, we made a big point and that's where all hell broke loose, when we said, "If you don't like, and fortunately we would like to please you, but if you don't like the schedule of fees you have a right to opt out," and what's that? That's socialism? No.

You know, we've talked about planning, that's another thing, well you don't talk to doctors, you don't talk to doctors. Well I have a list here of thirty-three committees where over 100 doctors are constantly meeting to discuss these things, way more than we've had under the former administration, way more, and since then we've had a committee meeting with the Manitoba Health Services Commission. My door has always been open, I meet with the College of Physicians, at their request, a few times a year and we set up a committee of the representation of the College, the MMA and the University, the Faculty of Medicine, to discuss some of the problems. So, you know, if you want to say that this government will do something — but don't bring things that are completely wrong things that you would like us to say that we never said. And you're joined by the Free Press who is always making those kinds of statements also.

**A MEMBER:** Get your own press.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Oh, get your own press. I can just see what would happen if we set up a press, what they would say.

**A MEMBER:** You already have.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** That's right, I think the Press has certain responsibilities — (Interjection) — I'll tell it the way I want. I think that both sides should be represented — (Interjection) — That's exactly what I'm doing; I'm telling you that both sides, that the honest truth should be said. Why do you have the right to say that we made a statement, that I said that, when you can't find it anywhere, when it is not true. This is what I don't like. The editorials, the paper can have their own policies. I'll give you an example. This government is always picking on doctors. Well How many times you've pushed that around the province? So did the press. Did you hear anybody say that the City of Winnipeg was picking on the bus drivers more than on anybody else. We have to divide that. Let's look at the medical profession, I have nothing but respect for them. I've seen them at work, they've worked on members of my family and so on, I have no hesitation. But when we're talking about members of the union, it's the same all bus drivers are pretty good; not too many of them beat their wives and so on. Nobody has a monopoly on goodness; there's some good ones, there's some greedy. All right, I'm not talking about the profession, I'm talking about the man and there's some good ones and some that are greedy in any profession and so on.

What we talked a during the time of negotiating is something else than just to say say . in there like

you like to see it that we've no respect that we're trying to chase them out of Manitoba which is absolutely wrong and again I challenge you to show one iota of truth in that. —(Interjection)— What was that? I'd like to be able to answer that if you have something to say. —(Interjection)— What's that got to do with what we're talking about? That we just didn't inherit that, that Information Services came from your administration, we kept on, it was working so well for you, we thought we'd keep it up.

You know, we don't have to be naive The medical profession, if you want to be fair, I said that we respect it as a profession. Let's talk about the individual now. They are all people who are in the highest bracket. Nothing wrong with that. Remember that, I said nothing wrong with that because you'll probably turn around that we're trying to bring them down, but I'm not naive enough to think that a government, like this government here is dedicated to closing the gap and to bringing these programs to help the poor guy at the bottom of the ladder, for that you need money and for money you need taxes and you must go to the people who have money. There's not too many of these people that will support this government and that's okay, that's fair. But let's not collar everything else, to say that we have no respect for medicine, for standards and all that because there's better standards now in Manitoba than we ever had before and that we are not talking with the medical profession . . . because that is wrong, that is false. I'll tell you where the trouble started. It was that this former government, the Conservatives, said, "Yes, we're going to go ahead with Medicare." Okay? Then they decided — but not this year, they passed, passed not this year. The medical profession — no supervision at all, no I don't think any other profession would have been able to do that, came out and worked a new schedule of fees. And the following year, they had an average increase — and that's not this year, dollars meant a little more — of \$10,000 and they went in from the second to about fifth or sixth, where Manitoba traditionally belonged, where we should be, to about second. The second highest pay and now they're back to about fifth. What am I supposed to do? I'm told, "if you don't do that we'll withdraw service from the All right. You tell me what you would do as a government, we've got to change this eventually. You can get really in the groove and think. Let's pretend that it's people at the bottom of the ladder, they told you that. Like my friend said a while ago, "Let 'em starve or force them to do this." This is probably what you would say. And we said, "All right. Nobody is forcing anybody to be in the plan. We are giving you something that we feel is fair and if not, fine. You can opt out." But now there's so many of them that are the free enterprisers that want the best of both worlds. There were statements made: "We can't do that; nobody will guarantee our pay."

You know, maybe we should try to enumerate some of the things in that profession that the government is always picking on. You know, who is subsidizing their education. Is it the public purse or not? And how much does that cost? Does it cost the same as this guy getting out in Grade Six or Seven and going to work in the mines or something because he can't afford to work? What did he get from the taxpayer? But he's helping to pay the education of someone. And then I'm not saying it's wrong but let's not be a bunch of bloody cry-babies. And I'm not blaming the medical profession as much as I'm blaming the members on this side.

Now there's been building of large hospitals and so on that make their jobs a lot easier. You know, we're talking about the shortage, how difficult it is to get some of those people to go outside of the cities and it's all over the world like that. They want to be close to the hospitals and I'm not blaming them but I'm telling you the facts the way they are. Is it our fault, is it my fault, that there's a shortage up north, because you get anybody to go? And how many now are making house calls? And we're talking about those that are working in the Plan and have all their deficit, there's no bad debts, the purse guarantees that. There's some of these doctors that are here in Manitoba that come from outside countries that are making up to ten times the amount of money they were making in their country and that is something that maybe we should talk about one of these days — the brain drain and quite apart from this, to see what we can do to help some of these countries. It's a shame to see countries like Jamaica and so on that have a hospital sitting on top of the hill they can't open because they haven't got the staff and so on. Do we have the right to go and bleed these people from the brain drain and at the same time, keep Canadian kids away from maybe going in their choice profession, the medical profession.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Three minutes.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Three minutes? I've only started. All right.

I wanted to bring in some of the programs that my friend says he's in favour of — medicare. Okay, that was socialism not too long ago, now he's not going to change any premium, so there's no point. We're certainly not going to change the government on medicare, they're going to do the same thing we're going to do. You know, there's something that is unbelievable. The Member from Rhineland, he stood up in front of about 600 nurses and listen to this, listen to this. He said, "It's that will decide; the doctors, the chiropractors, the optometrists, the chiropodists, the nurses, the LPN's, the physiotherapist, the dentist," he named them all and he said, "You will . . . The role of the government is this: you'll raise the money and decide how much money you are going to give." That's a Conservative government, the health critic of the Conservative government, so therefore no

wonder they don't want a Minister of Health. There's no need. the government will decide so much, here, you people decide. Can you see how well, how easy it is going to be with all these people pulling for their own which is a natural thing to do in all honesty, and then who would decide how much money between departments. I guess the other ministers would have to go too, that is accepting responsibility? That is what my friend would do when he becomes and if he becomes the Minister of Health, he is going to raise the money and he's going to say to those people, decide, decide, is that what he means, because that's what he said? That's what he said.

You You know, this is unbelievable coming from this type of government. And you say I've got three minutes, unfortunately I wanted to go through all the department. I was going to say if that's socialism, let's throw it out and and I was going to see what response I was going to have for that.

And Day Care, even Day Care, he said that we have abandoned day care. You know how we abandon it? The first year \$500,000 the next year \$1 million, this year \$3 million and next year over \$4 million. You know, that's the way we abandon and I think I've got figures. You know, he doesn't say he's for it; he doesn't say he's against it. And by the way, there's 1963, "1,700 can't get into that was a Conservative government. . "MD hits hospital plan;" "No waiting list at hospitals," "Premiums are doubled" — "Whitney Johnston. predicts increase in health costs and taxes," they called it taxes but not now, it's not that. "Hospital bed shortage becomes acute in city, twice the amount of '63, it is now 3,800." By now it should be 12,000 or something, you know.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize the time was going so fast because I certainly would like to challenge my honourable friend to the programs and talk about the programs in debate because I'm ready to debate any of these programs and I want to know, and the public of Manitoba wants to know, where we're going to cancel, what program we're going to cancel. I've made a lot of mistakes, I'll make more, but I think that I have another five years to practice and I hope that in those five years I'll be a little better.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, my first words would be words of congratulations to you, Sir, on your reappointment to your high office, wish you good health and co-operation in the session ahead.

My second words are words of welcome to the distinguished new member of the House, the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, my Leader. I'm sure that all members on both sides of this Chamber Mr. Speaker, particularly those on the treasury benches, will find this a particularly stimulating and vigorous session as the direct and the welcome consequence, I might say, of his being in this Chamber.

My third words, Mr. Speaker, would be to the Chairman of the Manitoba Liquor Commission, one Mr. Frank Syms who, I'm told, is wrestling with himself these nights, attempting to convince himself that he should persuade himself, that he should draft himself, to offer himself as the candidate of the New Democratic Party in the next provincial election in my constituency, the great constituency of Fort Garry. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that should things turn out this way, that I welcome Mr. Syms to the fray, but I do so, Mr. Speaker, with somewhat mixed emotions because I do not know if the candidate happens to be Mr. Syms whether all advertising will be banned during the campaign in Fort Garry. I do not know whether all speeches will be reduced to 3.9 percent politics by volume and I do not know whether all fortified politicians will be removed from the shelves, Sir. But on the basis of Mr. Syms' track record, I rather suspect that this will be the case and if all advertising is going to be banned, Mr. Speaker, I want to get a little bit of advertising in for myself right now before that happens. I want you to know, Sir, that my name is Sherman, Bud X and that I intend to run in the next election as a Progressive Conservative candidate for Fort Garry and anything you can do to help me, Sir, would be most welcome. I hope and trust you will pass that invitation pm I also approach Mr. Syms possible candidacy, Mr. Speaker, with mixed emotions for another reason and that is, that, you see, we have a few problems in Fort Garry, not major problems but certainly aggravations that weigh heavily and unfairly on various members of our community and some of them are with the Manitoba Liquor Commission. There's a little matter of a rental dispute that's being going on since the first of December between the Manitoba Liquor Commission and its premises on the corner of Oakenwald and Pembina Highway, only the busiest intersection in Fort Garry and one of the busiest intersections in all of Winnipeg. There's a little matter of Fort Garry's growth southward and agitations and efforts by myself and others for some three years now to have a liquor outlet established and opened further south in Fort Garry, to serve all the great population growth out there and get away the traffic problems that exist around that particular corner to which I've referred. There's a little matter of the projected St. Vital-Fort Garry bridge and the inconvenience, and the indecision that affects the lives and the homes of all the people in that particular area and, Sir, there's the matter of the Land Assembly Program for many persons in Fort Whyte, more than 50 property owners in Fort Whyte to be precise, who have been stalled, and stymied and frustrated and had their lives and their futures frozen by government inaction at two levels, indecision at the city level and the provincial level; by the fact that the Land Assembly Program has been a political football; by the fact that nobody's been able or been willing to deal with them fair and square to meet their problems

head-on, to explain their position to them, to give them a chance to look at assessments of their land that have been made, to give them a chance to look at the appraisals done for the city, by appraisers hired by the city, to give them a chance to know where they stand in terms of returns on their land.

All those problems have been boiling and bubbling up and causing their aggravations in Fort Garry, Mr. Speaker, and I and others have not been able to get much beyond second base on them yet and I rather suspect that Syms should Mr. be successful in convincing himself that he should draft himself, to offer himself as his party's candidate, that the morning after his nomination as the NDP candidate, all the troubles of Fort Garry will disappear, all the troubles will fly away. At 12 noon, Sir, the Liquor Commission's rental dispute will be solved. At 2 p.m. a new liquor store will be opened further south on Pembina Highway. At 4 p.m. construction will start on the Fort Garry-St. Vital bridge. At 6 p.m. the expropriated property owners will be called in and they will be settled, they will be given fair cash settlement, fair value for their property. And the night shall be filled with music and the cares that infest the day, shall fold their tents like the Arabs and as silently steal away. That, I see, Sir, as the possible immediate future for Fort Garry, should that particular nomination go that way. But I may be cynical. I may be cynical, there may be others, Sir, who say no government would be as crass and as cynical and as partisan as that. I just put it to you, Sir, as a consideration.

Then, Sir, what of the Liberal candidate, whoever he or she maybe. That candidate is not named yet, but what of those policies, the Fort Garry voters are going to be torn in a dilemma, Sir, as to whether to go for the existing incumbent and for the promise of the Progressive Conservative Party, or whether they are going to be tempted by the swift, decisive, non-partisan action of a government whose candidate just happens to be the Chairman of the Liquor Commission and at the central, focal point of many of these problems in the constituency. They have that choice to make, they also have to consider the Liberal's policy, the Liberal proposal, I don't know what it will be but perhaps that candidate taking a leaf from their former Leader's book, Mr. Asper's book, will propose a monorail, Sir, that will link the existing liquor store in Fort Garry with South Indian Lake and thus obviate the necessity of a St. Vital-Fort Garry bridge and anything in between.

Well, Sir, I haven't really refined and honed my policy yet, but I will keep you posted on it. I am thinking of possibly adopting part of the Liberal program and adapting it in a more useful way, proposing construction of a monorail that would link not the existing liquor store with South Indian Lake, but that would link Mr. Frank Syms with South Indian Lake, with a possible shuttle deep into the Northwest Territories, thus obviating the necessity of this government being embarrassed by some of the cynical questions that I suggest may be asked, may be asked, Sir, should swift solutions follow his nomination as a candidate for his party in that great constituency.

Well, Sir, so much for the dilemma that we are in in that constituency at the present time but it will be an interesting campaign and I'm sure you want to keep an eye on it.

I want to devote a few words, Sir, to my friend, the Minister of Labour, and I'm sorry he's not in the Chamber, because I want to say a few things about his approach to labour-management relations in this province. The Minister has accused me of ignorance of the labour-management process and of industrial relations. Well, all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that I should be ignorant. I should be ignorant. I've been studying at his feet for the past eight years. That should be enough to guarantee me a post-graduate degree in the kind of confusion and double-talk and flim-flam that he delivers in this Chamber. About the only thing that I haven't mastered from him yet is the art of five sessional resignations and the ability to accrue for himself three grievance motions every session.

I have my share of grievances, Mr. Speaker, I suppose with almost every member on the benches opposite, nearly every member. But, Sir, the grievances I have against the other occupants of those benches pale into insignificance, pale into insignificance alongside the grievances that I have against this Minister of Labour. I think this Minister of Labour is the most bull-headed, pathetic, the most retarded throwback ever to masquerade in the office. And I hope that won't be construed as criticism. No wonder the old CCF Party never won more than a dozen seats when he was their leader.

Mr. Speaker, here is a man who came out of the trade union movement, who purports to be a labour union man, and the rank and file can't even get through his office door, and if he challenges me on that statement I ask him to tell this House where he was and how accessible he was a year ago when the strike vote was being taken at Inco in Thompson and there were two thousand signatures on a petition up there protesting the manner in which the vote was held. And that isn't the only instance when the rank and file, the working man and woman in this province, the working member of the trade union movement has not been able to get a hearing from this Minister of Labour. The Minister of Agriculture and his beef marketing vote have nothing, have nothing on this Minister for loaded dice. This man is not a Minister of Labour in the broad, or in the necessary sense, in my view, Mr. Speaker, he's the minister of a vested interest group in the labour movement. He's the minister of big labour leadership, big labour leadership, that's all he is. He's an errand boy for the union bosses. And he's a historical relic. He should be stuffed and mounted in the Museum of Man and Nature. He should be right up there alongside Joe Davidson, the missing link. School children could be brought

down on tours and shown the wonders of the palaeolithic age. You know, they could have the two hoary old crusaders up there, a plaque on the wall with a big question mark on it and the printing could say "origins unknown," because that's what they are, they are hoary old crusaders. They've devoted a lifetime to banging suits of armor together, to painting red crosses on the front, to looking around for a couple of horses and then you know what, Sir, they missed the crusades. Somebody gave a crusade and they weren't there. Thank heaven, Mr. Speaker, that this Minister of Labour is not our Minister of National Defence. If he were, he'd be devising strategy right now to get the Kaiser. That's about the attitude and the currency which he brings to labour problems and labour industrial relations in this province, Sir.

Sir, during the last Conservative administration in Manitoba we had a Minister of Labour who did not, like this one, come out of the trade union movement. As a matter of fact, he was a chiropractor, but you'll recall, Sir, that he was an open, straightforward, approachable administrator who could see the whole coin of the labour management community, not just one small part, one small side of it. And we had far greater harmony in the labour management community and in industrial relations in this province then, than we've ever had since, Sir. Far greater harmony. This province needs harmony in that field, and it needs help. It needs help to get back on track as a province of opportunity for workers, for union members, for everybody, for individual men and woman, competitive with other provinces in Canada. And we can't afford any more help from our wild-eyed friends on the socialist benches opposite.

You know, the difference between a socialist and a Conservative, Mr. Speaker. I'll tell you. A Conservative is a fellow who, when he's walking down the beach sees a fellow 100 feet out in the water drowning and he throws him a 50 foot rope on the grounds that it's good for the fellow to make it for 50 feet on his own. A Socialist is a fellow who walks down the beach, sees the person 100 feet out, drowning, and he throws him a 200 foot rope and then he drops his end of it and walks down the beach to try to help somebody else. And we don't need anymore 200 foot ropes with nobody at the other end, Mr. Speaker. We've had too many of them. When Manitobans first elected this government in 1969, I believe, the majority of them believed they were going to get some help, and not 200 foot ropes with nobody on the end. The NDP was looking good in 1969 — I borrow a television phrase. They were the new boys. The socialists. Well, how soon one can be deceived and disillusioned by appearance, Mr. Speaker. You know that harsh probing light of reality and real politic gets through to the truth, sooner or later.

When I was a highschool student I had a physics teacher at Kelvin High School who used to weary of our inability to comprehend even the most simple rubrics like Newton's Law, and he used to say to us, "You know, gentlemen, your intelligence is deceptive. You're dumber than you look". And there's a lot of truth in that statement, Mr. Speaker. There's a message there for me and for those colleagues in that physics class of mine and for everybody else in this House, and particularly for those on that side who would pose and posture as somebody that they are not.

You know, if you want to ask the people in Manitoba whether these people in this socialist government, the New Democrats elected in 1969 as the bright, new boys with hope, if they have turned out to be what they looked like I suggest, Sir, you'll receive a very specific straightforward negative answer. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that these are the people who have maintained the do-good pose, the helping hand pose, the proffered hand of help and assistance and that is deceptive. The look of that government is deceptive. They're rougher than they look.

For the young person in this province looking for opportunity, for the old-age pensioner fighting against the encroachment of high education taxes to keep his home, for the rank and file industrial worker striving to maintain his individual rights and his own conscience, for the entrepreneur working to create or expand his own business, for the farmer trying to keep his land for his sons and daughters, for the researcher begging for nickels and dimes to do his research, for the school children trying to learn how to read and write properly, for the professional endeavoring to practice his profession with pride and dignity, and for the expropriated property owners asking for a square deal, for all these Manitobans, Mr. Speaker, and for thousands more that I haven't mentioned here, I suggest to you that we have learned to our bitter disillusionment that that so-called help, the proffered helping hand was a conjuror's trick. They got the hand all right but they got the back of the hand. That's exactly what Manitobans of the kind and the community to whom I've referred and thousands more to whom I haven't referred, have got, for eight years, from this New Democratic government the back of the hand. And I say that that old message from my old physics teacher is a message that they should take to heart because things aren't always what they seem and what they look and this do-gooder pose of theirs has been a cynical trick upon the populace of Manitoba because those who needed and wanted the help didn't get it, have not received it. The only people who have been helped have been their people. Those are the only people who have been helped. Their people, their most slavish followers.

This government rode the high road into office in the guise of champions of the people, that's what it was, the Party of the people. Well, they've proven, in nearly eight years, Mr. Speaker, to be the

Party of their people and no one else. The ' of Labour has proven to be the same way that the Minister Minister of big labour leadership, vested labour leadership interests and nothing else. He has never been a universal Minister viewing his role in the community sense, nor has this government been. The only people who are served are those who worship at their synagogue, their church, their shrine. You know, their cry could be, "Give me that old-time religion, boys, and if you've got it, you know we'll do something for you".

On to the street barricades, on to the winter palace, on to the boardrooms of the robber barons of the Union Pacific Railroad. Smash them. You know, it's only 1977, Mr. Speaker, but they must be smashed. And if they've been smashed, we'll put them all together again and we'll smash them again. That's right. The only trouble is, Mr. Speaker, somebody gave a smashing party and they weren't there, like the crusade. It doesn't seem to strike them as ludicrous, however. It doesn't seem to strike them as ludicrous, you know. It doesn't seem to bother them. No matter, boys. You know we missed that last crusade back there in the thirteenth century, but so what we're going to do it all over again next Sunday night, right on this stage with a cast of thousands and the Minister of Labour is going to be cast in the role of the pope, only he's going to be cunningly disguised as a worker priest and that's a disguise that I must say, Mr. Speaker, he has successfully effected even to this day.

And, if the Minister denies, Mr. Speaker, that he's on a totally unreasonable, anachronistic, anti-management crusade, let us look at some of the legislation he has in store for us, right now. Let us look, for example, at last session's Bill 83, The Workplace Safety and Health Act. The so-called culmination of this Minister's lifework. Well, we can be faulted for having voted for Bill 83, and I accept fault for that. But that's a coin that cuts two ways. This Minister surely was far more in favour of that legislation than we were. He's the one who introduced it and piloted it through the House, and he now is going through agonizing reappraisal of that legislation because he appreciates how impossible and how realistic it is going to be to impose in its present framework. Not only that, but he has had so much reaction from such a broad section of the community that he has been forced . . . This is what we wanted last spring but couldn't get it during speed-up. We wanted an opportunity for the various sectors making up the industrial community of this province to analyse that legislation and guide us and guide the government and produce something effective and workable. But, oh no, we had to get everything through at three o'clock in the morning. And there was no way that we were going to get drawn in by this government, Mr. Speaker, to putting ourselves in a position where it could be reported that the Conservative Party was against safety in the workplace. We may be slow, but we're not that slow. There was no way that we could impose that kind of institutionalized lofty principle the way it was introduced and rammed through this House during speed-up last year. We did try to move five or six amendments, challenging the reverse onus aspect of the Bill, challenging the enormous power that is vested in the Labour Board, and various other aspects of it, but we were not in a position, and I suggest to you that nobody in a position of public trust can run the risk of having their position distorted, as ours would have been had we opposed that Bill *carte blanche* at that time.

Well, now, we want to have another thorough-going, reexamination of that Bill, and we also want to have a thoroughgoing re-examination of who's in charge around here. You know, let us look at this bill for a second. There are three major areas of concern: one is the intrusion of government into areas which have been those of management and into areas in which we believe government has no right to intrude. Examples of that are of placing of workers in jobs which r which they are physiologically and psychologically suited for, interference with job assignments, power to pass regulations to set standards relating to organizational behaviour in a workplace, and creation of safety and health committees, the composition of which is determined by Cabinet but at least one half the members must be workers selected in accordance with Union constitutions. These committees have power to dispose of complaints about safety and health matters.

The second area is the area of the vast discretionary powers given to government appointed officials and in particular, Sir, the director of the work and safety health directorate, one Mr. Victor Rabinovitch. Well, let us hearken back to a famous catch phrase oft repeated in "Butch Cassidy in the Sundance Kid", when the protagonists were fleeing into the mountains and kept looking over their shoulders and there in the haze and the mist, barely discernable, barely distinguishable was a posse on their heels and they kept turning to each other and they kept asking, Sir, who are these guys? Well now we've got Victor Rabinovitch and who is this guy? You know. Well, I'll tell you who he is, Mr. Speaker. He is a product, in fact a refugee from the crumbling edifice of socialized British industry, that's what he is. He is an academic, not that there's anything wrong with that except that he is an academic who has never been out of the ivory tower and a trade union ivory tower at that and he's coming over here, Sir, to tell us how to invoke and enforce workplace health and safety. It's not enough that we've got the Joe Davidson's and the Harry Cohn's and the rest of the refugees from that crumbling industrial empire in Britain, wrecked and ruined by socialism. Now we've got more of them . . . coming over here to wreck our Yes, Victor Rabinovitch, Sussex University. His qualifications are essentially of an academic nature, Mr. Speaker, and experience with the British Trade Union

movement.

Now the British Act, Mr. Speaker, passed in 1974 by a Labour Government, when Victor Rabinovitch was teaching and writing in the United Kingdom and was also turning out some trade union newspapers, the British Act, Sir, is called the Workers Health and Safety, etc. Act. And that's a nice thing about the British, they are usually pretty honest. They don't say that we're just going to be coming in here and dealing with your health and safety, we're also going to be dealing with your etcetera. . We don't have that in the title of this Act, oh no, Mr. Speaker, that would open up too many avenues for invasion and intrusion . and attacks on privacy and individual rights, so we leave the etc. out. You'll get the etcetera boys, don't worry but we're not putting it into the title, that's right. It's just the Workplace Safety and Health Act and Mr. Speaker, etcetera, there ain't no except implied.

This is what we have now, Mr. Speaker, we have Victor Rabinovitch, Workplace Safety Director, editor and business manager for a number of trade union newspapers in Britain. He has never worked in industrial safety in his life and yet, this is the man who is being put into a position to ensure and guarantee for the Minister of Labour that the culmination of his life's work, his classic poem, The Workplace Safety and Health Act, is going to be put into place during his tenure in office as Minister of Labour. Well, Mr. Speaker, I imagine that what happened was that as the structure of British industry came crumbling and tumbling down, that Mr. Rabinovitch decided to get out before a chunk of plaster hit him head; on the or on second thought, I wonder if he decided to get out after a chunk of plaster hit him on the head. Anyway, we've got him, Sir, and we're going to hear all about that etcetera.

Sir, Sir, let me just refer once more in passing to the aspects of this legislation which I think are very severe and very destructive and very inhibitive of the work ethic, of enterprise and incentive, and of progress, not for industry, not for industry as such but for working people, for men and women in the workplace, in the factories and in the working places themselves. There is an enormous enormous discretionary power given to the appointed officials, government appointed officials, in particular, under this safety and health legislation. The Safety and Health Officer can issue improvement orders, for example, telling an employer to comply with the Act and regulations where he is of the opinion that a person is breaking the Act or the regulations. He can issue a stop-work order where he is of the opinion that any activities being or about to be carried on, involves or are likely to involve, an imminent risk of serious physical or health injury. And then it goes on to define health as soundness of mind, body and spirit, and, Mr. Speaker, I ask you and I ask the members of the Treasury benches opposite, where and at what price are they going to find people who can carry out that kind of a sophisticated, over-view of an industrial operation or a business operation where you are dealing with conditions that affect the soundness of mind, body and spirit of all people in that workplace.

Sir, this takes expertise. This takes professional training. This takes an aspect of understanding and experience and communication with people that no average worker or average manager or average bureaucrat could be expected to supply. Under this legislation, Sir, anyone can lay a charge against an employer, even an employee's disgruntled wife. There could be thousands of claims or charges laid. How is this government going to deal with those thousands of charges and claims? All that a claimant has to possess is "reasonable and probable grounds to believe" that the job is affecting him, her or her husband adversely.

Well, Sir, I could go on. Let me just say though that this legislation could seriously injure union people because supervisors, foremen, charge-hands, all that type of worker are all liable. Similar people, similar to managers, for example, are all liable, could all be the target of the charges or claims that are possible by a worker, by an employee under this legislation. Well who is going to want to be a supervisor or a foreman or a charge-hand much less a manager, if he or she is going to be put in that position of individual vulnerability? The penalties are unjustly severe; the burden of responsibility and accountability on one person is too severe; the fact that the classifications I have referred to, the supervisors, foremen and charge-hands are equally vulnerable under this legislation. All these things combine, Sir, to militate most strongly against haste in proclamation where this legislation is concerned. It's just unworkable, impractical and unfair and destructive to the trade union movement and to the industrial climate of this province if we are forced to live with a hasty proclamation where this legislation is concerned. And I don't even want to consider a hasty proclamation. I think the legislation should be withdrawn, should be pulled back, reviewed thoroughly in Industrial Relations Committee and Public Hearings and elsewhere and completely re-worked, re-framed and re-worked.

Mr. Speaker, doubtless I will have more to say about the workplace safety and health legislation later in this Session. I know I'm racing the clock right now and I don't want to conclude my remarks without saying a word or two about the need for reform of Family Law in this province and the fact that I have considered it a privilege since last November to serve on the Committee on Standing Regulations and Orders of this Legislature, reviewing that legislation. I want to acknowledge the help that has come from many groups appearing before the Committee and the assistance that has been offered by them. Also, I would like to acknowledge the non-partisan approach that members of the

committee have taken to the work and the leadership that has been supplied by the chairman of the committee, the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

Sir, it's my view that the reform of Family Law in this jurisdiction is long overdue and I intend to continue to work for its accomplishment but I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that we have miles to go before we sleep on this legislation. If the committee has discovered anything in the three and one-half months in which it has been at its task, it has been, in my view, two things. First, that there is a general disposition on all sides to frame a law that will enshrine the concept of marriage as an equal partnership; and second, that this is an enormously complex field affecting dozens of other legal instruments already on the Statute books and affecting the rights and lives not only of all those ill-treated spouses in this province, admittedly many of them women, but affecting the rights and lives of all the good guys too; affecting the rights and lives of every single Manitoban for generations to come.

As responsible legislators, I put it to you, Sir, that we do not have the right to rush into the framing of that kind of all pervasive legislation without due study and deliberation and due hearings involving the general public. We don't have the right to rush ahead merely to accord with some imposed deadline. In a field like this, we must go slowly and carefully as we make our haste and there must be no deadline because I think a poorly reformed version of the Law will be as bad as no reforms at all, it will simply transfer a number of inequities and injustice to another group in the community. It's had its effect though, Sir; I must say that all of us on that committee, I think, have been affected by the principles that have been under consideration.

The other day I got my legislative pay cheque, like everybody else, I guess, \$7,237; I took it home, I said to my wife, "Here's \$20." She said, "What's that for?" I said, "Well, we just got paid." She said, "Oh and is that my little bonus." I said, "No, that's not your little bonus. You know I'm on that Family Law Reform Committee." "Yes," she said. "Well, you know, we're talking about dividing the pay cheque, that's your share." She said, "What do you mean: that's your share." I said, "Well, I'm dividing it; \$20 for you, \$7,217 for me." Now, Sir, the truth of the matter is it's probably going to turn out the other way; my wife can look after herself, no one need have any fear of that and I'll be lucky if I get \$20 out of that pay cheque, but I recognize that there are many people, many wives and some husbands who can't look forward to an equitable and fair treatment and that's what we must work toward in the work of this committee.

Finally, Sir, let me just say that I respect the words of the Minister of Mines and Environmental Management when he was speaking in this debate last Wednesday, I look forward to the kinds of competition that no doubt are going to be developing at a very high level for the Minister who has often held this House in thrall in the years that I've been in here. I wish that I could speak and think in such a way as to hold this House in thrall the way he does but I think now that we have a leader, the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney who can do that and I'm sure all of us look forward to that competition, all of us have very strong suspicions as to the outcome which we believe will be salutary for the Progressive Conservative Party and thus for the people of Manitoba. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. JAMES H. BILTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and along with the rest of my colleagues, my first word must be greetings to you, Sir, and on behalf of my colleagues, I hope and trust that your good lady is continuing to improve after that unfortunate accident.

I would also like to congratulate the mover and the seconder. I wasn't present when they spoke but having read the Hansard, I think they did an admirable job.

It has been mentioned that it is the Queen's 25th anniversary of her ascension to the Throne, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to add my words and may she live long to reign over us. . . As far as I am concerned long may we respect the Crown, Mr. Speaker, as symbolic of our unity and that part of unity throughout the Commonwealth.

I also would like to take the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to applaud His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor with his thoughtfulness as the Queen was passing over Manitoba on her way down to the South Seas, in the sending of a message. I thought that was really something worthwhile and I understand he received a reply accordingly:

However, one can't overlook the fact that this government has been in the habit of taxing aircraft that either fly over or land here or what have you and obviously we all know that gentleman came out against them, so I do trust that if they have charged the British Overseas Airways that they will see to it that it is refunded in order that the Queen may have something for church on Sunday.

Following the usual practice, Mr. Speaker, one must, of course, take this opportunity to speak of matters in his constituency, and there was recently a very important question develop with regard to health care in my area. I listened with some interest to the Minister of Health this afternoon and he lambasted our particular party on Medicare and what we were going to do in the future insofar as Medicare was concerned, but he sort of completely forgot the days of how Medicare came in, and how the first crack at the whip when the federal government made an inquiry throughout Canada, including Manitoba, and were trying to persuade the provinces to take up this program and asking

them to pass enabling legislation. We were told, at the time we were discussing it, Mr. Speaker, in the House, that it was going to cost \$20 million, and that, of course, the province would have to raise ten and the federal House would pay the other ten. The reason for the delay of a year that the Minister mentioned this afternoon was legitimate by the fact that this party had an alternative to the program that was being put forward by the federal government, as an assistance to them, to make it more equitable insofar as paying the bill. However, as time went along Ottawa was going to be no party to it and ultimately a year later we went into the program.

But, you know, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't going to cost \$20 million, somebody goofed, it was going to cost \$40 million, and this government, or this party that was in government at the time, proceeded to bill the citizens of this province, in an appropriate way, to see to it that it was paid for. And that's a short thumbnail history of what happened at that time. We all know that come the election what happened, and we all know too how the premium was eliminated, the premium was eliminated by taxing the middle-income individuals another two points, and from that day to this, Mr. Speaker, that middle-income group has been taxed to death and will continue to be taxed to death.

But, speaking of my area, we have a hospital district, there's a hospital in Swan River, we had one in Benito and we had one in Birch River. The hospital in Birch River is what I want to talk to you about today, Mr. Speaker, if I may for a few moments because it is a very serious matter. A Doctor Boone carried on a medical practice there for some forty years or more and did a tremendous job, and ultimately he passed away because of age. And the community concerned themselves and they were told by the commission — I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you would ask those good people on the left to possibly remove themselves whilst I'm speaking and carry on their discussion elsewhere.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please. Would the honourable members please refrain from making a noise while the honourable member is speaking. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. BILTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think that it should be pointed out that some of the members of my friend's own party are doing the speaking, I wouldn't let the impression that we are not attentive on this side.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please. I called on all honourable members on both sides of the House to please cut down the undertones and the overtones that are going and give the honourable member who is making his contribution in this debate an opportunity to be heard, not only by myself, but by the recording. Thank you. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. BILTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying a moment ago, the Commission decided to close down the hospital because of the fact that a doctor could not be obtained. The doctor that they had got in, Mr. Speaker, he moved himself to Swan River because he found himself, not only functioning in the hospital and diagnosing medicine for patients, but then he had to move to another office to make up the prescription, and this of course is not an acceptable situation. He ultimately moved into Swan River and we finally have eight doctors in Swan River, and the same as I described to you happens in Benito. EHEY HAD A DOCTOR TOO WHO HAS ALSO MOVED TO Swan River, and he moved on the understanding that he would be available to the people of Benito at any time that he was required. Coming back to Birch River again, Sir, not only Birch River, but north of Birch River we have people coming 70 and 80 miles to the hospital in Swan River, and there was a meeting held, called, and the Commission sent a man and the welfare people were there, and it was called for ten o'clock in the morning. And if you ever wanted to see women wild, Mr. Speaker, there were 150 women in that hall and they raised particular hell. They feel that the Commission should maintain that hospital and keep it open, as a nursing station if you like. The health nurse that comes in and serves that area lives in Swan River, the police that serve that area live in Swan River, and everything has got to come from Swan River.

They ultimately decided that they would go to the local hospital board and prevail upon the hospital board to attempt to re-open that hospital as a nursing station and it is to be hoped that, as and when that comes before the Minister, that he will give it a sympathetic understanding. I realize there is a cost factor involved, Mr. Speaker, but there's over a thousand people or more have to be considered. And there were five schools in the area north, north of Birch River itself, and a lot of these people that are coming to the hospital, Mr. Speaker, to Swan River, haven't got an automobile, and transportation while it is reasonably good, that is by bus, it is inconvenient. But nevertheless I see no reason or why that can't be opened. As was explained to the meeting that day, Sir, there was a lady, a doctor indicated that she was to have a test, urinal test and a blood test, and she lived in Birch River and she could have very well gone to that nursing station where the nurse would be and taken that test, it had to be in the morning and at night for four days in a row. What happened, Mr. Speaker? She could have gone in the morning, come back, gone in the evening, come back. They put her into the hospital in Swan River for four days. — (Interjection) — Do what you like but do something for those people, that's all I'm asking. Mr. Speaker, we have people coming into Winnipeg by ambulance, of necessity, dying on the way and it has got to stop. Mr. Speaker, the speech as I listened to it, said little if anything, in our serious growing crime situation. Mr. Speaker, don't have to tell you our courts

**Monday, February 28, 1977**

are full to the door, dockets a mile high. Heavens knows when the people will come before the courts for their cases to be dealt with. Mr. Speaker, our jails are full to the door, what are we going to do about this situation? These overflowing institutions, Mr. Speaker, there's no wonder they blow up from time to time. What is happening? There's a breakdown in my humble opinion at home. Our juvenile institution, Mr. Speaker, as I recall it, something like 4,500 youngsters went through there, many of them, of course, repeats. But, somehow or other, Mr. Speaker, something has to be done. The TV is just plugged with ads, from time to time, liquor ads. Cannot a way be found, Mr. Speaker, by this government to set ads of that kind, to do with family life, in order to combat crime, in order to prevail upon the people to assist the police here, there and everywhere. We find now, Mr. Speaker, that in the City of Winnipeg, it is dangerous to go out after dark.

The speech itself, Mr. Speaker, made very scant remarks, it intends that the government will continue to be firm but fair. Mr. Speaker, there is no one knows better than I it is a very very difficult problem to deal with these many people. Many of them are habitual criminals, repeaters, day in and day out, year in and year out, and will always be a charge to the state. Nothing to lose and everything to gain by impudence and all that goes with it for those who must see to it that they are secure and away from society. any of these people, Mr. Speaker, live the better part of their lives in jail, they prefer it that way, but, Mr. Speaker, I feel within myself that we are passing through a cycle, what kind of a cycle I don't know, but it is a cycle of some kind surely and we must not panic, we must stand fast and stand up to these criminals and keep them in their place. We must hold steady, Mr. Speaker, and if I had my way, as I said last year, we've got to find some remedies, remedies I say, not revenge but remedies. Bring back the strap and bring back the rope. — (Interjection)— You betcha, and bring back the stocks if you like and put them on every street corner, but something has got to be done to arrest this situation.

What do we find on Christmas Day, Mr. Speaker, out here at Headingly Jail? Roast turkey, baked ham — I don't know whether they had chestnuts in the turkeys or not but I hope to God they did — bacon and eggs, brunch at 10 o'clock in the morning, what have we got? Mr. Minister, surely you didn't agree to that, give them bread and water, that's what they are there for, give them — (Interjection)— . . . that's something, Mr. Speaker, I said hot, not the other . . . Loin steaks, asparagus, mushroom sauce, apple pie and ice cream. What do we find? : Thousands of baskets, Mr. Speaker, distributed to poor people that commit no crimes, and many of them, Sir, going without a few of the goodies at Christmas because of their unfortunate situation. But not those birds down in Headingly, no sir, give them everything. And the day will come, Mr. Speaker, when we've got to get tough, all society has got to get tough and bring an end to this.

Somewhere or other the poor families, Mr. Speaker, with what they may get from welfare, cannot afford that kind of food and I feel that these people who commit crimes against society, they're there because they did an injustice against society. In many instances injuring people, maiming people for life, making cripples of them. I have no pity on them at all.

At the same time there are those who are endeavouring to better themselves and as they get out of these institutions they are on their way. But, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about spending \$14,000 or \$16,000 a year of taxpayers money to maintain just one of those individuals in those institutions something's gone wrong. Mr. Speaker, we're talking in terms of ten to twelve million dollars for another Hilton Hotel for these people. I say proceed with caution, Mr. Speaker

Men and women including yourself, Sir, went overseas during the last war and thousands became prisoners of war. I don't need to tell you, sir, how they were housed, and how they were kept in captivity. I'm not suggesting that for the people in our jails and penitentiaries, but I'm suggesting something similar. I'm suggesting why not set up huts within a wire fence; the same layout if you please; straddle a river so that they've got somewhere to bathe and then put them in an area, Sir, — and Rod knows we've got lots of it — close by where we have continual forest fires. Let them get out there and earn their keep. I'm sure many hundreds of them would appreciate it, put them to some use, put them to work in preference to lying around and making a nuisance of themselves and creating the damage which they in turn have no intention of putting back into place or even paying a penny toward it.

Press reports, Mr. Speaker, tell us these days that native leaders are not interested in handling their parolees. You've heard it said that these people are paroled and they have to stay in the city for parole purposes. People that have been brought in from other parts of the province and put into jail or penitentiaries and have served their time are not allowed to go back, they have to stay here because they have to report to the parole officer. I think this is a lot of nonsense, and as far as the leaders are concerned what do they think they are doing? Do they realize that almost a third of the population of our prisons and jails are people of Indian descent. . Pity it is, , Mr. Speaker, pity it is, but , nevertheless they are there.

I understand that there was a conference arranged the other day for the Chiefs throughout the province to come together to discuss this very problem with a view to the parolees going back to the reserves, or the areas from whence they came, and answer to somebody there. Only two Chiefs

turned up, Mr. Speaker. The press report indicates that a lot of these Indian inmates have no education, have no trades and the majority of them, Mr. Speaker, as I understand, are anywhere from nineteen to twenty-five or twenty-eight. I want to know where these people have been, because society has spent hundreds of millions of dollars over the years across Canada in placing schools and staff in remote areas, and near remote areas, for the sole purpose of assisting these people to become educated. Why are they finishing up in jails and prisons?

I feel that the Chiefs, and the tribes if you like; they've got to think this thing over again, and they've got to come forward and they've got to co-operate with the government and those responsible for the handling of our society that happens to be in our jails and prisons.

True, Mr. Speaker, there are many of Indian blood in our universities with government support and from what I can learn they are doing very very well. I say that I hail the day when they graduate, Mr. Speaker, and I hope they are well grounded in education and all the things that go with it and that they will go back; go back amongst their people and do their level best to improve their lot and bring them out into the sun where these good people should be.

Mr. Speaker all these people are not bad. There are some that create a situation, in the eyes of many people, of no-good bums and this sort of thing. I don't buy that at all. You get out amongst these people and you see the young men and women well taken care of, that is so-to-speak, from the point of view of health and clothing and that sort of thing, they're provided for them in many instances, but that is all to the good. I say to the Chiefs and I say to the tribes, get off your butts and give us a hand with this situation that we have in our jails and prisons.

I'd like the Minister of Corrections to tell me or tell the House sometime, or at least when he rises, about this Mr. Eric Cox. I realize that he is over in England taking a course or courses.

**A MEMBER:** : No, he's not. He's working.

**MR. BILTON:** He's working! Why isn't he working here? That's the point. He may be working, Mr. Speaker, but he has his secretary with him too. Who is the secretary? —(Interjection)— Well, you'll get your chance to answer me I guess.

Anyway, I'd like the Minister to tell us exactly what he is doing over there. If he can't learn from our system here in Canada in our penitentiaries from coast to coast, and we've got many of them and we've got many problems. Surely to heavens we don't have to send somebody over to England to find out how they handle their situation over here. Let's do it right here and get on with the job.

Mr. Speaker, having said that I'll leave it at the moment. But the First Minister said a word to me a moment ago and I am rather glad that I wasn't here last Friday. I had to read it in the newspaper. I'm not going to repeat it but I must say, in all sincerity, that I know in the heat of debate and the cut and thrust of debate that these things happen and things will be said, but I am very very disappointed in the First Minister in what he said that day, or at least what was reported he said. However, as I say, I'm very fond of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, and it probably will be my last round in here. Somehow or other I want to see that the respect that has been shown down through the years and the fine men and women that have gone before us that held the dignity of office and carried on the function of our democratic parliamentary system, that long may it go on and the structure be respected for everything that it is intended to be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I saw rather an interesting advertisement the other day in the paper and this being the election year it sort of tickled my fancy. I'm rather interested in the date. It says that this helicopter will be hired between June 20, 1977 and August 24th. I realize the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources requires that aircraft no doubt for exploration but I'm wondering if the candidate for the opposition will have the opportunity of using that aircraft along with the government members when the election is called rather than — (Interjection) — I'll send it over — but that helicopter is going into the remote areas and we would like to go too if you fellows go.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs the other day had a good time blasting my leader — but first of all I passed up the opportunity at the commencement of my remarks of congratulating my leader. I remember so well, Sir, when I occupied your chair he was the leader of the House, and I became very closely associated with him at that time. I've stood with him from that day to this, Mr. Speaker, and never regretted a day of it. I feel that as and when the time comes he'll make a good fist of it, Mr. Speaker, never you fear.

The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs talked about insurance profits, the other day, out of Autopac. He talked about them going into bonds for hospitals, schools, and the money was held here. Well, that may be true, but on the other side of the coin, Mr. Speaker, they go to Switzerland, they go to Japan and they go to Germany to borrow money for the Hydro, so I wonder why that money wasn't routed in that direction. Even in spite of that, if they had money to invest out of Autopac, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, they overcharged the motorists of the Province of Manitoba. They should have fed that money back to the people from whence it came. So with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure to participate in this debate and of course we are all looking forward to what will happen after supper.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister

Monday, February 28, 1977

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if — (Interjection) — No, it's a question. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Swan River would answer one question.

**MR. BILTON:** I'd be delighted.

**MR. SCHREYER:** I would like to ask him if — quite apart from his comments with respect to the philosophy of corrections, penal reform, quite apart from that entirely — in his reference to the policy that should be governing advertising as it relates to liquor consumption, I believe he said that there was too much "life-style and family life type advertising". Is he aware that — (Interjection) — Oh, that's why I'm asking the question. I wanted to confirm if the honourable member in fact meant to say, as I inferred, that there was too much family life and life-style advertising of liquor allowed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. BILTON:** Mr. Speaker, I did not say that. I said, Mr. Speaker, at least if my memory serves me right, that we were continually hammered with advertising on liquor. I asked the government to consider a similar sort of program on family life as a fight against crime, I believe that's what I said rather than the other way round.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I should like to, in beginning my contribution to the debate, in reply to the Speech from the Throne, like to follow the long standing and traditional format, Sir, of congratulating you on, is it the seventh, I believe it's the seventh consecutive year and session in which you have had the responsibilities of presiding over this Assembly.

I should like to also pause to reflect, in retrospect, on the fact that some honourable members who used to sit here in sessions gone by, some relatively recent, some not so recent, have passed on. And I should out of that also like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition on his election to this Chamber last autumn. I couldn't help but notice in his remarks in this debate, that he referred to the people of Souris-Killarney as salt-of-the-earth, which certainly is an expression that I could associate with and understand inasmuch as I believe I used that very expression in the remarks in the condolence motion of the late Earl McKellar.

It is understandable, I believe, that the Honourable, the Leader of the Opposition should be here now, since what could be more natural than that the Leader of the Official Opposition Party should have a seat in the Assembly at one time or another and also in the history and in the historical context of Manitoba, it is entirely understandable as to why he should be elected from that particular part of the province. I have to say with a mixture of both regret and simple acknowledgement of history, that the electorate of that part of the province have a long-standing history of voting for the Conservative Party and I say, rather ruefully while acknowledging that fact, that sometimes I think that it doesn't really matter very much what is done by government, the historical patterns change very slowly, if at all. I am not making that as a plea because I recognize that to be a political fact of life, not only in the province but in many regions of the country as a whole. So I believe it would be fair to say that any kind of major pattern which my honourable friends opposite are trying to extrapolate from the Souris-Killarney election result, is in high degree wishful thinking on their part. Be that as it may, the respective parties of this House will have a full opportunity sometime later this year, presumably, and if things proceed as I fully expect they will, sometime later this year, to cause the people of this province to decide and then we can at least minimize, if not avoid entirely, the kind of jocular, sometimes bordering on the childish, by-play that goes on just a little more in an election year in this Chamber than other years.

The Opposition have spoken in this Throne Speech Debate and it is always interesting for me, given that I have some 18 years or so, I guess 15 in this Chamber, in which to look back in retrospect and sort of make mental notes as to whether the philosophy of opposition, in the minds of opposition members really changes or whether it has remained quite the same and whether it changes as whether or not one party is in office and in the opposition, therefore, or another.

By that I mean, Sir, that I recall so well a fine old elderly gentleman, who occupied seats across the way years back in the early 60's, saying quite emphatically, with all the emphasis he could muster, that, in his perception of parliamentary democracy, the duty of the opposition was to oppose, to oppose and certainly it was easy to infer, I inferred it, maybe I inferred too much, that he really meant it to the extreme that it was in no way, but not in the slightest way, incumbent upon an opposition to bring forward alternatives or constructive alternative criticism. I've never had that view of an opposition's responsibility but then again, Sir, nowhere is it written, much less chiselled in stone, that the duties of an opposition are this or that, but I believe that for an opposition to be credible and to deserve credibility, it is incumbent upon them, at least some good part of the time, to have specific concrete alternative proposals hopefully constructed and that if they do not, all they are regarded as is, in a sense, vultures wheeling in the sky waiting for events to take care of themselves and then they move in for the spoils of office.

Now maybe that's too caustic an observation, but I must say, Sir, that I have yet to find some significant amount, if any, of constructive alternative proposals having to do with government, in the framework of government and policies from a Conservative opposition and I suppose one shouldn't

be surprised because it is probably the same at the Federal as at the Provincial level. The strategy, the philosophy of strategy or the strategy of their philosophy and I think it is sometimes fair to say that with Tories the two are really the same, there is no philosophy outside of strategy, that the whole strategy centres on a desire to avoid possibilities of making mistakes by simply not coming forward with any concrete ideas, at least not identifiable.

**A MEMBER:** Hiding in the bush.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Hiding in the bush is perhaps the colloquial way to put it, but I don't want to dwell on that, Mr. Speaker, that could be easily regarded as a negative view of mine that I have traditionally held of Tories.

So I want to go on then, to more positive aspects of this Throne Speech Debate, or more concrete at least and in congratulating the Leader of the Opposition. I must say that, in a personal way, I am rather pleased to see him here in much the same way as — well I guess with the passage of years one gets sort of accustomed to a certain arrangement, maybe it's a sign of innate conservatism on my part, Sir, one sort of identifies with someone after the passage of years and having the former Attorney-General sitting over here for a number of years, now sitting over there, is, in a sense, like old home week for me and I would hope that having an old professional, I hope he doesn't take umbrage at that, an old professional politician is, in many ways, like a comfortable old shoe, better to have that than a new shoe that pinches and I say that as a description of affection.

My honourable friends opposite would have the people of this province believe that somehow this government has so governed as to not improve but indeed to make worse the relative economic position of our province in relation to other parts of the country and in relation to what existed before. Mr. Speaker, now we're getting into it. Relatively concrete accusation and one which I have every confidence that I can refute in very concrete terms and, to begin with, maybe it would be appropriate to just help put the matter in perspective as a starter, that if the Conservative's strategy is to try to create the impression that when they were in office that they governed so well that the economy of the province was buoyant and that there were no serious problems, I must, just as a starter, there is much more to come, refer to the Centennial History of Manitoba, written by a distinguished home product Manitoba historian scholar, which, in the second last page of his Centennial History, this is the Centennial History of Manitoba by James Jackson, some of you I'm sure know of him, he goes on to describe how it coincided that with the end of the first century of Manitoba as a province, there was an election which resulted in the election of the first social democratic government in the province, and he goes on to say that the province now in their care is one with many problems. This is circa 1969. It's rather unusual for an historian to put it in quite those terms. If it were only something routine, nothing out of the usual, why would one say that there are many problems, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the Province of Manitoba in 1969 was beset with at least as many problems that was our inheritance as they are trying to pretend exist now; a government of a province beset with many problems. What were some of those problems, Mr. Speaker? I hope to identify many of them in the course of my remarks.

They would have the people believe that the economy of Manitoba has under-performed and, without going into great detail although it really deserves detailed elaboration, I want to point out that if one were to, just among other sources, take our 1976 budget documents which include compendiums and appendices rather, of both federal and provincial source statistical data, one finds — and what's wrong with this kind of comparison, I believe it to be fair, I believe it to be logical, I do not believe it to be statistical manipulation. In comparing the relative change, the relative dynamics of in which Manitoba's economy in the seven years they were in office — the last seven years in which they were in office — with the same seven years, so far as applied to Canada as a whole, and then take the seven years of this decade that we have been in office, 1976 inclusive, seven years, and compare the statistical dynamics of our economy with that period, as compared to Canada as a whole, so that you're comparing the same periods between the province and the country and then again the province and the country as a whole, and in that regard and in relative terms, whereas the economy of Canada increased by 65 percent; that of the province by 53 percent. For the most recent seven years, the economy increased, the gross national product or output increased, by 83 percent; that of the province by 82 percent. Now of course one will immediately say, "Ah, yes, but there's the distortion of in response to that I make two that one can adjust this for inflation obviously and the results bear out the essential fact that the economy, even in real terms as opposed to nominal has improved better. But I suggest as a second point that even if one leaves it in nominal terms when comparing the province to the country, because the inflation phenomenon is the same for both the province and the country, so that in relative terms, there can be no denying of the fact that relatively speaking Manitoba's economy was stagnating, relative to the rest of Canada in the 1960s in a way that can by no definition be said to have occurred in the Seventies to date. And there is no denying that fact.

Now my honourable friends opposite are strangely silent in the face of that kind of proof that much of what they say when they talk about economic stagnation is froth and foam that they themselves are generating, there is no substance or body to it. But I mean, Sir, what conclusions do

you draw? And I don't expect you to answer because of the necessity of your impartiality other than the fact that by any definition in relative terms, the Manitoba economy in the decade of the 1960's was just not a time that they could crow about unless, of course, they take pains to induce people to forget or hide the facts from them. Indeed, when I heard my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, not only try to make the point about economic stagnation which is so very spurious and inaccurate, Sir, he went on to talk about — and I think he mentioned it two or three or four times — that young people were leaving the province. Indeed, that is true, I can't deny it but I would suggest to him that young people have been leaving this province in greater or lesser numbers ever since World War II and the Honourable, the Member for Assiniboia, nods his head as well he would because he remembers, he understands. Mr. Speaker, irony of ironies, the very group that are trying to make some kind of unusual point about that, oh, they would love people to forget the fact that in Manitoba's 108 years, 107 years of history, there have been only three years in which there has been a net population loss and every one of those three years has been during their incumbency. Every one of the three.

I don't want to attach excessive importance to the relative statistical growth rate of population other than to make this point, Mr. Speaker, that in 1963, 1965 and whatever year in the Sixties which offhand I don't remember but it was either 1961 or 1966 — 1963, 1965 and either 1961 or 1966 — were years of actual net loss of population and that has never happened before nor since. Now what do they make of that point? That indeed the only point they can make is that if there is a problem facing this province with respect to out-migration, that that problem was at its most severe in those particular three years because in all other years, out-migration was more than matched by immigration plus natural growth. Indeed, the population of Manitoba today is somewhere in the order of 1,030,000 which in terms of increase since 1970 is much more than the increase in the decade of the Sixties.

Now one other point and that's interesting, one other point that my honourable friends — well it's understandable — would like to leave the impression that our agricultural economy and the rural regions of our province, that there is a kind of economic malaise which somehow has to be countered because if it isn't, there will be substantial rural depopulation and out-migration. My honourable friends should do a little bit of research and ascertain how many discontinuations of family farm operations took place in Manitoba in the years in which they had the responsibility of government, because if they're trying to make a point now that all, or indeed any major part of this problem, is the responsibility of the province and can be remedied by the province, then the same reasoning should have applied to them and should now be applied to them. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I am confident that statistical analysis and comparison by any common sense will show that there was a much faster rate of rural depopulation and family farm discontinuations in the decade of the Sixties than has been the case in the decade of the Seventies, indeed, and I have never suggested that the province could take credit for it, although who knows what Tories might do if they were in office, probably try to take credit for it, that the most buoyant time in the history of western Canadian agriculture in my memory, and that I know for a fact that before my memory was into the depression years, so it couldn't have been then either. In other words for the past 50 years at least, the most buoyant time in the past half century, in western Canadian agriculture has been the period from '72 to '75 inclusive.

And, Mr. Speaker, the kind of problems that my honourable friend refers to, that exist in agriculture, I don't need him to tell me that they exist in agriculture but I tell him this, that the severity of the problems that faced the farmers, and particularly the grain producers, of our province in 1968, 1969, 1970, were problems which they were at that point in time trying to cover over as best they could. There was indeed, I'm sure all honourable members are interested, of course, but some wouldn't have had occasion to know in quite that detail, that indeed there was a burgeoning, fast growing, frightening increment in the amount of farm debt obligation in the period '68, '69, '70. It was something to behold and something to be afraid of, Sir. My honourable friends can not now pose as somehow having succeeded when they were in office, in having an absolutely, or even slightly rosy agricultural scene or picture in our province. So let them not pretend that we are now facing problems, the severity of which was never previously experienced, it was experienced and then some during their stewardship when they had the responsibility.

Indeed, I am of the firm view, Mr. Speaker, that in terms of the basic health of our agricultural industry and rural towns that there is a better level of prosperity, there is a better level of services, a better level of amenities, a better level of health care, a better level of personal care than ever existed when my honourable friends were in office. Unfortunately it is such in politics that sometimes honourable members seem compelled or driven to exaggerate and to overdramatize. I regret, for example, that the Member for Swan River, who in many ways is a close friend, saw fit to introduce into the debate the offhand remark that something had to be done about health services in the Swan Valley because there were people dying on their way in to hospital. Didn't he say that or words to that effect? And, Mr. Speaker, does he by that imply that there was a better system of health care delivery

**Monday, February 28, 1977**

and ambulance capability in the 1960s? I'm sure that's not what he meant, but unless clarified that's what could be inferred from a remark of that kind, when in fact, Mr. Speaker, into the Swan Valley, as indeed into every other region of Manitoba, this government has seen fit to put its fiscal responsibility on the line to the extent of committing many millions of dollars towards the enhancement of and expansion of health care and allied or related services. Now you can't have it both ways, you can't have it, both ways, Mr. Speaker, if there is to be a dedication . . . —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please.

**MR. SCHREYER:** My honourable friend, if he will pause and reflect, will know that he has been known to say, privately and I guess in his more candid moments, that indeed the improvements in personal care services and personal care accommodation and home care and personal care financing and senior citizen housing, in terms of quantity is something which has impressed him very much, he has said that, if his own candor will now perhaps have the better of him and allow him to say it again. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I have not intimated for a split second that Swan River, somehow, received undue consideration. My point is simply to say that on a provincewide basis there has been a dramatic — there is no other word for it — a dramatic expansion and extension of those kinds of important, humane, decent, humanitarian services to people who, until we came to office, they were plodding along, with respect to some of these very basic services, practically, practically non-existent, or drudgingly so.

My honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, cannot — I have 60 seconds before calling it 5:30, Sir, 60 seconds in which to say simply this, that with respect to the basic medical care system they were reluctant. Is that unfair? They were reluctant — and that is putting it kindly — with respect to home care, the public financing of a major part of personal care, they did not have any intentions whatsoever, it was indeed almost anathema to them. Mr. Speaker, I call it 5:30.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The time being 5:30 I am now leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m. this evening.