

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 p.m. Tuesday, February 17, 1976

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the first report of the Committee of Seven.

MR. CLERK: Your Special Committee appointed to prepare a list of members to compose the Standing Committees ordered by the House

Your Committee prepared the following list of members to compose the Standing Committees ordered by the House.

Privileges and Elections: (12)

Hon. Messrs. Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Paulley, Messrs. Axworthy, Brown, Einarson, Henderson, Jenkins, Malinowski, McGregor, Petursson.

Public Accounts: (12)

Hon. Messrs. Bostrom, Toupin, Turnbull, Messrs. Blake, Cherniack, Craik, Graham, Johannson, Johnston (Portage), Osland, Walding, Wilson.

Public Utilities and Natural Resources: (12)

Hon. Messrs. Bostrom, McBryde, Uruski, Messrs. Barrow, Blake, Craik, Dillen, Enns, Johannson, Johnston (Portage), Shafransky, Spivak.

Agriculture: (12)

Hon. Messrs. Bostrom, Burtniak, Toupin, Uskiw, Messrs. Adam, Derewianchuk, Einarson, Ferguson, Gottfried, Johnston (Portage), Jorgenson, McGregor.

Municipal Affairs: (12)

Hon. Messrs. Doern, Miller, Pawley, Messrs. Axworthy, Derwianchuk, Gottfried, Johannson, Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Malinowski, Moug, Watt, Wilson.

Law Amendments: (30)

Hon. Messrs. Bostrom, Boyce, Desjardins, Evans, Green, Hanuschak, Paulley, Toupin, Uruski, Uskiw, Messrs. Adam, Axworthy, Barrow, Bilton, Brown, Dillen, Graham, Henderson, Jenkins, Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Jorgenson, McKellar, McKenzie, Minaker, Moug, Osland, Patrick, Petursson, Spivak, Walding.

Private Bills: (12)

Hon. Messrs. Hanuschak, Toupin, Messrs. Axworthy, Banman, Cherniack, Dillen, Ferguson, Malinowski, Petursson, Steen, Walding, Watt.

Industrial Relations: (12)

Hon. Messrs. Green, Paulley, Messrs. Barrow, Dillen, Jenkins, Johannson, McKellar, McKenzie, Patrick, Shafransky, Sherman, Steen.

Statutory Regulations and Orders: (12)

Hon. Messrs. Boyce, Evans, Hanuschak, Toupin, Messrs. Bilton, Enns, Johnston (Portage), Malinowski, McGill, Osland, Petursson, Sherman.

Economic Development: (12)

Hon. Messrs. Evans, Green, Turnbull, Messrs. Adam, Axworthy, Banman, Barrow, McGill, Minaker, Osland, Shafransky, Spivak.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Special Committee on the Rules of the House.

MR. CLERK: Your Special Committee of the House appointed to examine and review the Rules and Standing Orders of the House beg leave to present the following as their first report.

Your Special Committee appointed to examine and review the application, effect and enforcement of the Rules and Standing Orders of the House was established by resolution of the Assembly adopted on June 18, 1975.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

(MR. CLERK cont'd)

Your Committee, composed of the Honourable Mr. Speaker as Chairman, Honourable Messrs. Green and Paulley; Messrs Johnston (Portage), Jorgenson, Shafransky, Sherman and Walding, met on Tuesday, September 30, 1975, and Tuesday, January 27, 1976. The quorum for all meetings of the Committee was set at five members.

Your Committee recommends the following procedural changes:

1. That the provisional changes in the Rules with respect to the removal of the time limit on the Estimates debate and the imposition of a 40-minute time limit on the Question Period be continued for another session.

2. That the motion for "concurrence" in the resolutions reported from the Committee of Supply be eliminated.

3. That consideration of the Estimates by the Committee of Supply sitting in two locations be continued and expanded to allow consideration of more than the two departments now permitted. Your Committee agrees that the order in which the Estimates be discussed by the section of the Committee of Supply sitting outside the Chamber should be determined by the Government House Leader after consultation with the House Leaders of the parties in opposition.

4. That answers to questions asked in Committee of Supply, sitting in or outside the Chamber, shall be provided by the minister of the department under review, and not by members of the departmental staff.

5. That the procedure to be followed by the Committee of Supply, or any section of the Committee of Supply, in presenting its report to the House be standardized.

6. That a procedure be developed whereby a member may present a motion in the Committee of Supply, whereby the debate on the entire estimates of any department, excepting the item dealing with the minister's salary would be voted upon within a specified time.

7. That the quorum of the Committee of Supply, or any section of the Committee of Supply, shall consist of ten members.

8. That Standing Committees of the House be appointed for the life of a Legislature and not for each session, as is the present practise.

9. That the Rules Committee, now appointed as a Special Committee as required, be added to the list of Standing Committees of the House.

10. That a Deputy Chairman of the Committees of the Whole House be appointed at the same time as the Deputy Speaker and Chairman of the Committees of the Whole House.

11. That The Legislative Assembly Act be amended to reflect the changes in the life of Standing Committees as recommended in Item 8 above, and to permit the referral of matters to Standing Committees by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council while the House is in recess.

Your Committee recommends the following changes in the Rules of the House:
Adjournment of the House at 10 p.m.

1. That sub-rule 3(4) be repealed and the following substituted: 3 (4) Subject to Rule 65(8), at the hour of ten o'clock p.m., except on Wednesday and Friday, the Speaker shall adjourn the House without question put.

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees.

2. That Rule 9 be repealed and the following substituted: 9 (1) A Deputy Speaker of the House, who shall also be Chairman of the Committees of the Whole House, shall be elected from among the members at the commencement of the first session of each Legislature; and the member so elected shall, if he is present, take the Chair of each Committee of the Whole House.

Term of Office.

(2) The member elected to serve as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of the Committees of the Whole House shall continue to act in that capacity until the end of the Legislature for which he is elected, and in the case of a vacancy by death, resignation or otherwise, the House shall forthwith elect a successor.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

(MR. CLERK cont'd)

Deputy Chairman of Committees.

(3) At the commencement of every Legislature, or from time to time as the necessity may arise, the House shall appoint a Deputy Chairman of the Committees of the Whole House.

Deputy Chairman to act as Chairman.

(4) If, at any meeting of a Committee of the Whole House, or any section thereof, the Chairman of the Committees of the Whole House is not present, the Deputy Chairman of the Committees of the Whole House shall act in the place and stead of the Chairman.

Appointment of Acting Chairman.

(5) In the absence of the Deputy Speaker and the Deputy Chairman, the Speaker may, in forming a Committee of the Whole House, before leaving the Chair, appoint any member to be Chairman of the Committee.

3. That Rule 22 be amended by adding new sub-rule (5) at the end thereof:

22(5) When a resolution of a member is reached for the second time on the Order Paper for introduction, if the member is not present or does not proceed with the resolution at that time, the resolution shall be removed from the Order Paper.

4. That the provisional Rule 65, adopted by the House on March 17, 1975 be repealed and a new Rule 65, as follows, be substituted therefor:

65(1) Except as provided in sub-rule (2), speeches in Committee of Supply, including those of the ministers, shall be restricted to 30 minutes.

(2) The address of a minister introducing the estimates of a department may exceed 30 minutes, but shall be restricted to 60 minutes.

(3) While in Committee of Supply, the minister presenting his estimates shall be permitted to speak from a place in the front row of benches.

(4) The Committee of Supply is authorized to meet outside the Chamber to consider the estimates of government departments.

(5) The Committee of Supply is authorized to sit in two separate sections simultaneously, one section in the Chamber and one section outside the Chamber, to consider the estimates of separate government departments.

(6) Neither the Committee of Supply, nor any section of the Committee of Supply, is authorized to sit to consider estimates while the House is in Session.

(7) Subject to sub-rule (10), where the Committee of Supply, or a section of the Committee of Supply, has begun to consider the estimates of a government department within the Chamber, the consideration of the estimates of that government department shall be continued and completed within the Chamber; and where the Committee of Supply, or a section of the Committee of Supply, has begun to consider the estimates of a government department outside the Chamber, the estimates of that government department shall be continued and completed outside the Chamber.

(8) Where the Committee of Supply, or a section of the Committee of Supply, is sitting at 10:00 p.m. on any day, the Chairman, or the Deputy Chairman, of the Committee shall not leave the Chair at that time but, subject to sub-rule 9(c), the Committee shall continue to sit and shall rise at its own discretion.

(9) Where the Committee of Supply, or a section of the Committee of Supply is sitting after 10:00 p.m. on any day

(a) the Chairman, or the Deputy Chairman of the Committee, shall not accept any vote that defeats or varies an item in the estimates of the government;

(b) the estimates of a department shall not be introduced after 10:00 p.m.;

(c) unless the Committee of Supply, or a section of the Committee of Supply has risen earlier, it shall rise on the completion of the departmental estimates that were under consideration at 10:00 p.m.

(10) Where the Chairman, or the Deputy Chairman, of the Committee of Supply refuses to accept a vote that defeats or varies an item in the estimates, he shall put the motion as the first item of business at the next sitting of the Committee of Supply in the Chamber.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

(MR. CLERK cont'd)

(11) Where the Committee of Supply sits after 10:00 p.m. and after the Committee rises, any motion except a motion to adjourn the House is out of order.

(12) The Chairman of the Committee of Supply shall report to the House, from time to time, as to the progress of the Committee in the consideration of the estimates of the various departments of the government.

(13) Where the Committee of Supply, or a section of the Committee of Supply, is sitting outside the Chamber to consider the estimates of government departments, the Committee, or the section of the Committee, may continue to sit, from time to time, as the Committee or the section shall determine.

(14) Where the motion for the "previous question" is moved in Committee of Supply, or in a section of the Committee of Supply, the motion is not debatable.

(15) The Chairman of the Committee of Supply, or a section thereof, may receive a motion to the effect that the entire estimates of the department of government then under consideration, except the item thereof that deals with the minister's salary, be voted on within a period set out in the motion, and, upon receiving such a motion, the Chairman shall put the question on the motion without allowing any amendment thereto or debate thereon; and, if the motion is carried in the Committee, or the section thereof, and if, on the expiration of the period set out in the motion, the entire estimates of the department of government, except the item thereof that deals with the minister's salary, have not been voted on, he shall forthwith put all the remaining items in the estimates of the department of government, except the item thereof that deals with the minister's salary to a single vote which shall end all further consideration on those items of the estimates in Committee of Supply, or a section thereof.

(16) Where the only item in the estimates of a department of government that has not been voted on in the Committee of Supply, or a section thereof, is the item that deals with the minister's salary, the Chairman of the Committee of Supply, or the section thereof considering the item, may receive a motion to the effect that the item in the estimates of the department of government that deals with the minister's salary be voted on within a period set out in the motion and, upon receiving such a motion, the Chairman shall put the question on the motion without allowing any amendment thereto or debate thereon; and, if the motion is carried in the Committee, or the section thereof, and, if on the expiration of the period set out in the motion, the item has not been voted on, he shall forthwith put the item to a vote which shall end all further consideration of the item of the estimates in the Committee of Supply, or a section thereof.

5. That Rule 70 be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

70(1) At the commencement of the first session of each Legislature, a Special Committee of seven members shall be appointed, which shall prepare and report with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the following Standing Committees of the House: on Privileges and Elections; on Public Accounts; on Public Utilities and Natural Resources; on Agriculture; on Municipal Affairs; on Law Amendments; on Private Bills; on Industrial Relations; on Statutory Regulations and Orders; on Economic Development; on the Rules of the House.

(2) The Clerk shall cause to be affixed in a conspicuous place in, or near, the Legislative Chamber, a list of the several Standing Committees and Special Committees appointed during the session.

(3) The membership of the Standing Committees shall be as set out in the report of the Special Committee of seven members, when concurred in by the House, and shall continue from session to session within a Legislature, but shall be subject to such changes as may be effected, from time to time.

6. That Rule 71 of the Rules of the House be amended by adding thereto, immediately after sub-rule 2, the following new sub-rules:

71(3) The Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly stand permanently referred to the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House and shall be examined, from time to time, by that Committee.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

(MR. CLERK cont'd)

71(4) The Speaker shall be a member and Chairman of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the report of this Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other reports of committees? The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP M. PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders begs leave to present the following as their First Report:

Your Committee, composed of Hon. Messrs. Boyce, Evans, Hanuschak, Toupin, Messrs. Bilton, Enns, Johnston (Portage), Malinowski, McGill, Osland, Petursson and Sherman, met on Monday, January 12, 1976 in Room 254 Legislative Building.

Mr. Petursson was appointed Chairman and the quorum for all meetings was set at seven members.

Hon. Mr. Paulley, the Minister responsible for the administration of The Pension Benefits Act, advised the Committee that a Pension Commission had been formed and gave a brief outline of its activities to date. The Commission is composed as follows:

Professor E. Vogt - Department of Actuarial Science, University of Manitoba

Mr. Jim Goodison - International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers

Mr. Gordon Holland - Chairman and General Manager, Manitoba Telephone System

Mr. Larry Giffen - Director of Staff Relations, Management Committee

Mr. Harvey Bob James - Manager, Winnipeg Branch, Canada Trust

Mr. Ted Jacobs - Retired

Mr. Albert Edgar - Retired Manager, Estate Planning for Montreal Trust Briefs were presented to the Committee by the following:

H.W.B. Manning - on behalf of The Canadian Life Insurance Association

Dick Martin - on behalf of Local 6166, Steelworkers of America

A.H. Coulter - on behalf of The Manitoba Federation of Labour

Following the presentation of briefs, Professor Vogt replied to questions posed to him by members of the Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for Point Douglas, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I wish to lay on the Table the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture and the Annual Report of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation and the Annual Report of the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation.

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

HON. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE (Minister responsible for Corrections and Rehabilitation) (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, we would table the Financial Statement of the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba for the fiscal year ending March, 1975.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Leader of the Official Opposition) (Riel):

Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. Could he advise whether Mr. Marc Eliesen formerly with the British Columbia government, is returning to the Manitoba Government either on a retainer as a consultant or as an employee of the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I believe that - although I'll have to check it to be precise - I believe there is a three month or a four month arrangement, following which I understand the individual in question has duties awaiting elsewhere in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable First Minister repeat the last part, it was inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Oh, I was saying, that following which, I believe the individual in question has duties awaiting elsewhere in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader for the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, can he advise whether Mr. Cass-Beggs is also returning to the Manitoba Government from B.C.?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge. And if I were asked for advice I'd advise him not to because he is of an age where he shouldn't have to suffer fools any longer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights. Order, please.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): My question is to the First Minister. The Provincial Auditor in his report indicates that there will be a special audit undertaken of Flyer Coach Industries. I wonder if he can indicate whether that audit has been completed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Auditor has been involved in the audit of Flyer Industries. He is also the auditor for the MDC and as auditor for the MDC he would have some knowledge of it. But he is doing an additional audit and has not made a final report although he has sent some information to the government.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Resources then can indicate when the preliminary report was received by the government.

MR. GREEN: I hesitate to say but it was some weeks ago. I'm relying solely on my memory. I believe that there will be a meeting of Public Accounts shortly and the honourable member will be able to talk to the Auditor at that meeting. I believe that that has been the practice.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether the government undertook any corrective action as a result of the preliminary information from the Provincial Auditor?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, as I recall it, and I hope that I'm not going to be dealing with it in detail, but as I recall it the Auditor in his preliminary report indicated that most of the steps that had to be taken were taken by Flyer Coach Industries. He does indicate further additional steps.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the same Minister responsible for MDC. I wonder if the Minister can advise whether Flyer has been able to renegotiate any of its contract prices for diesel buses with the two major orders that they have in the States.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that there have been accommodations made between the company and the purchaser, particularly San Francisco, but they don't deal with price.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister can advise: has Flyer attempted to renegotiate the firm prices that they

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) presently have under contract?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I really feel that I had best deal with the question by indicating that I'm not going to be involved in discussing in the House or answering questions on internal commercial matters affecting Flyer Coach Industries Limited.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if he can inform the House if his department or any departments under his jurisdiction are presently negotiating for the purchase of an interest in Manco Dairies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any such undertaking.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the Minister indicate to the House if negotiations are continuing at the present time between the Health Sciences Centre and the maintenance and power house employees?

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Attorney-General. According to a recent report released by the Solicitor-General, Mr. Warren Allmand, they have recommended liberalization of wire tapping laws in Canada. Can the Honourable Minister indicate whether this subject has been a matter for discussion at conferences of Attorney-Generals throughout the Dominion of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, there has been some very brief reference to proposed legislation at conferences of the Attorneys-General by the Federal Minister of Justice, but those references have been very brief and there has been no involved discussion as to the detail.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question then. Has the Attorney-General or anyone from his office made representation on this matter to the Federal Government?

MR. PAWLEY: I don't believe there have been any representations. There may have been, Mr. Speaker, at the very early stages when the bill was first introduced some two years ago, correspondence back and forth and I think I should refresh my memory by reference to that correspondence.

MR. GRAHAM: Final supplementary then. Does the Attorney-General concur with the actions that are being taken by the Federal Government in this matter?

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please gentlemen. Before we proceed, I would like to indicate that in the loge to my right we have as a guest the Honourable John Pierre Ouellet, Minister of Youth for New Brunswick and also Minister for Cultural Affairs, Sports and Recreation among other responsibilities. On behalf of the honourable members I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture and would ask then in light of the chaos now existing in the dairy industry, if the Minister will be reinstating a quota system?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I am going to ask for the co-operation of the honourable members that they not preface their remarks with things which may become debatable. I would ask that they ask their questions and that the answers be just as terse as the questions. Thank you. The Honourable Member.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could confirm that he will be reinstating the quota system in the dairy industry?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: The Member for La Verendrye should know that we have a marketing agency that is in charge of the affairs of the milk producers and to the extent that from time to time they will have to impose any restriction on production they will do so. That is the purpose for which they have been set up.

MR. BANMAN: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the First Minister or the Agriculture Minister could then confirm that the Federal Government will be cutting our market share quota by about twenty percent?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is correct. I am not sure if the percentage is correct but certainly there have been two or three announcements in the last two months with respect to a roll back of dairy production across Canada. One of the problems with respect to Manitoba is that we have not pursued aggressively enough increased production in the last two or three years although we have been aggressive. To the extent that we didn't fully take up the market share agreement as was entered into two or three years ago, we are going to be rolled back a percentage point more.

MR. BANMAN: Further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could give us an idea of how much cutback will be involved in the producers in the field right now?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Well I think, Mr. Speaker, this particular subject really has to be debated in full. I think it would take more than a question period to discuss the point that my honourable friend is raising.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. USKIW: And in light of the estimates coming up within a matter of days I would suggest we leave it till that point in time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the fact that Manitobans are paying some six percent more for food than is justified by the retailers, is the Minister considering freezing food prices until his Department has time to take permanent action based on the Food Prices Review Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Consumer Affairs.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer Affairs, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I assume the member is also referring to the question that he raised yesterday with regard to the Food Prices Review Board report - a report which is not yet printed let alone public. I can tell him in answer to yesterday's question that I have not had the opportunity of reviewing that report of the Federal Government, a report which indicates that there is inefficiency in the food marketing industry in the province and in the country.

I can say that although the Member for Assiniboia may not have faith in the marketplace, I have yet to see a complete collapse of efficiency in food marketing. But if prices continue to rise, despite that concern of mine I will certainly take whatever action the government may deem necessary to examine food prices in this province. If I may continue, Sir, and say to you . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister. If the findings of the report are accurate will the Minister be taking any action?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, the findings of the report appear to indicate that rather than concentrate on curtailing food price increases the general attack of government should be on curtailing inflation and the Member from Assiniboia should know that that is precisely what this government is doing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. The Provincial Auditor's Report indicates that a draft directive was submitted to Cabinet by the Department of Finance and himself concerning accountability for grant expenditures. I wonder if he can indicate when that draft directive was submitted to Cabinet, the time?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have problems with my hearing. I didn't understand the last few words.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister can indicate when the draft directive from the Department of Finance was submitted to Cabinet for consideration.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it was perhaps not in the nature of a directive but rather in the nature of a Cabinet submission. Honourable friend will understand from his past experience the difference. It was something which was not agreed to for immediate implementation but rather for consideration.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, then, by way of another question to the First Minister. Can he confirm that no action has yet been taken on that recommendation?

MR. SCHREYER: Affirmative, Mr. Speaker. It's under consideration.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, by way of another question. I wonder if the First Minister would indicate whether the government in dealing with this matter considered the fact that there is suggestions that money was misapplied - the various grants that were given by government.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that's rather a general sweeping statement which I rather suspect was not alleged by the Provincial Auditor. My honourable friend will know that in their past practice of application of grants, outright grants to various external organizations or community organizations, that they did not have that administrative procedure either.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. James. The Honourable Member for River Heights will state his matter of privilege.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, simply to indicate to the First Minister it was never the intention, that was not intended to be a blanket statement or a suggestion that there was a specific . . . There's specific mention by the Provincial Auditor in his report of PEP grants, PEP grants, and it's . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The explanation has clarified the situation. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Then to the First Minister. Can he indicate whether there was consideration of the fact that there was mention by the Provincial Auditor of some misapplication of PEP fund grants? Was that considered by Cabinet in dealing with this directive?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could ask the honourable member to indicate to me more precisely just what he's referring to. I don't believe that we have had any significant problem in that regard but I would like to check it if I can get specific enough reference from my honourable friend, perhaps outside of the question period by way of note or whatever.

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

MR. MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for Autopac. I wonder if the Minister can advise the House if the Public Works Department is paying a standard insurance rate for the new Government electric cars?

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

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Minister for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation) (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice and check what rating group they're in.

MR. MINAKER: A supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister can also, when he's checking on that fact, advise the House if Autopac intends to charge an extra premium against electric cars to make up for the loss of the two cents per gallon subsidy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Public --(Interjection)-- The Honourable Member for Wolseley. Order please. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

. ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Will he confirm that the measure to reduce excessive rents for shelter will start as of October 14th?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Consumer Affairs.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, it has always been the practice here that when a Bill is introduced the policy of the Bill is introduced with the Bill. In any case, with this particular bill I have indicated by press release some months ago that the retroactivity would go back to at least October.

MR. WILSON: Can he confirm that Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation has increased the rents on Evanson and Arlington by 30 percent and will he be taking measures to reduce this excessive charge?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, I think that question is misdirected. In any case I could hardly have knowledge of every rent increase in the Province of Manitoba; but I can assure him that rents have gone up exorbitantly in some places.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if the Minister could tell us - today's Tribune indicates that the report of the meat inquiry . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. WATT: . . . commission would be tabled today. Will the Minister indicate to us if the report is going to be tabled as indicated by the Winnipeg Tribune.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: No Mr. Speaker. I anticipate that that report will be tabled soon however.

MR. WATT: May I ask the Minister how soon? Could I ask the Minister a supplementary question? How soon will the report be tabled?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I implied in my statement to the House yesterday, I believe, that within a week to ten days at the outside.

MR. WATT: Well then has the report been made available to the Winnipeg Tribune?

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WATT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has it been made available to any other source outside of this House since it was indicated on television last night and discussed on television, the report?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't usually have the time to watch the evening television programming, but let me indicate to my honourable friend that the report has as yet not been seen by my colleagues or anyone else for that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wellington and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, before I begin I would like to offer you my congratulations on your good health and your ability to handle your position for the coming year.

Also I would like to extend a welcome to the two new members, the Member for Wolseley and the Member for Crescentwood. I note from their experience and their pasts that they have City of Winnipeg Council experience and I'm sure that their views will be listened to with curiosity and perhaps we may expect that the government will take some of your advice seriously.

Also I think I would be remiss if I didn't say on behalf of my two colleagues and myself that we hope the Member for Souris-Lansdowne will be back with us. He's always made a great contribution to this Chamber. His lively spirits and his great zest for life and the manner in which he entered debates is missed by us and we hope that he'll be back with us soon.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne gives the Government the opportunity to outline its proposed legislative program. It enables the Government to review its past achievements, to take stock of the current problems and to indicate its future course in dealing with social and economic concerns. It also provides the opposition parties and the public at large the opportunity to examine what progress has been made and where we appear to be headed and to provide some alternative suggestions.

The current Speech in our opinion is a dismal document because it fails to deal with the fundamental economic problem facing both the nation and the province. Inflation has become a critical matter yet this government issues a document which focuses upon mosquito control and wilderness parks. It would appear that the Government has ceased to be relevant. The Speech from the Throne is deficient more for what it omits than what it contains. Let us examine some of the specific proposals identified in the document.

In the matter of rent controls the Liberal Party had advocated rent control and/or review a year ago before the Wage and Price Control Program was announced by the Federal Government. Our suggestion was greeted with disdain. When the wage and price control program was initiated we urged that a Fall Session be called to enact this important complementary legislation, so now four months later we know it's coming.

In the field of housing the Liberal Party advocated a more aggressive policy to stimulate housing starts during 1975. Federal resources were available through CMHC which were not fully utilized last year because the province was not prepared to inject the required provincial component to proceed with a full construction program. We hope this situation will not be repeated this year. The government's pledge to increase housing starts in 1976 is welcome but we will continue to make suggestions as to how this can be done without so much reliance on the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, which so far has been the only significant developer and landlord. If some imagination were used the private housing industry could be stimulated and it would complement the efforts of MHRC.

In the field of energy the Speech from the Throne suggests that the Churchill Diversion is proceeding as planned; and in fact we know it's a year behind schedule and that the diversion channel has had to be re-engineered and reconstructed. We calculate the loss at a minimum of \$17 million.

Last year the Speech from the Throne announced that a Nuclear Power Station would be constructed in Manitoba. This year we are told that the implications are to be studied before any commitment is made. We agree with the suggestion that Manitoba play its part in a coordinated national scheme for research and development of new forms of energy; but we must recognize that this may occasion some shift of emphasis away from hydro development or at least a slowdown of the capital expenditures on Hydro. There's nothing in the Speech from the Throne to indicate that the government is prepared to divert or decelerate its schedule of hydro development in the North.

On industrial safety we agree with the stated concern with respect to loss of productive time because of industrial accidents. We will await with interest some pronouncement as to how the Government proposes to deal with that situation. The Speech is silent as to ways and means to bring about improvement.

With respect to labour, changes to The Labour Relations Act were promised in 1975 but they were not forthcoming. We have made a number of suggestions which we hope will be incorporated in any new legislation. We suspect that no amount of amendments to the present Act will make up for the real deficiency and that is the failure of the Department of Labour to maintain enough adequate and experienced staff of conciliation officers who can be instrumental in heading off potential work stoppages before they occur, such as the present two strikes we now have on our hands in the transit and the hospital field.

Referring to Autopac, the Speech from the Throne states that the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation continues to operate without the necessity of public subsidy. Well, Mr. Speaker, who, pray, except the public, is going to pay the \$19

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) million deficit and who is presently paying the two cent tax on gas? How can it be said that there is no public subsidy from the Government or by Government when the Government felt obliged to decree that all governmental agencies and department must fulfill their insurance requirements through non-competitive quotations from MPIC? (Hear hear) That's subsidy. --(Interjection)-- Great West is a private company.

Turning to the Winnipeg core area the Speech from the Throne piously announces that the Government will limit its expenditures. But some paragraphs later it has stated, and I quote: "A number of provincial buildings are to be constructed in the Winnipeg core area." These are the very structures that we believe should be delayed or postponed without impairing a valid program of renewal in the core area. Their erection this year is an abdication of the restraint which is professed at the beginning of the document.

In the field of education, the suggestion that children with intellectual, physical and emotional handicaps will become part of regular class-rooms. This sounds fine in theory but it may be difficult in practice. Teachers untrained in handling these special categories of students will experience great difficulties in dealing with the special problems of such children and also in continuing their regular work with the rest of the class. We question the practicality of that suggestion.

In the matter of the dental program which was announced again this year - we were promised that program a year ago. Now it is belatedly introduced and we find that it's only going to be available to a small fraction of the school children of Manitoba. These and other suggested measures mentioned in the Speech from the Throne represent a bandaid approach. It deals with the nicks and scratches but it ignores the fundamental ailments afflicting the body politic.

The major problems faced by government, both federal, provincial and municipal is how to balance rising expectations for Government services with limited fiscal resources. It is a problem that has become accentuated by the present inflationary state of the economy and the desirability to exercise restraint. When the productive capacity of the economy is showing no growth, which has happened in the past year, we cannot continue to take more out of the economy through taxes to meet the escalating demands for government services. So therefore, some program would be necessary I would think. So we suggest a three-pronged attack.

Firstly, restraints must be imposed to prevent people from taking out of the economy in wages and prices more than is reasonably justified by growth in productivity; hence a massive program of wage and price controls imposed by the Federal Government.

Secondly, the rising expectations for improved and extended government services must be brought to check. This implies severe limitations on the growth of the Civil Service at all levels; the examination of government programs to delete those which can reasonably be terminated; to review the capital spending programs to eliminate or delay those projects that are not imperative at the present time.

Limitations on spending by the public sector, however, must not be imposed with such vigor and speed as to slow down the economic growth and . . . unemployment. So I guess the government must know that the pruning must be carefully done.

The third attack is in our view most important. That is to stimulate economic growth particularly with the private sector This is the part of the equation that is most often ignored. It is also an area that the Provincial, as well as the Federal Government can profoundly affect. Paradoxically this third area of attack, designed to develop growth in our gross national product will involve the expenditure of public funds perhaps on an expanded basis. For example the supply of adequate shelter and the stability of the construction industry which provides it is dependent upon increased injection of public funds.

With this three directional approach in mind let us examine what the Provincial Government can and should be doing in 1976 and beyond.

First, on the matter of wage and price restraint. The program is a national program devised by the Federal Government but it will function only with the

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) co-operation of all provincial governments. Some people in our society take exception to the program because it limits their demands, because they perceive that it will not work equitably because of the red tape involved and because they believe that the economy could recover without the need of a program of controls. But the vast majority of Canadians see the need for wage and price controls and are willing to co-operate to insure its success. If the controls fall more heavily upon labour than on business, then our function must be to urge alterations that will achieve the desired balance. No one who is affected by them like wage and price controls. They limit our freedom and spin a web of bureaucratic red tape. So the sooner, I suppose, we are rid of wage and price controls, the better we will like it. Therefore we owe it to try to make it work. Let us bend every effort to assure compliance and to supplement the federal program with complementary provincial measures in order that we can bring stability to the economy quickly. The only virtues of the controls is that they may - and we believe will - bring inflation into check. Let us accomplish that goal with all possible speed.

The response of the Provincial Government should not be tentative. Regrettably that is what we see in the Throne Speech. The government says, we will see how the program works out. If we're dissatisfied with the results, the lukewarm support will be withdrawn. Well, what we need is some complementary action and the government after four months has been rather slow, outside of one announcement about rent control, in stating what they intend to do.

The failure to legislate rent controls some months ago is an indication of the half-hearted way this government approaches the economic crisis facing the nation and the province. There are other steps which the province should take. As noted in the Speech from the Throne, the program of rent controls must be supplemented by a commitment to increase the supply of housing. We have urged a variety of plans to increase the construction of new housing units and we will continue to renew these suggestions in this session. We believe that provincial marketing boards must be brought under the guidelines. The artificial price imposed by a marketing board must not be allowed to fluctuate upwards unless justified by corresponding cost increases incurred by the producers. A price which provides a reasonable economic return to the average producer must be determined and thereafter that price should stay constant subject to evidence that the cost of production has increased.

The federal guidelines imposed restrictions on the earnings of professionals as defined in Paragraph 26, Section 2 of the Federal Regulations. But there are other professional or quasi professional groups that are outside the ambit of the federal regulations. It is important that the provincial administration monitor the fees and charges being levied by these groups and be prepared to legislate limitations if fee increases exceed what is reasonable.

In turning to other forms of restraint: government spending, the Civil Service. We are convinced that government services can be provided at acceptable levels without a net increase in the number of civil servants. This does not mean that there will be no expansion in any government department but there can be corresponding decreases in other areas. We believe that the Department of Northern Affairs has been and is grossly overstuffed. We believe that the program to develop the economy in Northern Manitoba, to create employment opportunities, to provide adequate infrastructure for northern communities should proceed without an accompanying army of civil servants commuting back and forth from Winnipeg.

It is not merely a question of numbers. Not only are some departments over-staffed but the salaries of many civil servants occupying the more senior positions are too high. There are simply too many high-priced civil servants. In some cases the salaries are totally unrealistic in terms of wage scales offered in the private sector. To take a specific example: the salaries offered to lawyers with two years' experience at the bar to join the staff of Legal Aid are far higher than corresponding salaries offered in private practice. So the effect of those unrealistic wages is to create an inflationary pressure which ultimately ripples through the entire economy.

We question the extent to which this government has become involved in advertising programs. Large sums are spent for television ads for the Liquor

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) Commission, for services of the Industry and Commerce Department and the like. Surely less expensive methods can be found to convey necessary messages to the public.

These suggestions serve to illustrate the point which should be made that all government departments must be canvassed with a view to reducing costs, and though the amounts may not be enormous in any one area the accumulated saving will be significant.

We are opposed to the concept of reducing direct payment and services designed to assist people in need. We can think - and unlike my friends to the right who have not been specific - of no social assistance programs which we would recommend be eliminated. These programs whether income supplements to the elderly, welfare payments, Medicare or Legal Aid arise in response to need and should not be jettisoned unless and until the need has been satisfied. While we question the salaries paid to legal aid professional staff, personnel for example, we do not question the validity of the service being provided.

We believe that the proposed capital spending projects must be scrutinized with care. Those projects which would be convenient but are not necessary should be delayed until the economy is healthier. In this category we would place such projects as the parking facility near the Legislative Buildings related for government offices. We say also a proposed 300-bed hospital in Metro Winnipeg and a new office structure for Autopac, these are in our opinion public capital spending that can be delayed.

We also believe that the staging of hydro development in Northern Manitoba must be reviewed with a view towards spreading the cost of development, and thus the horrendous interest charges over a longer period of time. The hydro development is utilizing an inordinate amount of capital which in our view might be employed at least in part in research and development of other forms of energy, specifically solar energy, wind power, and biomass energy. We have become prisoners of the technocrats in Manitoba Hydro in all our efforts and resources are being funnelled into their approach to energy development to the exclusion of other potential areas.

We are concerned about the extent of capital borrowing and the growth of public debt by all three levels of government. We are borrowing too much; we are creating too onerous a debt load for the future. We are taking too much out of the capital market for governmental purposes. Governments cannot continue their capital spending programs either in isolation from each other or from the private sector. If for example an Arctic pipeline is constructed in the near future then it will drain hundreds of millions from the capital market. Neither government nor industry can proceed with their plans oblivious to the needs of the other.

The three levels of government now take about 40 percent of the gross national product for their purposes. That figure is uncomfortably high. It will be reduced only if all levels restrain both their current and capital spending programs in a vigorous and co-ordinated way. This lack of co-ordination has been evident with respect to spending at the municipal and school board levels. The Provincial Government goes on with its own spending plans, oblivious to the financial needs of municipalities, particularly the City of Winnipeg and of the school divisions. There is no attempt to set proper priorities here, the municipalities and school divisions are left to beg for adequate funds each year after the province has taken whatever it wants out of the pot. So we renew our request that a Royal Commission be established to investigate, and suggest proper mechanisms for the funding of municipalities and school divisions on a long term basis.

During the decade of the 60's, people came to believe that there was an endless supply of capital and that if the private sector of the economy did not provide a prosperous economic environment, the government would do it. Out of that belief we developed the stay option program; it promised more than a chicken in every pot, it promised every economic prosperity in every town, village and hamlet. If the local economy was stagnant, government would prime the pump by persuading industry to move in, or by building schools, hospitals, nursing homes, and hydro sub-stations. We are now beginning to realize that certain false expectations cannot be maintained and that government cannot shore up and sustain the economic health of every community. Moreover, this diffused approach towards economic development does not work too well in practice. We believe that the time has come for a careful and perhaps a painful redefinition of the stay option

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) in rural Manitoba. We believe that sound economic development depends upon establishing strong regional growth centers and that they should become the focal points for developing growth in the areas of the province outside of Winnipeg. The stay option must be moderated to conform with the reality of the 70's, and that reality is that we do not have the fiscal resources to cultivate equal prosperity in every nook and corner of the province.

On the matter of stimulating economic growth, in 1975 there was zero growth in the Canadian gross national product. Because of this lamentable situation, wages and price controls were brought in. Those and similar controls will continue to be necessary until the productive capacity of the nation can again keep pace with the demands imposed upon it. The sooner we can improve real productive growth in the economy, the sooner we will be able to shed the controls which so many find distasteful. The Federal Government can take some effective steps to stimulate economic growth. The Competition Act should have the effect of making the free enterprise system work with greater efficiency and effectiveness. We believe an even more salutary development would be the reduction of trade barriers in accordance with the recommendations of the Economic Council of Canada, and to that end we will be presenting a resolution in this Legislature designed to encourage discussion and to hopefully encourage a directive from this province to encourage the Federal Government to move in that direction. The Provincial component in stimulating economic growth is as important as that of the Federal Government in Ottawa. Measures can be implemented which can help both individuals and corporations to be more productive. For example, in agriculture, the function of the Department of Agriculture should be to help Manitoba farmers maximize productivity. Ag Reps are being diverted from their primary function in our opinion. The Department is racked with dissention because of political interference, therefore productivity is not what it should be.

Manitoba does not produce the allocation of milk production allowed by the Federal Department of Agriculture, whereas other provinces are over-producing. As a result, the dairy allocation for Manitoba may be reduced on a permanent basis. This is symptomatic of a policy of encouraging small farms, some of which perpetuate inefficiency. It is desirable that young men be encouraged to embark upon farming careers, but it is undesirable that they should be encouraged to venture into the business without having sufficient land to operate an economic farm unit.

Turning to the Attorney-General's Department and Corrections, the essence of our criticisms of these departments again relate to productivity. The jails and correctional institutions have failed lamentably in providing inmates with training and emotional help to make them productive members of society. I know it is not an easy task, but it is a task that must be undertaken with renewed vigour. We have now a full ministry that has had over a year to have this problem, and we look forward to that ministry in producing some viable alternatives to the problems where prisoners sit around in idleness, they have no training programs that are worthy of speaking about, and the like.

In the matter of the Manitoba Development Corporation, we again make the point that the entire approach of the MDC which began by a Conservative Government and continued by the present administration has been wrong. That approach is one of extremely large loans or equity investments to establish an industry to solve a social economic problem. The statistics contained in MDC's Annual Report tell us that the smaller the loan the greater the job generation. We are grateful that recently that the MDC has not become involved in further massive investments comparable to CFI, Saunders, Flyer Industries and even Misawa Homes. The catalogue of losses that occurred over the past few years should not, however, intimidate government from continuing a program designed to stimulate small indigenous companies with local management by providing needed capital growth and expansion; nor should a government development agency be afraid of incurring losses. Dynamic growth will not occur unless high risks are taken. Our complaint is not that there have been losses, that is an expected result in a government doing its job, our complaint has been that the MDC has not learned to cut bait. In other words, in reality, the MDC has had decisions taken over

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd)by the Cabinet and the MDC in some cases has become a rubber stamp. Government financing should be available as seed monies to stimulate initial growth. To continue to pour funds into an industry to protect the initial investment merely uses funds which could have been better employed in giving initial assistance to many other small companies that could use a similar injection of risk capital. If our object is stimulate economic growth and improve productivity, then there is a need for an agency like the MDC to act as a catalyst for small business enterprises lacking capital for expansion and growth, and it should be used to attain those goals.

On social development, the most significant failure of this government has been its inability to end the estrangement of the Indian and Metis people from Manitoba society. When we consider the question of productivity of individuals or groups of individuals, we must confess that little has been accomplished to assist native people to be productive members of society and to enjoy the fruits of their productivity. In Northern Manitoba, a Hydro development has been pushed forward, oblivious to the rights enshrined in treaties. The livelihood of trappers and fishermen is threatened; this is hardly the way to gain the trust of native people. Without that trust, it is too much to expect that native people will rejoice when the bureaucrats announce from on high development schemes for the north. We know that training of native people and resettlement in communities where work is available must be moved forward, but such laudable plans will be greeted with resentment so long as the native people themselves are denied participation in developing those plans. Machinery must be established to ensure that native people have greater participation in determining their own destiny.

Turning to another subject, the role of woman. Half the population has been less productive than it could be, largely because the other half of the population has not allowed its potential to be reached. Women are still not attaining positions in government and in private industry consistent with their abilities; this failure on the part of our society to award women with jobs which fully challenge their skills and abilities must be overcome.

A MEMBER: . . . A woman as Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Perhaps that will happen. This failure on the part of our society to award women with jobs which fully challenge their skills and ability must be overcome. It is not only an issue of giving women equal rights, but it is also an opportunity to improve the productive capacity of our society. The leadership to break down these social restraints inhibiting the employment of women in jobs, responsibility rests upon government to show the way. We believe that there should be a provincial Council of Women, as there is in most other provinces, which would bring the information to the attention of both government and the public as to the measures of progress this administration is making in giving women greater responsibilities within the Civil Services and within the various boards and commissions appointed by the provincial administration. We are awaiting with interest government legislation relative to women's property rights, as mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. Too often on marriage breakdown, the wife is left with a wholly inadequate share of the capital which she helped to accumulate.--(Interjection)--I will. In our views some fundamental legislative changes are required to assure equality between spouses under these circumstances. I am glad to see the government took an interest in that particular item, and I look forward with pleasure to their proposed legislation.

In the field of education we pay lip service to the concept of equal educational opportunities throughout Manitoba. The fact is that Foundation Grants which were intended to pay the basic costs of education now represent about 50 per cent of the education costs, the rest must be raised by municipal tax levies within the school divisions. The poor and small divisions are not in a position to provide equal education standards and options under these circumstances, and equalization grants to them are inadequate to change the situation. The Speech from the Throne gives no promise of prospect of any substantial improvement in the foundation and equalization grants to school divisions. We call for a substantial increase in Foundation Grants, rather than the continued reliance upon the tax rebate program which is of no assistance whatsoever to school divisions. We call for more generous equalization payments for the less

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd)prosperous divisions, this should take priority ahead of any educational frills that the new Deputy Minister might have in mind. The present inequality leads to the kind of situation which recently occurred relative to the Seine River School Division, where parents unhappy with the program in that division were allowed to transfer to an adjacent division. All this accomplishes is to weaken the Seine River School Division to the point that more parents will be dissatisfied and make application for boundary adjustment. This is certainly no way to develop an educational system. To reach their full productive capability, our young people are entitled to equal education opportunities, and this will occur only through adequate Foundation Grants, by protecting the integrity of the divisional boundaries and by supplementing the resources of the poorer division by reasonable equalization grants.

Turning to labour. One simple way to improve productivity is to avoid work stoppage. In our view this is not being done, nor is it done by taking away the right to strike. Strikes might be avoided if parties to the collective agreement are required to keep the Department of Labour informed on a timely basis as to progress and negotiations towards a new contract; if the Minister will inject a capable conciliation officer into the negotiations before the agreement expires. If there are conciliation officers available to fulfill the duties, the conciliation officers are armed with statutory authority to require the disputing parties to participate in discussion. We have a special concern with respect to the public service employees. Two years have gone by since the Woods Report, which contains specific recommendations to improve labour-management relations in this sector, yet none of the recommendations have been implemented. In the interim we have seen a threatened nurses' strike, we have seen a strike of the University maintenance employees in 1975, a strike is on now of the transit drivers and maintenance employees at the Health Sciences Center - and we think that the Department of Labour, it's time they took action.

The matter of Manpower. The report of the Manitoba Economic Development Advisory Board on Manpower issues of Manitoba has confirmed our suggestions made throughout the last session that there is a need for greater co-ordination between training and upgrading programs and the market demand for jobs. There is a need for an intensive program to secure work for the disabled worker, which is interesting and challenging enough to engage his continued interest and which enables him to earn a reasonable income performing a productive job. The real employment program in Manitoba is that of matching the available employee with a job which is vacant. If the program could be made and if progress could be made in this area, we would achieve a great deal in improving productive capacity in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has three minutes.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you. In the field of immigration. Since the publication of the Green Paper on Immigration by the Federal Government, we have been waiting patiently for the reaction of the Manitoba Government to the invitation to participate along with the Government of Canada in establishing an appropriate policy for this province. Surely after a full year the government has the opportunity of considering whether Manitoba should be urging expanded policy on immigration in Manitoba or not. This requires some analysis of the growth potential of the province in the next two decades. It requires some vision of the future prospects in industry and resource development. We are fearful that Manitoba has not participated in this vital area because of an incapacity to develop plans other than short term or day-to-day.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the concerns we express, and we hope that the government will try to meet them with reasonable legislation, and if in our judgment it is so, we intend to support those measures.

Now in turning to our sub amendment, Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly to some friends on my right when in their Throne Speech they decried socialism - and they used the word about every other paragraph, or if not, more often - so I took the opportunity to look up the definition of socialism, and I must remind my honourable friends what it is. The principle of socialism is that the means of production and distribution should be owned collectively and controlled through government. Now I think many of us have no problem on agreeing that we find that distasteful. But I wonder if

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) my friends would say that old age pensions is socialism; family allowances, veterans' pensions, the unemployment insurance program, workman's compensation, and many others. Do they consider in Manitoba that the Manitoba Telephone System is socialism, or the Manitoba Hydro is socialism? Because if that is their term of socialism, I think they should go back to their books, because I'm sure every one of them would not for one moment think of taking away any of the programs that I've enunciated - and I might say they're mostly Liberal programs, they are mostly Liberal programs. So, Mr. Speaker . . . --(Interjection)--Well, I think we should have that on the record. One of the members in the Conservative Party said those are necessary evils that I've just enounced. --(Interjection)--That's right, that's right.

So Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia, that the amendment be further amended by deleting everything after the word "by" in the fifth line and adding the following words:

its disregard for the real needs of the Province of Manitoba;

- a) has omitted from this year's Throne Speech any mention whatsoever of financial assistance to municipalities and school divisions to meet the sharply increased costs of their operations, thus forcing the municipalities and school divisions to greatly increase taxes on property in order to stave off bankruptcy thus making home ownership more difficult and forcing large rent increases upon apartment dwellers;
- b) has failed to implement any comprehensive plan to deal with the economic crisis being faced by the Province and the Nation, and specifically has failed to institute its own anti-inflation program within the province and within the government itself in order to overcome inflation as quickly as possible and thus end the controls as quickly as possible;
- c) has aggravated the problems of the inner core of the City of Winnipeg by its announced intention to construct public edifices rather than utilizing those monies to solve the human problems in the inner core area of the City;
- d) has failed to deal with the housing crisis in the past by a reluctance to utilize all the federal monies made available, and has now proceeded to attempt to solve the housing crisis that is of its own making by having its agency act alone and not in co-operation with the housing industry of Manitoba.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister of Labour wish to speak to a point of order?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY: (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): No, Mr. Speaker, not a point of order, there isn't one.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The motion is before the House. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I first of all, in taking part in this debate extend to you my sincere best wishes for a reasonably pleasant Session. I appreciate and realize as I'm sure all members of the Assembly do, that from time to time you will be called upon to make very important decisions as to the conduct of the members of this Assembly. My colleague, the Member for Inkster, says, "Especially the present speaker." May I assure you I will endeavour to disprove the remarks my honourable colleague, the Minister of Mines.

It is customary, and I think a good custom, Mr. Speaker, to extend congratulations to the mover and seconder of the speech of His Honour. I think the Honourable Member for Wellington acquitted himself quite well, quite capably, and as one of the senior members of this Assembly, chronologically at least, I'm sure that he presented a point of view acceptable to the general population of Manitoba. The Member for Churchill, in his usual capable manner, presented to us for consideration many of the problems that he has encountered since becoming a member of this Assembly.

I must, while I am extending congratulations, congratulate the present Acting Leader of the Conservative Party for his contribution the other day. As I listened to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, I wondered whether this was the same individual who so short time ago was just the Member for Riel. It seemed to me in his remarks to the Assembly the other day a sort of a mellowness enshrined my honourable friend. The sparks that used to accompany his speeches of former Sessions had gone. And I noted that as he was delivering the oration of the Tories, that the absentee Leader of the Conservative Party - that is, absentee as far as holding a seat in the Assembly was concerned - was watching him with a gleaming eye from the gallery seat to your left; and I sort of sensed, after having been in the Assembly for awhile, that here was this rookie Pretender to the Throne having to take into consideration what would happen if he made a miscue and reverted back to his fiery self, a miscue in the presence of one that I affectionately called and do call "the red head."

I've had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of attending 28 openings of this Assembly. I don't really brag about that, because of the fact that it has given me an opportunity to see members of this Assembly come and to see members of this Assembly go. Some go to the advantage of the citizens of this great province of ours, and some do happen to come back to the detriment of the people of the Province of Manitoba. But I've seen them come and I've seen them go, all types of individuals, and I would say without any hesitation, without any doubt, that I would not require the fingers of one hand to count the men and the women that I've had the pleasure of sitting with in this Assembly that I couldn't admire and respect. I would imagine that I've seen pretty close to 200 changes in personnel in the 23 years that I've been a member of this Assembly. As I say, Mr. Speaker, most of them by far have made a good contribution to this Assembly and to this province.

Now then, in the years that I have had the honour of representing my constituency, under Liberals, under Conservatives and under the present administration, there are certain aspects of those respective political jurisdictions that I think are significant for what they've done. I remember the Liberals for their involvement in bringing about the rural electrification of Manitoba, and I give them great credit for that. They achieved something for this province. I recall also, I believe it was in the Spring of 1958, when the then Minister of Health of the Liberal administration reluctantly introduced a measure into this Assembly establishing a hospital plan of a universal nature, and I give them credit for that. I remember the Conservative administration for giving us CFI, which has been so costly to the citizens and the people of Manitoba; and that one of their bosom friends is still the subject of search in an endeavour to get that particular individual to return to Manitoba, to give us a true outline of the camaraderie that existed between the Conservative Government at the time of CFI, so that we'll have a true picture of this episode of blackness in the history of Manitoba. I remember the Conservatives in their contribution of about \$3 million to Columbia Forest Industries and the circumstances under which that \$3 million of public money was expended. But most of all I remember something of a positive nature of the administration, and that is that the Conservative administration under Premier Roblin did provide us with a Hansard which we jointly had

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) fought for for many a year, and it is interesting, Mr. Speaker, for members to be able to go back into Hansard and to read Hansard, to find out the tenor of debates that has taken place in this House, and the contributions of individuals in debate; and I intend, Mr. Speaker, in a moment or two, to refer to some statements that were made a few years ago by the now present absent Leader of the Conservative Party. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that they will be of interest to the Assembly, and I'm sorry that the "red head" isn't present to hear a recap of the statements that he made that I am going to refer to.

You know, Mr. Speaker, in the years that I have had the honour of being a member of this Assembly and a participant in the political life of Manitoba, I have seen leaders come, I've seen leaders go.--(Interjection)--That's right. But there's one thing that I would suggest to the present Leader of the Conservative Party, that he should not take for granted that he will remain too long as the Leader of the Conservative Party. I'm sure that the Honourable the Member for River Heights - and I'm sorry he's not here at the present time - I'm sure that the Member for River Heights cannot take his shirt off lest he reveal the stab wounds in his side by stilettos and his wounds in the back by his rapiers from those who were to support him as their leader in the Session just gone by. I never contested at an election where I was confronted with - as the Honourable Member for River Heights was - by a rejection of those that I was leading, because my constituents, my colleagues, did support me, sure - sure, there was an election but I had the support of my colleagues at that time and I still have them. I had the support of my present leader and he has my support. I didn't throw barbs at him or knife wounds in his back. I supported him fully.--(Interjection)--Yes, and the only reason, Mr. Speaker, he didn't get stab wounds in his front because he was on the front bench. Had he have been in the back bench, I'm sure that he would have had as many wounds in his abdomen as he has in his back as a result of the activities of the Conservative Party.

But he wasn't the first leader. Oh, he wasn't the first leader of the Conservative Party in this House that has suffered as a result of the activities of his desk mates in the House. How well I recall the episode of the battle between Duff Roblin and Eric Willis for the Leadership of the Conservative Party. How well I recall one of the Honourable Members of the Conservative Party at that time, the Member for Rockwood-Niverville, standing in his seat where the Honourable Member for Morris is, standing in his seat and complaining because leakages in caucus matters were coming out of the caucus room of the Conservative Party. He was quite a flamboyant individual, Mr. Speaker, a very knowledgeable individual; and I can picture him in my mind's eye right now standing in his seat and saying, "You know, Mr. Speaker, if I was absolutely positive that I knew the Conservative MLA that was giving out the secrets of the caucus, I'd break his other arm," and he turned to one of his honourable colleagues who had his arm in a sling sitting at the back row.

I wonder, with the breakages of arms and the wounds in the back and the side, how long the present Leader will last, or whether he would be decapitated completely.--(Interjection)--Yes, we had a confrontation. That's right, we did have a confrontation, and I was successful. As a matter of fact my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Resources had a contest with the greatest Premier the Province of Manitoba has ever had, but Mr. Green is still loyal; as he was loyal to me after that election, so was he loyal to the Premier, and it's questionable - it's questionable whether that same type of loyalty exists in the Conservative Party of Manitoba today. And what a shame it is, because they were, Mr. Speaker - they were, Mr. Speaker - and I give them credit for it, they were at one time an honourable party of gentlemen, and I wonder today whether such is the case.

But what about this question of leader? I said a moment or two ago that I was going to refer to Hansard to reveal some of the things which said about leadership and leaders a few years ago, and I refer to Hansard of June 17th of 1959. The Speaker, Mr. Sterling Lyon, who at that time was the Attorney-General of the Province of Manitoba, and I quote from Page 93:

"Now if I may say for a moment, Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal with a few

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) remarks that have been made over the past few days by members of the CCF Party opposite." We were the CCF in those days. "We are faced with a CCF Party which unfortunately is without a head in the House. I don't mean that literally, but not only do they not have a head in this House but they want to change their name. Now never," he says, "in my short political career suffered from these twin disabilities: 1. Not having my leader in the House; 2. Belonging to a party which soon was to be divested of its name." Here was the man - here was the man that was condemning our party because we didn't have, in his opinion, a leader in the House; and it is under this situation, Mr. Speaker, that I suggest the difficulties that are going to be confronted by the Honourable the Member for Riel, because if we agree and believe what Mr. Lyon said in 1959, the Conservative Party hasn't got a leader. Had a dummy possibly, a stool, or somebody to give utterances for the Conservative Party, but in the words of Mr. Lyon in 1959, the Conservative Party is leaderless. I wouldn't dispute that too much, Mr. Speaker, possibly they are leaderless. But this was the attitude and the approach of the member at that time.--(Interjection)--Laugh, laugh, of course you can laugh, because I say your laughter is because you realize that it's not me that's speaking, but your absentee leader. And I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether any of those honourable members of the Conservative Party are prepared to resign their seats in order to make it possible for the so-called real leader of the Conservative Party to come into the seat.--(Interjection)--Yes, I'm sure my honourable friend will let me know, if in the meantime he collects enough seniority to be eligible for a pension. I think that may be a consideration of prime importance. But we won't dwell on that, Mr. Speaker--(Interjection)--I doubt - I doubt the way some of you live whether you'll reach that exalted age, as indeed I have.

Then my honourable friend goes on: "We were discussing at that particular time, Mr. Speaker, a sub-amendment that I had proposed calling for a comprehensive government sponsored medicare scheme." And what is the Honourable, the present absent Leader of the Conservative Party saying today in respect of Medicare? What did he say in 1959? He said, "I'm rather pleased by the nature of the CCF sub-amendment which was moved by the Honourable Leader of that party. It points out to us on the government side, and I'm sure to the public of Manitoba, that the sights of this party are still trained on the socialist Valhalla of a Federal-Provincial health insurance plan. In fact, all the traditional darts that they used to throw across the House have been blunted and they may direct their sights again on this old old hackneyed topic of a national health plan." Mr. Speaker, that was in 1959, and if one listens to the utter nonsensical utterances of the present absent Leader of the Conservative Party, you can see as I can see, that he is endeavouring to take us back into the 19th Century from which we dragged him and the Conservative Party as a result of our endeavours and our consistent persistency in the adoption of a national health scheme for this province. I say, Mr. Speaker, and I think I know what of I speak, that the appeal of the Conservative Party today and its absentee Leader would turn the clock back, not only in the field of medicare and of hospitalization, but in so many other areas as well, and this is going to be the choice apparently one day of the people of Manitoba. Should we return - should we return to the premium basis in respect of hospitalization and medicare that we were presented with by the Tory administration of Dufferin Roblin and the Attorney-General, the absentee Leader of the Conservative Party today? Is that what you want? Have enough intestinal fortitude to stand up and be counted my friends one way or the other because you can't have it both ways.

I say, Mr. Speaker, what Lyon said in 1959, unless he was lying, is just as valid as what he says today, the clock would be turned back to the detriment. I would suggest yes from the interjection of the Honourable Member for Swan River, it would accommodate that honourable member because he'd never say no in the 16th Century, let alone any other century.--(Interjection)--That's right. And so he went on and went on.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that instead of talking of an illusive and fallacious - and I would suggest a fallacious socialist pipe dream such as a national health plan - this government is acting rather on the basis of sufferance for those who need it and we will

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) provide it for them and the intent and purpose at that particular time was then, as it would be on a return to that type of leadership, the recipients would get down on their knees and crawl and beg for an opportunity to be treated. That was the philosophy then of the present absentee Leader of the Conservative Party and I would suggest that it is still the same.

But there is another few words that he said at that particular time and I suggest this for the consideration of the Conservatives today. I quote again: "I would suggest that the essential differences between the CCF Party and the Conservative Party today is that the Conservative Party knows and knows full well that it has the responsibility of government." Mr. Speaker, I agree, and I trust, that the absentee Leader of the Tory Party will remember that, because we have the responsibility of government today and Manitoba has never ever been better governed than it is under our administration. (Hear, hear) So I could go on with the utterances of 1959, of the then Attorney-General. A psychology - to use a phrase that was once used by a Conservative Tory Premier Duff Roblin - a concept that should be as dead as a dodo, which of course Roblin used in respect to the implementation of a sales tax for Manitoba. It is as dead as a dodo.--(Interjection)-- Why don't we throw it out? Good Lord.

Now I want to talk of another attitude of the Conservative Party for a moment or two. I refer to some of the remarks of the Leader of the Conservative Party over a TV show Saturday, when he was castigating the approach of this government in respect of the field of Medicare and labour relations and the Civil Service. What does he say? We have a "do-nothing" attitude. He said that everyone has the right to life and that should take precedence over the right to strike. Here's that character, Mr. Speaker, who in 1959, figuratively speaking, wanted to refuse the rights of the citizens of Manitoba to a Medicare and hospitalization plan so that they had the right to live, now today is twisting that concept to suit his political approaches to say that the right to life should take precedence over the right to strike.

He goes on to talk of the evacuations from the hospitals because of the threatened strike. I think he must have been referring to the Misericordia where a strike did not take place because of the approaches made by the Department of Labour, its conciliation officers, and aided by other agencies as well. But how typical is it that the likes of the absent Leader of the Conservative Party and most of the Conservatives in this House would grasp at any straw in order to bamboozle the public into thinking as indeed the absent Leader of the Conservative Party. He said it was like a game, Russian roulette. Well I don't know too much about Russian roulette. I do know however that the programs and the policies of this government have assured to a greater degree than ever before in the history of this province that the people are cared for.

He has the consummate gall, where he hasn't got the responsibility, to say the doctors, nurses, etc should not have the right to strike, that no strike should take place in the area of health services. Mr. Speaker, that outfit had the governing reins of this province for ten years and nowhere in any of The Labour Relations Act or the statutes pertaining to labour was there any exclusion of the right to strike by hospital workers in the Province of Manitoba. The absent Conservative Leader is deliberately attempting to bamboozle the public of Manitoba in an endeavour to try and attempt to indicate that this administration gave the right to strike to the nurses, the doctors and the hospital workers. They've never been deprived of it. Sure, Mr. Speaker, we did change one piece of legislation in respect of the strike. We did give the policemen the right to strike. The teachers voluntarily decided against the right to strike for tenure in employment under the Liberal administration. The Firemen's Arbitration Act, again voluntary by the fire-fighters of Manitoba, have a prohibition for strike and at their request in consultation that provision still prevails.

But that outfit over there, Mr. Speaker, are attempting to indicate that this administration has given the right to strike to hospital workers and such is not the case, and they know it. If they would but be honest unto themselves, which somewhat, in my opinion on occasions is questionable. And what if they did have a prohibition against strikes, Mr. Speaker? In the turbulent days that we are living in today in

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) labour-management relations, if a group or groups are determined to withdraw their services in any field of human endeavour they will do it. If what the Conservative Party means for Manitoba and under other jurisdictions that we should impose a police state to force people into staying on the job, let them say so. Let them say so. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Fort Garry would agree with that type of approach having posed the question. I think after listening to him yesterday that he would.--(Interjection)--Franco? Lord Franco's approach to the labour movement in Spain would be mild compared to what the Honourable Member for Fort Garry would impose on the workers in the Province of Manitoba if he had his way. But I don't think, Mr. Speaker, he is going to have his way. I don't think that the absent Leader of the Conservative Party is going to have his way either. I think the people of Manitoba are too intelligent to ever return to the tough, dark, dreary days of Conservatism in this advanced hour.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable - and another absentee member - leader, sub-leader, substitute leader, or whatever he happens to be, the Honourable Member for Riel . . .

A MEMBER: Have you finished with their labour critic?

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, no. I am going to have a minute or two with the labour critic. The cries, the attitude today of the Civil Service . . .

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I may rise on a point of order. I wonder if you are going to deduct from the Minister's time the five minutes he delivered last night at the dinner of his Throne Speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a point of order.

MR. PAULLEY: You see, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I may have to add that time now.

MR. PAULLEY: You know, Mr. Speaker, I have every admiration for the skill of my honourable friend, the Member for Morris, because when the heat in the kitchen gets a little too hot he attempts to extinguish it by verbal nonsense and that is what he has just attempted. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I have never ever heard any presumed leader of any party degrade the civil servants of Manitoba as was attempted by the Member for Riel in his contribution in the Throne Speech a day ago.

Now I want to talk a little bit about the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. I suggest, I suggest maybe he, maybe he should be the member that vacates his seat so that his Leader can come in here and be challenged because of his nonsensical utterances on the hustings. But I don't think that he, I don't think that the Leader of the Conservative Party wants to be exposed in this House. I think that so typical that he would want to be able to chirp on the outside and not be called to task or confronted on the inside. You know my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry - and I must say a word or two about that lovely gentleman. He reminds me somewhat, Mr. Speaker, of Charlie Chaplin, a good actor, gesticulates quite admirably, very flamboyant. But there is one difference between the Honourable Member for Fort Garry and Charlie Chaplin. Charlie Chaplin kept his mouth shut and amused his audience. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry opens it and says nothing. There is the difference between the two Chaplins.

I want to thank my honourable friend for reminding me of an incident that occurred last year when as a result of some indisposure as a matter of health I didn't forward labour legislation as I had hoped to. Then because of the fact that I disagreed with a settlement that was made with a bunch of doctors I had the guts to say so and I said so. As a result of that I did spend a few days in the Health Sciences Centre. It was suspected the possibility of a tumour on my brain and some may question as to whether I have one or not, but I leave that to their judgment. But as a result of that, Mr. Speaker, after having been examined fully, the psychiatrist that looked after me said, "You know, Russ, I think you could go back to the Assembly. I think we can give you a certificate of sanity - something that is not possessed by many of the members opposite the front benches of government." And I should have taken him up on that.

Sure we've got strikes. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion we have to have different approaches and we're endeavouring to find those new approaches. I would

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) suggest that the prolonged strike that is still continuing at the Health Services Centre could be resolved if there was a slightly different attitude on the part of management to accept the general approach that was achieved in respect to the Misericordia Hospital. I will leave that for your consideration. I think it can be achieved.

One of the difficulties that we are having in labour-management relations today, Mr. Speaker, is, in many cases, the non-application to the concepts that I as Minister of Labour, my staff, my conciliation officers and advisors, have been trying to bring about - what are they? Voluntary binding arbitration be instituted? Set up the Woods Committee on Public Service where certain recommendations have been made. We have under consideration at the present time the advisability of applying on a provincewide basis - not conciliation - attempts to bring about collective bargaining bases on a provincewide basis and if this can be achieved, Mr. Speaker - and we will use every effort we can - we would stop . . . and we would have a confrontation if confrontation indeed should prevail at one time instead of periodic ending of collective agreements. This is our endeavour. And for the Honourable Member for Fort Garry who in my opinion has no concept at all of management-labour relations, who has no concept of conciliation or mediation proceedings, who poses as an expert, and who as I said a few moments ago, opens his mouth and says nothing. This is the approach, Mr. Speaker, that we have to overcome.

I am looking forward with pleasure during this Session and particularly when we are dealing with labour-management relations in the Department of Labour to present a truly further advanced program dealing with labour relations in the Province of Manitoba. We're not satisfied, but I do want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that we have at the present time in the Department of Labour one of the most dedicated, sincere and knowledgeable groups of conciliation officers that this province has ever been privileged to have. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my privilege again, Sir, to congratulate you for being chosen and being our Speaker again in this Legislature, and like all others have indicated, that I'm sure your job would be made easier if all of us were a little more attentive to the rules, as we should be, but under your guidance I'm sure that we will be able to deliberate and get the work of this Legislature done properly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like also to congratulate the mover and the seconder. I believe that they both did admirable jobs. I would only caution the Member from Wellington, though, that the Bible is a very - well, I won't say "dangerous", but not the sort of book you could quote from easily because you can also turn and find the complete opposite in many cases, which I'm sure could be done if we chose to go ahead and research that way. To the seconder, I compliment his words very well. I believe he was to some extent trying to say that the government and the Premier were ordinary people and doing their best to do a job, and he brought those points out very well.

My congratulations to my two new colleagues, which I have done earlier, and like all the rest I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure you would and all the members here, wish that the Member for Souris-Killarney was sitting with us today instead of being in the hospital. It's too bad.

It's too bad the Minister of Labour left. I was hoping sincerely that I would have had more than two minutes, or a few minutes as he stated, about the labour problems in Manitoba. I would also think that some of his statements about the labour problems and some of his statements about our party referring to labour problems, or our references to labour problems, he would have taken a little bit more to his bosom or his office or to somewhere, and consider some of the things that we were saying. We were just basically saying, and have said and will continue to say on this side, that the health of people is more important than somebody deciding that he won't go to work. Mr. Speaker, I heard on the other side when the Minister of Labour was speaking that we would force that person to go to work. I assure you if anyone's life here was in

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) danger, if I could, I would force him to go to work, and I'd like the man on that side to stand up and say he wouldn't. I'd like some of you to say that you wouldn't force somebody to go to work if somebody's life was endangered. Quite frankly, I don't think there is anything but logic in what I am saying. And to be able to turn around, be able to turn around and say that because somebody said at one time that he was not maybe fair in looking at the Medicare system or might not believe in it in 1959, which is many years ago now, is the same as saying that somebody should go to work if somebody's life is in danger; he is completely twisting, completely twisting, and completely out of context.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour should go downstairs or go to his office and get last year's Hansard. He is not in the Chamber right now. Mr. Speaker, I'm moving around, Sir. I'm in a new chair and this one doesn't seem to follow me the way the other one did.--(Interjection)--Quite true. Sorry. Mr. Speaker, he should go and read his speech from last year, because he started out - and this was checked while he was speaking - "I have seen many members come and go." Count them on one hand - and how long he had been here. Then he went into a discourse again about our Party. Do you know that the Minister of Labour spent most of his life talking about the Progressive Conservative Party. He doesn't talk about the NDP Party, he talks about the Progressive Conservative Party. Something must be bothering him. I remember, Sir, when I was a salesman for Paulin-Chambers biscuits many years back, and we used to have a program on the air, Corinne Jordan, on Sunday nights, and she used to play the piano and chat, and I never in my life when I was travelling heard more talk about the dislike for that program. The sales manager always used to say, yes, but they're talking about it. They're talking about it. And the NDP Party have got the Progressive Conservative Party on their brains so badly right now that they're worried sick and they can do nothing but talk about it. The question of the certificate of sanity that the Minister mentioned I will discuss with his doctor, I won't bring it up here.

Mr. Speaker, we mentioned in our answer to the Throne Speech yesterday that we would like to be able to see the socialist government change. And you know I've been saying that for a long time. Boy, I would really love to see the socialist government change, and I have been looking for it for approximately six years. But what has happened? What has happened? We get the same speech from the Minister of Labour, the same worry of our Party; the second question the Premier answered in the House on Friday was to the extent: well, that's better than what they did in Ontario. Again we're going to have a Premier come in the House continually and refer to what is done in other areas.

MR. GREEN: Where's your book, Frank?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, I haven't had it for two years. You see, Progressive Conservatives do look forward. Now, we have had this government really trying to defend themselves by what other people are doing in this country. When other governments do something right, that's the right thing to do, and when other governments do something wrong, we don't have any part of it. So you don't hear about those things - the way they did copy some of the things in that book my honourable friend speaks of - we never hear about that, we never hear about that. We only hear about what happens in other provinces.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the next speech we hear in the House is from the Member from St. Johns, and all we got from him - and I might say that I feel that he flopped again this year by following us on Friday. He seems to want to do that, that's up to him. But I don't think that he really did too well, because all he did again is start to refer as to what happens in Ontario, what happens in Alberta. I don't hear anybody mentioning what's happened in B.C. lately, but we will hear about it I'm sure. We will hear about it. But all we hear about what happens in other provinces.

Mr. Speaker, we really boil it down, really boil it down to this government now being afraid to defend their philosophy. You know, that's really something. Many of them have been afraid to admit it, and now we have them afraid to defend it. So they defend it by saying, look what they did in Ontario. And to compare Ontario with

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, is probably one of the worst things that could ever be done. When you're talking about the number of people there, the industry involved in eastern Canada generally and then you compare Manitoba with it, it's not just fair.

Let's talk about Manitoba. And one of the reasons this government won't talk about Manitoba is because they know that what they have done over the past six years, their policies, have probably done more to put Manitobans in an inflationary situation than any other government could have possibly done. We are dealing with a "rob Peter to pay Paul" government. That is the type of thing that should be . . . rob Peter to pay Paul, or get yourself into trouble and then try and spend your way out of it. That's exactly, that's exactly what this government has been doing.

Let's take a look at some of these things that they have done basically. You know, the government - just excuse me, Mr. Speaker, before I mention some of those things - this government used to brag, they used to get up and say that unemployment in Manitoba was low, and I'm not going to argue that. But what they did say, the cost of living and rate of inflation in Manitoba better than most, and in the last year and a half we've just gone like that. Why? Not because of the blame that you put on Federal Governments. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, if they were really sincere about the inflation that Federal Governments are responsible for in Manitoba, I would have seen more Ministers of this government camped on the doorstep in Ottawa saying, will you please stop this type of legislation which costs us a fortune, which brings increases. You know, government legislation brings increases. Mr. Speaker, I am not here to argue bilingualism, and I won't, because I have my beliefs on that. But the costs that are being put on Manitobans because of the policy and the way it's been put in - not the fact of whether you have it or whether you don't, but the policy, the way it's being put in, is costing Manitobans a fortune and I don't hear anybody from the NDP Government on that side fighting the Federal Government on it.

The metric system. Is that a fast priority? Is that something that has to be done tomorrow? And where are the people on that side of the House camping on the Federal Government's steps to tell them that this shouldn't be put in, that we have other priorities that should go ahead of this because we are in an inflationary situation and we should watch government spending? Where have our government people been with the people of Ottawa on those subjects? If they've been there I compliment them, Sir, but I haven't read it in the papers.

Mr. Speaker, Autopac. Autopac. For anybody--(Interjection)--and he'll be there a long time. For the record, somebody said, "Dan McKenzie is still there." He'll be there a long time.

Mr. Speaker, Autopac. They argue and fight or, Sir, I don't need to call them "they" - the Government argue and fight that the two cents is not inflationary. Well, let's put it this way then, Mr. Speaker. They've said nobody has said that, but they did say it's not a tax, not a subsidy, it's - well basically it's nothing really to harm the people, according to them. You know, two cents on gasoline really shouldn't hurt anybody. But I'll tell you what it does. As we said in our speech, it's raised the cost of everything that is carried by truck in this province. So it is logical, it is logical that this government, because of its legislation over the years, is catching up and starting to make inflation grow.

Their education policies. I've never seen such wild spending in my life. The research part of the budget that we did not vote for last year - or the Estimates that we didn't vote for last year - we voted against that section of the Estimates of Education and we will do so again if they're even as much as they were before because it's useless spending. It's useless spending that could be placed to help the cities, towns and municipalities, if you want, to maybe get the education burden off their backs. But within the Department of Education at the present time you've got a policy which is inconceivable, and the Minister doesn't even run the Department as far as I'm concerned, he's been run ragged by bureaucrats. I don't think that we've ever had a sensible answer from him in this House at any given time. The financial grants help cities and municipalities, which

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) were \$12.5 million last year and increased by the two percent which they will receive this year, that wasn't enough. We said last year, if you find another at least \$6 million to help the cities and municipalities, get your grant up to \$25 million approximately and you'll help them over the inflationary period, and you can do that by cutting out some of this stupid wild spending.

Your priorities have all gone shot. A socialist government priorities that has wasted money in industry. The Member from Portage la Prairie has brought out some of these points. He said we should stop the Development Fund that we started and you have carried on. He's asked you to do that. For four years we've said you should look at it and close it. For four years we have said you have got to take another look at the way you encourage business in Manitoba other than the policies that have been in the past in this province, and I'm man enough to say, even while we were here. Because I'm not like the Minister of Labour who keeps talking about 1959, I'm saying today is today and there are new ways of doing things. We have said that, but your philosophies will not allow you to do it.

A MEMBER: You're really on your way, Frank.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Every Minister, every Minister on that side, Mr. Speaker, has really tried to have his own personal little empire. When they couldn't do it through the Development Corporation or some way, we get the Minister of Agriculture who wants a whey plant; the Minister in charge of the telephones, he wants to get into computers; we've got, you know, any number of Ministers wanting to have their own little game.

A MEMBER: The Minister of Industry and Commerce wants an airport.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yes. Well he has an air force. I heard from the other side, how would you do it? That happens to be the very next note I have here. I have seen very little encouragement for industry in this province from the Department of Industry and Commerce except a lot of wind-bag talking which has produced nothing. I assure you of that. I have seen legislation within this province which will discourage and harm small businesses.

In exploration alone, we've got small businesses closing up because there is no more exploration or it is down so considerably that it hurts small businesses. So where have we seen, where have we seen a person in Industry and Commerce take the products that are sold in this province from all over the world, if you want to, and say - "Could they be made here in a small town here with twenty-five employees, and a small town here with fifty employees?" - and build up this province in the rural areas with industry that can be done in the small towns. I'll guarantee you my personal business is such as a manufacturers' agent, and I know all these agents, if he couldn't find 200 products that could be manufactured and worked on here tomorrow, I'll eat my shirt and it's never been done. Now you tell me - I just told you one way how to do it. Mr. Speaker, the businessmen in this province are not doing it because businessmen are always aware of a shaky government. Mr. Speaker, I say let's see the change. Let's see it. Let's see it. Let's look through the budget and let's see it.

We are looking to legislation on rent controls. Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech we indicated our policy on rent control. We want to see that legislation very badly and I sincerely hope that the government has looked at it in a very very serious vein. I lived in Regina under rent controls back in the old CCF days and you couldn't get a place to live. Well there were the NDP there at that time so I came back here. The reason I'm here now is I'm here to fight. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that people were paying under-the-table moneys to get apartments they were so scarce. The Regina wartime housing up on the north end of the city at that time should have been eliminated long ago - they were the size of garages is what people were living in - and only because of rent control. In 1950 there was rent controls in effect. It was called the Mediation Board at that time and I'll tell you that it just caused more chaos than you'd ever believe, than you'd ever believe. Mr. Speaker, I have never read a report - maybe there are some around that really say that rent controls are the answer in the situation we have today. So let's hope that this government has taken all of those things into consideration and when they bring it in it's something that can be put on without harming the

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) economy of this province and also helping, not discouraging people from building because the government will have to build houses, they'll never build enough. You're kidding yourself if you think they will. They never build enough. So you'd better be very careful of your rent control legislation.

As a matter of fact the last report out of Manitoba's Survey on Rent Controls right from this province is very much against it. It was by the University of - well I'm not sure which University it was - the University of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, and it says that rent controls are disastrous, absolutely disastrous for any area. Well take that and think about it and be very serious when you bring in the legislation as to what you're going to do to Manitoba. And it can't be on for long. I warn you it's the hardest thing in the world to take off once you put it on. But it can't be on for long or we'll have complete chaos in Manitoba as I saw in Saskatchewan under rent controls.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention at this time I also received a brochure from the Premier that came to my door and I'm always very pleased to get a brochure from the Premier - more pleased than some of you would think I would be. But I would wish again and I would like to repeat again that when the Premier deducts, when the Premier deducts the education tax rebate, you have to add in the property taxes as well. Because he deducts them from your Manitoba tax one day, and then when you get your tax bill he takes it off there too, and the Premier stands up and he says - always makes people believe that you're getting that rebate off everything. You're only getting that rebate once and the only time you can deduct it is when you add in both your provincial and your real taxes. I wish, I wish that people would read the accounts of an accountant in the paper that showed that. I wish that people would examine that and tell me, or agree with me that you can only get that rebate once. The Premier always tries to give that rebate away twice, and the Minister of Agriculture tries to give it away every time he speaks, and the Minister of Education tries to give it away every time he speaks, and it fools the people. As a matter of fact it fooled the press. They haven't seen through it yet and they go to their accountants down at the Free Press and take a look at it and take a look at the accounts of everything last year: The Budget and all that goes with it; the Budget speech and everything in there, you will find that the Premier takes that off just about every time he deducts something. Here we've got a cost to the people of Manitoba, we'll deduct this tax. Here we've got another cost to the people of Manitoba, we'll deduct the same tax, and it happens all the way through it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly, not briefly, I would like to end up by having some discussion with this Legislature about the chaos that this government has put the City of Winnipeg in with the Unicity Act, and I would sincerely hope that they are now in a position to admit, admit that the structure of the City of Winnipeg at the present time which was legislated by this government has caused the people of Winnipeg higher taxes, less representation and not nearly as good a government, and not because of the men that are there because they're working under a structure that makes it almost impossible for them. You ought to research some of the things I've said about it before as you introduced the lobby system - and I said that two years ago - into the City of Winnipeg. You took a city or any area, or even a municipality, which should never have partisan politics involved in it and you threw it into a situation which sides against one another and a lobby situation. You've come back now, and most of the people on that side that I've heard speak said, "Oh we can solve that because we've got too many councillors." The answer to the City of Winnipeg is not too many councillors. If you cut the councillors in the City of Winnipeg you are going to do a complete reversal of democracy. --(Interjection)--I assure you you will.

In the Federal Government you have so many members taking care of the whole of Canada. In this Legislature you have 57 taking care of the whole of Manitoba. And local government has been the government that was supposed to be close to the people. If you turn around and cut those aldermen you may as well, you may as well say you're reversing the democratic system of people's representation to the man, to the people that they have to complain to about their garbage and everything of that nature.

A MEMBER: Right on.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. F. JOHNSTON: So if you go ahead and, as we've heard said from that side, just think that your answer is to cut politicians in the civic area, you're wrong. We had a 103 before Unicity, we've got 50 now at double the cost of 103. More than double the cost of the 103. Your legislation that you brought in has brought chaos to the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, this government is going to have to, whether they like it or not, whether they like it or not they're going to have to discard that little blue book with a few pages in it that was taken by the Member from St. Johns around to all the areas before this was done, the hearings, the recommendations that were in that White Paper, and you're going to have to burn it right on the front steps out there; and whether you like it or not you're going to have to take a look at the Boundaries Commission report that was written just before and as you came in, presented as you came in the government.

The Boundaries Commission report: in that report it did not make any specific suggestions, it only made recommendations; it was a report, and that's all there was to it. And it shows you what it would cost, it told you what it would cost if you went to nine, three, five, six, it had all the way in there and it gave you a basis to work from. But it was tossed out because within that report it happened to say that nine cities would be the most economical and everybody jumped up and said, "Nine cities, isn't that ridiculous!" So they tossed it out. But it was only a report. Now you are going to have to take a close look at it because if you do not have a situation where you have a regional government with more autonomy in the local areas, you're just heading for more chaos. And it's been proven. It's been proven that the people are the ones that are suffering because the aldermen and councillors do not have a good structure to work under. And the sooner the government raises their head and realizes that, the better off the City of Winnipeg is going to be; and the better off the people are going to be.

Mr. Speaker, I always feel very badly about the fact I . . . The Minister of Urban Affairs, who was a mayor in one of the cities of Winnipeg previous to Unicity - and I might say one of the better mayors in our area, the Minister of Urban Affairs - I always felt that he was not a person who completely believed - and this is my feeling - that Unicity was the best thing for this area or complete amalgamation of all the areas. I was very disappointed the day the Member from St. Johns said in this House that we shared committee rooms together during an election and he was really able to convince him that this was the right thing to do and the best thing to do. Not exactly in those words but it was there.

I'm sorry that he did, and we have a Minister of Urban Affairs now finally that knows something about urban affairs in Manitoba, and in the City of Winnipeg especially, and I sincerely hope, I sincerely hope that after the hearings that are on, or have been on and are on, that he take a close look at the advantage of having certain autonomies in areas with a regional type government. And if you don't take a good look at it you're going to be in trouble. Mind you somebody in this House may stand up and say I fought a certain bill last year that I said was regional government for rural Manitoba. I don't believe in it for rural Manitoba because you can't afford it out there right now but unless you go to it in Manitoba and take a clear look at it, you're in for trouble.

There are certain areas of responsibility that should be handled by a regional government and certain areas of responsibility that should be handled by a local body with autonomy to handle it, and they're very well defined. We've had ten years of experience of Metro, we could take the good and the bad; and we've had five years of complete chaos, complete chaos in the City of Winnipeg structure which was put in by this government and led by the Member from St. Johns. I must say, I must say that the Minister of Mines and Resources was very proud to present that legislation that night and I know he thinks that way too. But I say to them, take another look at it because the City of Winnipeg cannot continue the way it is.

Mr. Speaker, I hear from the other side of the House that there are going to be some changes and I now hope that they are going to go to what is basically common sense as far as the city is concerned. Let's not just have another situation where you made a

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) mess of something and now you're going to make a bigger mess of it, because that's what this government has been doing for six years. I assure you that that's what you've been doing. You jump from one thing to another all the time. It's just amazing, just amazing how you do it. And on the basis . . . I don't know what basis you do it under. It's not the philosophy of the NDP. It's not the philosophy of the NDP to become the rich entrepreneurs, the big land owners, and all that. --(Interjection)-- Is it? You keep telling us it isn't. But you are gradually becoming the big bosses and the fellows who rob Peter to pay Paul, or if you want, to jump from one chaos to another. And your one chaos to another is costing the people of Manitoba a fortune. The people of Manitoba are just not going to be able to put their hands in their pockets any more; and the reduction of Budget saying we held the line, is nothing unless you've cut out some of your crazy spending, unless you've come down to plain common sense and started looking at the people's pocket instead of many of your own socialist ambitions, we're going to be in real trouble. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's now five o'clock and I presume that I can very likely conclude before the adjournment hour. If not, if I am unable to complete my remarks before five then I will call it five-thirty at that particular time.

I'd like to begin by first congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, on once again being in charge of our deliberations, and if the last two days can be looked upon as a barometer of how you're going to keep us in line, I think that the proceedings will be better than they have been in the past. I think that the last couple of days will show that you're not going to let us get away with anything contravening our regulations in the House.

I would like to also congratulate my colleague from Logan, who is not present at the moment, but on his appointment as Deputy Minister - Deputy Speaker, and also my two colleagues the Member for Wellington, who has moved the acceptance for the Speech from the Throne, and the seconder, my colleague from Churchill. They both made very good contributions to the debate. (Hear hear)

Perhaps we should begin by making a few short comments. I'm not going to waste much time speaking about the Opposition. They seem to be having enough trouble without us on this side causing any more. It's been sad to watch the inner conflict that has taken place in the Conservative Party, the Opposition, and I suppose it's all part of our democratic system.

You know, I watched with a little bit of sadness as I saw the former leader blindfolded being led to face the firing squad. I was a little sad because I had a great deal of respect for the former leader and the Member for River Heights. --(Interjection)-- I did always say that I felt that he was a very able and capable person and I've mentioned that on more than one occasion. The new leader I do not know very well, I've only met him once, and I certainly don't know where he stands, but I think that I can suspect very strongly that he portrays insofar as I'm concerned, to myself he portrays an image whereby he would champion the corporate sector of our society rather than be concerned about the people. Now I stand to be corrected; perhaps the months or the years ahead will tell us where he stands.

As far as my Liberal friends, the small Liberal group on the opposite, I listened with interest to the Member for Portage la Prairie and he made a very good speech in his most calm manner. He covered the waterfront. I don't intend to go into the particulars of what his remarks were, but I can say that the Liberal Party is having more and more difficulty in selling their ideas to the people of Manitoba, and particularly in rural Manitoba. The group seems to be an urban-city-oriented party now and I'm sure it appears that they have lost their credibility in the rural areas.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, in my remarks to try and keep to my constituency and other matters relating to my constituency. I'm sure that everyone is aware that in 1975 I believe that my constituency suffered very very heavy losses because of excessive rainfall, particularly in the fall. There were very very severe losses in crops and hay losses. The majority of the crops were not removed until after the frost set in. In fact

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ADAM cont'd) I think in December we were still trying to harvest. Of course they didn't wait for frost, they tried all throughout the fall to try and get their crop off; and also the Interlake country was hit just as severely, if not more so, than the constituency of Ste. Rose, but they tried to take their crops off that had lain in the swamp for many weeks and they tried with every imagination that they could muster, you know, hooking two tractors in front of the combine or in front of the swather to swath the grain, and as a result of this you can go down and see many many fields, field after field with very deep ruts between every swath, these fields are practically ruined and may take some time to bring back into the proper condition to again seed and crop. This has been the situation there and as I mentioned earlier, the harvesting didn't get under way till after the frost and of course with heavy losses to the grades and the yield.

Now we had some of the fellows that went as far as to modify their combines and swathers with half-tracks that they had found - secondhand half-tracks used on tractors - in order to be able to move in these very wet fields. We've also seen a lot of extra expenses caused because of this heavy rain. Many of the farmers have turned to buying rice tires in order to attempt to get through their fields and then this immediately brought on other problems, and in fact in one area there were three Massey combines that had been installed with these rice tires that immediately broke down three transmissions because the transmissions were not designed for that type of traction. The transmissions were \$700.00 apiece to repair. The tires I believe were very very expensive as well, and it's the same component that was breaking down when they were changing their tires. So it was a very very sad situation in my constituency both to the income of the people in there, the farmers, and for the province as a whole.

There were some towns and many farm homes were flooded and particularly Ste. Rose was very hard hit. The water was laying in the streets for about a week. There was very extensive flooding in homes and basements. But fortunately the Provincial Government along with assistance - cost-shared assistance from the Federal Government - were able to pick up some of the damages that were sustained by the people in Ste. Rose and in the surrounding areas.

It was also necessary for the Provincial Government to . . . Because of the very extensive feed losses for livestock, many people were faced with the very grim prospect of having to sell their livestock at extremely depressed prices or go out and buy extremely high priced feed. Fortunately the province was able to come in with an assistance program to assist those who had lost their unharvested hay, and harvested hay, and help them to at least try and save the basic cow herd.

However, this did not solve all the problem. It was fine to be able to have programs to find feed and to also provide assistance to buying this feed; there was other problems of a greater magnitude and that is the price that the free market system was providing for those who sold cattle and livestock - and the weaknesses in the free market system were much more pronounced in the livestock industry during 1975 than for many many years - and as long as I can recall I've never seen such depressed conditions in the livestock industry, and particularly in the cow-calf end of it.

Many farmers were faced with the specter of bankruptcy last fall: Lost crops, lost hay supplies and prices that would not even come near to being realistic; cows were going for as low as \$80.00 a head, and people being forced to reduce their herds even with the assistance programs. I don't think there were any . . . They'd have to be a very outstanding animal to get anywhere near \$200.00 for a cow. It had to be outstanding. There were many cases where cattle were selling - cows were selling from six cents up to about sixteen cents in that neighbourhood, and this was just terrible, a terrible situation.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, this is a bigger problem than the flood really, because it seems that it comes too often; this boom and bust cycle in the prices of our livestock is far worse in my opinion than an occasional flood every four years or every five years or every ten years.

I believe that if we are to have the viable livestock industry in Canada that farmers will have to demand major changes in the old free market system that we have been using

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ADAM cont'd) for decades and they will have to decide - the farmers will have to make that decision - as to whether they wish to continue to operate under a boom and bust system of a free market system or whether they wish to opt for a different form of marketing their produce that will provide a better income and a more stable income for themselves.

A MEMBER: A marketing board?

MR. ADAM: That will be up to them. I hear a member say a marketing board. Well that may be one answer.

Now I understand that in the United States at the present time the farmers' union has called for a holding action on, I believe it's oil seeds and perhaps other grains as well. I believe that holding action has been under way for about a week now in the United States. Now this may be one alternative, I don't know, but the Honourable Member for Arthur says a marketing board, well, maybe so; I don't know, that'll be up to the farmers. But they will have to decide; they'll have to make a very serious, and take a very long look at what's happening because there's no way that this industry can survive under that system. They cannot expect the public to come in with subsidies and subsidies after subsidies, so we have to put some order I would think into the livestock industry. I'm waiting with anxiety as to what the commission, the Beef Commission that was appointed last year by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs, I'm waiting anxiously to see what they have to say, and they have made an in-depth study, and I am also waiting - I believe there is another commission at the federal level that was looking into the beef aspects. I would like to hear what they have to say, and we will see if the two compare. It'll be interesting to see just how they compare.

As I mentioned, the situation in the livestock industry was so bad that some measures were taken by the Minister of Agriculture. In my area there are many farmers who lease from the Crown, lease land from the people of Manitoba, and the formula was changed to reflect more the economic rent of these lands to the farmer rather than a set formula of royalties and increase in poundage of beef for the five month grazing period. This has resulted in a considerable saving to the ranchers in my area and it was very very timely because we were hit with a flood, we were hit with very depressed markets, and it was very timely that the Minister brought in this program to at least alleviate some of the problems, and I would certainly commend the Minister for having brought in the new formula for Crown lands. However, this is not going to put the livestock industry on a sound basis. It's going to take more than that, and this is unfortunate, but that's the way it is. Now in recognition to the very serious problems that were faced by our livestock producers, of course a new and very innovative program was introduced in Manitoba, and of course I'm referring to . . . the Beef Assurance Program was introduced in 1975. I have no doubt whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, that this program saved many ranchers from going out of business last fall. It's apparently very very popular and nearly six thousand farmers have participated in the program and nearly \$19 million in subsidy was advanced to the cow-calf operators. Now, this alone will prove that there was a shortfall of \$19 million by the free market system - there's a shortfall somewhere. Why wouldn't the free market provide at least the cost of production? But it doesn't, and it did not, it has not, and it probably never will. It's a boom and bust cycle. And I assure you, Sir, that you know we never heard a - the Opposition were very conspicuously silent when that program was announced, very much so. They didn't condemn it. They didn't dare. They didn't applaud it because they didn't want to give us any credit.

There was one exception, now I apologize, there was one exception to that. You know, the Honourable Member for Roblin he objected to that program, I believe, I noticed in one of his articles in the Russell Banner - I think it is - he objected to the program. Of course the Member for Roblin is quite adept and has a habit of making statements without verifying the facts. I don't want to be uncomplimentary, but some of the statements that he made in his article were not based on fact, and furthermore they were misleading and they were without foundation.--(Interjection)--It's good reading. It's good

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ADAM cont'd) reading for some of you fellows who want to see how little concerned the Honourable Member for Roblin is about facts. The article appeared in the Russell Banner on December 4th, 1975, and under the heading of "Wally McKenzie, MLA".

In the article he states and I quote: "In my view, which is shared by many, the beef industry has had more stability than any other sector of the agriculture industry, for years and years and more years in the past." That is the Honourable Member's - I took this quote directly out of the article. Now I'm not sure whether he's responsible for it but his name was at the top, so I have to presume that it was his statement.

Mr. Speaker, during the past 20 years, beef prices have fluctuated from a low of \$16.92 per hundred weight to \$53.99 per hundred weight, and this is what the honourable member calls "stable market." And I leave it to the farmers of this province to decide if they are satisfied with that fluctuation, and the honourable member's statement that the free market system has provided stable beef prices; I'll let the farmers decide.

The honourable member pretends that he is afraid if the government gives the farmers too much help they will produce too much livestock, according to his article. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, Canada is a net importer of beef and almost everything else. In 1975 Canada had a net importation of 70 million pounds of beef. That doesn't look to me like a surplus. Canada imported two and a half million pounds of pork, and that doesn't look like a surplus. Fifty million pounds of cheese were imported in 1975, that's not a surplus. Twenty million chickens were imported to Canada - those are the chickens that the Honourable Member for Morris was going to . . . the ninety million chickens that he was complaining - the little red hen - I'm sure he recalls that remark.--(Interjection)-- Twenty million chickens were imported last year and four million turkeys, So, my colleague is not growing enough turkey, my colleague from Arborg is not growing enough turkeys. But the point is, Mr. Speaker, that after 100 years, a hundred years of Liberal and Conservative administration in Ottawa and agricultural policies that they have come out with, you know, Canada is scarcely able to feed itself. We heard the Member for Lakeside criticize the . . . Oh, he was applauding the free system, the free market system, the freehold system of agriculture, and he was comparing that with the problems that the Soviet Union were experiencing in their agriculture and, you know, we don't have to look at the Soviet Union with 200 million or 270 million people to feed. Compared to our little 22 million here in Canada - we can't even feed ourselves - you know, it's a possibility that the problems that exist in the Soviet Union, I don't think they can be compared to ours, I think that our record is not as good as theirs. It's certainly not as good as that of China. China is almost self-sufficient now on food although they are still importing some grain from us from time to time.

But the Honourable Member for Lakeside is trying to suggest that we've got an unblemished record, that everything is free sailing under our system. I can tell you that we're very inefficient. You know, I farm 1,000 acres and I have a hard time to feed one man and his wife, and that's me. And there's enough land there and enough area to feed maybe 300 people. There's lots of room there only you have to get the people to work to be efficient. It's impossible, impossible to be. Don't say that we're efficient, we're unable to feed ourselves yet.

You know, the Conservative attitude, if you want the Conservative attitude, Mr. Speaker, it's clearly exposed in the TED Report. Let them look at their own Bible, let them look at their own manifesto. They like to talk about the Regina Manifesto. Look at their own manifesto, the TED Report.--(Interjection)--What does it say? Published by the Tories at a cost of \$500,000 to the taxpayers. Let's look at page 59, Mr. Speaker, which recommends that the number of farmers be reduced to 20,000 by 1980. That's what they recommend, Mr. Speaker, that's what they recommend. They would be forced off the farm faster than the attrition rate, that is what it says. And for the new members who are newly elected let them look at the TED Report - I don't know if they have looked at it yet - page 59, that the farmers must be removed from the farms faster than the natural attrition rate.--(Interjection)--That is how, that is how. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives, the Tory Government, of which the Honourable Member for Roblin is a member, they believe that the best way to eliminate the farm problem is

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ADAM cont'd) to eliminate half of the farmers by 1980. That's what they believe; that's a good way to get rid of the problems, get rid of the farmers first and then you don't have a problem anymore. I'm not sure the new member - Is it Crescentwood?--(Interjection)--Wolseley? - You know, you're looking with interest or listening with interest at my remarks. Take a look at page 59 of the TED Report, that's your own Bible, your manifesto.

MR. WATT: I wonder if the honourable member would submit to a question at this point.

MR. ADAM: Later, later on. Much later. I want to advise the Honourable Member for Arthur in all due respect he has so much difficulty asking a question that I wouldn't submit to a question.

Mr. Speaker, last year we were out on the land hearings and in my opinion the land lease policy that was introduced again by our government was a program to assist the transfer of land from one generation to the next. In my opinion it was just another agricultural program to assist farmers in their operation. That has been an ever-growing problem, and that is the transfer of land from one generation to the next, because of various reasons, because of various factors, because of the fluctuations in market price for agriculture produce, because of the high cost of land or speculation, whatever the cause it was an ever-increasing problem. The National Farmers' Union has been trying to bring that to our attention for many years, that the average age of the farmers, I think back in 1969 was 57 years, or thereabouts, and this indicated that we only had a few years to come up with a solution, because when you get past 60 you're not as efficient physically as you are when you're 35 or 25.

A MEMBER: I'll sure buy that.

MR. ADAM: I was very disappointed that last year . . . and you know it appeared, Mr. Speaker, that those land hearings were - what is the word now, the term? - I think that they "packed them," I think that's the word, they packed the meetings. I think I can say with all, you know, without a doubt that I believe the Conservative Party packed those meetings. They had their boys there.

Now the Honourable Member for Riel I'm sure packed those meetings and I think they were all really tuned in what they had to say, what kind of briefs they had to present to the land hearing committee. I think they had caucuses in every town with the local farmers and they had their hand-picked men in there.--(Interjection)--Oh, that was this year. I'm coming to that after supper, I'm going to come to that after supper.

Mr. Speaker, the province and the people of Manitoba are searching for a long term and a good land policy for the Province of Manitoba and those people over there did everything they could to sabotage that. They did everything they could--(Interjection)--I say "shame", I say "shame". I say, "shame". They used the land hearings as a forum to condemn an agricultural policy, the land lease policy, which has nothing to do with land policy, it's a land-lease program.

I was just wondering what happened this year, what happened this year in the hearings. You know, wherever we went last year it was the same thing. Last year we heard the same rhetoric from place to place, town to town, and this year we completed our hearings and somehow again the opposition members on the land hearing committee were so silent I wonder what happened over the winter months to make them change their minds or what happened over the winter months . . . I'm afraid they must have had some backfeed, backfeed from the constituencies, a feedback, backfeed. I'll continue after supper, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. I would suggest the honourable member only has five minutes. If the House is amenable I'll let him have it now. (Agreed) Very well.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence I have much more than five minutes to speak so I will withhold my remarks for the Budget Speech or some other estimate.

MR. SPEAKER: I am recessing the House until 8:00 p.m. The floor will be the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose for five minutes. Accordingly I leave the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m.