

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the loge on my right where we have as our guest the Honourable Bernard Landry, Minister of State for Economic Development, and representing the constituency of Fabre in the National Assembly of the Government of Quebec. On behalf of the Honourable Members, I welcome him here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Continuing Education.

HONOURABLE BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the **Seventh Annual Report (1975-76) of the Manitoba Arts Council.**

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

HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the **Annual Report of the Manitoba Telephone System for the Year Ending March 31, 1976.** Members of the Assembly had been presented with a report dated October 18, 1976.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STERLING LYON (Souris-Killarney): I rise on a matter affecting the privileges of all members of the House. Yesterday first reading was given to a bill to amend The Judges Act, in Manitoba. In today's newspaper I believe it is the Winnipeg Free Press, there appears a dissertation by the Honourable the Attorney-General with respect to the contents of that bill, the bill not as yet having been distributed to any Members of this House to the best of my knowledge. I merely raise this point, Mr. Speaker, to indicate and to have you indicate, Sir, to the Members of the front bench that this House is sovereign with respect to the receipt of legislation. If the Minister wishes to speak to outside persons such as the media with respect to the contents of the bill, let him do so after the House has been seized of the contents, but not before.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader. — Interjections — Order, please.

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to debate the question of privilege. The Honourable Member has made his point and I suppose the Attorney-General will deal with it if he wishes to.

I have a matter not of substantive privilege, but apparently a difficulty in communication, Mr. Speaker, out of the remarks that I made yesterday. I am quoted in the Winnipeg Free Press as saying with respect to the mining companies, "We have to give them concessions to make sure that they proceed." Mr. Speaker, I made no such statement. As a matter of fact, I thought that the total effect of my speech was that we will make no concessions to the mining companies and depend on them proceeding in accordance with that. Normally it is not a matter of great substance, but the policy of the government is not to make concessions and I made no such statement.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister: In the light of statements that the First Minister made last evening to a political meeting, I take it in the constituency of Wolseley, concerning the future participation of Manitoba in the Anti-Inflation Board controls, I wonder if he would be good enough to advise, this Chamber second, of course, to his own political meeting, as to what the future of Manitoba will be with respect to AIB controls.

As a second part, Mr. Speaker, could we have some guarantee from the First Minister that hereafter he will advise the House of matters of policy rather than his own . . . —(Interjections)—

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

MR. LYON: . . . Mr. Speaker, that hereafter when the House is in session that he will advise the House of matters of policy rather than his own political meetings?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, just to give a short form reply to that question, I would indicate to the Honourable, the Leader of the Opposition, that what I indicated at the meeting last evening was no different in substance to what I had indicated on at least two other previous occasions last autumn and early this year; and that

secondly, what was indicated there was based on ample precedent in the sense that my honourable friend has not been known particularly for containing all of his statements and announcements of anything new, if indeed anything is new in what he has said to this House, but rather to meetings of his particular political party.

And just to give a more specific precedent, Mr. Speaker, I recall very clearly that when the first rumblings were made by the Conservative Party when it was in office with respect to the consolidation of schools, it was done at least three months in advance of any introduction of legislation.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in response to the second part of my question, could we have some undertaking from the First Minister that when the House is sitting and the House was not sitting last Fall, that this House will be favoured with statements of public policy before his own political meetings are?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would say in all fairness, at least to the same extent as is practiced by my honourable friend.

A MEMBER: That's right. And well remembered by those of us who are still here.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I am sure my honourable friend would wish me to respond by saying that when we occupy those benches, we will behave properly. —(Interjections)—

MR. SCHREYER: If it is in order, Sir, it would be in order for me to rejoin that my honourable friend holds a responsible position of Her Majesty's Leader of the Loyal Opposition and he has an equally solemn obligation to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We are in the question period; there will be no rebuttals anymore. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. —(Interjections)— ORDER PLEASE! If the Honourable gentleman has a . . . order please. Order please on both sides of the House. This is the question period if there are any questions, we will proceed. If not, we will both . . . The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Mines and would ask him if he could confirm that most gravel pit owners in Manitoba will be forced to submit a \$5,000 cash bond as of January 1st, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, he said "most something owners" and I missed the word.

MR. BANMAN: That all gravel pit owners will be forced to post a \$5,000 cash . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there are new regulations with regard to gravel pits. I don't remember each specific one but I will check for my honourable friend and give him the information.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister then would also check with his department and see if the cash deposit could reflect more to the benefit of the gravel pit owners the size of the operation because it's onerous right now.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would agree with my honourable friend that sometimes the bureaucracy operates on a level basis when there should be differences and I will see whether there can be modifications owner. made, if it's doing a hardship to any particular . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Development and I would ask him whether his department will be investigating the reported contention of one Mr. Ken Spence, a community official at South Indian Lake, to the effect that half the welfare recipients at South Indian would not need to be on welfare if they would take available jobs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HONOURABLE LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, if there is any formal accusation or statement made that reaches my office it will be investigated. That's all I can say.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister as a supplementary whether he has not heard from community officials directly in South Indian Lake to that effect himself?

MR. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Speaker, and I doubt that I will because I think that my honourable friend is talking about something that should be dealt with with the Federal Government.

MR. SHERMAN: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since when did Manitoba Hydro come under the aegis of the Federal Government? —(Interjections)— The jobs are at Hydro.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Finance I direct a question to the First Minister. It is with regards to the borrowings of Manitoba on the foreign money market. In view of the speculation of the drop in the value of the Canadian dollar, I wonder if the First Minister can indicate what impact this will have on the borrowings of the Province of Manitoba that have been made in the recent past and those that are now going on the market in the fairly new future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as my honourable friend the Member for Riel knows, it is not possible to give a standing answer that is relevant to all particular issues because the terms of each issue vary. But just to attempt to answer the question by way of example, the most recent issue in Europe which was at 5 ¼ percent according to quick calculations would require approximately a 17 percent evaluation of the Canadian dollar in relation to the Swiss franc in order to come to the same

ultimate net cost, as though it were borrowed in the North American market. So, on the basis of that one case in point, it gives my honourable friend some appreciation of the latitude involved.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister could indicate, with regards to the recent announcement about borrowing in the Japanese currency, the Japanese yen, some 40 million dollars of borrowing; is that to be repaid in Japanese currency or is it to be repaid on the value of the Canadian dollar?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I will take it as notice because I am not absolutely certain but usually on first time issues of that kind in a market we try to get a split — in repayment terms, half in the currency of the lender nation and half in the currency of the borrowing nation — but I will check.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, there is a speculation in the last couple of days that the Canadian dollar may drop to something in the order of 92 cents American. In view of the fact that most of the borrowings do tend to be those from American markets or likely end tied to the American dollar, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether it would be the intention, in those markets, of the Provincial Government to borrow on the basis of repayment according to the Canadian dollar or the American.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting for a moment they aren't valid questions, but they aren't questions that lend themselves to any terse reply. Naturally we are concerned about any speculative prospects of significant changes in the international value of the Canadian dollar, but when my honourable friend starts talking in terms of 92 cents and the like, he should remember that it isn't since the good old days of Alvin Hamilton *et al.* that we've been having that kind of prospect stare us in the face.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and ask him if the Cabinet is meeting with the Union of Manitoba Municipalities today?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HONOURABLE BILLIE URUSKI (St. George): Yes, Mr. Speaker. As far as I am aware, the meeting is still on; I have had no calls to the contrary to my office, but I would imagine with the condition of the highways today that it is possible that a full meeting may not be held.

MR. FERGUSON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister indicate to the House why this meeting has been held off until the point where the House is in session?

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable the First Minister and it is based on a report that the Manitoba Government is paying \$22,470 this year for in theft insurance on senior political appointees the Cabinet. Now, my question, Sir, does the First Minister really consider that the Cabinet should be included. I'm serious about this. I think it's a reflection on elected representatives at large.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, while I have the highest regard for the seriousness of my honourable friend I have no way of being sure that he isn't asking this question with complete tongue-in-cheek. In any case, I would say that as I recall the whole question of theft insurance is handled routinely and is based on a long august tradition going back many years in the history of this province.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, if I may be permitted another tongue-in-cheek question, Mr. Speaker. Did the government take competitive bids before the award was made to the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that as notice because that is an aspect of financial administration that is not really in my direct ken or knowledge. The Honourable Member for St. Johns, I happen to know, is more familiar with those details. I will take it as notice and report back to my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. I direct the same question to the First Minister as the member for Gladstone directed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I would like to know, and the House would like to know, why the Meeting with the municipal people has been delayed until this House is in session for 3:30 this session, afternoon when the Cabinet are supposed to be in this House?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker. I don't know exactly the precise sequence and detail as to how the Meeting date was arrived at. We have met with the Union of Manitoba Municipalities for seven or eight annual regular Meetings and some additional special Meetings, but I would say in final rejoinder to my honourable friend that it is certainly — at least I never recall, my honourable colleague the Minister of Labour may recall — that the previous administration felt answerable to this House as to the scheduling of the time for conducting the business of this province which includes / meeting with local government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the

Honourable, the First Minister, is giving me an opportunity of reply but I don't recall at any time when my friend's office had consulted with me as the Leader of a Party, as to when they were going to meet individual organizations and I may say that there is another Meeting regarding municipalities which I understand will occur in that great city of Portage la Prairie on March 4th. Now, of course, even my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, should be cognizant, if he is not, of the necessity of prior notification so that we can get together to discuss the problems of Manitoba.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Labour has made a statement, may I reply to the— (Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. We're still in the question period. The Honourable Meer for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was going to give the Minister of Labour a chance to speak today, anyway. I was intending to ask him, Sir, whether it is the view of this government that the hiring of new employees at Griffin Steel constitutes strike-breaking.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, it could well be and I'm sure that this is unknowledgeable of my friend opposite as to the contents of labour legislation in Manitoba. I didn't have the opportunity of listening to the Leader of the Opposition but I read some of his guff as placed in the news media of Manitoba.

My direct answer to the Honourable Member from Fort Garry is evidence, of course, of his lack of knowledgeability of labour law in Manitoba because there are no provisions contained in The Manitoba Labour Relations Act or in any labour legislation pertaining to strike breaking.

MR. SHERMAN: Perhaps I could rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker. That was not my question. I think Hansard will show that I asked the question, whether in the view of this Government or this Minister whether that activity constitutes strike breaking.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is inviting me to indicate a personal observation. I hate persecution in the field of labour as I hate persecution in any other field and if my honourable friend thinks an invitation to employees to work is a violation of the general humanitarian principles I leave it to him to judge as to whether it is reasonable or not.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker' and I thank the Minister for his candid, forthright, direct, easily a comprehensible answer. On the basis of that answer I would ask him whether he intends any action between now and next Monday to prevent certain trouble on the picket line.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, there is always the possibility of troubles on so-called picket lines, but in order to further educate — if it is possible — my honourable friend there is no reference to picketing in the labour laws of Manitoba either.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Continuing Education and he's also responsible for the Arts Council. Can the Minister indicate whether he has been in any contact or has made any enquiries concerning the financial difficulties of the university owned radio station which is in the potential of going in default in the next month?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Continuing Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Speaker

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate whether he considers it part of his responsibility to enquire into such a matter and determine whether some assistance might be provided to this radio station from provincial sources?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, if any responsibility rests on anyone I'm sure that the operators of the radio station, if they wish to contact me they know where I can be reached.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe I can raise a further question with the Minister to indicate whether the government is prepared to place any of its own institutional advertising with this station to provide additional sources of revenue for it.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not responsible for the placing of government advertising in any radio station or in any media form.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary then I would address the question perhaps — if it's not to the Minister of Education — to the First Minister. First, could he indicate who is responsible for placing such government advertising and then if once we find that answer we can determine whether they would be prepared to provide some assistance?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. I'd like to ask him if it's his intention to reappoint Mr. Rudy Usick to the Marketing Board come March 1st.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HONOURABLE SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Well, Mr. Speaker' that's a matter of policy but I would state now that I would have no hesitation. He's a very capable individual.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, now that the Honourable the Attorney-General is in his chair I wonder if

he would respond to the earlier Question of Privilege that I raised, he perhaps in the meantime having been informed of what it was, with respect to an undertaking from him and for that matter from his colleagues on the Front Bench that hereafter when the House is sitting matters of legislation will not be revealed to outside sources until the House has seized of the legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that there was anything at all improper in communicating the general nature of intended legislation to, in this case, reporters outside the House. I am not claiming to be a parliamentary expert like the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and the Minister of Labour, but it is not my understanding that there has been any such understanding given nor that there is anything improper in that respect.

MR. LYON: I trust in the light of the Question of Privilege that has been raised, my honourable friend will now be aware of that fact.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I'd like to address a question to the Attorney-General now that he is in his seat. Considering that the Attorney-General was present at the apparent public dispute that took place last evening between the landlords and tenants, could the Minister indicate — (Interjection)— Well, that's right. First, could he indicate what the outcome was, but more importantly, could he indicate what the nature of the representation was that they would want to make the Attorney-General and is it going to require some government enquiry investigation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was in company, just in case the honourable member feels that I was all alone in company of the Member for Lakeside for a short period of time — (Interjection)— but my principle role is to listen. — (Interjection)— He was there during the scuffle, I wasn't there during the scuffle, so that he can speak to the scuffle.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAWLEY: I arrived afterwards. But insofar as the meeting of the landlords is concerned, I indicated to them that my honourable colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs could best deal with questions involving rent controls and Rentalsman, etc., but that I was anxious to receive their questions pertaining to the Human Rights Act and the involvement of landlords pertaining to that Act, as well as complaints that they might have in respect to various difficulties in respect to the workings of the judicial system.

We had a number of very good questions posed. I attempted to provide information to the people present and I think generally it was a constructive meeting which was generally information back and forth with no reference to rent control that I can recall while I was there, despite the contrary reports in the media.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Attorney-General indicate if there were any specific charges that were raised concerning the lack of fire safety in the buildings that the tenants were occupying and do these give rise to any investigation on the part of the government?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there certainly were no such points raised by the landlords, but I had an earlier meeting with some of the tenants in which they requested a meeting with me and which I indicated that certainly I was prepared to meet with them. I suspect they may very well raise some of those points with me, of concern that they have pertaining to accommodations.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is also to the Attorney-General relating to the same incident. I would like to ask the Attorney-General if the legal advice supplied by Legal Aid to the tenants was solicited or imposed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: The lawyer that was present was there as a result of Council providing legal services to the of Self Help and there had been a meeting with the Council of Self Help I gather some day or two earlier in which there were requests for various assistance pertaining to by-laws and regulations of the City of Winnipeg.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Public Works. My enquiry is with respect to the state or should we say the health of the Woodsworth building. Is it correct that a memo was circulated to occupants of the building that they were to take care in piling books and heavy loads of material near the outside walls because there was some sagging?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, that question fell flat but the Woodsworth building is okay.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I was wondering if the Minister could not answer the question. While he may attempt to answer it, I would pose him another one. Is it correct that on windy days the overhead enclosed walkway over to the Law Courts building, in the wind twists somewhat and the doors jam and people are caught in the walkway?

Thursday, February 24, 1977

MR. DOERN: Not that I am aware of, Mr. Speaker, but I would point out to the member that almost any large building where there is some airflow from the opening of the front door, etc., has some effect and it wouldn't surprise me and it wouldn't be unusual.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for Logan, an amendment thereto by the Leader of the Opposition, an amendment thereto by the Member for Portage la Prairie, the Honourable Minister for Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I intend to direct most of my comments to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I don't know whether he will be present or not but if not perhaps he will read some of them later.

The Member for Souris-Killarney is a man whom I have known, I guess for the past ten or eleven years. I came in with a team of New Democrats in 1966, some eleven in number, who were then bumped up to twelve in a by-election and finally in 1969 won the government; so since 1966 in this House I have had the honour of knowing the Member for Souris-Killarney and for three of those years sat with him in the House. People have asked me on a number of occasions as to what he is like. The question has been put, "What is he like? You know him, what do you think of him, etc.?" I have said, and I think the statement can be borne out, that first of all he is, in fact, a good reader; that secondly, he speaks with a great deal of cliches and that third, he is unquestionably a right-winger in the mold of his predecessor Walter Weir, former Premier of Manitoba and Bobby Bend who was the Leader of the Liberal Party. So all of us waited with some interest, some genuine interest, for the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, because some of us had waited in effect for eight years for it and others had waited at least a year since he won the nomination, and he took up the sword of free enterprise to attack the socialist hordes. This was his goal, this is what he had sought to do, this is what he said he would do and there are many members of the Conservative Party too who wanted to see just what he would do and how he would do. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in effect he gave himself a self-inflicted wound; that he made a number of mistakes in his speech and I don't think impressed the government or frightened the government and perhaps did not also impress some of his own backbench.

He made some comments which came as no surprise to any of us, that he would let certain things stay and he listed them off, but he didn't make it clear as to whether there would be modifications at a later date. For instance he said, in effect, that Medicare can stay but he didn't say anything about the introduction of deterrent fees or modifications to the program which might have a pretty damaging effect on it.

HE said Pharmacare could stay. He didn't tell us whether he might modify that; or Autopac could stay, or whether or not there would be some competition. He also made some totally inaccurate statements. For instance, he said at one point that sixteen percent of the government's buildings were unoccupied and that, Mr. Speaker, is simply a false statement. We have our own assessments and I quote from a memorandum which was written in the middle of January, from my Deputy to the Chairman of Management Committee, a short paragraph which said as follows: "Attached please find a listing of unoccupied space in 399 buildings administered by the Department of Public Works." The overall vacancy rate is under three percent which I consider to be a remarkable utilization rate. So he gave us the figure of sixteen percent and I don't know where that information came from but it is false information. I gather that the honourable friend's office is picking up all kinds of information. They will take information from anybody, they will take it from strangers, from friends, acquaintances, anonymous phone calls, they take it from the Free Press — they have advertisements. I saw one pamphlet from the member's office, from the Member for Charleswood, and it had a little box in there and it said, in effect, whatever you can get, whatever you can come up with, you give it to us and we will use it, we will fire it against the opposition, against the government. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is a mistake and if they are not too selective they are going to find out they are making too many false statements.

I remember the Leader of the Liberal Party, Gil Molgat, when he was in this House, he had a habit of hitting — I say this to my honourable friends in the Liberal Party — he made the mistake of hitting everything that the government did with full force. It didn't matter how small, it didn't matter how significant, he hit it with everything that he had. The trouble was that after a while people didn't listen to him because they knew that if it was two paperclips that were missing, or whether it was \$100 million, he would say that everything was significant. So, whenever he cried an alarm or cried wolf, after a while people started to ignore what he said and the Tories are falling into that trap. They are going to hit us with everything that they can find, including the kitchen sink.

Mr. Speaker, when you listened to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition and you look at certain parts of it — and I must confess, I haven't re-read it yet, I haven't had an opportunity to do so, but I did listen to his speech — what you really got was a number of cute or clever turns of phrase.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Savage.

MR. DOERN: Yes, savage is the new word, it is a new word in here and I think I even heard a

Federal Liberal use that word the other day.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Socialist.

MR. DOERN: Well socialist is an old word but savage is the in word, it's very trendy, so if anybody wants to be with it, I suggest they start incorporating that in their speeches.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Lloyd is picking it up already.

MR. DOERN: Now, he tried to make a connection between a whole series of unrelated things. For instance, he gave one example about how the Souris River is flooding and the NDP spends money on this. Well, the point is, you know, I don't know the Souris River — the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, he does. It's probably been flooding since the dawn of history and the fact that the NDP spends money on something else, I don't see the connection because the problems of the Souris River in terms of the constituency in southwestern Manitoba are no different today than they were when the Conservatives were in power. There is no difference. The Conservatives could have probably taken some action in that regard. . . . —(Interjection)— Well, that was good, that was good, I will admit that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. DOERN: But don't blame us for doing nothing about the Souris the way you wanted to when you, yourself, of course had roughly ten years in office to make that same correction. You didn't do it then, why should we do it now? There is another "clever example" and I don't know if this was in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition or if this was in that one Tory pamphlet that I saw. It was a really big point. It said that the New Democrats turned down a traffic light for \$35,000 and then they spent \$3.5 million on Gull Harbour. And this is what they are trying to do — they are trying to take isolated things, small things and big things, and put them together and make a connection in the public mind. They gave another example. We're spending \$5 million on critical home repair for people who have homes that need fundamental upgrading and then they say, "Well, the government spent \$50 million." This is a favourite of my friend from Fort Rouge; he's the man who's for the little guy, you know. Like the Liberal Party historically, they are the defender of the little guy and he's the one who is against — like the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues — they are against this program of expenditure. They forget, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to the \$50 million of Public Works buildings, which I'll deal with in a moment, there are many other programs in the core area for the people of the core area. MHRC has given a commitment to build — I don't know whether it's 100 or 200 units in that area. There is a job-creation program specifically designed for that area; there is a critical home repair program specifically, well it will certainly cover the city but it should hit pretty well in that area; there are health and welfare programs, etc. So, to me, this is, you know, it's clever debating, I suppose, but inaccurate and my friend from Wolsely, I hope he didn't say this, I listened to him on the radio. He has a bit of a knack, a bit of a knack for getting a headline now and again. He made a comment which I hope was incorrect where he said that the government's program would be to spend \$50 million on a garage. Now, I hope that I didn't hear him right. I hope that he said it was for a number of buildings including that because the garage component, of course, is million. . . . only, I think a \$2

MR. SHAFRANSKY: It's more than that if you say it that way.

MR. DOERN: Well sure, it's. . . . —(Interjection)— So there are five major buildings in the area, Mr. Speaker. There is a new Autopac building; an MVB building going in there; an Environmental Lab.; a Provincial Court Building; a Provincial Garage and a computer centre. Now, you know, what is the alternative? My honourable friend from Fort Rouge, and the Leader of the Opposition, they don't want this sort of thing. They don't want the government to build. They're against it. Well, I'll tell you what the alternative is. The alternative is to get a developer to build it and then lease it from the developer. That is the alternative.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: No, no. Consult with the Chamber of Commerce first.

MR. DOERN: For instance, the Autopac staff is now in five floors of the Royal Bank. We have Bank of Montreal —(Interjection)— thank you. We have space leased all over the city; we have some of our departments in various locations and a lot of them are rentals and we have decided to consolidate them, first of all for present needs and secondly for future expansion in our own buildings. The opposition wants us to go out and get the developers and the builders and the contractors, give them the money and then lease it back from them. That is the system that they prefer. The Liberal Party, the last office building that they built was the Norquay Building. I want to tell you how that building was built, Mr. Speaker. It's a pretty interesting story. They decided one weekend before they were thrown out of office in 1958, they decided one weekend maybe a few months before, that they were going to get a building going — fast — that they had to show some activity to people, that they had to show that they were doing something. So, they got a bunch of architects together I think on a Friday or Saturday and said, "Could you give us something by Monday?" So, the firm worked night and day, whipped up a few sketches and a few cost figures and that was how the Norquay Building was born. There's a few problems with the Norquay Building, Mr. Speaker, a few problems. For example, people who work there don't like working there. They don't like the long corridors; they don't like the three elevators that are inadequate for the thousand-plus people that are in that building —(Interjection)—

A MEMBER: They don't like the cafeteria.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DOERN: You like my cafeteria, good. So, I'm just saying that is Liberal planning. That was *ad hoc*, snap-the-fingers kind of planning and the Tory planning, the Tory approach is go and rent, lease whatever space you require from developers. Well, you know, we're not surprised with that.

Mr. Speaker, I would also mention again that the choice of the sites, the place that they were located, was from a decision of the City of Winnipeg Council and the Provincial Government. It was a resolution passed by both bodies and the sites for these buildings was picked by a joint team of planners, so if my honourable friends want to criticize the selection of sites, the location of these buildings, they should also go to their friends in City Hall. They should talk to their buddies in Council who voted in favour of this resolution. — (Interjection) — Yes, I'll take one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to interject in the Minister's speech, but the question occurred to me — is it possible perhaps that at the moment, your government is renting more space than any previous administration ever rented before?

MR. DOERN: Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, if we take when the Conservative Party got into office and then when it was defeated ungraciously in 1969, go and look at the figures of the size of the Civil Service at the beginning and at the end; look at the size of the budgets at the beginning and the end and look at the size of leased or built space at the beginning and the end, and you will see it increased and you will also see that in our administration, it increased too. We have been in office, of course, for eight years. So the Leader of the Opposition is against this, but when he comes to me as the Minister of Public Works and asks for more space for his caucus or for his operation or for research people and so on, that's okay and I tell you that in my judgement, that's okay — it is a reasonable request. But he thinks it's fine to ask for more space for the operations of the Conservative Party. He finds it peculiar that the government requires more space when it comes to its operations, including the operations of the parties in the Legislature and the Opposition in the Legislature.

Well, Mr. Speaker, an interesting thing in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition was the fact that he was concerned for the farmer. He expressed, as a rural representative, his concern for the farmer in Manitoba. And you know I would repeat to him what the Honourable Walter Weir once said. He said that any Premier of Manitoba must be able to kick manure off of tractor wheels. Now, he could do that. Our leader certainly knows about that. The Leader of the Opposition wouldn't qualify. If that's a qualification, then he is ruled out by the Weir dictum. He doesn't know anything about farming.

Mr. Speaker, he said that one-third of the Manitoba economy was based on the farmer. What he meant to say was that two-thirds of the Conservative Party is based on the farmer. That's what he meant to say. The old, rural agrarian base of the Conservative Party — that is the concern of the Leader of the Opposition and of the members of the opposition. said practically nothing on the north, where the Conservatives have been wiped out for eight years and he said very little, very little about Winnipeg. All of us who are Winnipeg reps. — 600,000 people sitting out there and the Tory Leader ignores the citizens of Winnipeg in his speech.

Instead he comes out with all his clichés, the socialist, the Marxist dogma — his whole vocabulary from the 1950s that he's lugged along with him into this 1977 Legislature. How dismaying, Mr. Speaker. The only refreshing thing was that he called us Fascists. Well, the old jack boot stuff — the Member for Fort Garry's speech. That was refreshing.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: I'd call them Fascists. How could he do that?

MR. DOERN: We're so used to being called Communists that it's refreshing to be called Fascists because it shows a little balance and shows how absurd this kind of thing is.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, the funniest thing of all was the Member for Sturgeon Creek. You know he got the prize the other day. He said "Hitler had the National Socialist Party". The word socialist is in that thing. You have to watch words, Mr. Speaker. They creep up on you. They sneak up on you. I could see the Member for Sturgeon Creek peering over his shoulder all the time looking for a word sneaking or creeping over his shoulder. I'll bet you, Mr. Speaker, that in the home of the Member for Sturgeon Creek there isn't a single book with words in it. afraid of words. He just has picture books because he doesn't like the idea of words. Coloring books, but certainly no books with words. You have to watch words.

Mr. Speaker, we have watched with some interest how the Conservative Party acts in terms of leadership. They have a famous tradition about knifing their leaders. You know that's what they're famous for. I can understand it. I appreciate that intellectually to this extent: when you're out it's hard getting in. You know, the Liberals federally have done very, very well — going back to MacKenzie King and so on. I'm no fan of theirs, I'm no admirer of Liberal leaders but they are successful. They are hard-nosed political realists. The Tories; who are more idealistic, have had the problem and dilemma of getting in in general in Canada against the Liberals and now in Manitoba against the New Democrats. And they'll do anything to get into power. After Duff Roblin their troubles started. They then went to the Honourable Walter Weir as their leader and he didn't work out so they got rid of him. Then they picked the Honourable Sidney Spivak, and he didn't work out. He hasn't been here for

quite a while. He didn't work out. They got rid of him. Now they're getting their new leader, the Honourable Sterling Lyon. And I can tell you this — God help him if he doesn't in this election because he'll be gone within twelve months, do well and they will then have a new leader to give it a try once more.

Mr. Speaker, in 1967, when they took their first leader they had an opportunity of picking their present leader and they didn't go for him and I'll tell you why. The backbench was determined — this is a history lesson for the Member for Fort Garry and others — they didn't like the Leader of the Opposition because he had an acid tongue and he used his own ability and agility with devastating results in caucus against his own members. They were determined not to have that man as leader and they voted against him. Why, some of them even voted for the Member for Lakeside. Remember that? They were so mad at the present leader that they even voted for the Member for Lakeside. Now that shows, I think, the air of desperation in those ranks. But, in 1976, they chose the present leader. But even though they have a new leader, Mr. Speaker, he does not command the support of a substantial segment of the Conservative Party. There are a lot of Conservatives out there and a few in here who do not support the present leader (a sizable segment).

Mr. Speaker, I think the evidence of this is coming. It has come already and it will come more in the next few months. It is coming in the form of challenges in the various ridings. The Member for Crescentwood was challenged, not as an individual, but challenged in terms of the conflict of the old leader and the new leader. The Member for Rock Lake was challenged by someone who was from the other side. So those are the sort of manifestations that you are going to see.

Now there's a difference, Mr. Speaker. My friend from Fort Garry asks about challenges that are forthcoming in this Party. One to me; one to others. I'll tell you the difference. Those are personal challenges. That is not a leadership fight, grit large, in terms of two individual candidates. There is personal ambition and any individual may seek nomination against anyone else in your Party or ours. The difference is this: our leader has the full support of this caucus and this party and theirs does not.

It's also evident in the maneuvering that's going on now in the Tory Party now in terms of their convention — Oh, they don't want this convention. They had in booked. I think there's supposed to be one, and then they forgot about it, and then they went out and booked a hotel and then to make sure they booked another hotel and now they might have a convention.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, when the member mentioned getting information from anybody in rumours can he tell me where he got the information from, that he just repeated.

MR. DOERN: From reliable sources, Mr. Speaker. I must get on the mailing list. I would like to get on someone's mailing list, maybe the Member for Wolseley or someone else can put me on so I can read those pamphlets because I find them very entertaining.

Mr. Speaker, we welcome very much, in the government, the election of the present Leader of the Conservative Party as an MLA in this House because all of us are tired of him hiding in the bushes. You know it's very hard to fight an opponent when you can't see him. You don't know what he looks like. You don't know how he's armed. You don't know where he is. Like, for instance, he's not there now. It's much better to have your opponent come out of the bushes and step into the arena because then the fight is fair and it's straightforward.

So, we are delighted that we will have an opportunity of listening to the Conservative leader make these positions. We want him to speak on the issues and we want him to take positions and we know, even though he doesn't like to, he's going to have to vote. And then he is going to establish a record and we will take that record and show it to the people of Manitoba and place it before them and say "Here is their record, and here is our record." And let me tell you, we are all anxiously waiting for that moment, to place those two positions before the people of Manitoba. Because, when he gives his position and makes known where he stands he will be seen for what he is — an obsolete right-winger in the tradition of Bobby Bend and in the tradition of Walter Weir. That's where he is and that's where he's going to stay. And the people of Manitoba have rejected that kind of leadership before and they will reject it again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what did it take to bring this man back into the ring? That, to me, is the question. What did it take? It took only two things. First, a salary of \$36 thousand a year from a slush fund. Second, a safe seat. Those were the two requirements. And, you know, the interesting question now that I hope someone in the side offices will enlighten us on is what's happening to that \$36 thousand a year? Is it \$36 thousand plus \$36 thousand equals \$72 thousand, or is it \$36 thousand kept in the account accumulating interest for the eventual retirement of the leader. That is where it may be. But I would be curious to know, if the members of the opposition would enlighten us on what is happening to that fund.

Now, compare that to our own leader. When he ran, he did not receive a single penny from this Party for his personal welfare and secondly, where did he choose to run? In one of the toughest, for our Party, one of the toughest urban ridings. Now what about the Leader for the Opposition. Where does he run? Oh, he took that tough riding of Souris-Killarney. The question is when you run in

south-western Manitoba, the general question is how many thousands did you win by? You know, it's a case of thousands. It's not a case of hundreds. —(Interjection)— Well, it's similar. And we're going to watch, very closely, whether the Leader of the Opposition has any guts in this election. We know that if he runs in Charleswood that he's chicken. And we know that if he runs in some of the downtown ridings — well the suggestion comes that he should run in Wolseley. Now, there is a good suggestion. And if he runs in some of those other ridings we'll know that he's going for broke. And it will be very curious.

But, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you —(Interjection)— He can run against me. Or he can run in say, Burrows, wherever he likes.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the Leader of the Opposition, if you look at his past record, he lacks courage. He lacks courage. He was prepared to run for leader only when it was handed to him on a platter. That was the deal. You know when I think of him — I was pondering this the other day. It reminded me, Mr. Speaker, of a famous character in fiction, in the Wizard of Oz, the cowardly lion. You recall one of my favourite characters in fiction — the cowardly lion — who was brilliantly played in the movie by Bert Lahr, where he roared and he said "put 'em up, put 'em up," and all that stuff, and he tried to frighten everybody and then the little girl (what was her name) Dorothy, came along and twisted his tail and he started to cry. Then he used his tail to wipe the tears from his eyes. And you know, Mr. Speaker, that's very much like the Leader of the Opposition. I started hearing him roar yesterday. Did you hear him when the gentle Minister of Mines started to punch a few holes in him. He started to roar and he undoubtedly will roar some more. And then, I think, Mr. Speaker, he will then start to cry. And that is still to come.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when he had this slush fund set up for him he was getting \$3 thousand a month. Maybe he still is. But he forgot about it. Now that was unfortunate. It was just one of those things, you know. It just slipped his mind. Mr. Speaker, he couldn't remember getting \$3 thousand a month. You know I can remember when I got \$3 a week from my dad, back in high school days. But he couldn't recall this. He had to go away, lie down and rest, and then he remembered and he went on television and fessed up before the Manitoba audience. Yes, siree, he wanted to correct that. He has a bad memory. You know, I saw him interviewed by Jim Farrell one night; this was December 8th, 1975. I was watching him — I don't know if this was before or after the Tory leadership, was it before or after. You see they don't remember, they have bad memories too. And they said to him, "What are you going to do about unifying the Party, after the leadership contest. What are you going to do?" And he gave an answer and then he wound up with a dramatic statement. He said "And on we go 1967 to , and Jim Farrell said, "1976", and he said, "Oh, yes 1976." I think his problem —(Interjection)— You know what, you're right, it was a cryptic comment, a cryptic comment. Two thousand and sixty-seven I have offered from the back bench.

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

MR. DOERN: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the people of Manitoba don't have to wait — what is it — 98 years for another Conservative Government? That would be too long, that would be too long.

Mr. Speaker, he doesn't know . . .

A MEMBER: Let's have a few words for Public Works, eh Russ.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, he doesn't know where the money came from for his slush fund. He doesn't want to know. No, Sir, he doesn't know and he won't listen if they tell him. Well he doesn't know but we know. You know we know where that money came from and it shouldn't come as a surprise to anybody else. Where would he get hundreds of thousands of dollars for a trust fund or a slush fund, where would it come from? Well, figure it out, insurance companies, mining companies, national corporations and wealthy individuals or businessmen, that's where the money comes from.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DOERN: And then there was ten bucks from the Member for Sturgeon Creek, I forgot that.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about sixes these days, \$600 million — 600 million the Tories say we overspent on Hydro. On television there's a character called "The Six Million Dollar Man". I suggest that your boy is a -\$600,000 man, because that's probably just about the amount of money that has been set aside to take care of the Leader before he became the Leader, when he became the Leader and after he became the Leader.

The interesting thing is, don't you think that your leader should know who is bankrolling him? Don't you think that's important? Wouldn't you want to know who was putting up a heck of a lot of money to finance you? I think I would like to know. I think the people of Manitoba would like to know who is putting up the money for him to run. There's no accounting, no control, anonymous donors. —(Interjection)— the CIA, that is a possibility. I would be worried about that if I were getting money from secret sources. There's an old saying and it goes like this: "He who pays the piper calls the tune", and the people who are paying the piper they know what they're doing. The Leader of the Opposition might not know what he's doing, but I can tell you one thing, the people who are donating money to keep him in office, they know what they're doing, you better believe it. They know that there will be a

return on their investment. There's a lot of people, Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of things that the Leader of the Opposition would like to forget about the years that he was in office. I think one of the things that we have to try to do in this Session is to remind the people about his record before and to clarify his record now. I think the choice ultimately is going to come down to this — since I'm running out of time I'll have to end at this point. In spite of the fact that a clairvoyant said that he would get elected alone' the only one to predict his election, but unfortunately that person also predicted that a woman would be the Mayor of Winnipeg and that Ronald Reagan would be the President of the United States.

So the choice is going to come down to this and this is what it's going to be all about in a few months or in a year or six months. It's going to be the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and the Progressive-Conservative Party with their mysterious, wealthy backers against the Premier of Manitoba and his New Democratic team who have provided eight years of honest and effective government in the public interest.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS McGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on your reappointment to that high position. At one time I wouldn't have said this, but today I do think you add dignity to this House. I also congratulate the Mover and the Seconder. I didn't exactly agree with all their points but I think they did a good job under the conditions.

So I suppose it's normal to reminisce within one's constituency just a little bit. On the east side of my constituency is Virden and a new project there Oo-Za-We-Kwun who at this time is having considerable success but not without problems. The success is certainly showing in the general Rivers area, in the Town of . Rivers and to some of the news people who may have toured out there some years ago when it was folding up. Today the opposite is the case. They're opening up shopping malls, they're opening up new stores. And that from rural Manitoba has got to be encouraging to their member.

On the west side of my territory was an industry that started with a lot of promise, Waldon Industries. Well, it did fail, but again a group of local businessmen at Virden are trying to put that operation back on an economic sound base.

But the biggest factor outside of agriculture is the oil production and we still at this moment have 660 wells producing oil, and I say in the general area of Virden which does extend into the Constituency of Arthur and maybe an odd well in someone else's.

But the alarming fact in contacting the department yesterday was in disclosing there's 120 wells there capable of production, but because of Federal and Provincial tax, the high hydro costs, it's just not economical to put them on production. At a time of dire energy needs it makes one wonder, you know, how long we can go and hold up. What we're really doing is holding up production because of our tax structure, Federal and Provincial.

The production of this product last year was just under four million barrels. The year before it was considerably over four million, so the production is dropping off unless there's encouragement to have these producers produce that aren't, that'll be probably the story for the years ahead.

I know the Manitoba Government joint ventures, the CDC, with the mines and natural branch did jointly drill some holes, but they were dry. There were some seven in that region that were dry.

One of the reasons that there isn't as much explanation as maybe there should be, because when you look at the story from the producers, Chevron Standard or California Standard, their take — well, they get \$9.19 a barrel — their take is \$1.16. So there's eight dollars and some cents, and three cents is going from government, hydro and all the other things. If I was running a company I would look pretty hard at that, to go into a venture where the gain was only \$1.16 a barrel.

There has been some development. A local company did strike a producing well last year and I'm not sure if this would be declared development or exploration, I'm not really certain of what the area is, but it is announced "Copperhead strikes oil."

Now to change the subject just a little bit. In recent weeks there's been an announcement of the Canadian Senior National Baseball Champions to be played in Western Manitoba, August 17th to 21st. This will be displaying the same kind of baseball of about seven or eight years ago and it will be played at Boissevain, Souris, Macaulay, Binscarth, Hamiota and Brandon. While we hear of great globs of money going out to the Winter Games I wonder how much these organizations are going to get in additional funds to upgrade their bleachers, etc., because I think this is not as important as the Winter Games but it is important and it is representing all of Canada. Manitoba indeed will have two teams. One is the host and one is the All-Star.

If we're reading the daily papers and we see the new Autopac buildings, the new garages, the immediate thought that comes to one is where is — remember the announcement last year of the tremendous new Cancer Clinic, what stage is it at? If you are as I many of my people have been afflicted with this disease, they're deeply concerned when this is going to be under operation. Is it next year or will we have many, many more public buildings, of garages, before the health of this nation is being served first? Likewise to the great needs in the Retarded Homes and schools. You know, we can get anything. Most of us human beings, if we really aim for, we can do and get most of the things we want. But the retarded people are a people that can't do that. There's workshops like at

Rowandale and at Virden, they're begging for a little more assistance to keep a workshop going, to keep those people doing something, not in a dollar and cents profit, but it would be more that way if there was more funds coming out of the Provincial Treasury

The Mineral Acreage Tax certainly isn't new, but it certainly is the same nuisance it always was, and it's the veterans, the people that have left the farm, struggled those hard hard years to keep those things together and now have to pay that extra penalty. Surely the government isn't that hungry for real estate to really go after the people in that way because you know and I know, Mr. Speaker, the really little amount of money that entire sum comes to could easily be waived and indeed our party has committed itself to scrap that particular program.

I work closely with all my municipal people' and I know they work closely with their Minister over the last few years. I know he is very popular with them, but at the same time they dearly desire to have more control, more say in their municipal affairs, and indeed have control of doling out the welfare. They see the abuses and they're most annoyed when they try to control something, they bring it to the Appeal Board and they get the notice, "Pay that person or else". It would be a good deal of saving money, not really as equally spread possibly, because some Municipal Councils would be tougher on us than others, but I think there would be a great overall saving and the satisfaction to those local Council people that do such a good job in the first step of governing our province.

In recent weeks I've had some complaints of spraying and pesticides and fertilizers, and enquiring today I found out that Act that we passed — and I think we've improved upon last year — the Pesticides and Fertilizer Act has not yet been proclaimed, and I wonder, Mr. Speaker, when? Is it because we supported it that they're holding it up or what is the reasoning? Surely it will be proclaimed before the next fertilizer and pesticide season comes along because there is much adjusting and maybe there's a legitimate reason for it not being proclaimed. But I think this House deserves to know the reason.

There's been a lot of talk on the Beef Marketing Board and I won't add very much to it anymore than again. The senior farmers that have been farming all their lives selling one or two hundred head of cattle and phone — and I've got a letter here from one of them — just expressing that him and his son to cut costs have joined hands. So he doesn't get a vote, his son does. In this day and age of high prices, everybody that isn't thinking and trying to cut costs isn't really being real with themselves and the world. Yet when they do that they have that penalty. Really when that vote does come will we ever know, was that a true vote, was that the true representation of the cattle producers, because you have the government on the one side telling the one story, you have another group sponsored by the packers telling the other story and in between it's the producers. I know everything isn't right in the market system. I know there's room for improvement. I know I go most every summer and buy 4H calves to help the young people out. Last year I paid and paid dearly and it was sent to the market the next day or the two days afterwards and I took my usual \$100.00 loss, a little over, and that's fine that was my decision; but two weeks later a chap, a friend of mine put cattle on the market the same weight right off the grass and came up with four cents a pound more. That is the problem we're facing, but I don't know that we have to let the government control this, a monitor or someone watching these ups and downs could do the job without going through this vote type of thing and let the government have full control.

Another area that I would like to speak on — I don't see the Minister of Highways but it's pretty important to my area. In fact as you're quite aware, Mr. Speaker, for the first time I've put out some of these red, blue and white papers and one came back. It was rather interesting.

I have expressed my concern for years because of a particular highway and these both highways because we're supporting one more than the other — he's quit my party — but you know that's the way it goes. Again, those highways are 250 north and south of Rivers. It's very important and the municipal people certainly know the need of this, Mr. Speaker. Also the east and west road along north of the Rivers airport that does desperately need hardtopping, 259.

But the more tragic situation is an area of highway in Manitoba that is not part of my constituency' at least where the damage is and I'm speaking of Trans-Canada No. 1 between Kemnay and Oak Lake. Just for the record: 1972, 46 dead; 1973, 51 dead; 1974, 56 dead. It just happens that many of those deaths have come from my community. I say, with all the four-lane highways, surely if the department would only look at that chunk of road that has a higher-than-average amount of death because it is curved and the four-lane program won't be hitting it for several years down the road, are we going to sit next year and watch 60 deaths be taken in that short, little strip? I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to your Minister, surely there have got to be remedies put on that road even before the four-lane comes.

I am not sure if, in my opening remarks, I congratulated my leader for being elected to this House. If I didn't, I should have. I did appreciate him leaving me with the responsibility that I certainly don't know all the answers on, but I enjoy working with the racing commission and things involving the racing industry. I was down south three or four weeks ago. I was in Venezuela and I went to their race track. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, to the "How much do they make?", I took some money to spend, but up here in Manitoba I have a pretty hard time figuring out the program and how you read

the winner out of it, their's was Spanish so I was hopelessly So I didn't bet. But it was a fabulous clubhouse, the most impressive one, I guess, in South America, even though the country was pretty poor.

That brings us back to a change in some of the structure in the racing industry here in Manitoba. I was just going to read back remarks that were issued twelve years ago which fit fairly closely right now, if I could only find it in Hansard. Yes, this was March 3, 1965. "The next point I would like to mention is reference to the racing commission. I think it is a step in the right direction. I think the racing industry certainly can afford it, but there is just one thing I would like to mention here. While this may have been brought into being to do with Assinboine Downs, I would just like to suggest in rural Manitoba, the trotting horse, the Standard Bred Association put on many days of entertainment in the summer and I would like to see a member from the Standard Breds people or the Trotting Association be on that commission."

That was 1965. Part of our problem today is based just on that. — (Interjection) — There's one on, that's right. But just hear me out, Mr. Minister. It is true there is a racing commission with very capable people — Sid Halter. Who is more hard-nosed than Sid Halter? But he contributed an awful lot to the racing industry here in Manitoba. Mr. Cartilège I believe is the chairman today, a fine fellow, meaning well. But the majority of that commission is thoroughbred people, and that's the point. — (Interjection) — Yes, there is one on, right. But one in a group cannot really get the fair share. I am not in any way putting my remarks against the Assiniboine Downs or Mr. Wright, and the fact that economics forced him to go purely thoroughbred, but the fact is that there were seven-and-a-half million dollars spent last year on the standard bred.

I ask him through you, Mr. Speaker: When is the Minister going to announce to the rural circuits, to the rural fair boards, when a program, when a breeder-incentive grant and what its size is going can't wait until the grass is green and then start programming for the summer. I have been waiting, wanting to ask you question since the House I would hope in the short days ahead a positive decision would be coming here in this regard. We have some 800 standard bred in Manitoba with many stables of 40, 60, 70, and 90 brood mares. They cannot operate a few days in rural Manitoba and have an economic program. They are going to be forced to go to other tracks. If they are going to be at Cloverdale in the wintertime, they are soon going to be raising their colts there and their whole operation out of there. So I will urge through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister, that we have got to have a program encouraging to bring the standard bred, whether it is in conjunction with the Assinboine Downs, separate from the Assiniboine Downs, I have no hangups. The business is there. The trade is there.

The last point that I would make in this area: If indeed it means making betting legalized on the street, funnelled properly through the track, would maybe be the real saver for the standard bred horses. They could run in the wintertime. We could bet on them here, there, or elsewhere. I won't get any support at home from my religious sects on that, but I really think that is down the road somewhat, and it is worth thinking of now.

It is not hard. If you were in St. Louis today, you would see the Manitoba horses. If you were in Cloverdale earlier this winter, you would have seen them in Calgary. That business should and could stay here with the right guidance from the top, from the Minister. I am not sure right at this hour how much influence the racing commission has on this Minister. Maybe he is the lord and master. But I did like the appreciation of working with the former Minister, who, I think, understood the problems and needs. Maybe the new Minister I have offered my services and if he indeed can see through some of the things I have been telling him, this will come about. The benefit will be the taxpayers in Manitoba because this stay here is an industry and it is going somewhere. If we don't encourage it to stay here, it will indeed be lost to us.

Another area. I think last year I spoke on this. I could not understand the ridiculous amount of liquor advertising. The Minister at that hour agreed with me. Recent statements by the Liquor Commission, Frank Syms has agreed with. The question, Mr. Speaker: Who in the world is setting up for advertising? Don't tell me we are back into the days when we used to give Dalton Camp some \$400,000 to do this for us. Are we still in that ballpark figure? I don't know. With everybody seeming to agree that this money could well be funneled to help people who have gotten themselves into problems with alcohol, certainly I agree with this. Everybody agrees but nothing is done. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Continuing Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Firstly, I wish to congratulate you on continuing to occupy the position of Speaker of this House and I want to wish you well for this session. I would hope that, be it you or whoever in sessions to come, the Speaker will be appointed from the political party which now forms the government.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday I listened with great interest to the remarks made by the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition and particularly to those which may have had some reference to either of the two departments for which I am responsible. I say "which may have had some reference"

because some of his comments weren't all that closely or directly related. I sort of had the impression that whoever was responsible for preparing his notes for that particular speech wasn't all that well acquainted with the operations of my department, or for that matter, of any department of the government going beyond those for which I am responsible.

Mr. Speaker, just quickly browsing through Hansard, the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, who is not in his seat at this time It is strange, Mr. Speaker. The leaders over there all have that common characteristic: they will come in for Questions and for Orders of the Day and after Questions, away they go. You don't see them. I seem to recall that that was the characteristic of his predecessor and the one prior to that. —(Interjection)— Right.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney said that, with reference to the Arts Council, "And there were those who hoped that the election of the NDP, some few in Manitoba albeit "Not that few, Mr. Speaker. Enough to elect us as a government, which would indicate a larger number than supported that side." . . . would lead to a sort of cultural Renaissance in the arts in Manitoba." And then he goes on to say, "But somehow, in some

fashion, the NDP bureaucracy continues to absorb the money and the energy that might well have made the arts brighter and more . . . flourishing and more vital in this province."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney should well remember some of the events which occurred, but maybe he doesn't because I have to go back twelve years.

A MEMBER: Oh, no, no. You can't do that.

MR. HANUSCHAK: You know, his memory may become somewhat blurred about what occurred twelve years ago. Well, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of all of us, I just want to go back to May 11, 1965. On May 11, 1965 —(Interjections)— For the benefit of the Honourable Member for Roblin, I will start in 1965 and I will go ahead and I will indicate to him the rate at which we moved ahead from 1965 to 1969 and the accelerated rate at which we proceeded to move ahead from 1969 to this date.

In May, 1965, the **Manitoba Arts Council Act** was passed by Mr. Roblin, who at that time was Premier of the province. I suppose he saw the handwriting on the wall. He knew that his days were numbered and he probably felt that he had to do something for the arts in the province. And he passed the **Manitoba Arts Council Act**. It was passed on May 11, 1965 and it sat there on some Minister's shelf and has collected dust for - not a week, not a month, not two, but over two-and-a-half years, Mr. Speaker! Finally, on December 15, 1967, two years and seven months later, it was proclaimed. It was proclaimed.

It was about that time, yes. And even then nothing happened in 1967. Then there was a change of leaders. —(Interjection)— Yes, yes. Then there was the one from Minnedosa and he did nothing about it. This is all as the Honourable Leader speaks about that side's concern for the arts. You know what they would have done. Now two-and-a-half years have gone by. Legislation passed, two-and-a-half years later proclaimed, and the next Premier from that side sat on it until that point in time when all these started meetings at the Fort Garry Hotel and all the advisors descended upon the caucus on that side about March of 1969 when all of this started. And on March 20, 1969, somebody on that side of the House decided they had better call a meeting of the Arts Council. And the first Arts Council

meeting was called. The first Arts Council meeting on March 20, 1969 — four years after the legislation was passed, Mr. Speaker. Four years. And, oh, the appropriation that the Arts Council received from the then-government. I will be fair. I will be fair to that side because this is for the operations of the Arts Council — there was a pittance that some agencies received directly, but the Arts Council received a magnanimous sum of \$7,500, seven thousand five hundred dollars to run its affairs.

As I have said, I want to be fair. I want to be fair to the Honourable Member for Wolseley. I am well aware of the fact that I am not including whatever little grants may have been made to the Art Gallery and to the symphony, to the ballet, and so forth. From a level of support to the Arts Council in 1969-70 of \$205,000, our level of support for the Arts Council has increased to over half-a-million dollars for the current fiscal year. Five hundred thirty-five thousand dollars plus an additional amount close to \$200,000 which the Arts Council receives from their participation in the lotteries, which brings it close to three-quarters of a million dollars, Mr. Speaker. And that their leader says is a lack of support of this government for the arts as compared to the level of support that that government gave.

A couple of other matters that I want to talk about today, Mr. Speaker. Farther on in this speech of the Leader of the Opposition, he tells us that he went up north earlier this year and he visited a community and he spoke to a chief and he reports to us that this is what the chief told him: that a New Democratic Party government was elected and they expected change, but no change is happening. So the Leader of the Official Opposition would want the people to believe.

It is unfortunate that, firstly, I am not quite certain whether the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition heard this chief correctly. It is also unfortunate that he did not look around the community to see what was happening and to see the change that was happening. Time and time again he repeats the comment that, "We will put the emphasis back on getting help for those who need it." And he repeats that comment in two or three different ways throughout his speech, that they would not destroy hope in the province, hope and the idea of opportunity particularly for young

Thursday, February 24, 1977

people and so forth. Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition would go back up North and stay there a bit longer and open his eyes and look around the community to see what is happening and to see the changes which have come about over the past seven years. I want to tell you about a few of them, Mr. Speaker. I want to tell you about them because I'm not sure that the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition would want to listen even if he were in the House or would understand.

One of the programs which we instituted very shortly after we became the government commencing at Brandon University, was the special Mature Students program. A program designed to give people an opportunity to have a second chance at obtaining training, a second chance at obtaining an education which they may have missed out on obtaining the first time around in their youth. Mr. Speaker, within that special Mature Students program at Brandon over the past seven years commencing in 1970 to 1977, we have had a total of 188 students enrolled in it, one hundred eighty-eight. Commencing with an enrollment of 20 in 1970-71 and this year there were 45 enrolled. Out of those students, 28 to this date have graduated and have found their way into meaningful jobs and have become self-sufficient citizens and contributing members of this society. What is even more significant about that program, Mr. Speaker, as you will find is common to a host of other similar programs, is that they are designed to assist the disadvantaged, to assist those who were not in a position to help themselves to progress, to improve their lot. For example, of the 188 students in the special Mature Students program, 40 percent of them are single females with dependents; 56 percent are natives; 71 percent are over twenty-five years of age; 42 percent of them are over 30 years of age; 24 percent are over 35; in fact, nine percent are over 45 years of age. Now, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa says that they are over-the-hill then. Now, perhaps that's what a banking experience does to an individual, that by the time he reaches 45 years of age he loses all ambition and incentive to work but obviously that is not true of the Northern Community, that they do not consider themselves to be over-the-hill at 45 years of age, and perhaps the Honourable Member for Minnedosa would want to tell these people enrolled in our program, those over 45, that they are over-the-hill, that they ought not to be enrolled in these programs. I would like him to tell them that. Perhaps he would like to visit his friend the Member for Brandon West or our friend, the Member for Brandon East and go out to their constituency because that's where these people are enrolled, and tell these 45 year olds that they are over-the-hill because he considers himself as being over-the-hill at that age. As I indicated a moment ago, that now the graduates of these programs have found their way into meaningful jobs, ten are employed in the helping professions with average incomes of over \$12,000. Twelve are presently teaching with incomes ranging between \$10,000 and \$12,000 and these were people who, prior to enrolling in this program had zero dollars income.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, to tell you about our teacher-training programs; our impact program and most of these programs are field-based. They're new, innovative, quite different from the style of training teachers field-based where student teacher does the bulk of his training work in the classroom where the professor comes out to the community and works with groups of student teachers and then moves on to another community where the student teacher is able to live at home with his family and at the same time obtain training to eventually become qualified as a teacher. In communities such as Dauphin — this is the impact program — Dauphin, Portage La Prairie, Swan River, Camperville, there are 42 students enrolled in this program. Since this program came into being, there have been 21 graduates, 17 of whom are still teaching. The Winnipeg Centre project — a similar designed to assist the disadvantaged in the core city area. In the five years that it's been in operation, there have been a total of 156 students enrolled in it. The makeup of the student teachers in the Winnipeg Centre project or the distribution of it is not unlike that of the Impact program which I have described or the Mature Students program. Of the total number of students in the Winnipeg Centre project at the present time, 35 percent of the students are native; 12.9 percent are immigrants — landed immigrants — settled in Manitoba and Winnipeg and 51 percent would come from what the sociologists and economists would call the "working class poor." That is, the criteria being lack of money to further their education; inadequate academic background to pursue an education program in the normal manner; residence in or wide experience inner city area and family situation which would make full time study in a regular program difficult. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, in the Winnipeg Centre project, 37 percent of the students are single females, 33 percent are single females with dependents. And of the Winnipeg Centre project graduates just to indicate to you the type of ambition that these people have and the initiative that they have, there are some continuing with their postgraduate studies; one is education director in administration at the Fort Alexander Indian Reserve; many of them are employed as full time teachers in Inner City schools of the Winnipeg School Division, working within their area, having the benefit not only of the teacher training training, but also being in the position of being better able to relate to the student that they are working with, having lived and been brought up in the same environment.

The Brandon University Northern Teacher Education program, known as BUNTEP, 238 students have been enrolled since 1974 - 1977. This coming year, 1977, 45 will be receiving teaching certificates and many are planning to continue with their studies towards a Bachelor of Teaching

degree. This program is offered in communities, Mr. Speaker, to which post-secondary education services, for years and years during the administration of those two parties, was completely inaccessible, places like Island Lake, Cross Lake, Split Lake, Nelson House, Oxford House, Norway House and in communities of that kind, people have an opportunity to obtain, to upgrade, themselves and to take their place in society as the Honourable Member for Churchill says, "For the first time in a hundred years." And he is right, Mr. Speaker. He is right because prior to 1969 a survey was done in this province and it was found that in our public schools there were 11 teachers of native origin — eleven — in the whole province and today we have hundreds, Mr. Speaker. The special Mature Student program at the University of Manitoba at the present time there are over 130-140 students enrolled in it.

The special Mature Registered Nurse program which has commenced this year with an enrollment of 20, and it too is designed and aimed to assist the disadvantaged. Sixty percent are single females; 45 percent single females with dependents; 65 percent of them, Mr. Speaker, are natives and 45 percent are over the age of 25. So that is one example, Mr. Speaker, of the type of programs that this government has undertaken to assist people in remote communities to improve the human condition in those areas.

Another program, Mr. Speaker, again designed primarily for remote communities and for the core city area, the New Careers program. This, Mr. Speaker, is an on-the-job training program for disadvantaged adults and it is now in its seventh year of operation. It commenced in November 1970 to test the hypothesis that persons trapped in a chronic cycle of poverty can, through a combination of special efforts, break out of that cycle permanently and become productive members of society. Presently 80 percent of the 200 trainees are of native ancestry — 80 percent, Mr. Speaker, 160 — 80 percent have less than Grade Nine education; 85 percent have work histories described as intermittent, unstable or never employed. Last year, a formal evaluation of the program concluded that it is meeting its stated objectives. Of the 93 graduates of the program, 71 were employed in the job-trained core or in a similar job or a better job; three found their way into employment in an unrelated field. As of the end of next month, there will be 166 graduates of the New Careers program and the over-all retention rate of trainees in the program since 1974 has been in the order of 70 percent. We believe that the success of the program stems from the fact that persons are placed in jobs and then trained. Waiving the traditional credential requirements is not a violation of the merit principle, it isn't finding an easy way to get into a job provided that it is accompanied by a structured on-the-job training program related specifically to the skills and knowledge that are required to competently perform that particular job. And that is what is done because about 70 percent of the training period which usually lasts two years, is spent on the job; 30 percent is spent in the classroom. Supervisors of trainees on the job and New staff work together to Careers identify a training plan which integrates the classroom component with assignment of tasks on the job.

The majority of the trainees placed within the provincial civil service are working in the human service area as legal assistants, community health workers, community recreation workers, probation assistants. But there is an increasing number which is being placed in technical areas such as Cartography, drafting, systems analysis and engineering services.

A year ago, the Manitoba Telephone System together with IBEW, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and New Careers, initiated a project in Northern Manitoba to train local people — train them on the job — to be installer-repair personnel. This is the craft apprenticeship area of the Manitoba Telephone System and it provides access to reasonably well-paying jobs. The communities selected to participate in the trainee recruitment were identified by the Manitoba Telephone System, selection criteria was determined by the future staff requirements and in conjunction with the proposed service expansion into the Northern communities by the Telephone System, the communities selected were Berens River, Churchill, Cross Lake, Pikwitonei, Putatowogan, Moose Lake and Norway House. The trainees were recruited from each of these communities. I should also mention, Mr. Speaker, that in the recruitment process, the local band council is very much involved in this so it isn't somebody as someone may think, some so-called bureaucrat from Winnipeg who goes into a northern community and selects someone whom he thinks is qualified and eligible to enroll in this program, but the community is involved in selecting those people that they think have the ability to complete the training program and would do a worthwhile job in whatever program it is they are training for, upon completion of their training.

The on-the-job training and supervision has been provided by the Manitoba Telephone System personnel, salaries and academic upgrading are the responsibility of my department through the New Careers branch and the upgrading was designed to improve potential candidates' mathematical skills which they required to enable them to achieve a passing grade on the systems mathematics qualifying examination. This examination is the same exam that all have to write as a pre-requisite for further technical training at the Manitoba Telephone System training centre.

The training program, Mr. Speaker, began with a four week on-the-job orientation at the Telephone System office and this was followed by a two week classroom session during which New Careers' instructors provided a basic oral communications skill course, and then an assessment was

made to determine their levels of mathematics proficiency using the adult basic education placement test, and this happened at the commencement of the program a year ago and the majority of the trainees obtained scores equivalent to a Grade Eight academic level with two trainees obtaining Grade Five equivalents.

Now, less than a year later, February 4th of this year, ten months later, five of the original seven trainees are still on this program, they have received nine weeks of intensive upgrading, thirty hours of classroom training per week and out of these trainees, four have successfully completed the Manitoba Telephone System mathematics qualifying examination and their scores range from 67 percent to 87.5 percent. They are scheduled to begin their AC-DC training program at the Telephone System commencing next week. The exam that I've just said that they have written now is the one that other apprentices who have to have Grade Eleven to enroll, write — the exam is given them — and these people came in with the type of training program that they received over a ten month period. They were able to upgrade their mathematical skills to that level which proves that a job can be done in assisting adults in upgrading themselves.

So thus, within one year, persons previously unemployed without credentials to enter regular training institutions, will have entered the primary job market.

Now at the request of my colleague, the Minister of Renewable Resources and Transportation Services, fourteen trainees are working toward employment as conservation officers and a classroom component of their training program includes course work from the Kelsey Institute of Applied Arts and Science in Saskatoon — this is the closest western college which offers a Resource Technology certificate, a desired academic credential for the conservation officer field.

In November of last year, New Careers Community Health Worker graduates employed by the health centres in seven regions, in Amaranth, Alonsa, Glenella, Sandy Bay, to name a few, met with a medical delegation from Tunisia who had heard of our New Careers Program and were interested in it, and wanted to find out how it operates to see whether that model could not be used in their country to train their disadvantaged. The visit was requested by one of their officials in their Department of Health and they met and they left being very very highly impressed with the New Careers Program that we operate here. It is a program, Mr. Speaker, that is recognized internationally, recognized nationally. The Federal Public Service Commission has initiated a Northern Careers Program based in Yellowknife in the North West Territories after the Manitoba experience proved successful. There is presently a proposal being considered to structure a New Careers element in the Canada Manpower Industrial Training Program of Canada Manpower so that all provinces would be encouraged to hire and train special needs clients.

It receives cost-sharing through Canada Manpower and through DREE; 10 percent of the total program cost is for administration; 20 percent education costs; 70 percent is for trainees' salaries on which I should remind you, Mr. Speaker, the trainee pays income tax of which a portion is returned into the public treasury.

So thus, Mr. Speaker, this program is not only meeting the provincial manpower objective of employing the severely disadvantaged, but it is doing so in a cost effective manner. Secondly, if someone may think or fear that the New Careers Program is lowering standards, lowering admission standards to various occupation areas, the fact of the matter is that it is not, it has no effect whatsoever on the admission standards to whatever occupation area one may think of. What it does do, is it bridges the gap between the point of entry into a given occupation field and the position at which a prospective applicant may be and the gap may be quite wide between them if one were to follow the traditional route to get into that particular occupation field. Not only may it be wide but perhaps may even be impossible to traverse.

Now I would like to turn for a few moments, Mr. Speaker, to the manpower side of my department. The change in nomenclature represents a modernization of the government's approach to education, training and work. Now, while the term manpower has some currency in Canadian usage, it is nevertheless somewhat difficult to define. Someone once said, a researcher at the Ontario Institute for Studies and Education, that the plain semantic fact with which an effort to define and delimit manpower policy must cope, is that the simple word manpower has no established meaning in any of the social sciences or in popular discourse. Only in some of its military applications can it be said to be a straightforward, unambiguous English word. In almost all instances the user of the word is dependent upon his listener's or reader's charitable disposition to give the word an appropriate meaning in the context in which it is presented.

In the Manitoba Government our manpower policy is the expression of a myriad of programs and activities carried out by a number of departments. I would like to stress that aside from my own department there are six other departments that are concerned with manpower issues, Labour, Industry and Commerce, Northern Affairs, Health and Social Development, Agriculture, Co-operative Development, and so forth. All these are involved in the delivery of programs that are quite properly termed manpower programs. It's the relationship and co-ordination of these programs that counts and which define the manpower policy.

The objectives of our manpower program, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the overall, overriding manpower policy, is the provision of individual, meaningful and socially productive opportunities for participation in the economic life of the province for all Manitobans. Very simply, this embodies the sentiment that everyone must work; not only must everyone participate by working in the Manitoba economy, but there must be a job for everyone. Recognizing the importance of participation in the economic life of the province for all Manitobans, we've carried out an informal survey of departmental estimates and found that excluding the activities of the Universities Grants Commission, during the current year, our cost of departmental activities in the manpower field, in all departments in government, amounts to something in the order of \$70 million. This is a level of commitment in terms of our overall expenditure that far exceeds the proportional allocation to manpower activities in every other province in Canada. Manpower and employment are central concerns of this government and our concern is reflected in the way that we allocate the funds.

Our first operational objective is to strive for full employment by the development and provision of sufficient desirable employment opportunities for all Manitobans who need and want work. We recognize that there is a need for the public sector to provide temporary regionalized employment to those workers who are displaced by fluctuations in the labour market over which they have no control. The activities of the Provincial Job Office are of particular interest in this regard; a special Northern Native Employment Program, the Inner City Employment Program, the Accelerated Capital Works Program, all of these are responsive to the objective of striving for full employment.

Looking at the manpower situation as it exists in the province today, if there is one manpower problem in Manitoba that is pervasive, it is a failure of the economy to equally distribute jobs or even the opportunities for jobs to all.

Another objective of ours, Mr. Speaker, is to develop opportunities for the structurally unemployed and the non-participant special needs unemployed, to find and maintain desirable and meaningful employment. My department, the Department of Health and Social Development, Northern Affairs, Agriculture, are particularly concerned with this objective and we are determined that a more equitable distribution of job opportunities must be achieved and that those who historically have not been able to fully participate in Manitoba's economic life will find opportunities presented to them.

Another objective of ours is to improve the quality of the work environment. And here I should cite the progressive program of Workplace Safety and Health of my colleague the Minister of Labour, and perhaps mention the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labour, the Human Rights Commission, the Career Planning Office of the Civil Service Commission; all of these are seen as contributing to achievement of this objective.

As I have indicated, or tried to point out, Mr. Speaker, the manpower policy is the implicit or explicit commitment to a pattern of behavior intended to increase the rate of returns accruing to society of the resource which is the population, our people. That pattern of behavior may be discernable only by observation *ex post*, after the fact, or it may be reliably represented in official statements as to objectives and procedures. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, during the Estimate debate of my department and the debate of the Estimates of my colleagues, that we will have ample opportunity to present to you the evidence of our success in the manpower field. For example, I will have a few things to say about the labour market outcomes, of training carried out in the community colleges. The record is excellent with a very high proportion of our graduates obtaining work in the specific fields for which they were trained or in closely related fields. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will have similar evidence to present to you. In total, Mr. Speaker, we will demonstrate to you and to the people of the Province of Manitoba that progress has been made, that opportunities for employment, opportunities for training to obtain employment, have greatly increased over the past seven years, that today people are finding ways and means to enter the labour market, to whom the doors to employment had been shut for over 100 years; now they can find ways and means of becoming productive citizens.

But that is the type of thing, Mr. Speaker, which the Honourable Leader of the Opposition just simply ignored when he spoke about his trip to the north. He didn't see that going on; perhaps he didn't recognize it, Mr. Speaker, and that's probably what happened, because programs of that kind would be completely strange and foreign to him, he wouldn't know what they are and that's why he didn't recognize them. But the people of Manitoba, the people of the north, the disadvantaged, wherever they may be, are very much aware of the government's design and delivery of programs of this kind such as I have mentioned and many more which we will deal with during the debate of my Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like again to congratulate you on the position you hold in this House. There is no question that you have the toughest job, as I have said before, as probably anybody could have, to be in control or rule over a group of politicians who, at any time, when they get the chance to speak, certainly take the opportunity to do so and sometimes they shouldn't. We shouldn't interfere with other others when we

do and we appreciate the work that you do. Also, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that at any time that I wanted to speak to you outside the House, we've had very good conversations with one another and you have been able to explain many things to me when I have been in doubt, and I thank you for that.

Mr. Speaker, my compliments also to the mover and the seconder. I think the Member from Logan and the Member from Emerson did excellent jobs. I again must say, as all my colleagues have, that I am not in complete agreement with them and I am sure they would be very surprised if I was, but I think that is the way it has to be and that is the way it is going to be. I shouldn't say that's the way it has to be, that's the way it is and I don't think it's going to change.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the debate very carefully and I have enjoyed the debates up to now. I think I have been in the House for part of everybody's speech that has spoken to date. I must compliment the Minister who just spoke. I say this to him, that our Leader took apart some things in his speech and the Minister —(Interjection)— take it easy now, I'm being complimentary, I can change very quickly. Mr. Speaker, I can say this, that the Minister defended his department and we again will have the opportunity to discuss his department in his Estimates, as he said.

The level of debate from the Minister of Public Works was nothing more than gobbledegook. We really had a —(Interjection)— No, I really don't appreciate being taken through Alice in Wonderland and the Wizard of Oz and all of these different things and I am really not interested in the fact that he has talk about my Leader because he is scared stiff of him. It is pretty obvious when that happens and you get conversation like that, methinks he says too much because he's obviously afraid. At that point, I would say that I'd like to say that I congratulate and welcome my leader into this House as the Member for Souris-Killarney.

I was a little disappointed the other day in the Member from Ste. Rose. I know that all of us put our names on the line to run in the House in this Legislature and we make many sacrifices to do so and, although we may call one another incompetent or wrong-headed or something at times, that's fine but to say that one of us is unfit to sit here, is something that I know is an opinion but I would hope, Mr. Speaker, if I ever expressed that opinion that you would please stand up and correct me and I would withdraw it and apologize immediately.

A MEMBER: Who were you speaking about?

MR. JOHNSTON: The government. We were talking about the government and I'm sorry if I've made some remark that has bothered the he is Member from Ste. Rose but I don't think unfit to sit here, personally I don't think he is.

Mr. Speaker, the other day we were having remarks from our leader regarding the Progressive Conservative Party being in favour of a lot of the social legislation that has gone on by this government, improvements on legislation that was put in and many cases started by the government that was there previously and if the men on the other side, the honourable members on the other side, say that there were no nursing homes, they were wrong. —(Interjection)— well, there was in the constituencies that I know of — and Mr. Speaker, we did start other programs which have been carried on and when the members of the other side say do I agree with it, do I agree with them carrying on social legislation, I think they would have a hard time pointing to the time that the members on this side of the House voted against such things as medicare, such things as pharmacare, were opposed in the budget to helping senior citizens, etc.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about social reforms to help people. And I assure you they will be hard pressed to find where we actually were against it. We voted against the budget at many times because this government takes the opportunity to put about five or six things in the budget that, you know, we all approve in this House. But then they always put about a hundred things in the budget that we can't approve. They do it with their Bills. They're very famous and very cagey the way they put in Legislation in such a way that they say, "Well, well, you didn't vote for that" but they don't really have the Legislation written so that you can stand up like honourable members and say "I agree with this, I agree with that or I don't agree with this." They try to put you in that trapped position of having all kinds of things in Legislation.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday when the Honourable Minister of Mines was speaking we had a little go back and forth and he was talking about the different countries that had dictatorships, and what have you, and he calls a dictatorship and Fascism and things like that, he calls it Conservatism. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I would indicate Capitalism, state-imposed Capitalism. That's fine. Well, it is state-imposed capitalism. I must agree with him. But I say to you this, that I don't agree with any government that takes the right of vote away from people. But let's take a look at how those governments usually got there. They got there by calling themselves socialists, Social Party, many times democratic parties, went to the people and said everything you've got is bad. You know, many of these countries have come a long way from Kings and things of this nature to the point where they were democratic and had a vote. And then all of a sudden, because somebody came along and sold them a fairly good Bill of Goods, and it must have been a Bill of Goods because the minute they got elected they took away the voting power from the people. Now you wonder why we get a little suspicious of those words. You wonder why we say when we hear the words National Socialism,

when we hear the words Great Democratic Party, we're from the people and all of a sudden they're elected and then all of a sudden they don't have a vote. All of a sudden they don't have a vote and as I said when I was speaking, I said they sneak up on you and when they get there they took the vote away from people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you wonder why we are suspicious on this side of the House. Well, I'm going to tell you why. I've been listening very carefully to my colleagues and I went to the trouble of reading some of the things the Minister of Agriculture has put out in this beef marketing situation and I'm absolutely amazed. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, I'm a city member and when I see what is being done to the people in this industry, as far as their rights are concerned and privileges I have reason to be very suspicious of what's happening. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me put it this way. If two people live on the same piece of property or a man lives here and his son lives here with his family, and they both own cattle, the fact that those cattle mix together in the field or in the feedlot — one of them does not have a vote. Now that is absolutely amazing. And the fact that the only people that automatically got a vote were the people that the Minister decided got into the beef business through his program, let's put it that way, they were the ones who automatically got a vote and, as my colleague said the others had to go down and verify that they were in the business. But even if they were and they owned cattle, a father and a son with their families, living in separate houses on a farm; the fact that their cattle mix together disqualifies one of them from a vote.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you wonder why we're suspicious. I say to myself, you know, if my dog wanders down the street and plays with another dog, which one of us is going to have the vote. You know, that is just about what is happening. You know, the puppies. The cattle go out and mingle and eat together and all of a sudden somebody has a vote taken away from them. You know, all of a sudden the fact that if people who own animals let them get together and talk to one another or whatever animals do when they get together, somebody doesn't have a vote. Now, Mr. Speaker, you wonder why we're suspicious on this side of the House.

I'll tell you. Maybe the analogy is overexaggerated but do you really believe, Mr. Speaker, or I shouldn't say do you really believe Mr. Speaker — I wonder why the honourable members on the other side would disqualify a person who's been in the cattle business for a long time and because his cattle happen to mix with somebody else's he's disqualified from a vote. I'd like an answer to that. I can't really figure it out.

Mr. Speaker, I was canvassing in Souris-Killarney and I came across a man who is a milk farmer with his son. He'd been a milk farmer for many, many years, and his son had come into the farm with him, sitting with his wife in the livingroom watching television in the evening when I called on him, and again I'm a city man, I'm not in agriculture. So anyway, the gentleman said to me, he said, "I can't understand, I just really am having trouble trying to figure out that why, if I overship my milk, if I ship more than my quota, why am I penalized." He said "It used to be when I shipped over my quota they would give me whatever they could for it. I didn't complain." But he said "Now, if I happen to ship more than my quota I am penalized." I went to my colleagues and I asked them. I said "Does that happen?" They said "Yes. That's the rules. That's the rules. We encourage a man in Emerson constituency to dump his milk on the ground." Dump milk on the ground. Just think about those words. Dump milk on the ground, and the government encourages them to do so. Because he gets penalized if he happens to overship. And here we have a government, Mr. Speaker, that has a program of milk and cookies and breakfast to school children in this city in the core area. And you are saying dump milk on the ground. or encouraging it. If you'd use that milk you dumped on the ground or if it came in and you did nothing with it but use it to help defray your costs or give it to somebody in this city who could use it, or maybe ship it north for nothing as I'm sure the previous Minister who was speaking would like to have done, I can understand that. But the New Democratic Party encourages people to dump milk on the ground. I say to you, you wonder why we're suspicious on this side of the House.

You wonder why we say to you, what's coming next? Because every year we have some little thing cropping up to take privileges away from people or to really harm people, from a government who has come across and continually said "We're your saviours, we're the only people for you, we're the only ones who can help you." Mr. Speaker, as I said we're suspicious and you've given no reason for us to be otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech Debate the City of Manitoba Legislation has been mentioned or is to be changed, it's the Unicity or City of Winnipeg. Legislation is coming forward to make some changes. And here we have all of these complaints from people continually in this City and Province. They talk about the number of councillors and I'm one who believes that we don't need fifty, we could get along with less. But I can tell you sincerely that it is not the number of councillors that is the problem. People seem to have the impression that when you cut the council down you are going to cut the budget down, or we're going to save a tremendous amount of money. But I would like to inform you at the present time the cost of the councillors in the City of Winnipeg budget is .053 per cent of the overall budget. That includes the expenses and everything that is put forward towards the councillors in the city. So you know the cost of cutting down the council is not going to make that

much difference. And the fact that it is fifty at the present time is maybe a little unwieldy but I assure you the unwieldiness and the problems that are in the City of Winnipeg is the structure that this government forced upon the City of Winnipeg, when it brought it into Unicity. And it's being proven every day. Unless you bring in a structure, whether you have less aldermen or not, which will allow the people in the different areas to have more say over their destinies you are not going to be doing a thing to help accomplish anything for the people of the City of Winnipeg and you won't do anything if you don't do that to help their tax structure.

What happens at the present time? You have your community meetings. You have your citizen members and your community councillors will vote on decisions there, those decisions will go to Public Works Committee, from Public Works Committee to Executive Council and Executive Council back into the Council, and if the Council doesn't like it they give it back to the Community Committee again. And those people who were the citizen members who believed that they would have some input or some control over their destiny or be able to get anything done are becoming very, very annoyed at the fact that we go to meetings all the time and we make suggestions and if we happen to even make a good one, we'll be lucky if it happens in a year if it happens at all. —(Interjection)— Oh, well, Mr. Speaker, again the Minister has not been listening. I said that if the citizen members of the community council happen to make a good decision and they do, they don't get in. So if you don't think they make good decisions, will you please come out and tell them or tell them in your area.

Mr. Speaker, the overall structure of this city, at the present time, is going to keep binding and binding and binding to the point where there will be nothing basically accomplished. The structure, at the present time, harms the development of housing. Mr. Templeton's observations to the Land Committee was, in one respect, very excellent when he said local communities and cities when they were there and could administrate and develop different lands, as they used to do, they would not sell the houses to developers, at least in the case that I know of, we would have line-ups in front of our City Hall. No more than six lots to a person, and if there wasn't a house on it within six months they would have to make an application to have it extended. And we had housing built because the local communities were doing more to get development within their areas than the overall city is doing at the present time. And the overall city can't do it at the present time because they're bogged down with structure.

Mr. Speaker, the City Legislation, when it comes in, if it does not give the community areas, and if you want to cut down the community areas from the number that they are now, fine, I don't think that that would be a mistake — and give them more control over their destiny and if it were lesser community areas I think the core area would probably have more say than they do at the present time because they are having problems at the present time with the urban area having more power in there than they have. That's a problem at times. Maybe I shouldn't be saying that, coming from an urban area. But that's a problem, at the present time. And we even should be looking at the case that if there's an area that wants to have something in their area and they are willing to pay for it, that if they vote for it or have a referendum, that they should be able to have it. It's not hard to put that little extra on the tax bill in that area. It's nothing more than an accounting problem. But we have taken away the rights of people in this city. They just can't get through the bureaucracy and until you change that, you've got problems. And again the government won't listen. They didn't listen before that Legislation came in. They didn't listen to the men that are very knowledgeable about city and urban affairs in this province and in this city, disregarded them completely, and just slapped in Legislation that has not been a benefit to the people. So that will have to be changed, and I will be looking for the Legislation very interestingly.

Last night the Premier of this province was speaking at a nominating meeting of somebody or other in Wolseley. He said "You know, the Leader of the Official Opposition is saying that you couldn't dismantle Autopac at the present time." Well, I would like to say to you that he says "It could be done." He's just saying that, it could be done. You could get rid of it. That's what the Premier said. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what the Leader of the Opposition said, my leader, was absolutely true. We on this side of the House are not bull-headed people. I will tell you the difference. You see, we use our eyes and you know you can even go and you can feel those buildings, they're there. The operation is there and we don't intend to clear out the buildings of people and get rid of the desks and make warehouses out of them, they're there serving a purpose that they were put there for. You know that is something that the Progressive Conservative Party wouldn't do' but I'll tell you what this Government does, Mr. Speaker.

This government came into power in 1969 with the Hydro program in front of them that would have the hydro rates in this province right now very close to what they were then but they were so bull-headed that they would not accept the presentation that was there; they threw it out for what reason? To take the Premier and the NDP Government off the hook for election statements that were made in 1969 against the Churchill Diversion. They were brought in —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm hearing from the Member from Thompson. We would have gone four or five more feet of water than you are in South Indian Lake right now and the diversion would have been done. —

(Interjection) — No, Thompson wouldn't with another four or five feet. You're going ten, we would go fourteen or fifteen.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, fine. The reports are there. They're there for everybody to see. But anyway you threw away a program, you called in a person who said — as the Minister of Mines said — "It wouldn't be too bad if we went ahead again with the Lake Winnipeg Diversion at the present time", or something of that nature and wrote that little report, and away we went.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not being told by the Member from Thompson what I'm about to say in my speech. If he doesn't like what I'm saying at the present time he doesn't have to listen. He, for sure, will not be here listening next time.

Mr. Speaker, you turned around, this government went into a project to save face for election talk in 1969 and there's no other way around it. That's exactly what they did. The Jenpeg Station is not producing anywhere near what it should for the cost it came to. The Lake Winnipeg regulation is costly and proving a little disastrous. You're overrun on your hydro is such that you're going to have to give it away to the Americans one of these days. You have not built on the basis that we will have enough for ourselves and a little more and we have more capacity and if somebody wants it, and wants to buy it, you negotiate with them before you start throwing your money away; and you've got 600 and the \$600 million figure is there whether you like it or not; whether the Minister of Mines stands up and says: "There were four more reports after the McLellan Report", doesn't matter: If there was four more you'd still pick the wrong ones and wouldn't listen to the right people. In other words you disregarded anything that was done before you — in fact in 1969 in The Throne Speech the words were: "We will throw out old dogmas and traditions," and you're living by it. —(Interjection) —

Well, Mr. Speaker, they may be words but they're absolutely right. It won't matter, you can stand up in this House and they started out in The Throne Speech by trying to get out of Hydro on the basis of complimenting the Hydro for getting a good engineering job done. The Member for Logan got up and complimented them that they did the impossible with all the other projects that were going on at the present time. The Minister of Mines gets up and he starts to talk about Hydro on the basis that there were other reports after Underwood McLellan or after 1972 and not one of these round-about excuses that you're giving at the present time defies the fact that the hydro rates in this province at the present time have increased far more than inflation has, for one thing, so you can't blame inflation. You can only blame your bull-headedness on throwing away something that you had that was right because of election talk in 1969; and if you want to, gentlemen, go and get some of your pamphlets that you put out in 1969. Go and get some of your pamphlets that you put out in 1969 and read them over to yourselves and you will find that the biggest campaign of the NDP Government was on Hydro, South Indian Lake and you changed it around to save face which has cost the people of this province \$600 million now and more for the generations to come. Now why else, why else would we now have to pay 42 cents? Now you go down and you pay your electric light bill to the Manitoba Hydro, and Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentlemen on the other side to go down and pay it in one dollar bills and every time you hand that girl one of the dollar bills, say to yourself 42 cents of it is going on interest, with more to come, and only because to get out so you could get off the hook. Yes, yes.

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

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member confirm the figures that I've been given here? Percentage increase between June 1971 to June 1976, electricity percentage increase 51.9; fuel oil for heating 101.2.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Do you mean to say that you're now in a competition to try and keep up with them? Do you really seem to think that because something else goes up in price that you've got to go out of your way to put up the other? That's the way this government works because Ontario does it, Saskatchewan does it, B.C. does it, Calgary does it, we should do it. What kind of nonsense? Is that the kind of nonsense that you run this government on? If that's the kind of nonsense that anybody ever run a business on they'd be out of business tomorrow on the basis because something else went up in price we should sure get our share. Is that what you're saying? You're damned right. That's what you're doing.

Mr. Speaker, and my colleague reminds me how much government tax is there on gasoline. There's two cents for Autopac in there as well. Give me that kind of nonsense. Good Heavens. Mr. Speaker, I tried to keep calm.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Another thing that is mentioned in the Throne Speech I look forward to, but I would remind the government at the present time that at 500 acres the cost is going to be about \$40,000 an acre to develop; it was \$35,000 last year. I would say it will probably be \$40,000 this year. I would sincerely hope that you develop that property as close to present trunk lines and services and roads as you can at the present time. I would be looking very seriously and interested when the Minister is going to tell me where the property is and where the 500 houses or lots are going to be available, because we need them. I hope this isn't just the same shot-gun approach — (Interjection) —

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The same shot-gun approach to putting pieces of land on the market which we really need that you have had in public housing. There has absolutely been no organization within the Manitoba Housing Corporation ever since it was started; it is all based on the fact that there is a political decision made in Cabinet one day, one day they decide that we're going to spend \$70 million — not of your money, of the federal government money, I might add — on housing and you turn around and you say to them, "Build \$70 million worth of houses, get units, I don't care what they are, get units." You don't take any observation into the fact that you put strain on materials, you put strain on everything which does help to keep prices up in the area. There is absolutely no planning within the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation and there never has been and I don't think there is going to be under this Minister. I assure you of that. I hope there is but I have not got the confidence in the Minister at the present time to do it and we'll debate that during his Estimates. If he wants to prove to me that he's changing it, fine, but I don't see any changes coming along and if you're not making your plans right on those 500 lots, you're going to have a lot of problems. — (Interjection) — Five hundred acres then, and as I said at \$40,000 an acre and I sincerely hope that you are near trunk services or you're going to be much higher than that.

The Auditor's report about the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation is something that is disgusting and you should be hanging your heads about. I really can't understand, and it isn't the first time it's happened, and the surveys and reports within the department have told you all that — those in-house reports that we never see. Maybe we'll be showing you some this session. But I assure you, I assure you right now, that the shot-gun approach to housing by this government has been bad and it has to be changed.

Mr. Speaker, I must be nearly up with my time. I can only say — I don't want leave, I wouldn't give leave, Sir, I assure you of that, I tell the honourable members right now I wouldn't. If you can't organize your time in 40 minutes the way you're supposed to, maybe you shouldn't be there speaking. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, I say to this government, they are bull-headed in their management and all of the things that they have done over the years culminating right now in this election year, still makes us very suspicious, very, very suspicious of what they're thinking for the future of Manitoba.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C.: Mr. Speaker, I might start, if you like, because I would like to make a few comments on the contribution from the Member for Sturgeon Creek which was one of his more reasoned, rational speeches and I look forward to more of the same kind in this Session. I must say that I was a little bit disturbed when he was trying to justify what appeared to me, the jackboots attitude evidenced by some of the members opposite by starting to talk about these countries where they "sneak in democratically and they eliminate democracy." I'm not sure what he meant, I'm not sure if he meant that this is what happened in Germany or in Spain or in Italy or in Chile which were the countries referred to by the Honourable Leader, the Minister of Mines, the House Leader, but if he was, I would have liked him to spell it out because if there's any thought further amongst members opposite about the jack-boot theory, I would like to hear them come out openly and say so instead of making insinuations of which I think he contributed a little bit today.

I want to deal only with Hydro and only, because I'm not an expert and never pretended to be an expert on the costs of hydro and the development of the hydro program. I can say this, that I was in this House in the memorable Spring of 1969 when it became apparent that it was the effort and the attempt of the Weir government to ram through this Legislature and through the Province of Manitoba, its program and its bill which it attempted to ram through in order to carry out its program and when we went to the people, when the Honourable Leader of the Government threw up his hands and said, "Well, I cannot any longer carry on with my efforts and I'll call an election", it was during the election when the Conservative government took the platform and said, "We will proceed with our plans to flood South Indian Lake, we will go ahead with the plans which we have" and which they concealed from us. The Liberal Party said, "We will not go ahead with the plans; we will not flood South Indian Lake" and we, the New Democratic Party said, "We will certainly delay matters long enough until we have had an opportunity to study the reports that were hidden from us — we do not commit ourselves either way except to look and look carefully." I had something to do with engaging Mr. Cass-Beggs to come in and tell us what was the urgency of the picture and that was the first occasion on which he gave us a report in which he said that he believed that it would be possible for us to postpone our decision for a year in order to re-assess the entire situation — which we then proceeded to do. Now, that part is historically correct, Mr. Speaker. What went on as to the decisions made by government, I don't pretend to be that knowledgeable, nor do I intend to deal with it in the time allowed to me and I certainly would not ask for extended time from the member who was so concerned about bull-headedness.

But let me say this, Mr. Speaker, in all earnestness, that I share with very many people a great concern about the increasing fear about the reducing power and energy situation that will confront the world over the years to come, in our lifetime and I am older than most of those present in this House. I am very deeply concerned and I know very well that hydro power resource is the one

Thursday, February 24, 1977

resource on which we can rely for an indefinite period of time. I also know that it is the most capital intensive resource, energy resource, one can have and I therefore know and I knew when I was much younger than the Member for Sturgeon Creek, that the capital investment in hydro-electric power is a very, very large proportion of the total cost and the maintenance thereafter is small and that can be proven by the Pointe du Bois plant which still serves the people of Winnipeg, that it is necessary that a very large part of the cost of energy production in hydro shall be payments of long-standing debt. So it is almost bull-headed not to acknowledge the facts as they are in that relation. He made a good speech — it would have been better had he not been carried away by figures like \$600 million which are a nice round sum of figures and which he and his colleagues will be repeating time and time again without any real effort to give evidence of the justification for that figure.

Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if at this time you would call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well, I'll call it 5:30. I shall return to the Chair at 8 p.m.