

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, April 20, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): I should like to direct the member's attention to the gallery on my left where we have 18 students of Grade 11 standing from Frontier School Division No. 48, the Gillam School, under the direction of Mr. Barry Heaton. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you here today.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Petition of Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba praying for the passing of An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report for Manitoba Forestry Resources Ltd. for the year ending September 30th, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. NORMA L. PRICE, Minister of Labour (Assiniboia) introduced Bill No. 11, An Act to amend The Retail Businesses Holiday Closing Act.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I would direct this question to the First Minister, realizing that it is his colleague, the Minister of Finance who would be in a better position to reply. And that is, that given Manitoba Hydro has engaged in certain negotiations from time to time directly with utilities in the United States; and given that there is some interest now in reviewing once again the possibility of an upgraded interconnection with Saskatchewan and possibly even Alberta, can the First Minister indicate if there is any formal discussion taking place as between Manitoba and Canada with respect to proceeding with more detailed analysis of the possibility of responding to the U.S. requests which have been tendered formally through the U.S. Ambassador to Canada as to the possibility of longer term fixed amounts of electrical energy being sold southward as part of really national or federal policy in that country rather than just on an ad hoc utility by utility basis.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, in response to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I would have to take that question as notice, not being personally familiar with what discussions the Minister or his officials may have been having in that regard. I would be happy to take it as notice and if I can obtain the information from the department before the Minister returns, I will be happy to give it to my honourable friend.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education. That is to ask the Minister of Education if he is engaged in any discussions with the Government of Canada, the Department of External Affairs in particular, with respect to the question as to whether or not there ought to be Government of Canada financial input by way of foreign aid assistance to those students in Canada from other countries enrolled in our post-secondary institutions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I can assure him that there are some discussions being carried forth on this topic.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have some questions for the Minister of Consumer Affairs. The first one deals with the submissions that have been appearing before the Milk Control Board concerning the proposed increases of ten to fifteen cents per litre. Can the Minister indicate whether his department has undertaken any recent studies to determine what the actual percentage inflationary increase has been for milk in the Province of Manitoba in comparison to other provinces and whether in fact it is really within that range of ten or fifteen percent increases the consumer can expect to have?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, the department does have an interest in these discussions that are now going on with respect to applications for increases in the price of fluid milk. I believe that the present situation is that these prices applied for have not yet been approved. We are monitoring the situation and it would be premature, I believe' Mr. Speaker, to make any comment on the amount of the increase until that has been established.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate whether officials of his department have any intention of making submissions to the Milk Control Board on behalf of consumers and transferring any information they may have in terms of the way in which the proposed increases would affect consumers, particularly those with lower or moderate incomes who do require milk, particularly if they have young children in the families, and what the particular cost increases would have in terms of their income position and the kinds of effects it may have upon their ability to supply whole milk for children or for older people who need it?

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, the question is a fairly lengthy one and involves a number of thoughts by the Member for Fort Rouge. I simply say that his initial question as to whether or not officials of my department are making submissions to the Milk Control Board in this hearing, I will accept that question and respond in due course.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, if I can address a final question to the same Minister concerning his statement yesterday on the intervention by the Manitoba Telephone System in the case concerning the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Board over the cable system. Can we take it that the Government of Manitoba now accepts as a policy the fact that the Public Utilities Board should not have jurisdiction over the Manitoba Telephone System in the supply of services such as cable, computer lines, proposed burglar, fire detection services, even though those are monopoly conditions, because the Manitoba Telephone System controls the access to the lines which deliver them?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the question relates to one which I attempted to respond to yesterday. The matter of disputes in respect to rates charged for the use of cable in Manitoba by MTS is one that, under the Manitoba-Canada Agreement, is properly put before a provincial body with authority to deal with such disputes, and that has been done by Order-in-Council in respect to a rate increase that was initiated by MTS in 1977. That dispute by Order-in-Council was referred to the Public Utilities Board entirely in keeping with the terms of the Manitoba-Canada Agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge has had two supplementary questions already. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister of Labour found that a letter appearing to be sent by the MGEA caused wives to be distressed, resulted in frightened callers, caused a great deal of distress and was a shameful thing to do, having had this effect — in view of the fact that the Minister described and made those adjectives with regard to a fake pink slip, can she tell us how she would feel about the real thing having been done?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: It's a hypothetical question.

MR. GREEN: Is the Minister saying that it's hypothetical that 375 real thing pink slips were sent out to employees, and would the Minister feel that the effects of the fake were any more of a problem than the effect of the real thing?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the honourable gentleman for Inkster. He said "appears to have been sent by the MGEA." It was sent; they have owned up to having sent the letter.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I direct a supplementary question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. When the Attorney-General is investigating the legality of this use of the official provincial crest, would he also investigate the similar use of the official emblems of the province by the Conservative Party in 1977, and would he apply the same penalty to the Conservative Party as he intends to apply to the Manitoba Government Employees' Association?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I have not indicated that I intend to apply any penalties.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Minister of Labour's desire to alleviate distress, can she inform the House whether the Re-deployment Committee has met yet and whether it has alleviated any real distress of those who have been laid off?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, the Re-deployment Committee has been meeting regularly for the past three or four weeks.

MR. FOX: Can the Honourable Minister inform us how many people have been re-deployed through the efforts of the committee?

MRS. PRICE: I will take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Labour. In light of the fact that the nurses at Deer Lodge have reported in sick in order to get a decent raise in wages, does the Minister of Labour consider these nurses "spoiled rotten"?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Minister of Resources has not been in his seat this week, I will pose this question to the First Minister or the Acting Minister, whoever that may be. My question is, will the Ferry Barge Service which was initiated two years ago for the use of the communities of Bloodvein and Princess Harbour, particularly useful to them during their fishing seasons in the spring and in the fall when they ship their fish out in a fresh state via truck on the barge to the plant in Winnipeg, will this service continue this spring and summer?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to take that question as notice for the Honourable Minister when he returns.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to follow up my previous question to the Honourable the Attorney-General who indicated, not in answer to my question, that he hasn't said that he would apply any penalty. I asked the Minister to assure me that the same penalty, if any, that will be applied to the Manitoba Government Employees' Association will be applied to the Conservative Party of the Province of Manitoba that acknowledged that it had wrongfully used emblems not belonging to it and belonging to the people of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I could only assure the Honourable Member for Inkster that if there was an investigation and if there was a court action, and if there was a finding of guilty, I could not assure him what the penalty would be because that would be up to the court.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not referring to court action. I'm referring to the Attorney-General in his role of administering the laws of this province. And I'm asking him whether the laws of this province with regard to the use of emblems will be applied equally to the Conservative Party and to

the Manitoba Government Employees Association. I am not asking him about a court action.

A MEMBER: It's a legal question.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it is not a legal question, and I will speak to the . . . I am talking about the Attorney-General's role as to the administration of justice and if my learned friend doesn't understand that that is not a legal question then he has learned nothing in all of his years of administration. Will the Minister assure this House or will he not, that the law will be applied equally to the Conservative Party of the Province of Manitoba and to the Manitoba Government Employees Association. Now that is a straight question of administration.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the law is applied equally to every resident of the province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address further questions to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. On the question of the government's position on the regulation of cable systems, the Minister still hasn't quite made clear if it is a government policy to support the position of the Manitoba Telephone System, that the Public Utilities Board should not be in a position to provide regulation over the setting of rates for those services that MTS provides through its cable or through its parent lines, particularly when it is in competition with private suppliers who must use the Manitoba Telephone System facilities. Is that a government position or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member inviting perhaps an answer that would impinge upon the time allotment for the opposition to place questions in this House. I can only say that he should not infer that some government policy is involved because MTS chose to be involved in an action in court in which they were very directly concerned. This is a normal, it seems to me, position for a corporation to take when their particular rates are involved very directly in the action in court. So the fact of MTS appearing as an intervener should not be interpreted as some indication of government policy.

MR. AXWORTHY: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, then in taking the Minister's answer. Could he tell us whether the Cabinet or the Minister himself reviews the rate structure the Manitoba Telephone System establishes in relation to those services in which it is in competition with private suppliers. I am thinking of things like computer data services, telephone answering services, proposed service for fire safety and burglar detection, where in fact, they are in a position to undercut private suppliers because they themselves maintain the monopoly of the actual communication link. Now who is it that is then reviewing or assessing the rate structures of that service and who in fact can have access to the service considering that MTS is in competition with proposed or potential private suppliers?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the kind of question that the Member for Fort Rouge is asking is not one that properly can be replied to in this question period. In my view it should be the kind of question that he would place to the Minister responsible during the consideration of the estimates of the department and of the report of the Crown Corporation to the Committee of the Legislature.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I will accept the Minister's reserve for further discussion. Perhaps he could tell us, however, if the Manitoba Telephone System and the Government of Manitoba have authorized the Telephones to proceed with a provision, as they have announced in the past, of supplying so-called burglar or fire detection service at an estimated capital cost of \$58 million? Is that to be part of the Manitoba Telephone System's expansion service when in fact we know that there is a poor supply of services in the rural parts of Manitoba? Has that decision now been made?

MR. MCGILL: I would say, Mr. Speaker, to the Member for Fort Rouge that that also is a kind of question relating to the policy of the Crown corporation which could very well be discussed, as has in the past, during the discussion of the Annual Report of the Manitoba Telephone System at the Standing Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, recently the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition asked me a question relevant to our Health and Social Development office at 408 McGregor Street in Winnipeg and relative to the termination of three term employees there on March 23rd and asked me whether there was any pattern of overtime from that particular health district office either before or after the termination of the said three term employees. I would like to respond to that, Mr. Speaker, and advise the honourable gentleman that none of our professional staff at 408 McGregor or any other facility formerly records overtime. They are expected to adequately meet

demands for services regardless of hours. However, a survey of the staff at 408 McGregor indicates that some staff do work beyond normal hours to the extent of about 100 hours per month involving 21 professional staff. This office was located at 1010 Sinclair in March and April 1977, and the overtime situation was the same there as it is at the present location. There hasn't been any significant change in the amount of overtime worked since the three staff were laid off.

Sir, while I'm on my feet, I would like to request of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that I be permitted a little more time to answer the somewhat more complicated and detailed ramifications that relate to the question he asked me yesterday about overtime in the Community Operations Division generally. I could either take it as an Order for Return and would accept it as such, or if the Leader of the Opposition prefers, I will continue to regard it as a question, respond in Question Period, but I need a little more time on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would be quite satisfied to leave it with the Minister in the form of a question to be replied to. May I direct a supplementary at this time to the Minister of Health and ask him whether he would indicate when referring to the northeast Winnipeg district office of Community Services Division of the Department of Health, in referring to the layoff, of three term employees, if he could advise as to whether in fact there is a difference of approximately 10 or 11 employees working from that district office today as compared to say six months ago? The Minister mentions 3; I'm asking him to verify if in fact the difference is not 10 or 11. Related to that, I would should like to ask the Minister as well if he can advise whether he has received indication that the directors of Patient Services in a number of our Winnipeg hospitals have written to the district offices of the Department of Health indicating that the withdrawal of social worker service from the hospitals has resulted in a deterioration of patient care quality.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Sir, if I may answer the questions in reverse order, the answer to the second question is no, I can't confirm that. I will continue to check that. The honourable gentleman raised that question in similar form yesterday; I do not have confirmation of that but I will check further today.

With respect to his first question, I would just remind him that the whole exchange of information here emanates from his original question to me on March 23rd which related to the layoff of three of the personnel of the northeast Winnipeg division office, 408 McGregor Street, so everything that I've been providing, Sir, has been related to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's reference to the a layoff of three. Those were three term employees whose terms terminated on that date. If there have been further reductions in staff, it would have been through the attrition process. I'll investigate that and report back, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. Since Mr. Frank Allen participated in the preparation of the Review Team's report to the Task Force dealing with Legal Aid and since that same Mr. Frank Allen has since been appointed chairman of Legal Aid of Manitoba, is the Attorney-General prepared to release the Review Team's report in respect to the recommendations on Legal Aid?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the only material that I have available to me is the material contained in the Task Force Report that was distributed to all members of the Legislature.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, is the Attorney-General now, in view of Mr. Allen's position as chairman of Legal Aid Manitoba, prepared to assure us that Mr. Allen concurred with all the recommendations of the Task Force pertaining to Legal Aid Manitoba or whether he dissented from some of the recommendations, in view of the important position that he now holds with Legal Aid Manitoba.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have the same regard for Mr. Frank Allen that the Honourable Member for Selkirk has in which he indicated to this Legislature in the last session of the Legislature that he was one of the most highly respected lawyers with demonstrated ability in the Province of Manitoba. I'm sure, as a person of that character and reputation, he will do an excellent job in this position.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, just on a point of privilege because I'm unable to recognize on the part of the Attorney-General in answer to my question. I was not debating whether or not Mr. Allen was a respected or not a respected member of the Bar. My interest was his particular position in respect to the recommendations in the Task Force Report on Legal Aid as were expressed in the Review Committee's Report to the Task Force.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can make one comment before answering that question. I've noticed, as a new member of the Legislature, that many members on both sides of the House raise matters of privilege and I can certainly see no matter of privilege in the comments of the Member for Selkirk or in the reported points of privilege that have been raised by members, and I would ask, Sir, that when a point of privilege is raised, you ask the member to succinctly and briefly state what his point of privilege is so that you can determine that matter before members are allowed to speak and ramble along as the Member for Inkster does from his seat.

I'd be pleased to answer the question, Mr. Speaker, by saying that the information available to me is the report of the Task Force and if the Honourable Member for Selkirk wishes to determine whether or not Mr. Allen disagrees with any points in that report, he'll have to ask him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Has the Minister received any estimates of the number of jobs, or the number of positions being eliminated at hospitals, personal care homes and nursing homes in the Province of Manitoba because of the current restraint program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker. I have heard the cries of alarm that have been bandied about by in particular members of the opposition but I have had no factual evidence placed in front of me on that subject whatsoever.

MR. EVANS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Honourable Minister be willing to undertake a survey of the health institutions — namely the general hospitals, the personal care homes, and the nursing homes — to ascertain to obtain an estimate of the total layoffs occurring because of the restraint exercise? The two to three percent increase which they have obtained, of course, is a lot less than the nearly nine percent inflationary increase. So in real terms, there is a reduction of resources. So because of this reduction in resources there has to be some cutback somewhere. So I would ask the Honourable Minister whether he would be willing to undertake a survey of these health institutions to ascertain just to what degree jobs or positions are being reduced or eliminated?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the government sees it as its responsibility to monitor that kind of situation all the time. The employment levels in the province are, of course, of surpassing concern to the government and I expect that during the review of my Estimates, or examination of my Estimates, that the kind of information that the honourable member is seeking will be available at that time. I will try to make that sort of thing available during my Estimates, but it is being monitored continually. I have no reason for alarm at the moment.

MR. EVANS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the Minister's concern in that he is attempting to monitor the situation. In his monitoring, would he also take into consideration just what other cuts may be taking place in these health institutions? Because if cuts are not taking place in jobs, then there must be cutbacks either in food, bedding, medicines, or what have you. So would he undertake to monitor just where the real cuts are taking place, because of the real reduction in resources being given to these health institutions in the province?

MR. SHERMAN: That is being done right now, Mr. Speaker, and I can assure my honourable friend that essentially, fundamentally, basically, the cuts are taking place in unnecessary and uncontrolled and unjustifiable areas of expenditure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, my question to the Minister of Health flows from his last two answers. I would like to give the Minister an opportunity to say now whether he has received information from the southwest Winnipeg office and the northeast Winnipeg office of the Community Services Division of the Department of Health that (a) caseload is not down — contrary to his statement of the other day that caseload was down. I believe the Honourable Minister was referring to Income Maintenance Division. I am referring to Community Services Division. There is a difference. And that (b) the number of personnel employed in those division offices, because of a decrease of more than 11 people in the two offices combined, are not able to respond to the standing arrangements with the district hospitals for patient care, social worker service, and not able to respond adequately to the general community need.

Is the Minister wishing to deny that such information has been forwarded to him on those offices?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. While I realize that the question period is for the benefit of all members, somehow I get the feeling that perhaps we are dealing with Estimates during the question period, rather than during the proper time for it. However, it is the members, themselves, that have control over the type of questions they want to ask. Does the Honourable Minister of Health want to

reply?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, when I was referring to the caseload being down in the province I was indeed referring to income security — provincial income programs. I have told the honourable gentleman that I will seek out the information relative to his questions pertaining to the Community Operations Division. I have told him that, to my knowledge, I have not had that kind of information that he suggests he has made available to me. He is aware, I'm sure, of the volume of information that passes through Crown departments every day. I have not had that drawn to my attention. I told him, I thought, earlier . . . I assured him earlier that I would continue to check on the situation and keep him informed.

MR. SCHREYER: Would the Honourable Minister of Health, not personally necessarily, but would the Minister of Health indicate if he is prepared to contact, or cause to have contacted, the Director of Patient Services of such hospitals as Victoria, Concordia, etc., to ascertain whether or not those people directly involved with patient care services and quality have registered a protest and a complaint with respect to the withdrawal of social worker services from the respective district offices of community operations?

MR. SHEAN: I will ask the Health Services Commission to do that for me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Minister to whom the Manitoba Telephone System reports. On several occasions in response to questions from myself and my colleagues, the Honourable Minister has indicated to the House that phone service to remote communities is proceeding on a specific time table. My question to the Minister then is: What is the cause of numerous time delays in completing phone service to the communities of Gods River, Gods Lake Narrows, Red Sucker Lake, and other communities in that area?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Member for Churchill is repeating a question with a somewhat different preamble. The question was placed on April 11th. I can tell the member, and I did respond and he many have been absent from the House on the day of my response, but he will be able to consult Hansard for the answer that was given some days ago.

However, the service that he refers to was originally scheduled for Gods Lake Narrows as a toll and local dial service for September, 1977, and for Gods River, a toll pay station service for November, 1977.

The member may be aware that there was a fire at Gods Lake Narrows microwave site in May of 1977, and the completion of this schedule of service was delayed as a result of that fire. Gods Lake Narrows now is expected to have a temporary toll pay station service by May 1st of this year and toll and local dial service by September of this year. Gods River will be receiving toll pay station service by May 1st of this year. So, in a matter of ten days those services will be provided.

MR. COWAN: I thank the Minister for the answer and the specific dates. I would ask the Minister, then, if he would communicate with the Chief and Band Councils of those communities and inform them so, as they are quite concerned about the completion of their phone service.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I did receive a copy of a letter written by the Chief, addressed to a Federal Minister or official, I'm not sure which. But we will be pleased to accept a copy of that letter and respond to it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD MCBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. I wonder if the Minister will be recommending to Cabinet the reinstatement of the courthouse and jail at The Pas that was cut off, and if he recommends the jail facility proceed, what is his percentage chance that he thinks he might have of having that approved?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I can't give the honourable member any clearer definitive answer on that. That subject is under review by Cabinet and I hope to be able to furnish an answer fairly soon. I don't have one at this juncture.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. MCBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Public Works then if he will be taking this matter to Cabinet, and what he thinks his percentage chances are of having the jail facility at The Pas approved.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a supplementary, perhaps to the First Minister, I'm not

sure. The Minister of Health has stated what his chances were — he was going to recommend a Snow Lake hospital to Cabinet — what his percentages chances were. And I just would like to know who is the Minister that takes this type of proposal forward to Cabinet? Is it the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Health? Does it originate out of the air? Could the First Minister tell us who brings the proposals for construction, who will be bringing the proposal for the construction of the jail at The Pas to Cabinet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate my honourable friend's lack of knowledge at how Cabinet works, even though he was a member of a Cabinet, because we're cleaning up, week by week, month by month, some of the lack of management that my honourable friends left behind them. What I can assure my honourable friend is this — (Interjection) — it's not sarcasm, it's fact. What I can assure my honourable friend is this, that when a statement is to be made on behalf of the government with respect to matters of government policy, it will be made by the Minister charged with that responsibility. Now, I realize that it is strange, it may be a strange occurrence for him to come to the realization that there are such things as Ministers having line responsibility; that's something that's changed since the 24th of October, because back in the days when my honourable friend was carrying the title of a Minister, we realized that members such as the Member for Transcona, who was one of their super bureaucrats, was really making most of the decisions, and the Cabinet didn't know what was going on. So I can understand, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend's consternation, and I've given him the answer. .

ORDERS OF THE DAY—ORDERS FOR RETURN

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, since there seems to be a minute to go, may I ask a question under the Orders, before Orders for Return?

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question — I would have liked to address a question to the Minister of Finance, but not knowing who is the Acting Minister of Finance, I would direct it, I suppose, to the First Minister. In view of the fact that the loan guarantee to the Co-op Implements Company is being charged to General Purposes, 1., does that mean that it is being written off now as a dead weight debt? 2., is that therefore used to reduce the 27 or \$29 million that he spoke of in relation to his comparison on the Highways increase in Estimates?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'll be happy to take that question as notice. The loan guarantee, to the best of my knowledge as I stand here now, is only a loan guarantee. How it will appear in Estimates is a matter upon which I'll get further advice and be happy to advise the honourable member.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, just a supplementary. I inform the Honourable First Minister that he signed the Order-in-Council and that indeed it was charged to General Purposes in the Order-in-Council which he signed. You cannot guarantee something without having an authority to which to charge it, so that I would expect that he will learn what the procedure is and inform us.

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return, the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return of:

Updating Provincial Tax Comparison Tables prepared by the Taxation Division of the Department of Finance.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, the information requested by my honourable friend is contained in a document published by Statistics Canada under the Public Finance Division entitled "Principal Taxes in Canada," and that document is available to my honourable friend. If he wishes something more detailed prepared by the officials of the Department of Finance, then I must inform him — I think he already knows — that that information is departmental in nature and is not normally revealed. I think my honourable friend knows that.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Just to inform the Honourable the Minister, the House Leader, I have written a letter to the Minister of Finance, as a result of which he invited both the filing of an Order for Return, and also stated that he saw no difficulty in accepting such an Order on the information which I had requested. Under the circumstances, possibly the Minister would like to defer the matter or to lay it over to debate or something, but I don't think his answer is quite sufficient.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to provide for my honourable friend a copy of this document in which the information that he seeks is available.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Can I understand then, that this matter is deferred for debate?

MR. SPEAKER: It's been moved by the Honourable Member for St. Johns, seconded by the Member for Inkster, that the Order be transferred for debate.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I believe that it's automatic if it's refused by the Government.

MR. JORGENSON: No, Mr. Speaker, I just want to correct my honourable friend. It's not automatic; it's transferred to debate only at the request of the person who is seeking the information.

MR. SPEAKER: It's been moved by the Honourable Member for St. Johns, seconded by the Member for Inkster, that the matter be transferred for debate. Is it the pleasure of the House . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just find difficulty with the procedure you're taking. When the Order is moved, which it was, and seconded, then it's determined whether the government will accept it. If they don't, then he asks that it be transferred for debate. There is not a separate motion which you have now put, and I would not want there to be a separate motion. I think that the Speaker can announce that the matter is referred for debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. I accept the advice of the Honourable Member for Inkster, and ask that the matter be set over for debate.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. I think there is another confusion that arises in that whilst the Honourable House Leader is indicating that the Order is not acceptable, he's indicating it's not acceptable because the Order need not have been placed in the first place, because the information is readily available in another source to my honourable friend. In other words, that the material is already available in the journals of the House, or in the library, or whatever.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable members that that is probably a good reason to transfer it for debate.

Order for Return, the Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following information:

1. The name, position, salary and qualifications of each person hired since October 24, 1977 to work within the Civil Service Commission, and in agencies reporting to the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission, and the nature of the competition held for the position.

MOTION presented.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that the Minister of Labour was going to be here to reply to that question. I wonder if you can defer it until the Minister of Labour is in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Then may I call on the Honourable Member for Inkster. I believe he had a point of order he wanted to raise.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was going to say, that given the length of these two, we could have them moved as they appear on the Order Paper rather than have them read out.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, then may I ask whether you want the two lumped together or does the government wish to treat them separately?

MR. JORGENSON: I apologize for the fact that the Minister of Labour — I presume she was called out. If they can stand over until tomorrow they'll be dealt with at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas on a point of order.

MR. MALINOWSKI: No, on a point of clarification. It means that both will be voted on tomorrow, then.

MR. JORGENSON: They both come under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Labour, so I'd like her to deal with them rather than . . .

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take part in this debate. My grievance was the performance of the First Minister yesterday afternoon. It was the biggest let-down, I think, in the history of this House and I wish he'd stay for a little while, but I don't think he will. — (Interjection)— Oh, I'm sorry, okay, I'm sorry. Go back to your monkey business then and we'll keep on digging.

Mr. Speaker, you know we were told by the First Minister that there were going to be all kinds of horror stories. We even had a special meeting of caucus to see how we could react; should we all walk together; should we call reinforcements; should we hide under the desk; we were trembling with fright at this. And then we were told that, yes, he was going to tell us about this deficit; he was going to tell us the story. He stated that to the press, he stated that to everybody, but no, what a let-down. It was a nothing speech. You know, he was racking the pot; he tried to take the time; he didn't want anybody. And I stole that from somebody yesterday, I think it was the former speaker — go and count your money in the bank.

The honourable member can make good speeches; the Throne Speech wasn't bad. But this one was only insults. He talked about the Federal Government. He had the audacity to prepare a platform for my honourable friend from Fort Rouge. I don't know if it's the same platform he used last time he ran federally, but it wasn't too good. Mind you, there's something that was very important, we exchanged pleasantries. He told me how much he wanted me to stay in this House; I was definitely very impressed at him seeking the Federal nomination, but when he said that, I did not want to disappoint him and I made a decision right on the spot that I would stay here at least three or four years to be able to discuss with him.

He brought in the question of aid for private schools and he tried to cause a riff between my honourable friend and I. Whenever this question comes again we will be fighting each other as hard as we can. We understand that and we know that. But, if it wasn't decided and if there's any unfinished business, we brought it in and I fought hard when we were in government; but it was the Conservative Party, in the opposition then, that did not allow free vote. There was only one that broke the whip and he didn't come back after that. Well, call it what you want, all right, broke ranks, I should say. — (Interjection)— How would you say it in French, smartie? How would you say it in French, smartie? No, well, I guess he can't answer. All right. Sometimes, you know, when it's a second language you do make mistakes and I think people could take that into consideration, especially when they can't. They couldn't speak the second language — official language — at all.

Yes, there was talk about aid to private schools and it was the same party that decided that they thought that it would divide the government and then they would have a better chance of taking the power, so they did not allow a free vote on it. But they said that had they been in government — and the Minister of Highways said that — that they would deal with it differently; they would be more firm and not beat around the bush and bring something constructive. So I hope that I'll be able to support the motion of the Minister of Highways. I'm very pleased to know that.

Now another thing that we heard — I was so damned fed up with this word "doctrinaire" that I finally went to the dictionary and tried to get the definition of "doctrinaire", because I've heard it so much. It says, "A person who would put a political or social theory into effect without regard for its practical difficulties." And if this government is not a government — a group of doctrinaires — well, then there's no such thing.

But when you talk about this government, Mr. Speaker, the first thing that comes to your mind is the word "liar" and you shouldn't say that. It's not parliamentary. But, you know, when you want to say it, what is an untruth? What is falsehood? What is anything to deceive? And that is a lie. But we can't use this word here and it's very very difficult, it's practically impossible to make a speech without referring to that. So in order to be parliamentary, instead of using that word — if it ever crossed my mind, if I want really to explain a falsehood I'll use the word "ding-a-ling", I've never seen that. That was for a "ding-a-ling" or something like that.

And the first "ding-a-ling", it is that this group here needed an excuse for their doctrinaire approach. They needed this excuse. They did not have the guts to say, "This is what we believe in." So they had to have an excuse and they invented all kinds of "ding-a-lings"; they talked about the real deficit, the mess we left

them in, but the story came out. The truth came out and it wasn't that at all.

Then, you know, to make it even worse and with their information service, they said, "Had this group of people been returned to office and formed the government, it would have been another \$400 million deficit." They apparently received the different departments — you know, it's nothing for them to say \$400 million or what is it? — \$5 million lost, and all this stuff; well, approximately, and they can't back it up.

But is there anything so deceitful as to try to let the people believe that our Budget was all ready to go, approved by all the Ministers, individually, approved by the staff of the Ministers, then approved by the Cabinet, and this is what the Estimates were, because that wasn't it at all. Not one of us — I've enquired of my colleagues, the former Ministers — and they the same as I, had not seen anything at all. Some of the people on their staff were going on the first draft and there could be 5, 10, 15 drafts, and if you know the way that we used to go through the Estimates, you wouldn't recognize the first draft with the last draft, Mr. Chairman.

A MEMBER: He said most of the Ministers never saw the . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, you know, when they dispensed the brains, they gave them to all of these guys, if you listen to them. We didn't know anything at all. It was very poor. And it was so poor, Mr. Speaker, so poor that they made their campaign — it was built on that, that they were going to save all kinds of money to reduce taxes. As my honourable friend . . . we were too stupid, there was so much mismanagement, and it was only the fact that it was going to be cut off and they were going to save all kinds of money. —(Interjection)— True, true, the one that said true, is saying that they are not cutting programs then, that they only used fat. All right, let the record show that it is only the fat that they had to cut to save all this money, not programs and so on, so let's not ever blame the former government and say it's your fault if we have to cut day care, if we have to cut these programs or increase fees, yes —(Interjection)— They didn't cut day care, Mr. Speaker, what they did, they allowed a few pennies . . .

MR. ENNS: . . . or was that in the projected Estimates that you just denied you weren't going to be prepared to pass? You can't have it both ways, Larry, you can't have it both ways.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, we can't have it both ways but how can you say you can't cut day care when you freeze day care, because you said there is not going to be one more space. Is that cutting day care or isn't that cutting day care? That's not cutting day care. I am sorry we were both right but he understands things a little differently. If he freezes something it is not a cut, it is just frozen solid, you can't cut it, you can't put your knife through it, it's frozen solid. All right so they freeze it, I call it a cut and this is what they are doing. Now, you know the first thing you would have them . . . it was such a mess! Any people in their right mind, when there is a mess will . . . All right, there was a Task Force that was named, that was supposed to bring all this mess and show it to them and then they would act, but they all started like gangbuster, everything was decided before the Task Force. It was a cold document when it was tabled here, it was passe, it was finished because they had done exactly what they wanted to do as a doctrinaire group of people, that's exactly what they had done . . .

First of all, it was a great thing, the Succession Duty Tax was eliminated. And the First Minister made a very big thing yesterday about . . . He tried, he started a questionnaire and let the records show and so on and the questionnaire was: What would you do if the Succession Duty, the tax of Succession Duty, what would you do if you formed the government? All right, let's have it quite clear, let me tell you quite clear without hiding behind my desk, without anything, to tell you the way I feel about Succession Duty. I think it is one of the fairest tax ever. I think it is because you are going to the people that have money. You know we heard how rotten the people were, how spoiled rotten they were that they tightened the belt. But we made a great thing here yesterday of saying, okay, no succession duty tax at all, we will remove that and that is people that they would have the first, what is it, at least \$200,000 clear. . . . How much? All right, \$600,000 for a couple and they are the ones that are saying we are spoiled rotten, tighten the belt. Do they want to tighten the belt? No. I will say this, that personally as far as I am concerned —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Succession Duty, as far as I am concerned, if you have other provinces, all right take it off. If you are the only province that has it, no, I think there is no point in keeping the tax, but that doesn't change the fact that it is a fair tax, one of the fairest tax. You know, taxes are no good, nobody wants to pay taxes, but isn't it the best thing to do to tax people that have money along the lines that if they have money the people that can afford more pay more. But that is a sin, that is against these doctrinaire people over there. So this was the first thing they did. It was supposed to leave a mess and they removed this tax, for those people, you know. Then they are saying to the people, take a cut, two meals a day is enough for you. The hell with you, two meals a day, who are you trying to kid, and before you say it it might be enough for me but not for the old people in those senior citizen homes and I am not there, not yet anyway. —(Interjection)— That's right, that's right, I agree with that, but I am not there unfortunately — maybe one a week for a couple of weeks anyway.

Then there was a reduction on corporations. Of course, the corporations, they are tightening their belt all the time, you know, and then we talked about priorities. There were more moneys spent on highways than before, we were told that we didn't spend enough money on highways, and everything else, when everything else. . . . There's one that I probably agree with the Minister of Highways, there certainly wasn't any freeze on that, or no cut on that program. And of course, law enforcement, because we expected the people would not be very happy and we spend more money on law enforcement.

You know we hear so much about the economy and if these people say it, it's just like if you took it out of the bible. The economy is in danger and what do you have to do, there has to be more profit. Do we ever stop to think a minute what we are saying? We are saying that the large corporations, if they can't make enough money here, they will go somewhere else, they will go to the States, or they will go to a country, or if they can find somewhere where there is still slavery they will go there and we have got to compete with that. And the people, the people on the panel with my honourable friend, the Minister of Labour, who said that they are spoiled rotten. He was born with a silver spoon in his mouth, a millionaire father. Is he going to tighten the belt? Is he going to have any difficulties at all? You know, we are saying this and all of a sudden it's the saying and nobody should argue with that — tighten the belt, it's a very difficult time — the newspapers take it up and so on, and you know, this is the time of restraint. But who is asked to do it?

The Minister of Health, not too long ago, yesterday or today, was defending the increase that he was ready to offer the doctors. He was defending that, he exaggerated a bit, some of the things that he said made sense, they have their expenses and they are supposed to go up but what about a freeze on that? You know, you are freezing the budget of the government. Did anybody go to the doctors' offices and find out that everything is all right. If you are going to pay for it, shouldn't you look at the budget? Isn't it the group that said a while ago, more control about the corporation and so on. The public is paying the cost of these offices so maybe you should find out what the cost is and if there is a . . . If the hospitals are told to go back on a 2.9 increase maybe the doctors' offices should do the same thing. But then, that is all right, you defend that, the Minister defends that, but he also defends the right of the hospitals to say you take a cut in salary so we can pay the doctors more, so we can pay the corporations more, so we can take the succession duty off, because that's priority, it's not doctrinaire, but that's priority. This is what we need more. You know, they said tough time and the people who are making only \$600,000, damn it, why do you want to take a few bucks from them. You can't do that, cut the wages in the hospitals, cut the meals, two meals a day, you know, that is fine. And that's what we hear and we take it for granted. I would like to see anyone here if it was their family that we are talking about, if they would not go for the most underprivileged if they had a retarded child or a child in the hospital, and I am convinced that every single one of us would do the same thing. We would go bankrupt, we would sacrifice anything. But then when we talk about this family of Manitobans, or for that case, the family of human beings, what do we say? We are lectured by the people and who are the ones who are saying, we must do that to create more jobs, there must be more profit.

You know, progress is just the big dollar sign. That's exactly what it is and nobody will defend that, nobody will debate that. I think that this is awful, because who is to say that the main thing, the first thing, don't let the doctors leave, don't let them go somewhere where they are going to get more money and so on, you have got to fight back. But at the expense of who? At the expense of the guy at the bottom of the ladder, the guy that can't do a damn thing. Who's getting fired first? The maintenance people. And the big thing, we were talking about the cut not too long ago of the salaries and that's exactly what we're asking; it's routine; everything is fair. So you're going to ask somebody that's getting \$10,000 or something, you're going to tell him to take a cut in wages but you're going to get somebody that's getting \$50,000 or \$60,000, a corporation and so on. Now, tell me, tell me, what are those people, where are they going to suffer? Are they going to have, as the president of the Great-West Life or those other places, are they going to have one bottle of Crown Royal less, one trip less? No, the taxpayers will probably pay for that. But you don't care if you take the last slice of bologna from the table of certain people — or they'll go without jobs. That's exactly what you're doing.

MR. ENNS: Now, now, now, now, now.

MR. DESJARDINS: You wouldn't know what bologna is, maybe; there's some people that would be darned please to have that but they haven't got a job. They haven't got a job because you want to cut, to make sure that this guy gets \$600,000 or something, you know, you've got to give him the money. And you're so proud of that. Your cocky leader yesterday was standing up, or on his knees, I don't know, and he was telling everybody how great it was, how great it was — the succession duty, and that was his claim to fame, that was his claim to fame.

We are supposed to be spoiled rotten but, who are saying that? You know, the leader, he made darned sure he didn't move until he was guaranteed by a corporation a salary of over \$3,000 a month and now he's in their pocket but that's exactly what he had to do. He insisted that this would be done before he'd move. What about this inflation? What about the troubled period that we're in? What did he do in this regard? He insisted — and I don't blame him — but I blame him when he doesn't look at the little guy and I blameeeee by ' the way, the members of the backbench because they're the ones that can keep these people honest and they'll have to remember that when they have to go . . . All right, I don't expect them to jump up today and agree with what I say but I think they've got to be a little more active in caucus and remember that they're not just rubber stamps, not just automatic votes for the leader and two or three of the others to decide, and do what they're doing with the people of Manitoba today. —(Interjection)— Don't tell me you're the Chairman.

You probably noticed that I asked very few questions before Orders of the Day to the Minister of Health because I sympathize with him, it's a very tough portfolio. I really sympathize with him and I've

seen him. I've been concerned about him because, you know, maybe that's why the other group, the former government wasn't stupid. Maybe that's why they took the fat guy and put him in there because I had a lot of weight to lose, but he's losing weight all the time and it's a difficult time. The last time that I talked to him — and I'm glad to see him come into the House — last year I told him that I did not blame him for what was going on in his department because I didn't think it was him; that I felt that he was a gentleman and I felt that he had a heart and that got him mad because he felt that collectively he was responsible. So therefore I won't make the same mistake again and when I say the Minister of Health, I mean the government, and when I say the government, I mean the Minister of Health. If he wants to accept the responsibility, fine, but let him accept it all the way.

As I said, I was ready — and I'm still ready — to go along and give him a chance to learn his department, but now he's playing God. Now he knows that all he's been . . . starting on — when was it? I think I wrote this somewhere — on October 29th, a few days after he took office, he said that he will guard against party ideology creeping in and calling the shot, and he hasn't succeeded in that very much because that's exactly what's happening. He talked about "the relations will be based on consultation not confrontation." Well, I've never seen so much confrontation with groups since this government took office. Four days in office, four days in that department, you know, anybody could be a little humble, but four days. He said the budget paring is so obvious in his department, it's so big. Four days. He didn't find out what the programs were. He knew nothing about it but then he was ready to go.

Well, it is clear to me that they took a Cabinet Minister, a fellow that's considered a good guy because he had a tough job to do. I don't think he's calling the shots — and he can get mad if he wants — I think that the shots are being called by the First Minister and the Minister of Finance, and he's the PR for the department. And he's good at it; he's good at it. He speaks well and, you know, instead of being on the defensive, the first thing you know, he's on the offence and he's blaming somebody else for the shortcomings that are happening and he's doing a good job at it. But what he's been doing, what he's been doing, Sir, is flying kites and trial balloons. That's all he's been doing. There have not been any decisions in that department at all.

You've talked about the Misericordia Hospital. It was going to be closed and moved; it wasn't, and when the people got mad, well, we'll talk to them. There is still no decision on that. And then there was Seven Oaks, the same thing, and all of a sudden, now maybe Seven Oaks is going to expand more. The Mount Carmel Clinic, now the Mount Carmel Clinic is going to be cut. All these things are going to be cut — now they're not too sure. The personal care beds, we've heard nothing. For years we've needed more acute beds — we hold firm on that — but the then opposition talked about the acute beds, now they don't talk about it; later on they're just talking about personal care beds and the health critic for the department — unfortunately it will probably cost him the job of the Minister of Health because they couldn't put him in there after advocating that there should be more personal care beds and those are frozen also. Now we never know what's going to go in that.

The Minister a couple of days ago, told us that he would not yield to public pressure, he would not yield to public pressure, but then a couple of days he said that these hospitals they would freeze. And where the pressure started, in Snow Lake, he announced that they would build a hospital, but then he had to again have this red herring and try to blame the former government for what they did and so on. I've got news for him. I don't know the way he does it now but in those days we had a Manitoba Health Services Commission and there was not politics played in any construction of a single hospital, and I include Seven Oaks with that. The hospitals were recommended by the Commission but I understand that the Minister has not met — or has met once — with the members of the Manitoba Health Services Commission and that the Commission has not met since 1978, unless they met just a couple of days ago. And this is what we have.

Now, a while ago, I wasn't trying to be insulting, but when I told the Minister that I felt that he was playing God — how can he stand up here and announce, as if it was something new that they'd found, that there was global funding. This was done, and any good manager will tell you that periodically you have to go to line-to-line funding because after a while it gets out of kilter and you have to look and you have to check because there are abuses and so on. We've had global budgeting too. And if you say global budget, then what do you say? The big announcement. The government takes the credit, a big announcement that they were going to do more for open heart surgery or the heart team at St. Boniface Hospital. But then, oh, that's part of the 2.9, the 2.9, and now we understand that that is frozen also, that there's very little. What's going to happen? They're going to have enough money for maybe 20 or 30 open heart surgery operations a year. Who's going to wait? Is there only going to be Riley if he needs it, or is it going to be the Minister, or my wife, or anybody here? No. You know who's going to wait — the guy at the bottom of the ladder — because he's not going to count, because you're going to be afraid of that big deficit. And this is what's going to happen. You're talking about a 2.9.

It's a global budget, but then any time there's a complaint, well, the Minister is going to check into it, he's going to monitor. He's used that word so much — monitor. And if he says it's all right, well then that's it, that's it. Two mills a day, that's okay, he said it was all right. You are forcing the people. You are giving them global budget; you are saying 2.9 and personal care home 4. something, and they don't know what to do. They're even cutting meals. Oh, that's all right. They are cutting meals and I heard the fellow explaining today, "Well, you know, like I do at home. I stay in bed on Saturday. These people, Saturday, Sunday, is the same as Monday. Why not three days? You'd save more money. Why not four days? Those are old people; they don't go to work. — (Interjection) — What program? I read the paper. We certainly didn't have any of these programs; you can rest assured of that. This program

was started on April 1st, on April 1st —(Interjection)— Well, that's what I was told, that it started on April 1st.

The thing is that you can't blame these people. You can't even blame the people from Victoria Hospital. I disagree with my friend here. They are going out of their minds trying to run their business with 2.9 and they can't do it. I think that if this is the case and if the Minister is so sure that it can be done, why does he have to monitor? They have global budget and they are doing their best. They can't be criticized for the thing they do wrong and for the things that they try in order to do something else. If they're told, "That's it, it's a global budget." And it's no longer a global budget. It's a hell of a global budget when you say to the people, "You're going to do this; you're going to that; you're going to do that but you have to do it with 2.9 increase."

The Minister said yesterday, and that got a laugh, that he was concerned about the dental nurses and he was sweating. Now, a few days after taking office, the Minister of Health stated publicly that he was one because he was always one, and I remember in opposition we shared the same thoughts that he was one in prevention. He believed very much in prevention and he stated shortly after he became the Minister of Health that there was one program that was not going to be cut, that was the dental program; that they would not interfere, that he was going to look at what the dentists had to offer but he wanted to make sure what was going to happen. Now you've got people who, in good faith, were hired to do a job. It was a program that was announced and it is one of the most successful programs you can have. You didn't have one criticism except by some of the dentists who wanted to have a private plan. And this is not ideology; this is something that has never worked. A private plan, the utilization rate of a private plan has been approximately the same in certain areas like Quebec, where they tried it, is exactly the same or about the same as it was before the plan. In other words, the same kids that were taken to the doctor, taken by the hand by their mothers and fathers, the same people go but now the public pays. We have a program that was successful. We were told it's going to be costly. Well, I've got news for you, Mr. Speaker. I have the last report of the Saskatchewan Dental Plan and this is supposed to be . . . of course, when you start it's going to be . . . you're starting from scratch, you need equipment; the utilization is not that much and you can start, it can't be universal from day one.

Well, let me read, because this was said to be so expensive in Saskatchewan: "The increased number of children," — and I'm quoting now from the report — "of children enrolled in the program combined with growing efficiencies has resulted in a reduction of the average cost per child from \$158 in the first year," — that was 1974, I think it started September, 1974, so 1974 to September 1975 — "and the last year, 1977, it went from \$158 in the first year to \$83.00 in the current year despite the high rate of inflation during this year per period." Now, has that been looked at? It was a program that was very successful and it's going down. As you go along, it's going down and it wasn't just the supporters of the New Democratic Party, it was the people in the school division and so on that liked this program, and they said so.

Then you might say, "Well, it's not a good program. They can't do the work." All right. Well, let's see what happened in Saskatchewan. "In 1976, a study was conducted to evaluate the quality of care provided by the Saskatchewan dental nurses. In February of that year, three dentists from outside the province — one specialist in children's dentistry and two specialists in restorative dentistry — surveyed 410 children from Kindergarten to Grade 2, a total of 2,107 amalgam," — I don't know, I'll have to ask my friend, is that the way you pronounce it, amalgam? Restoration.

A MEMBER: Amalgam.

MR. DESJARDINS: Okay. I can't say that. ". . . and 97 stainless steel crowns were assessed. Later analysis of these fillings showed that 1,503 fillings were placed by the Saskatchewan dental nurses and 604 by dentists. Overall, the restoration were rated as follows by three dentists: placed by a dentist — 21.1 percent unacceptable; by the dental nurses — 3.7. Okay. And it's not dental nurses that did that.

Superior: dentist — 16.5 percent; dental nurses — you would expect maybe 2 or 3 percent — 47.7 percent. So it's a high quality program. It's a universal program and then it's a program that is costing less money than the others. And now let's look at the utilization. I think I've got the utilization here somewhere.

Well' I can tell you that the administration was another thing. It would cost so much to administer. Well, it started very expensive at first. It was \$25.99 and it went down \$7.30 now.

Just before I leave this program, I wanted to tell you about the utilization, if I can find it, Mr. Speaker. The utilization in there was an average of 96.9 percent. All right. So you've got a cheaper program. It is much better utilized and it is at least — I won't insult anybody but I will say at least — as good work. And by this report and what was studied, I read you the figures and you judge by yourselves.

So why, if my honourable friend, and I agree with him that we want to prevent, and we've got in this field a darn good program that pleased everybody and the large cost should be behind us now — in percentage. Because it is tough to start. . . Now, we have paid the salaries; the people of Manitoba have paid the salaries of these dental nurses. And they are good, and some of them are ready to go. Well, and I have no doubt — I know the Minister — I have no doubt that he will do everything possible to find them a job. But where? You know, I don't think he is an employment agency and he has to cut in this program. I don't know if it is going to be that simple and just imagine if it was your daughter.

Now, we have talked about the program. This program wasn't built just to help dental nurses, but

there was something. You talk about people coming in, a new industry and giving jobs. All right, then this was a program that was educational, preventive, and a good program. And you have these people who quite honestly accepted this. They were recruited. We went after them and we said, "All right, we will pay your education." That was costly. We had to start that, or we could have maybe gone to recruit and pay more for people from Australia or somewhere else.

So what do we do? We get these people — those that came back. There was some adjustment to be made, but they did damn good work. Ask anybody? Ask Bobby Bend. Bobby Bend is certainly not a supporter of this party and he was a director. I say that; I wouldn't use his name to try to involve him with what has become a political debate, but I mean he made it quite clear. And it wasn't a political decision for him that it was a good program, and he always backed this program.

Then we have the people who have had one year. What are they going to do? You know, what are they going to do? They have one year. —(Interjection)— What? Well, I know you don't like that. I know you don't like that. You would just as soon say to hell with those dental nurses. To hell with a good program, and let's give it to the people that want it. Let's make this a private plan, because you talk about ideology. You've got it. You are so afraid of anything that was touched by the former government. Well, you know, it has got to be bad. It has got to be bad. Everything that was started before has got to be bad.

Now I'd like maybe the Minister without Portfolio, or the House Leader, to stand up and tell me that he doesn't believe in that program. Because that is, in effect, what he is saying — that he doesn't believe in this program, that it didn't work. Sure, in your action here today; you don't want to hear about that. You think it's not . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: That isn't what I said.

MR. DESJARDINS: I know what you said. And say it again — I'm having another drink.

MR. JORGENSEN: That's the first time I saw a windmill run by water.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, all right. So therefore that is exactly what I said. So a windmill. . . Then it's only wind; it has no substance. All right, then that's exactly what I am accusing you of — that you feel that this program has no substance. That it's just talk. You don't care. Apparently, you don't care. —(Interjection)— My own imagination! Was this prepared by my imagination? Was this plan prepared by imagination? All right, did you listen to the figures that I have quoted? No, there you go. My honourable friend is talking about a windmill but he didn't listen. He didn't give a damn because he is so set in his ideas. He is all right. He wants to make money. He wants to sell his land to foreigners and make a hell of a lot of money, put it in his pocket, and then say to the other guys, "Well, you guys take it easy. You take a salary cut. You take a salary cut." That's all right because this is a class government. Sir, not a classy — a class government. Just a certain class, and you know what class they want to protect.

They are the people that are crying, that are saying, "You know, it's a hard time." They will give me an example of one. You know, in Manitoba two might be a little too much, but one person who is saying now, "Cut, it's time to cut," that is doing something himself — that is going without something because he is so concerned with the difficult times. Tell me one fellow that is squawking and is talking about leaving the country that will say, "No, I'll stay in Manitoba. That will be my sacrifice. I can maybe make a few dollars more somewhere else but I will stay in Manitoba to help the people of Manitoba, and I will take a little bit of cut." No, they don't want that. —(Interjection)— Because you were ding-a-lings; because you were ding-a-lings and you are still ding-a-lings. That's why, because you told them that you were not going to cut anything but the fat. That it was mismanagement and you invented ding-a-lings and you are a bunch of ding-a-lings. Because you had said that there was a mess, and you know what the mess was? Your imagination. Your ding-a-ling mind — that was the mess. That's exactly the mess.

Of course, you know people switch. There were some people in the middle who elected the Schreyer government; there were some that elected this government. But never again. You fool these people. Oh, you please the corporations — the real hard-nosed Conservative right-wing fascist and you've got them. You've got them. They will never change. But you've got the people in the middle who believed that you were so great, that you were going to do such a better job that you were going to have these programs — better programs — just by the money that you save from the abuse, from the mismanagement of the former government. That's what they believe. That's what 44 percent . . . And even then there was still 53 percent that said, "No, you're not the people that are going to do it."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time has expired.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Member for St. Vital on a matter of privilege.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It's a matter of the privilege of the House, which I understand by our rules require that it be raised at the first available time and I do apologize for taking the time of the Honourable Minister of Highways.

Mr. Speaker, I have a document which is a regulation drawn under the Tobacco Tax Act and it bears the legend at the top that this is Schedule A referred to in Order-in-Council No. 396/78, and it is signed W.K. Ziprick, Acting Clerk of the Executive Council.

Now you are aware, Mr. Speaker, as all members of the House are, that the Provincial Auditor, one W.K. Ziprick, is a servant of this Legislature and has certain specified duties in carrying out his work for the Legislature.

On the other hand, the Executive Council has its own clerk, who is a servant of the Executive Council.

If this is true, as suggested here, that our Provincial Auditor, the servant of this House, is acting in another capacity as Acting Clerk of the Executive Council, it does raise some very serious questions, Mr. Speaker, as to the propriety of this particular action.

Mr. Ziprick would obviously be appearing to compromise his position as a servant of this Legislature. It raises questions, too, as to the actions of the government involved in this matter and whether they have been attempting to pervert the integrity of the office of Auditor.

We look to you, Mr. Speaker, to serve the members of this House in helping us to find the answers to these questions. We look also to the government to tell us what has been going on here, and whether we can continue to respect Mr. Ziprick in his position as a servant of this House, or whether he has in fact been co-opted to work as a servant of the Executive Council, to sit in on Cabinet meetings and to do those sort of jobs that we do not expect of him, as a Provincial Auditor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for raising this particular question. I can only assure him that Mr. Ziprick has not been co-opted, has not been acting as Clerk of the Executive Council. — (Interjection) — Well, if my honourable friends will just contain their souls and be patient for a moment, let me take the question of a privilege and advise my honourable friend that I am quite prepared to look into it and see how the signature was affixed to this document.

I have no knowledge of that. All I'm telling my honourable friends now is that Mr. Ziprick has not been acting — and I believe I have attended most of the Cabinet meetings — has not been acting as Clerk of the Executive Council. But I will take the matter under consideration and report to the House as soon as I am able to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would want the honourable member to report to yourself, as I take it he is going to do. But let the record show, Mr. Speaker, so there is no misunderstanding, that the document bearing his signature, or what appears to be a photostat of his signature, was given to the Honourable House Leader and that what we would like and I'm sure the honourable member would accede to, is that he will report to you, Mr. Speaker, and that you will then deal with the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would hope that the Government House Leader will look into this matter at the earliest possible opportunity, examine it quite thoroughly, and report back. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I just simply cannot resist to use the privilege that is granted to each of us once each session to pursue some of the remarks made by my friend and colleague, the Member for St. Boniface. It is with regret that I note that he has had to leave this Chamber because he and I have had numerous debates in this Chamber that, whether or not we have both enjoyed them at any given time, we have certainly managed to get a few things off our chest.

Mr. Speaker, just prior to getting into the comments that I did want to make, I must say, as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface kept repeating, it is amazing, it truly is amazing how a few head offices that don't reside in Manitoba, and one or two other rich people that I suppose do reside in Manitoba, made up the 49 percent of the people that voted for this government and put this government in. You know, it's always the few and the non-existent, the evil foreign international conglomerates that we are accused by virtue of reason of being here. Ones that are nowhere near Manitoba, one would assume, in Amsterdam, in New York, in San Francisco, and yet somehow in a mysterious way they made up the 49 percent of the Manitoba average citizen that put in the present administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having got that off my chest, let me begin my remarks with respect to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface by agreeing with him.

He started off, Mr. Speaker, you recall, saying that he had difficulty with the word "doctrinaire". He was tired of hearing the word "doctrinaire" to the point where he actually went to the dictionary and found out the full and true meaning of the word "doctrinaire".

Well, Mr. Speaker, the last person in this Chamber that will ever be charged with being doctrinaire in his politics is in fact the Member for St. Boniface, Sir. He will never be charged with ever adopting a doctrinaire position in politics.

Sir, when I first came into this Chamber, and I was sitting in this desk here, right behind me now,

and the Honourable Member for St. Boniface then was sitting on or about where the Member for Ste. Rose is sitting. He then was reputed and he demonstrated to me, as a novice in this Chamber and a new Minister, as being and representing the right-wing element of what the now House Leader of the New Democratic Party has correctly described, a right-wing Liberal party that was considerably to the right of the then Conservative party. That is how I first got introduced to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. I used to hear parade and loud speeches about the evils of socialized medicine, never should medicare schemes be introduced into this province, one and another subject matters along the same line.

Well then of course, Mr. Speaker, he drifted, I suppose, somewhere in his makeup to becoming just simply a Liberal, no longer a right-wing Liberal, but a Liberal. Then, Mr. Speaker, we witnessed, some of us that were here, his conversion to the Independent status and then finally we have seen him come over to the socialist side of the bench. But, Mr. Speaker, even sitting there, or rather I should say here, when they were government, as a socialist, what did he have to say on April 19, 1971, and I quote from him, pages 216 in Hansard, "Many I am sure, like myself, could belong to a party led by the present Premier", he was then of course referring to the now leader of the opposition, "but could not work under the leadership of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources", the now House Leader. But, Mr. Speaker, this is what he also said in that same comment, "Many also as I", that is the Member for St. Boniface, "could belong to a party led by the former Attorney-General of this province, Mr. Lyon". That is what the Honourable Member for St. Boniface had to say in 1971 sitting as a New Democrat, having converted from a right-wing Liberal to a Liberal to an Independent to a Socialist and as a socialist, as an NDP Cabinet Minister he said he would have been proud to have been led by a leader like the leader that we now have as our Premier, Mr. Lyon. That, Mr. Speaker, is on record on page 216. I say that with some feeling, I don't mean to hurt the Honourable Member for Inkster, he also said he could never work with the Honourable Member for Inkster. Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to draw up the honourable members — particularly some of the newer members' attention to the fact that we will never, we will never accuse that honourable gentleman, the Member for St. Boniface, of being doctrinaire. Never have, and never will, Mr. Speaker, because he has gone through the spectrum of political conversion that is wonderful and amazing to behold.

Mr. Speaker, he has also, of course, seen some other hard decisions in his day. And some of those hard decisions came about in this conversion. The Honourable House Leader asked during the question period today some questions to the Minister of Labour about pink slips, about pink slips. Nobody, Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber, knows better what pink slips mean than the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. Because in that conversion and it was heartrending to watch, we watched a big grown man just about break down, we watched a big grown man, a most respectful member of this Chamber talk about resignation because he knew how hard it was to personally deliver a pink slip to many hundreds of people in the private sector, many hundreds of them, and I may add, Mr. Speaker, many of them being some of his friends. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking about the honourable member having an acute memory and a feeling and a heart. I watched him stand in that seat, Mr. Speaker, and I watched tears roll down his cheeks as he was announcing his resignation from public life because he found that decision so difficult to make and I respect the honourable member for that, I respect the honourable member for it. Don't think that it is particularly easy for us to carry out some of the hard decisions that we are finding ourselves being forced to make, that we are being forced to make.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member spent a little bit of time about how totally unfair it was, how totally unfair it was that we took those preliminary first draft estimates and made the assumption, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface said, made the assumption that that is the way the final figure was, that they had not had the attention of the scrutiny of the Ministers, that everything that was there including the bumped up costs were just going to be bought holus bolus. Mr. Speaker, I accept the honourable member that that of course, isn't necessarily so. That they go through many redraftings and the hard prioritizing of where money can be spent and where it can't be spent does take place. But, Mr. Speaker, they can't have it both ways, because contained in those Estimates for instance, was a consideration for some expansion of day care centres. Now what has happened care is there has been no cut in the day centre allotment. What has happened in fact is some enrichment of the program did take place. Now if the honourable member wants to argue that there was the cut taking place, then he cannot take the position that he just took a little while ago, that those first flush estimates were not to be accepted as a true figure on which to base projected deficits. He cannot say that. He cannot say as he is trying to say, and this is what the honourable members opposite have been doing, they have been imagining situations and then building a case around it and of course, trying to bamboozle the public while they are at it.

You know, the member spends a good part of his time talking about how the dental care program has been thrown out of the province. It hasn't been touched; it hasn't been expanded. It hasn't been expanded in the way you might have wanted to expand it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Why is he sweating for the dental nurses?

MR. ENNS: It's not been expanded the way it might have been allocated in your first things but the dental program that was in place last year is still in place today and you know it.

MR. DESJARDINS: And you're telling the nurses they haven't got a job.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I am having great difficulty listening to the debate. If we would have one speaker at a time. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it is no different — you would have us believe that we have already scrapped the Autopac Insurance Program, that the moguls from Toronto aren't here and we have thrown out that Crown Corporation. That simply isn't true. It hasn't happened and it is not going to happen and you know that. But it makes good copy, it makes good copy particularly if you have a friendly media, it makes very good copy. —(Interjections)— I will deal with that subject matter in a little while, Mr. Speaker.

At the point that I wanted to make, you know in the outset with my honourable friend, the Meer for St. Boniface, (a) we will never accuse him of being doctrinaire, he has described the conversion to so many areas and I really should read to him — he was absent — the conversion that perhaps, in fact that the Premier, the First Minister held out to him yesterday afternoon or on one other occasion when he was on his feet speaking in this Chamber. It was in 1971 that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface said that he certainly could belong to a party led by the former Attorney-General of this province, Mr. Lyon. You couldn't work for the Minister of . . . —(Interjections)—

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, point of order. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, it is absolutely true that I said that, and I have also changed parties but I have been more consistent than any person in this House and in those days, the choice that we had was, Weir, Enns, Craik or Lyon, and Lyon was bringing in the programs that Roblin was doing but now it is an about face and he has gone to the right of Weir. I could then, but he is not the same Lyon that he was in those days. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: I do want to indicate to you though, Sir, that I would have a matter of privilege if it were indicated to me that he might have supported me back in those days, or would support me any other day because then I know that I would be in deep political problems.

Mr. Speaker, the question of his political intransigence has been dealt with, his understanding of what it means to deliver a pink slip has been dealt with, because he dealt and he individually possibly, carried the brunt and the weight of dealing out hundreds of pink slips, more than anybody else, hundreds of pink slips —(Interjections)— It was the only time in the history of the Manitoba Legislature that we had to bring armed guards into the hearings, into the deliberations of our Committee Rooms.

Mr. Speaker, then let's deal with the honourable member's concept about taxes and about economics and of course that is really the sad situation that we expect and will have to live with constantly, not just from the Member for St. Boniface, but from all members opposite. There is no question, if you want to talk about just plain rottenness, and that word has been used in this Chamber in the last little while, and if you want to talk about how low and how cheap, and what an expedient politically populist position a political party is prepared to take, we are seeing it demonstrated every day in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, is there any doubt? There is not a single member there that believes in his heart that my colleague, the Minister of Health, has personally gone on the phone and cut down the meals in some private run nursing care home in Portage la Prairie.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right, I said that, I said that.

MR. ENNS: That he has taken away needed meals from the hungry, that we on this side eat steak and you eat bologna. —(Interjections)— That is just so much nonsense. —(Interjections)— Mr. Speaker, we are used to that, we are used to that. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have a . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. I am still having trouble listening to the debate. Could we have just one person debating at a time please. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: We have a running bet on. For instance, we know that when we come to 2:25 p.m. or 2:30 p.m. to come into the Chamber and when we see the CBC lights set up, you know not somewhere else but right here, because they know that is precisely where the Minister of Health usually leaves the Chamber after question period, we know, we know the format. We know that the call has gone in from the New Democratic Party Caucus to the CBC that there will be a sob question asked of the Minister of Health, we know that, we have tested it, let's test it tomorrow or next time it happens. Because when we see those lights we know the First Minister will get up and ask the Minister of Health, is it true that the Minister has ordered the putting of sand in baby diapers at the Children's Hospital, you know, and then the Minister has to leap out and he has to deny and say, no I am not putting sand in baby diapers anymore. But they have done it and of course we have been accommodated that way. We have watched this procedure, you know, the message comes through and unfortunately nothing is secret in government, you fellows know that, you have been there, I am not suggesting any activity that is out of the usual.

But there will be some discussion perhaps of the raising of the per diem rates of personal care residents, the phone goes through and there the camera sits and the Minister has to respond immediately to that situation. Mr. Speaker, we have to live with that, we expect that, we know that, it's like, Mr. Speaker, the other day, I am sure some of the members from the north will be interested about this, when we had the story of the Churchill difficulties. I could have, and in fact did, I could have and in fact. . . Well, Mr. Speaker, just for the record — I shouldn't do this because I have respect for the. . . no, I am not going to do it, I will do it on another occasion because I have respect for the media and if I reach out to them occasionally, I do it privately.

But Mr. Speaker, with the Private Members' Hour coming up at 4:30 p.m., let me simply conclude by a few basic facts. For instance, there is, in effect, a basic 274 guaranteed annual monthly income in this province and so it is totally wrong and irresponsible on the part of the media or on the part of the members opposite, to headline stories, tragic stories about what can I do on \$200 as was the case of the Tribune story of some few days ago. It simply is not true. Any checking with the Health Department, putting together the basic forms of pension, supplementary pensions, Manitoba supplements together, brings that figure out to 274. But that is not a matter of interest in terms of accuracy. It simply is not there.

Mr. Speaker, the strategy is to attack attack attack the rich. The strategy is to wherever possible bring and heighten the degree of deviousness within our community, and of course, Mr. Speaker, to imagine the wildest things and to make great they are true. speeches around them in this Chamber and then pretend Well, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the difficulty with taking that approach is that — you know, two years down the line, these people are prepared to jack up the taxes — they've told us that yesterday. Two years down the line, senior citizen people are going to be looked after better than they are today, children in day care centres are going to be looked after better than they are today, auto insurance is going to be sold in much the same way as it is today. People will enjoy better highways, better roads to drive on, more people are going to enjoy parks and camping grounds to enjoy the areas of our province, and with all this, people are going to be left with more of their own money to spend as how they see fit. That's our challenge. That's our challenge. We'll have to put up with a bit of flack in the meantime, but we're quite prepared to do it, Mr. Speaker, we're quite prepared to do it in the meantime.

In the meantime, you will ignore the only honest New Democrat that I met — the only honest one — well, he's not a New Democrat, he was a Communist — but this is what he had to say about your approach to taxation and economics, and there are enough members opposite that agree with him, and I quote Mr. Gonick on March 1st, 1973: "It's only the small businesses that fear this government." And he was talking about his own government, the NDP government. " . . . because the small businesses are afraid of increased minimum wages that we are legislating, so it is these small businesses that are being squeezed by social democratic governments while large corporations prosper. Large corporations prosper under a New Democrat government. It's the small business that gets squeezed out." That was Mr. Gonick telling you that.

And that is one of the paradoxes of social democracy. Well, gentlemen, you can't have it both ways. You can't tell us on the one hand that we're only looking after Great-West, when your policies will drive the very men that you pretend to stand for, out of the province. And in fact, have. You can't talk about sob stories about the estate taxes, about what's affecting the wealthy, wealthy, wealthy — we're talking about jobs. We're talking about jobs, we're talking about farms, we're talking about farm transfers. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, I'm quite happy to let the honourable members opposite talk, but I just every once in a while have to rise, rise up on the back of my feet, because I have no difficulty in talking this way in the community halls of Woodlands or of Glenboro, or of Morris, or anywhere. Because the people understand me. They understand me. And a majority of people understand me when I speak that way in the city of Winnipeg, or any other urban centre.

But Mr. Speaker, you know, I just put off entirely the kind of — you know, viciousness, of the honourable member's attack. I accept with some regret that that's going to be the . . . of this government, that we're going to have to live with that. You know, that we are dealing with irresponsible populists, irresponsible populists of the first order. They're not telling us what they believe in, no way, no way. They're saying what they will do, and they're prepared to do those things that will drive the greatest wedge between Manitobans and Manitoban society, that will attempt to drive that cleavage between the systems, and that will hope that in that sense there are more people that will vote their way than our way.

But the surprising thing, Mr. Speaker, is that although we're accused of having only the support of the multi-nationals, the multi-rich — the multi-nationals don't live in Manitoba, they live where? And the real, very rich — hell, they're still Liberals. Jimmy Richardson still doesn't vote for us. So, who does vote for us? Who does make up the 49 percent? That's what's bothering my . honourable friends opposite. That's what's bothering them. Mr. Speaker, it's going to bother them for a long time, because I would say that we'll have difficulty, as we get re-elected for our third term — in our twelfth, thirteenth year — there's always a liability that governments get complacent and are not quite as responsive to the needs of those people that they represent — but we will smarten up by the sixteenth year. We'll smarten up by the sixteenth year. But I want to tell you gentlemen opposite, be prepared, dig deep in the trenches. I was in the trenches for eight years; you'll double my time in the trenches, you'll double my time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm interrupting the proceedings . . .

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with Private Members' Hour, I wonder if I may respond to the question of privilege that was raised by the Member for St. Vital. I find that, in perusing the Orders-in-Council, that he is indeed correct, that Mr. Ziprick is Acting Clerk of the Executive Council, by virtue of an Order-in-Council that was passed on the 30th of August in 1972, signed by Mr. Paulley, and the Order-in-Council revoked the appointment of Mr. James Grange McPhee and appoints Mr. Carl Ziprick as Acting Clerk of the Executive Council. And I suspect that that appointment has not been revoked, and so therefore, he is still Acting.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, to the question of privilege. I do not know whether the Provincial Auditor has acted in that capacity. I have no doubt that the Government House Leader has correctly given us what the Order-in-Council was. I still say, Mr. Speaker, that the matter of privilege is properly raised, that you should take it under advisement, that the Provincial Auditor should not be acting as the Clerk of the Executive Council for a previous government, or for this government, or for any government, that he is a servant of the Legislature, and the Member for St. Vital has raised a proper question of privilege. If it came to his attention previously, I am sure he would have raised it if the New Democratic Party was in power, but that the Speaker —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I ask you, as Speaker, to take this as a matter of privilege. I assure you that I did not know that the Provincial Auditor acts as Clerk of the Executive Council. I don't know whether he has ever acted so before, and if the honourable members consider that a joke, they can consider it. They think that I got up here, making this a matter of privilege, knowing that he had been previously appointed? I can tell them that I am not as stupid as they are. It was raised as a serious matter of privilege, it is referred to the Speaker for attention. We do not think that the Provincial Auditor, who is a servant of the Legislature should act in that capacity. It was raised by a member who has never been a member of the Executive Council, and I am sure, unlike my honourable friends opposite, that he would have raised it no matter which government was in power. Something that they obviously will not do, by the jeers that come from that side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, just to clarify the situation. It matters not to me, the fact that my honourable friends signed the Order-in-Council. I have advised my honourable friends opposite that to the best of my knowledge, in all the Cabinet meetings that I have attended, Mr. Ziprick has not acted as Acting Clerk of the Executive Council. And whether that appointment was made for signature purposes only, in the event that the Clerk of the Executive Council was absent, I do not know. But I think that my honourable friend has a legitimate question of privilege, and I ask you, Sir, to look into it as requested by the Opposition House Leader. I don't think that there's any disagreement on that particular point; I am simply drawing to the attention of the House that the Order-in-Council was passed at that time, and I concur with my friend from St. Vital that it is a question of privilege that should be looked into.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. On the question of privilege, any further advice from the Honourable Member for Inkster?

MR. GREEN: Yes. To add to the advice that was given by the Government House Leader. The appointment of Mr. Ziprick in August of 1972 was to replace the appointment of Mr. McPhee, who was the Auditor up until that time, who was appointed as such in 1965. Now if that will cause them to jeer, on what is a matter which they should be just as concerned with as anybody else in this House, let them jeer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Just to the same point of privilege that was raised. It came as a surprise to me to hear the Honourable House Leader mention that there was an Order-in-Council passed in 1972. It was quite new to me, and I will assure the members on the back bench, particularly the Member for St. Matthews, that I would have stood had I known at the same time and made the same point, because I believe that the appointment of the Provincial Auditor, who is a servant of this House, to work as a servant of the Executive Council to be quite improper.

MR. SPEAKER: I have listened to the advice that I have received from various members of the Chamber and I assure you I will look into the matter and report to the House at a future date.
Now, proceeding with the Private Members' Hour.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, Bill No. 6, The Freedom of Information Act. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

PUBLIC BILL — SECOND READING

BILL NO. 5, AN ACT TO AMEND THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT

MR. DRIEDGER ALBERT presented Bill No. 5, An Act to amend the Liquor Control Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, in rising to open the debate to Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act, after the debate that has been taking place here in the last hour, I would hope that I could elicit that kind of joint response that has been going on here.

I would like to give some background history as to the bill and why I'm presenting it. It is the same bill that was presented last year by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, and the bill is in the same context again. It's an open bill. And the reason why I am presenting it again, you might ask — it was defeated last year 27 to 23 — since that time we've had a change in government, elections, and we have 17 new members in the House and I feel the question is important enough that it should be raised again.

For some of the members here who have been here previously certain of the debate will probably be repetitious, but I think it is important that the new members here have a chance to get involved and hear the arguments for and against.

I believe, as I think all members do, that the responsibility of this House is to pass good legislation; and just because some legislation has been passed, it does not necessarily make it good. I'd like to quote from an Aware Program Study done in Saskatchewan, by the Saskatchewan Department of Health. I'd like to read: "During the early 1970s changes in the age of majority which included changes in the legal drinking age were legislated in all ten Canadian provinces, and in about half of the United States. At the time such liberalization was considered to be both appropriate and desirable by many in positions of responsibility. However, recent evidence strongly suggests that these sentiments were naive and misguided. As early as 1973 dramatic increases in alcohol-related collisions among young drivers were reported from jurisdictions affected by the legal change."

I'd like to quote further from a Health Policy note here: "Governments have long seen alcohol and its sale as only a means of revenue. Only in fairly recent years have governments, not just in Manitoba or Canada but across North America, recognized the consequences of this one-sided view. The recognition has come in response to society's own attitudes and the irrefutable statistics about alcohol-related problems in our society. While governments derive revenue, they also have an obligation to take the leading role in modifying attitudes to alcohol.

"The governments' involvement in the role of alcohol can be interpreted as implicit health policies. Alcohol use affects the health of people. The health and welfare of people is an accepted and legitimate concern of government. If we sell alcohol on one hand, we must accept responsibility for ensuring that the effects are not intolerable. The first step is to control the flow of alcohol to those who are often too immature to make wise and sound judgments and who are unduly influenced by those 1, 2 or 3 years older than themselves."

Mr. Speaker, as with anything else, there is two sides to the story and I would like to just indicate to the members in the House here that surveys have been taken in various ridings, rurally as well as some within the city, and they indicate that between 70 to 80 percent of the voting public are in favour of raising the drinking age to 19. I would also like to indicate that out of those 70 to 80 percent, in the area of 70 percent are in favour of raising the drinking age to 21.

In a recent survey done in the constituency of St. Matthews, a survey indicated that even in the city ridings 80 percent of the people were in favour of raising the drinking age.

I'd like to just touch on some of the arguments that have been used in the past in opposing this bill, and the major argument, of course, is the age of majority is 18. I'd like to deal with that to a degree.

I'd like to refer to a letter that was written to the press on March 27th, and it reads this way: "A grandmother replies on drink. With regard to voting at 18, that was just a red herring by our legislators to lower the age limit for drinking." And she refers to a young teenager who had written to the same issue, and it indicates: "That the voting privilege which occurs every five years federally and every four years provincially, but in all probability she will have that pleasure this year and then again not until she is well past her 21st year. What a rabbit-elephant deal in comparison to her drinking privileges.

An 18-year-old, being old enough to marry depends on the necessity of it, but a marriage at that age without strong adult support can be a hardship.

As for an 18-year-old being old enough to die for one's country, that privilege has no age limit when it comes to war. It would be more heroic to live for one's country. Canada, in the past, has been a refuge and a haven for those who have fled from their own war-torn countries.

And when it comes to school drinking, it is high time that our school system got back to rules and order to protect our vulnerable young. One cannot reason with a child, fool or a drunken person. We must protect them.

The fact remains that most young people of that age are still dependent on their parents for support. At 18 one has rarely finished education or accumulated enough financial security to be independent. Past generations consider the age of 21 as maturity and discretion to give the young a chance of maturing with dignity of not having an adult living off another adult; a doubtful privilege today. Or could it be that today's parent is shirking its duty and responsibility for the three most critical years of a young person's life?

Before we condemn the parents of today, we might look back to the legislation that lowered the age limit. We, the public, had no voice in the matter, however much we objected. Our former Conservative Government instigated it, a Liberal member introduced it and the NDP Government made it law. A small group of men robbed our youth three precious years of their development, and why?"

She goes on, it's a lengthy document. I'll just read the bottom part of it. "The effects that liquor have had in our society" — and unfortunately, I haven't got the means to do a study on this thing in each of these categories that are listed here but she refers to the incidence of drunken driving and fatal accidents involving young people particularly; robberies and break-ins involving the young; battered wives and children and murderers; rape and assaults; child neglect by both parents. These are some of the major items that are contributed to by drinking.

I'd like to now get back to the main reason why I've brought this bill forward again and this is to remove the drinking age from high school. At the present time the majority of our young people turn 18 in their 12th year; and the exposure to alcohol, some of that is creating a lot of problems, not just with the 18-year-olds, it is creating problems, in a ripple effect, to the 17, the 16, the 15 and 14-year-olds.

This can be validated by the fact that I have supporting resolutions from a variety of school divisions, including the Manitoba Association of School Trustees.

This bill is not directed to responsible people, and it is not directed at the responsible 18-year-olds. This bill is intended to help control those people who do not act responsible and we have the same situation applying now. Why do we have speed limits? Why do we have .08 as the danger point in drinking? Why do we have hunting regulations? If all people were responsible there would be no need for this. I think we have to accept the fact that we have to help control the age at which a juvenile is allowed to drink.

The argument that is used, is we're taking away the privilege of the 18-year-olds to drink. My argument is, is it a privilege to be exposed to liquor? Statistics show that nobody gains anything by being exposed to liquor. Sickness, accidents, these are all detrimental things when it comes to liquor being involved.

I'd like to just refer to the study again that was made in Saskatchewan regarding accidents with liquor involved. It says: "The incidence of fatal crashes in three states and one province affected by the change in drinking age, and in three states where no change took place. Both 18 to 20-year-olds and 15 to 17-year-olds experienced significant increases in fatal collisions in those areas that changed their law. Even larger increases are noted for night time and single vehicle collisions which are more likely to involve alcohol."

Further on it indicates: "Collisions among 18-year-olds increased by 17 percent. However, 16 and 17-year-olds experienced the largest increase of any group, 46 percent."

I have a few more references, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to make out of this document here. It indicates here: "The findings of this study lead to two major inferences. Firstly, the lowering of the drinking age has the effect of increasing rates of alcohol-involved collisions among young drivers who became illicit drinkers. Secondly, the lowering of the drinking age has the effect of increasing rates of alcohol-involved collisions among drinkers who remain under the legal age even after it is reduced."

And the final area that I'd like to touch on out of this study here is: "First, young drivers aged 18 and 19 already had the highest rates of accidents of any group prior to the change of drinking age. Lowering of the drinking age has further increased the margin. Secondly, allowing 18-year-olds to drink has introduced legal drinking to high school students. Thus, under-aged drinkers have increased opportunities to obtain alcoholic beverages and borrowed forms of identification from their slightly older schoolmates and classmates. Thus, raising the drinking would do much to reduce that excessive incidence of collisions among young drivers and halt the spread of drinking and driving to even younger age groups."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just make some reference to our neighbouring provinces and to the states across the line. In Saskatchewan last year the Member for Weyburn, Mr. Pepper, introduced a Private Members' Bill similar to this, and it got passed in spite of the arguments that were used and will be used here, I guess.

The Ontario Government at the present time is presenting a bill and they've done a study. I'm

hoping to have the information on that study a little later. They're introducing a government bill to raise the age of majority to 19.

Various of our neighbours across the line to the south have already done the same thing; and what we've done in a sense, we've created a pocket-effect here, that this is the only area where youngsters are allowed to drink at 18.

I have in my constituency various hotels that have substantial revenue coming from across the line. In fact, in one particular case I think it amounts to a gross income of about an additional \$10,000 that comes from people that come across the line to enjoy the pubs on this side; and the majority of those consist of 18-year-olds because they are not allowed to drink on their side. Still when they do get back you have related problems.

The same thing happens when people from our side — 18-year-olds — go across the line feeling that they still can drink there and again we end up with problems.

I want to do a little bit of clarification on the bill. Like I mentioned, it is similar to last year. Anyone reaching their 18th birthday before the date of Proclamation, if passed, would be allowed to drink. It is an open vote. And I would hope that the members opposite would not vote along partisan lines. — (Interjection)—

The hope, why I'm presenting this bill — I'm not indicating that this is going to solve the problem of drinking in high school.

MR. GREEN: We'll see who is more solid, which party is more solid.

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I am not indicating that this is going to solve the problem, but it is in my estimation only a step. I think it is important enough that we do not just ignore it, and this is why I've presented the bill again.

In relation to this, I would like to see the school boards go back and possibly start an education on alcohol use. I would also like to see a system of proper identification very similar to the ones that they have in B.C. so that proper enforcement can be maintained, and this is another thing that I think is very important, enforcement of the drinking age.

I would like to close at this time, Mr. Speaker, asking the true consideration of all members of this House here. I am sure that in the ensuing debate there'll be many questions coming up and I look forward to the debate. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit one question. He made a statement that members vote without reference to party lines and in a non-partisan way. Can he assure me that there will be a greater split in the members of the Conservative Party than there will be in the members of the New Democratic Party?

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that everybody will vote by conscience.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Burrows that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

ORDER FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: On the Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, on a point of order or clarification, the way I understood last time was the first they could be introduced was when the Order for Return took precedence in this hour. Once it was done, well then it could be during any Private Member's Hour. This is what I understood. Now, if I'm wrong —(Interjection)— This Order was filled last week.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before I recognize the honourable member, I realize we have a rather thorny problem on a question of interpretation of our rules. The Honourable Member for Inkster want to speak to a point of it?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there's no problem with the interpretation of rules as I see it. I think that the Government House Leader gave us a proper interpretation of the rules, that it has to be adjourned to the first day on which Orders for Return appear on the Order Paper, which is a Wednesday. Once it gets there, it can be debated on any following day. It has not yet got there. There has been no Wednesday on which this item has appeared on the Order Paper because there was no Wednesday last week or the previous week because the Throne Speech took priority. Next Wednesday will be the first Wednesday on which it can get on the list and following that, it can be debated on any day. That's what I understand the rules to say; that's what I understood the Member for Morris to say.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. This matter will be stood over until next Wednesday.

The proposed motion of the Honourable Government House Leader, seconded by the Honourable

Minister of Highways that the House do now resolve itself into a Committee of Supply. Could we deal with that resolution at the present time? The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I want to comment and say that I don't think there is any point in convening the second committee in the 35 minutes that are left so up until 5:30 we will sit only in one committee and then we'll go into the second committee at 8:00 o'clock.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management⁸, and the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in the Chair for the Department of Agriculture.

SUPPLY — MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats: I would direct the honourable members to Page 57, Mines, Resources and Environmental Management. Resolution No. 81. 1.(a)(2) Salaries — \$143,300—pass; Item (3)—pass. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wasn't able to catch your eye before you moved off (a)(2). I wanted to ask the Minister if this is the appropriation that includes the salaries of his office and deputy minister and the staff of his office too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: Yes.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to refer back for a moment now to a couple of statements that the Minister of Finance made when he introduced the, I believe it was the Interim Estimates, where he spoke about the preliminary estimates that were submitted to the previous Minister. I would like to ask the Minister if he can tell me what the amount of those preliminary estimates was that was submitted to the previous Minister.

MR. RANSOM: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: Can I ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, what the amount of the preliminary estimates were that were submitted to him?

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that we are discussing the printed Estimates in front of us.

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Chairman⁸, indeed we do have printed Estimates in front of us. I wanted to know, though, by what amount the preliminary figures were that were cut down either by the Minister or by Cabinet and to what degree of restraint was exercised in that department and by whom. That information pertaining to Industry and Commerce was given to the House or to the Committee by the Minister of Industry and Commerce and I'm simply asking this Minister for a similar figure for his department.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that the honourable member is aware that there is a rather lengthy process that we go through in arriving at the final printed Estimates and that there are cuts that are perhaps made by staff and there are cuts that are made by Ministers and there are cuts that are recommended by Management Committee and by Cabinet, and finally there is a decision arrived at which is printed here and, Mr. Chairman, those are the figures that we are discussing.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am aware that the preparation of the final Estimates is somewhat of a lengthy process and that there are cuts made at different stages in the consideration of them. What I'm trying to find from the Minister is what the starting figure was. I see the final figure is \$26.6 million. I wonder if the Minister would tell me what the first preliminary draft was that was presented to him presumably by his Deputy and prepared under the guidance of the Deputy.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not prepared to tell him that figure.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will then ask the Minister whether he is prepared to tell the Committee, what was the total Estimates for his department that were submitted to Cabinet for their consideration?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I'm not prepared to tell the honourable member that information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would not reconsider his position in view of the fact that the government has considered this to be very pertinent information. We have come into this House and we have been told that there are terrible horror stories, that spending was out of line and that the Progressive Conservative government had reduced spending by some \$400 million, or if that doesn't sound big enough then they'll say \$500 million. But this matter was not brought in issue by the members on this side. This matter was put into issue, into direct issue, for the public of the Province of Manitoba to judge by the Conservative government. Once they have put it into issue, Mr. Chairman, as being an essential feature of what they have done, are not the public then entitled to know what they have done or are they entitled to say, and is the answer of this administration, "This is what we did globally; we have reduced the spending Estimates, departmental spending Estimates by \$300 million; that if the New Democratic Party had taken power these Estimates would be \$300 million higher than what we are presenting to you." And then when it comes down to a question of where and when, they say to the public, "You are not privy to this information."

Now, Mr. Chairman, perhaps if the Minister of Finance had not come in and said that there were these cuts to be made and that we have saved the people this amount of money in arriving at the ultimate figure, perhaps the Minister could quite rightly say, and I might agree with him, that these are not relevant questions. "The only relevant question is the figure we present to you in seeking authority from the Legislature for our spending." And, Mr. Chairman, I think that I would sympathize with that answer.

But that's not what this government has said. This government has come in and said, "We have taken those departmental Estimates which were prepared by drunken sailors with leaking taps and horror stories." He's talking, by the way, about the two gentlemen who are sitting in front of him. Because departmental Estimates, as anybody knows, are prepared by departmental staff in saying what they think is necessary to carry on the duties of their department but they are the ones who said that these things are necessary and these things are relevant and what the Member for St. Vital has asked is a very simple, not difficult to answer, relevant — by their definition — question. Where were the leaking taps, where were the horror stories, what terrible things which were included in this hundreds of millions of dollars did you, as a bright young man and as a new thrust and as a zero-based budgeter, what did you do for us? Well, frankly, I would like to know, Mr. Chairman. What did you do for us to get to this figure? What are the figures? What did you eliminate?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, we are quite prepared, and I am quite prepared to discuss the Estimates line by line in making comparisons with what the expenditures were from the previous year and point out where changes have been made as a result of policy, where changes have been made from an administrative point of view. I will make every effort to provide the honourable gentlemen opposite with information that will clearly show the changes that have been made. I am not prepared to go into the internal operations, the processes that we went through to arrive at the final figure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, what the Honourable Member has just said is that he is prepared to give to the people of the Province of Manitoba everything that he wants to but nothing which their representatives are asking for. We know that you are prepared to tell us what the difference is between \$1,071,300 and \$1,085,800.00. I mean, we don't have to be geniuses to know that you're prepared to tell us that. That's not the question that a representative of 20,000 people of the Province of Manitoba — and I join another 20 — and the 40 percent here, say 400,000 people, of the Province of Manitoba are asking for. Now you can refuse them. You can say, "Yes, 400,000 are asking and 600,000 are backing me in my refusal to give you the information." That's what you're suggesting. — (Interjection) — No. Then let him stand up and say that the Minister of Finance and the First Minister have stood in this House and they have said that they have reduced spending Estimates by \$300 million or \$400 million or whatever figure, and that they have eliminated these horror stories, but we won't tell you what we reduced.

You know, Mr. Chairman, and the Member for St. Boniface is correct, this all relates to the supposed horror stories.

There was a man in 1950 who went around in the United States scaring people by saying, "I have in my pocket a list of 170 communists who are employed by the State Department and at the appropriate time I'm going to reveal that list." And succeeded, Mr. Chairman, in intimidating hundreds of people, millions of people in the United States. And then the next time something came up, he said, "I have on my list a statement of 100 communists who are employed by the State Department." Well, Mr. Chairman, every time that government gets into trouble, they say, "I have a list of 100 horror stories; I have a list of 170 horror stories." Well, Mr. Chairman, they have reduced departmental spending by \$300 million. — (Interjection) — No, if the Honourable Minister says he's going to give them to us one at a time, that is satisfactory. Let us know what has been reduced, even one at a time and line by line, one at a time and line by line, but not the difference between last year and this year, the reduction from the departmental spending that was put forward to the previous administration which has been reduced, line by line, as to what was taken out of it so we can see the great services that were performed and the reduction. Could he give us the figures?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, it is quite evident from looking at the printed Estimates that there have been reductions in spending within this department without dealing with internal matters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Could the Honourable Minister please give us the figure from his department that forms part of that \$400 million that his First Minister and his Minister of Finance had referred to, that they had succeeded in reducing? What part of that total comes from his department?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, as I said, I am prepared to discuss in detail the Estimates that are before us. I am prepared to give every bit of detailed information that I can. I am not prepared to discuss the internal negotiations that went on in terms of deciding what appropriations would have what amount of money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: I think that we should be satisfied with the extent to which we have been able to get a reply from this Minister. I mean he has been pretty consistent, but then let the record show that what the Minister is saying is that of the so-called \$300 million that has been reduced from spending requests to spending estimates, he will not give us any information whatsoever as to what part his department formed in this \$300 million, because with regard to the spending reductions that he referred to, I would think that the greatest figure there, just by a cursory perusal of the Estimates, relates to a change in policy in Mineral Resources, that that would be the biggest figure, which I understand perfectly, Mr. Chairman, but I don't agree with and I will venture to say that the geology group in the Department of Mines will be a much less energetic, aggressive, and spirited group than they were because of the reduction. But we will ultimately get to that, that the geology group will certainly not feel that they are performing to the extent that they have performed in the past two years for the people of the Province of Manitoba as they have in the past. We will get to that, Mr. Chairman, in due course. We are now dealing with what was the Member for St. Vital's initial request and I gather from what the Minister has said and that there be no mistake about it, that he is one Minister who is not going to lend any credence, lend any credence whatsoever, to the statement of the Minister of Finance that \$300 million has been reduced, because he won't tell us whether one cent has been reduced.

Now I happen to believe that there have been some reductions, because if the honourable member will inquire from the people who are sitting in front of him he will find that there has never been a year in the past eight years that the preliminary Estimates were not reduced by similar amounts; I will not say identical amounts because the member hasn't give me the amount. But that is what he will determine, that there hasn't been a year that the government in that department and in other departments, but particularly in that department, of which I can state with some personal knowledge, that they never got their preliminary Estimates. They never hoped to get them and usually they walked out with much less than what they even expected would be the case after we went through the process. So I merely want that, Mr. Chairman, for the record, because what the government is hoping to do is to get away with major falsehoods and major extravagant claims on the basis that they won't have to particularize them; that what the Minister has told us is: "Yes, that is so. We are going to say we reduced by \$300 million, but we are not going to show you where it came from because we don't want to." I think that it should be clearly understood that that is the case.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is one other field that the Minister in his opening remarks indicated certain reductions in staff, and I don't have all of them. But he indicated in each case, Mr. Chairman, that he was dealing with unfilled positions, that there were, let's say, 11 staff man years reduced in one area — 8 of which were unfilled. I am not giving the identical figures but he went through that procedure. Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't remember the exact number of staff in this department. I wonder if the Minister can help me out quickly and give me the exact number, the total, so that I can then follow up the discussion? The total number of staff? It seems to me it is in the neighborhood of 1,000.

MR. RANSOM: 156.38.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, probably when I said 1,000 I was thinking that the department was somewhat reduced from previous years. Bt we are talking about 750 people. Now at any time, Mr. Chairman, of a staff of 750 people you cannot fill staff man years that you don't have. So we are always talking about some vacancies. When we use the figure 753 people we do not mean 753 people are employed. We mean that there are 753 staff man years available to be filled and at any time somebody has retired, a position has not been filled, or there is a competition taking place for the filling of position, has the Minister any idea as to when we have a complement of 753 people, what the percentage of vacancies are at any one period?

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, my understanding without giving the exact figure was that the department was running in excess of 10 percent vacancy rate.

MR. GREEN: If the department was running at a 10 percent vacancy rate, fact that you show 750 staff man years, you are only then despite the paying at any one time for 675 people; if there is a 10 percent vacancy rate that runs across-the-board, then at any time, although you have staff man year authority for 750 people, if your 10 percent vacancy rate is a consistent vacancy rate you are only paying for 675 people. Can the honourable member tell me how many people he is now paying for?

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

MR. DESJARDINS: While the honourable Minister is looking for his information I want to go back to the question of the Honourable Member for St. Vital, because I am not satisfied with that either. The Minister can stand up and say he is not ready to give this information, that is could be done during the Question Period, but we were told that we were unfair to this government and we were saying, don't misrepresent things. I am not satisfied that we should leave it go at that. Because, first of all, I don't believe that this is the case, because we have had examples before of people taking a figure out of a hat and saying, "This is it." Now that figure of \$400 million was used and it was said by the Minister of Finance publicly, they used the Information Services — it's imprinted — and they told the people of Manitoba that had this former government remained in office there would have been a further deficit of \$400 million, and besides that they cut down the succession duty, corporation taxes, and personal tax, so that should be added also to the 400, because they were saying that we weren't going to do that, and therefore this would be the amount of the Estimate, 400 plus that cut in revenue. And now we are asking — I think that the people of Manitoba are entitled to know — well, first of all, first of all is it true or is it just a figure that the Minister of Finance, an amount that the Minister of Finance took out of a hat? I think this is too important because that was one of the main things to build this excuse to go after the kind of program that they want, and to point out to the former government and say, "You are responsible for that." Like my honourable friend says, "It is a horror story."

Well then we are entitled to know. First of all, I never saw that. It was never prepared when I was there, it was being prepared but it was never given to me because usually — I'll speak for myself, I don't know what the other Ministers, did. Then my Deputy Minister would look at it and say, "No way." He would send it back and I am sure you are doing the same thing. You know, I can tell you the way it was done. That was the first time he would send it back or wait a minute, first of all let's go back a step. First of all the different Directors of the department would send it back and then the ADM would send it back, and then the Deputy Minister, and then I would see it and I would send it back — we'd have a policy committee, we would send it back. And then I would go to Cabinet and Cabinet would say, "No, Sir. You send it back. There is no way." Then we would go to Management Committee or Management Committee and then Cabinet. And that is the way it was done.

But, you know, this is why I spoke the way I did today. I don't like the people to, at my expense . . . all right they say they have got the nerve, they have got the courage to stand up and say, we are going to do that, it's tough, but we are going to do it. But don't do it on our backs. Don't blame me for something I didn't do.

Now if you were in court they would say, "All right, you took the figure, no8prove it. Give it to us." Just as we might say how many staff you've got, we can say where is that 400 plus made? And the only way we can get that is during this exercise, ask every Minister the same question. I don't think that my friend has the right . . . we can't break his back, we can't force him, but I don't think my honourable friend in all honesty and sincerity has the right to say, "No I am not going to give you that." Or at least if you want to do that, at least to have the courage to say to the people of Manitoba, "We are not ready to give it to you. Maybe it is right, maybe it is not right, but we don't want you to see it, so we withdraw this, we withdraw this." The same as they finally did on this other deficit of this money coming from Ottawa. At least the poor members of the Opposition will have one less horror story to live with. I don't want to be accused of that and I don't think it is fair.

So therefore if my honourable friend and the rest of the Ministers say, it's internal, you can't just give part of it. You have got to be able to stand behind the accusations that you make or don't make those accusations. We didn't force you to make any of these accusations. You know, you don't even have to say, "It's not true." Just say, "We are not ready to give it to you so we withdraw that," and use your Information Service the same way as you did and then tell the people of Manitoba, well, you know, that's not quite true. We don't know. We take the word of the Ministers that they didn't know and we can't say that they are lying. We can't say, okay, this is what they have approved. We can't say that. So therefore, you know, let's try. We have got a tough job and the Opposition have a tough job, and it's no use crying about the bad Press. You know, not so long ago the Press was all one way, now they are trying to see things and they have got a job to do and this is what this is all about, the Estimates. This is why we have a Session. It is the only chance that the members of the Opposition have a chance if you are bluffing to call your bluff, if you are not to set the record straight, and let the people of Manitoba know. But you can't just go on and tar our reputation, you know, and make all kinds of statements that you are not ready. I won't even say that you are not ready or that you can't prove that you are not ready to prove, and that, you know, if that is the case the next government or next year you will be encouraged if we let you get away with this. Next year you might say \$1 billion. Why not? \$1 billion. —(Interjection)— No they can say they made a mistake. —(Interjection)— Well, all right, then we can get in power, like we will in three and one-half years or so, and say, "We saved

the people of Manitoba \$1 billion." Would you like that? Would you think that it was fair?

MR. RANSOM: I think it is hypothetical that you will get in.

MR. DESJARDINS: It's not hypothetical. You did it. You did it. You said to the people of Manitoba and it was one of the big, you know, you built, you need the frame, and it was your steel beam to build your frame for what you are doing, and that is it. This is a mess. The former government mismanaged. You won an election on that. You won an election on that. You had the people believe and you had the liberal-minded people believing that it was a mess. And we want to know — (Interjection) — well, all right, if it is a mess put up or shut up. You know, just the fact that a backbencher says it was a mess, doesn't make it a mess. You know, you are dealing with very important things here, and we are entitled to know.

So I suggest that the Minister give us the amount. I want a little more. I want the figure approved by me, not only the first one, the one approved by me. That's the one that I want to prove, and then we are going to add it up and we are going to see, and if it is, well then you've won. You have proven to the people of Manitoba that if they had this former government, this is what would have happened.

But that is not the case at all and it is cowardly to make those kind of statements. To hit somebody and make a statement and say, "Well, I said it, so that's the gospel truth." I don't think that's fair enough. And then you've talked about the staff. You know, we talked about saving. All right, when things were going up and we felt that we weren't getting the revenue, that we were called. And you might do that during the year and say, "All right, the Estimates said that you are going to have so many. From now on I don't want you to hire a single person." We did that last year. Well, in 1976, and who said that we weren't going to do it in 1977?

So that's not new. You didn't invent that. So the only thing that we're saying . . . And I don't think it's good enough, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect I have for you and for the Minister, I don't think it's good enough to inform the public and make a big thing and construct your own plan of action with a big steel beam of a mess. Furthermore, they left us with this mess although they knew that there was more money coming from Ottawa, and that came out. The public will know and they will judge. Our job is to keep this government honest, also. So therefore if that is the case and if it came out that all of a sudden there was more money from Ottawa and the deficit wasn't that much, but now we want to know because the Minister of Finance stood here and used — paid for by the public, it wasn't just a propaganda sheet, well, it might be; maybe it is being used as a propaganda sheet — but it was the Information Services that went out to all the little dailies and all the news media, and so on. It said, "Furthermore, we want you to know that just because we are here it is costing you \$400 million less than would have been the deficit." Plus, of course, because of the revenue they would have spent more than that. So they estimate the difference would have been more than \$400 million.

So therefore I think there is only one honest thing to do. Either give us this information, or say to the public, "We're sorry; we shouldn't have said that. We're not ready to give that so therefore disregard . . ." I'm not even saying to you — which I suspect is the case — that it's not true. "We lied." I'm not asking you to do that. Yes, we ding-a-ling, I'm not even asking you to say that. I'm just saying, well, we're not ready at this time to give you the internal working of this. So therefore, in all fairness, we withdraw the statement. I think that it has got to be one or the other. If you were in court, that's what you would do. And if you were anywhere this is what you would have to do and if you were dealing with free enterprise, and so on, this is what you would do. If they were sitting here and if we had made the statement, they would call our bluff and they would say, "Put up or shut up." So I'm saying to the Minister, "Put up or shut up."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: First of all, Mr. Chairman, the question was asked about the vacancy rate. At present, there are about 550 permanent positions in the department, of which 43 are now vacant — approximately six percent. The other positions are term and casual and they are almost all filled at this time.

I would certainly be quite prepared to acknowledge, Mr. Chairman, the process of paring of the initial Estimates that the department goes through. Having been in the Civil Service, myself, I am aware of that. The process starts — as the honourable gentlemen opposite are quite aware — rather early in the year and by the 24th of October the process is rather well advanced by that time.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface alleged that we were elected on a policy of mismanagement, saying that the members opposite were mismanaging the government. I would wish to — without being patronizing in any way — point out that our First Minister has acknowledged that the previous Minister of this particular department was one of the very few Cabinet Ministers in the previous government with uncommon ability, and I daresay that was reflected in the management of this particular department.

I also think, Mr. Speaker, that we campaigned on the basis of some issues that are reflected in the Estimates that are printed before us, on the basis of what was spent in the department last year and what is proposed to be spent this year. I think it will be evident to the people of Manitoba when they look at that. In fact, through our proposed management of this department, there will be savings to the people of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour of 5:30 having arrived, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8 o'clock.