



ISSN 0542-5492

Second Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

26 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



Vol. XXVI No. 5

2:30 p.m. Wednesday, March 22, 1978

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Thirty-First Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

<i>Name</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Political Affiliation</i>
ADAM, A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANDERSON, Robert (Bob)	Springfield	P.C.
AXWORTHY, Lloyd	Fort Rouge	Lib.
BANMAN, Robert, Hon.	La Verendrye	P.C.
BARROW, Thomas A.	Flin Flon	NDP
BLAKE, David R.	Minnedosa	P.C.
BOSTROM, Harvey	Rupertsland	NDP
BOYCE, J.R. (Bud)	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	P.C.
CHERNIACK, Saul M., Q.C.	St. Johns	NDP
CORRIN, Brian	Wellington	NDP
COSENS, Keith A., Hon.	Gimli	P.C.
COWAN, Jay	Churchill	NDP
CRAIK, Donald W., Hon.	Riel	P.C.
DESJARDINS, Laurent L.	St. Boniface	NDP
DOERN, Russell J.	Elmwood	NDP
DOMINO, Len	St. Matthews	P.C.
DOWNEY, James E., Hon.	Arthur	P.C.
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	P.C.
EINARSON, Henry	Rock Lake	P.C.
ENNS, Harry J., Hon.	Lakeside	P.C.
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FERGUSON, James R.	Gladstone	P.C.
FOX, Peter	Kildonan	NDP
GALBRAITH, James	Dauphin	P.C.
GOURLAY, Douglas	Swan River	P.C.
GRAHAM, Harry E., Hon.	Birtle-Russell	P.C.
GREEN, Sidney, Q.C.	Inkster	NDP
HANUSCHAK, Ben	Burrows	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd G.	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
JENKINS, William W.	Logan	NDP
JOHNSTON, J. Frank, Hon.	Sturgeon Creek	P.C.
JORGENSEN, Warner H., Hon.	Morris	P.C.
KOVNATS, Abe	Radisson	P.C.
LYON, Sterling R., Q.C., Hon.	Charleswood	P.C.
MacMASTER, Ken, Hon.	Thompson	P.C.
McBRYDE, Ronald	The Pas	NDP
McGILL, Edward R., Hon.	Brandon West	P.C.
McGREGOR, Morris	Virden	P.C.
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin	P.C.
MALINOWSKI, Donald	Point Douglas	NDP
MERCIER, Gerald W.J., Q.C., Hon.	Osborne	P.C.
MILLER, Saul A.	Seven Oaks	NDP
MINAKER, George	St. James	P.C.
ORCHARD, Donald W.	Pembina	P.C.
PARASIUK, Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PAWLEY, Howard, Q.C.	Selkirk	NDP
PRICE, Norma Hon.	Assiniboia	P.C.
RANSOM, Brian, Hon.	Souris-Killarney	P.C.
SCHREYER, Edward R.	Rossmere	NDP
SHERMAN, Louis R., Hon. (Bud)	Fort Garry	P.C.
SPIVAK, Sidney, Q.C., Hon.	River Heights	P.C.
STEEN, Warren	Crescentwood	P.C.
URUSKI, Billie	St. George	NDP
USKIW, Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, D. James	St. Vital	NDP
WILSON, Robert G.	Wolseley	P.C.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, March 22, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): At this time I would like to direct the members' attention to 17 students of Grade 4 to 8 standing from Grosse Colony School. These students are under the direction of Mr. R. Katazinski. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

At the same time we have 46 students of Grade 9 standing from the Carmen Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Gordon Johnston. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Pembina.

On behalf of all members we welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports By Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

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

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): On a matter of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify some of the remarks I made yesterday on the information that I then had.

My belief at that time was that the construction of the particular road — in reply to the question from the Member for Brandon East and the Member for Inkster — was that the construction for that particular road was the only thing that was allowed with regard to the development of the Big Whiteshell.

I have proceeded with the understanding that nothing could happen, or would happen, other than the road construction. I did authorize my Deputy some months ago to sign an agreement in principle for potential development subject to the requirements of the Provincial Parklands Act and all water and environmental regulations.

The agreement that was tabled in the House yesterday by the Member for Inkster specifically states that the developer must comply with provisions of the Parklands Act and other specific standards as to the environmental and water regulations.

It is my understanding that the developer proceeded on his own to build this road and was so advised by my Deputy Minister, and the developer has also confirmed that.

In the short time that I've had to review this matter — and until my Deputy returns from vacation — I have asked Parks not to deal with any considerations involving this proposal until a full review is undertaken. I would like to also say that if any misconceptions arose from the answers that I gave yesterday I have no hesitation in apologizing to the House for that. I will undertake and report to the House when a full review of this particular matter has been undertaken and as I mentioned I will report to the House at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, in light of the Minister's statement I would confine my question to simply one for now, and that is to ask the Minister whether it is not a fact that the arrangement that was provided for in the terms of the proposed agreement, copy of which I understand was tabled last evening, provides for both at the same time in the same document, for the proceeding with the construction of a road and the 200-unit condominium. In light of that, would it be correct, I ask the Minister, that either none or both of the proposed developments would be subject to the same restraints, and not one alone?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding until a further review is undertaken that there was permission given to build the road, and the road only, and that subject to the Parklands Act and the other stipulations that are contained in that particular development agreement, that nothing can happen. Now, I am checking into that and will be reporting back to the House in full detail.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Attorney-General. In view of the agreement which was tabled last night, and in view of the commitment in that agreement that there would be rapid preparation of documents pursuant to that agreement, can he advise whether or not his department has been requested or instructed to prepare any legal documents pertaining to the agreement tabled last night?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): The answer, Mr. Speaker, is not to my knowledge, no.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk with a supplementary.

MR. PAWLEY: Yes. The Attorney-General indicated, not to his knowledge. Is the Attorney-General prepared to take the question as notice so he can confirm whether or not there has been such a request?

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Tourism. Was it the Minister or the Department that gave approval for the road construction in the public park?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Transcona want to rephrase his question?

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, the Minister responded by whispering or saying something from his seat and not rising so that I could hear his answer to my question. I am going to ask it again. Was it the Minister or the Department that gave approval for the construction of a private road in a public park? Was it the Minister or the Department?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, a permit was issued for that construction of the road by the Parks Department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the Minister of Labour an opportunity to clarify what I believe to be an incorrect assumption. Can the Minister of Labour advise whether the Independent Medical Review Board that was established last year to deal with Workers' Compensation cases of a lingering nature is still operational and actively functioning. And similarly, as regards the office of the Workers' Compensation Advocate which was established last year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

A MEMBER: They don't even know what department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition want to clarify his question?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, no, perhaps the honourable lady would like to take the question as notice. It is a matter of some importance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance. Given the fact that last year both he and the then Member for River Heights, the Minister without Portfolio, expressed considerable interest in the possibility of Manitoba pursuing with Polar Gas Limited the possibility of following a route of pipeline through central Manitoba and through the Interlake as opposed to the northeastern route proposed by Polar Gas itself; given the fact that Polar Gas has announced that some several months from now in 1978, presumably 6 or 7 months from now, they will be proceeding to file an environmental impact review with the National Energy Board, can the Minister of Finance indicate whether the Province of Manitoba will be taking advantage of the next six months in order to make an elaborated case to Polar Gas for the alternative route.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Leader of the Opposition's question, there was a public statement made on this about a month ago indicating that a special Cabinet Committee had been formed to bring together the various interests that have been involved in looking at this project over the past while and also to bring to focus the other interests that will come to bear in the question. These include the Minister in charge of Environment, the Minister of Northern Affairs, the Minister of Education has some involvement as well and there is one more

ministry that has had involvement in the question that's also involved.

At this time, we are preparing to intervene at the hearings when they are scheduled by the National Energy Board which we presume will be in the next 6 to 8 months. We have, in the meantime, engaged special legal counsel to bring together the preparation of the intervention and to present it on behalf of the province.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what prompts my question. I have before me a press release issued by Polar Gas of yesterday's date and given that the press release continues to state by way of assertion that Polar Gas will be filing for the northeastern route, can the Minister advise whether or not interim notice of serious intent will be filed or communicated by the government to Polar Gas well before the hearing dates so that at least there is some hope of their changing their mind voluntarily?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Well Mr. Speaker, in reply to the supplementary question I would indicate to the Leader of the Opposition that in addition to preparing for the intervention itself we have had meetings with Polar Gas and we have indicated that to them directly, that we are not in agreement with the southeast route that they have set as their number one priority and that we want to see the route through Manitoba come through the Interlake country. So that has been made perfectly clear that our position in intervening would be to see the routing follow the Interlake route through Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Would he not agree that the construction of a road, or the approval to construct a road, is, in fact, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. May I point out to the member for Elmwood that questions of agreement are questions that I understand, in the past, have been ruled out of order in this House.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I will be more direct then. Is not the approval to commence construction of a road in partial agreement, or in partial fulfillment, of the requirements to complete the condominium one step in that direction?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in my statement, I will be doing a total review of that particular thing, nothing will happen until that review is completed and I have reported to the House.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to refer to a couple of documents that I intend to table shortly pertaining to this — namely some correspondence between and Mr. Henteleff, well known Winnipeg barrister, and the Deputy Minister. I would like to ask the Minister for a comment and ask him whether or not the Deputy Minister is, in fact, also misleading the writer of this letter and consequently the public when he states . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please, order please. May I suggest to the member that when the Minister has given you an understanding that he would table a full report, would it not be better to wait until you receive that report? The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I do not have that degree of confidence in the Minister. I am now referring to something else, I am referring to an exchange of correspondence between a Mr. Henteleff, an owner of property in the area, and the Deputy Minister. And my question is, is this not misleading information in that the letter states that only permission has been given to build a road and that is all, and that that is, in fact, a misleading statement, that it is in partial fulfillment of the agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Brandon East. The Honourable Member for Elmwood with another question.

MR./ DOERN: I would like to ask the Minister whether, although his Deputy Minister will not give this assurance, whether he will give this assurance to property owners in the area, that no steps whatsoever will be taken in respect to such application made by Jarmoc or any other persons in respect to the said development until a full investigation has been completed by the Department, into the relevant legislation, and that all cottage owners at Big Whiteshell Lake and other members of the public who might be interested, will in due course be given an adequate opportunity to make

representations to the government before any final decision is made on the said application. Will he give that assurance to people in the area?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development who is also the Minister responsible for Corrections and Rehabilitation. In view of the impending layoff of guards at the Brandon Correctional Institute has the Minister satisfied himself that he and his department will not be breaking the fire regulations of Manitoba with that reduced staff level?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a supplementary.

MR. EVANS: Has the honourable minister assured himself that an average of two guards per shift — which is what the situation will be after the layoffs — to look after approximately from 50 to 90 inmates — a population of from 50 to 90 — whether that number of staff will enable that institution to abide by the health standards referred to in the Prisons and Reformatories Act of this province?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to certainly review this situation as outlined to the House by the honourable member, but I would say this that the present inmate population at that institution according to my information is much closer to 50 than it is to 90. It is between 50 and 60 and the staff is as it was last year when the population was at that level, and prior to the increase in population that produced the increased temporary staffing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East with another supplementary.

MR. EVANS: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Honourable Member advise the House whether, in assuring himself that the fire regulations of Manitoba are not being broken, that he has received and has read the report of the Provincial Fire Commissioner with respect to those fire regulations as it pertains to the Brandon Correctional Institute?

MR. SHERMAN: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't catch whether the member was asking whether I will do so, or whether I can assure the House that I have done so.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I have been advised that the Provincial Fire Commissioner has reviewed the situation at the Brandon Correctional Institute with respect to the maintenance of the fire regulations of this province. I have not seen his report; I am hoping to do so. I am asking the Honourable Minister, in assuring himself of this matter, whether he has looked at this recent report of the Provincial Fire Commissioner.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I could not assure the House that I personally have looked at that report. I rely on my department officials, my department officials advise me that the requirements are being met, but I will undertake to search out that report and examine it personally.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, but a brief preface, because I don't think the present Minister of Health or I could prevent suicides, but nevertheless as a direct result of your cutback in staff at Brandon, where it was adjudged that this person who recently committed suicide was to be transferred to Brandon to fit into the program to deal with people who have alcohol problems rather than criminality and had to be transferred back to Headingley Jail. Do you not think that your cutback in staff out there is destroying that total program where some of the less difficult people in the criminal institutions can be dealt with outside of Headingley Jail is a direct result of your cutback in staff at Brandon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the suicide watch at the Brandon Correctional Institute which calls for a patrol approximately every 15 minutes among those potential suicide cases, or those individual situations that are regarded as having a potential for suicide, is still being maintained. The individual to which the honourable member refers, and a subject of the recent unfortunate incident, apparently was not able to adjust or fit in with the population in the institute in Brandon and the request was made to have him transferred back to Headingley.

MR. BOYCE: But is it not the case, Mr. Speaker, while you're dealing with smaller numbers, the population at Brandon vacillates between 50, as it is currently, and 100-plus. Now you have to deal

with population not by direct staff ratio but nevertheless the number and classes and kinds of people that you're dealing with and you have to have people there that are capable and competent to deal with them. If you're cutting back your staff now . . . —(Interjections)—

A MEMBER: The member's asking for an opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. If the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre can ask his question, can we proceed?

MR. BOYCE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will abide by your ruling, Mr. Speaker, not some of the people over there.

As I said, I don't want to make big of this case because I didn't appreciate it either but, nevertheless, it's not strictly numbers so would you not be better advised to review that total staff reduction in Brandon Correctional Institution?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): On a point of order, the question is asking for an opinion which my honourable friend must know is contrary to the rules pertaining to questions at this particular stage of our proceedings.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre on the same point of order.

MR. BOYCE: I will accept the House Leader's criticism as being valid. Will you reconsider the cutback in Brandon Correctional Institution?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will consider very seriously the advice in this area that comes from my honourable friend because of his experience in the area. I would only say at this juncture that the action that was undertaken did not represent a cutback in the technical sense of the term. The staff had been increased on a term basis to accommodate an increase in prison population. When that population was reduced to the normal level, there was no longer justification for that additional staffing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Health if he is wishing to imply that the residents' population or inmate population at Brandon jail is some fixed normal level or is he acknowledging that it fluctuates by some tens of numbers, in which case the answer is absolutely meaningless.

MR. SHERMAN: The answer to the first part of the Leader of the Opposition's question, Mr. Speaker, is no. I am intending to imply no such thing. I am defining or attempting to explain an action that was taking relative to a specific situation there. I would concur that populations are flexible. I would hope that the Department of Corrections will be flexible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: A question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Would the Minister assure this House that the HMS Lord Selkirk will continue to operate on Lake Winnipeg during this forthcoming summer season?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I suggest the member speak to the new owners of the boat.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, since the honourable member has indicated to Chambers of Commerce and other interested groups that he would encourage the continued operation of the vessel in Manitoba, what means is he using, as Minister of Tourism and Recreation, to ensure that that boat is encouraged to operate in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's common knowledge that we would like to, in the department, see that boat continue to operate and, given that, I'm sure the gentleman will try to accommodate us.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Are there any overt actions on the part of himself as Minister of Tourism and Recreation to ensure the continued operation of that vessel this forthcoming summer?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, as the member knows the boat was sold several months ago. It's in the

hands of several private individuals. We are not providing any subsidies for the running of that boat and the running of the boat is now in the hands of those particular individuals.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I would just like to ask the Minister, who is Mr. Joe Jarmoc and what interest does he represent or who are his financial backers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas with another question?

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Tourism. Could the Minister tell us whether he has ever met with Mr. Jarmoc, or any of his backers, and whether Mr. Jarmoc was the best man at the wedding of any of the ministers opposite?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona. Has the Honourable Member for The Pas another question?

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I asked the first part of the question in all seriousness and that is whether the Minister has ever met with Mr. Jarmoc or any of his backers. My final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is whether the Minister would be willing to table the correspondence through which he gave Mr. Jarmoc permission to proceed with the road?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to continue with the supplementaries that I was raising with my question about 20 minutes ago. This is to the Minister of Tourism. Would he table the departmental permit giving the private individual authorization to build a private road in a public park?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that would be part of the report I table when I report to the Legislature.

MR. PARASIUK: In conducting your report, would the minister undertake to ensure that the environmental assessment review process of the Minister of Mines and Environmental Management was not contravened when the department, or yourself as Minister, issued a permit to construct a private road in the public park?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona with another question?

MR. PARASIUK: A final supplementary. Is the individual referred to, Mr. Jarmoc, only available at 200 - 155 Carlton Street, which is his address, which is the listing of a Telephone Answering Service . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he should know very well that information regarding specific individuals in society is not the responsibility of this Chamber.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. PARASIUK: On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I think it is very important that the people of Manitoba know who the Minister of Tourism is dealing with when he is making special arrangements in a public park for the development of a private . . . —(Interjection)— This is a Point of Order . . . when it's a special accommodation for an individual in a public park.

I'm asking that question because in 1966 a special concession was made to unknown individuals requiring the development of forestry resources up in Northern Manitoba. —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to all members that the types of questions that are asked in this Chamber will eventually reflect on the individuals themselves that ask the questions.

I can rule a question out of order, if you so desire. It is my intention to allow the utmost latitude in questioning and also to make sure that all members' rights are protected in this Chamber.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. Johns): On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: I am concerned about whether you are ruling that questions cannot be asked about individual people because as I recall there is not any restraint or restriction in the rules that prevents questions such as the honourable member asked, and that is the address of a person doing business with the Department of Tourism.

MR. SPEAKER: What I did was inform members that I do not think it is the responsibility of members of the Ministry to provide information on individuals in society.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on the same Point of Order, I don't think that there is any suggestion that it is the responsibility of any member of the Treasury Benches to answer any question in this House if they want to refuse to answer them. But it is certainly their right to have the opportunity to answer that I want to ensure.

Mr. Speaker, I just on the Point of Order wish to state that since you have not made a ruling that I don't think it is the prerogative of the Speaker to suggest what is or is not the answer that may be given by a Minister to a question which is within the rules.

I only raise that point because of what may be future questions and that we should feel free to ask the questions unless they are in direct infringement of the rules, and that the Ministers can refuse to reply — as many of them do and have done — or they may reply and give an honest answer.

MR. SPEAKER: I may then refer the honourable member to Beauschiesne Chapter 5 dealing with the propriety of questions that are asked in the House. Beauschiesne is available through the library and I'm sure that all members would want to avail themselves of that very important piece of parliamentary literature.

I would suggest that you read from Section 171 on to the end of the Chapter.

MR. CHERNIACK: On the Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your advice. It has been distributed; I have it in my hand. I have not seen anything. I will read it again, Mr. Speaker, to see whether there is anything there that suggests that no one may ask a question about the name or address or background of a person who is doing business with the government — the present government of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, if I may, on the Point of Order. The area in which questions can be asked at this particular proceeding of our business is pretty clearly defined in Beauschiesne.

It seems to me that there are further avenues on which the members of this Chamber are able to seek information: Address for Papers; Order For Return and indeed questions placed on the Order Paper.

In addition to that, contrary to the procedures that are available to members of the House of Commons . . . Perhaps it is because of that situation a lot of people assume that the same rights that apply in the House of Commons apply here insofar as the Question Period is concerned. Honourable members should remember that in the House of Commons there isn't an opportunity for anybody in the Opposition to question the Ministry on Estimates because the Estimates are not brought into the House.

In this Chamber, Estimates are freely debated and there is no time limit on that debate. So the questions, then, that are asked in this Chamber must conform to the rules that are laid down — which are in Beauschiesne — with the added proviso that they must contain some urgency. Questions that can be readily asked during the course of the Estimates should be delayed until that particular time.

The urgency of questions in the Chamber is one of the criteria upon which questions are based in this Chamber and always has been. It is one of the reasons why we have this particular period of time to enable people to ask questions which are of an urgent nature that cannot wait until the Estimates are brought before the Chamber.

Now that has been my understanding of the rules and that has been the practice that we have followed in this Chamber and I hope that honourable gentlemen opposite will follow that rule as it is laid out.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, this is perhaps the first confrontation on interpretation of the rules that you have the privilege of enjoying as Speaker. I daresay, Sir, that it's a matter of exercise of judgment on your part as to whether a given question is relevant and in every respect acceptable under shall I say common sense interpretation of the rules.

But my purpose in rising to this Point of Order, Sir, is to express distress at what I sort of feel is the rather broad interpretation you are summoning up with respect to questions that relate to any particular individuals or corporations.

I should have thought, Sir, that under parliamentary practice it is not only not rare it is rather commonplace from time to time to ask for particulars with respect to a person or persons who are in some contractual relationship with the Crown, or purported to be, in which case, Sir, there is every right under the rules to ask for particulars.

I hesitate to say more, Sir, at this time because in other respects you may deem the question to be

perhaps not acceptable or relevant. But surely, Sir, it cannot be because it has to do with an individual.

I repeat, Sir, under parliamentary practice to ask for particulars of a Minister of the Crown with respect to a person or corporation, who is in contractual relationship with the Crown is not uncommon.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we go any further, may I suggest to honourable members that I am but the servant of this House and the suggestions that I have made — or intend to make from time to time in this Chamber — will be in order to facilitate the questioning and the debate in this Chamber.

May I suggest that members may want to read from a ruling of Speaker Lambert on October 16th of 1962 where he states "But if the rules exist for the Speaker to interpret, they also exist for honourable members to observe. It is not the sole duty of the Speaker to preserve order." I would submit there is an equal duty on all members to do likewise. The questions in this Chamber are limited to a forty-minute period. If we direct our questions clearly, concisely and of very short manner without a whole lot of preamble I am sure that we can get more questions asked and probably more questions answered. It is my hope that all members' rights will be protected and all members will have opportunity to ask questions in the Chamber. This does not mean that a Minister has to answer a question, and questions of a facetious manner or matter I would suggest will probably reflect as much on the person that asked them as it does on the content matter of the questions. So it is incumbent, I suggest, to all members to conduct themselves in a manner which will ensure that a good level of debate continues in this Chamber.

For the information of the members of the House, I am not counting this part of the time as part of the Question Period.

MR. CHERNIACK: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate very much the indication you have given of your purpose in making interjections during the question period, and I think that it is of value that we reflect on the questions we ask; nevertheless I assume we have the right to ask questions and you have the right to stop us if we infringe on the rules, and the reading you gave us of the learned speaker is validity for all of us. Nevertheless, and may I in passing refer to Beauchesne Citation 181 which says that an answer to a question cannot contain gratuitous references, and if it does it must be expunged from Hansard. I think that could cut down some of the time that is given to the opposition to make inquiries, if Honourable Ministers would refrain from their gratuitous comments.

But I do want to reflect, Mr. Speaker, on the valid and very valuable suggestions given by the House Leader, except for the statement that questions must be of an urgent nature. I have not yet seen any ruling that says they should be of urgent nature, but, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the questions asked by the Honourable Member for Transcona have become more and more urgent by the mere fact that there is no answer given as to who this firm is that is supposed to be developing or proposing to develop a 200-unit condominium, nor the address, which is apparently a mailing address. Therefore I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the First Minister, who makes his best speeches while seated, is continuing to do so and interjecting so as to prevent you, Mr. Speaker, from hearing a point of order which I have raised.

The point of order I have raised is that the House Leader's suggestion that a matter of urgency I suggest is incorrect. I'd like to see reference to it, but I also urge strongly, Mr. Speaker, that that question is now of the utmost urgency. I think it is important that this House know whether the Minister, who is present in the Chamber today, personally directed that the road be allowed to be constructed, he didn't answer that question. Secondly, does he know the person he is dealing with; thirdly, whether those people are people . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member that he is now asking questions rather than talking to the point of order. The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Tourism. Is Mr. Jarmoc, the signer of this agreement with his Department, an individual or an incorporated company?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Transcona with another question.

MR. PARASIUK: Supplementary. Can the Minister confirm that the only known address of Mr. Jarmoc is 200 - 155 Carlton Street, which was the address of a telephone answering service?

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

MR. DESJARDINS: I would like to ask this question of the Honourable Minister of Tourism. — (Interjection)—

MR. PARASIUK: Supplementary. — (Interjection)— I have one more supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: How many supplementaries?

MR. PARASIUK: I raised one question, I had one supplementary, I believe I have a third

supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well, the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister of Tourism issued an order to Mr. Jarmoc to cease construction of the road pending his investigation of this matter?

MR. DESJARDINS: The same Minister. A question of the same Minister. In this promised report would the Minister list the development under the former administration because that was one of the areas where he misled the people on the radio program yesterday by saying there had been no development under the former administration, so would you list that in your report, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister, assuming he is familiar with the doctrine of ministerial responsibility, does he not feel a commitment to honour his Deputy Minister's agreement, does he not feel that this binds the government? Another supplementary then. If his Deputy Minister signed an agreement that he does not concur with, does he intend to reprimand the Deputy Minister or revoke the agreement? —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

HARVEY BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I would like some clarification on the information the Minister gave the House, that is, the Minister of Tourism. Did the Minister actually give instructions to his Deputy Minister to sign an agreement in principle for the condominium development?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in my report I authorized the Deputy Minister to sign an agreement in principle for the potential development subject to the requirements of the provincial Parklands Act and the Water and Environmental Regulations.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could explain why yesterday when he was asked by the member for Brandon East if his department, he or his department, had signed some agreement with the potential developer indicating approval in principle for that condominium to go ahead, he replied, "No, Mr. Speaker." Now how does that jive with what he said today? Was that a deliberate misleading of the House? Is that a lie?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Finance. Has the Minister of Finance obtained any estimates from his staff on the number of jobs being lost in the private sector as a result of the current reduction in government spending, or alternatively, is his staff in the process of estimating the negative effects on employment as a result of restraints and cutbacks in government spending in the province?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Member for Brandon East, the only indication I can give him with reply to his first question is that I would suggest that he await the budget and the indications by the government in their spending programs to interpret from that what the impact might be on the job market.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Would the Minister not agree that there are many variables at work and while he quotes one source, does he not think it a useful exercise to ask his staff that estimates be made or be provided of the negative multiplier effect at work in regard to the reduction government spending. In other words, while there may be other factors at work, there is nevertheless, a negative multiplier effect in process and I would like to ask the Minister if he would ask his staff to look into that matter and perhaps provide this House with that type of estimate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I would say in reply to the member for Brandon East that if there had been any money at all left in the cupboard when he left office, I am sure that we would have been more inclined to be spending more on government programs than we are at the present time. But when you are operating from a deficit it is a little difficult.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a final supplement.

MR. EVANS: Yes. Well Mr. Speaker, that last answer just reveals the honourable minister's ignorance of the working of the provincial economy. My question is. . .

MR. JORGENSEN: I rise on a point of order.

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

MR. JORGENSEN: Just a moment ago the Member for St. Johns suggested that if there were no gratuitous answers, the questions would be answered a little quickly. I suggest to the honourable member, if there are no gratuitous comments made with the questions, they would perhaps be more readily answered.

While I am on my feet on the point of order Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the point of order that was raised by the Member for St. Johns, who was good enough, at least, not to catcall and holler when I suggested that questions at this particular stage of our proceedings should be related to matters of urgency. I would like to refer him to citation 173 of Beauchesne's and perhaps he will therein find the authority that I was basing my suggestion on. That is on Page 149.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk. The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a final supplementary.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, when I was interrupted from the Honourable Member for Morris, me thinks he protests too much. However. . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Again, I suggest to the honourable member, if he has got a question to put, let him put the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: On that point of order then, for eight and one-half years I sat in this House and listened to questions and gratuitous remarks from the Honourable Member for Morris, for eight and one-half years. But on my question, my supplementary question. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Has the Honourable Member for Brandon East a supplementary question?

MR. EVANS: Yes. A supplementary question concerning the most important issue facing this province today and that is to the lack of jobs for our people. My question is: Is the Minister not concerned sufficiently enough to want to obtain the negative multiplier estimates that the reduction in government spending will have on this province. You make reference to lack of funds in the kitty, lack of funds in the treasury. Do you not understand the principle of deficit financing with respect to the creation of jobs. —(Interjection)— You don't understand.

SOME MEMBERS: We understand, we understand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the questions which I posed earlier in regard to — in which the first Minister took as notice — Mr. David Young, possibly the Minister of Agriculture could assist us. Would the Minister of Agriculture be able to identify Mr. Young's relationship in respect to the provincial government. In view of the fact that Mr. David Young lectured a seminar sponsored by his department, the Department of Agriculture, on February 15th, in Brandon, describing himself as "Private Consultant and Policy Advisor to the Progressive Conservative Government".

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Selkirk with a supplementary question.

MR. PAWLEY: Is the Minister of Agriculture prepared to take the question as notice if he is unable to answer the question this afternoon?

MR. SPEAKER: The unonourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: I rise on a point of privilege of the House. Just a short while ago the Minister of Tourism said that he did not deny yesterday, that there was approval in principle and I want to quote directly from Hansard of yesterday on Page 36. First of all, the Honourable Robert (Bob) Banman, La Verendrye. "I thank the member for asking the question because there seems to be a lot of misinformation floating around. The development in question is not taking place at present. The gentleman that is proposing a development has been given permission to build a road at his own

expense, from a provincial road to his own property and that is all. And on the next page, there was a question from Mr. Leonard Evans. "Mr. Speaker, following up the question of my colleague from Inkster, would the Minister of Tourism and Recreation advise the House whether he, or his department have not signed some agreement with this particular potential developer indicating approval in principle for that condominium to go ahead."

Mr. Banman: "No, Mr. Speaker, the particular party in question has been given authorization to build a road at his own expense." That's all, so I think that this is misleading again today.

MR. SPEAKER: I want to inform the members that the time has now expired for questions. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland on a point of order.

MR. BOSTROM: Point of privilege. On the same point of privilege raised by my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface. In view of the fact that I asked a question today, directly to the Minister of Tourism, asking him if he did give his deputy minister instructions to give approval in principle for a condominium development on the particular lake in question, his answer to that question today is yes. His answer to the same question yesterday as pointed out very eloquently by . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Order please

MR. BOSTROM: my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface, was no. . . . my

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, Order please, Order please. I want to point out to the member that there was a statement made today at the opening of the question period by the minister which I think covers that particular point. However, if the Member for Rupertsland wishes to pursue — proceed.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that the Minister can hide behind the excuse that he gives, that he did not have all of the information yesterday, because, Mr. Speaker, he admits today, that he himself was the one who gave the instructions to his Deputy Minister to go ahead with an approval in principle for the condominium development. Yesterday when asked the same question, he replied, no. Mr. Speaker, that is a deliberate lie to this House and I believe that the Honourable Premier, the Honourable First Minister should be requesting the Minister's resignation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, your generosity in allowing the honourable member to continue when he had no question privilege whatsoever, is commendable. The honourable member was not offended by any breach of the rules. Therefore he had no question privilege. What he is debating is a matter that is a matter of difference between himself and the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. It does not constitute a question of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER: Well Mr. Speaker, I believe, speaking to the point raised by the honourable, the House Leader, I would say, Sir, that perhaps there is another way in dealing with the problem but certainly the Honourable House Leader is quite incorrect. The Member for Rupertsland would be quite correct in rising on a point of privilege, I believe Sir, in all candour, were it not for the fact that the Minister of Tourism has already indicated to this House shortly after the Question Period began, that he is checking over the record closely to ascertain the full facts and that if he did misinform the House, he apologized. I believe those were his words. That is what removes, temporarily, the point at issue.

ORDERS OF THE DAY — THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the Adjourned Debate on the Motion of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, the amendment proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and the sub-amendment by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are several major points I want to deal with in my response to the Speech from the Throne and the first one is the credibility of this government which I think has once again been brought into question. You know, it was very interesting to listen to the Speech from the Throne what seems like a month ago when in fact it was one week ago, when we were told that there were initial steps to recovery already being taken in Manitoba in regard to the Canadian economy. That was one of the lines in the Speech from the Throne. I suppose that those steps were layoffs and program cuts.

They also indicated that Manitoba had sound economic leadership, sound economic leadership. Well, Mr. Speaker, what kind of economic leadership are we getting from this government? More layoffs and more program cuts and that they're going to continue to develop policies and programs to further the expansion of our economy. Again, more layoffs and more program cuts.

About the only positive thing that we saw in the Throne Speech was the happy announcement

applauded by all members of the House and all citizens of Manitoba that there would be from now on direct distance dialing to Europe. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is something that the people in my riding have clamoured for years and now this is one of the achievements, one of the first steps given by this government to the people of this province. No longer, no longer will someone in my riding have to bother with a long distance operator. When they're trying to phone Paris, or London, or Rome, they're not going to have to sit there and go through the operator and get all that hassling, those delays, the crackling on the line, Mr. Speaker. No. From now on they just pick up the phone, dial the numbers and they get their friend or their business associate direct. Now that's progress, that's progress and I want to give credit to the Conservative administration and the Minister responsible for MTS for bringing that technological breakthrough, so much needed, so long sought after, to the people of this province.

MR. SCHREYER: The only positive thing they had in the Throne Speech.

MR. DOERN: That's right. People in Red Sucker Lake, boroughs all over Manitoba, this is something . . .

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Except that at Red Sucker Lake you only have a radio phone at the present time.

MR. DOERN: . . . wherever there are telephones.

Mr. Speaker, on the last page of the Throne Speech the government talks about its high regard, the high regard they hold for the members of the public service of Manitoba. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, that to me is somewhat analogous to respect for the dead. It's in the same bailiwick that when you murder somebody or someone passes away, you often have a lot of respect for them and in this case, the government is slaughtering and murdering civil servants in Manitoba but they feel rather proud of these people, even the ones that they fired. They have a high regard for them and for their commitment to the people of the province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I obtained a pamphlet that some of us have received and I guess all of us will get copies of, painted in pale blue. —(Interjection)— No, no, not just the Minister for the Task Force. This is the Minister of Education, an old friend of mine, an old colleague from Stonewall Collegiate when we used to . . . Well, he's not that old but he just looks old after he's been a minister for a few months. He looked a lot younger a few months ago. But he presents this standard pamphlet — (Interjection)— No, no, it's all of them. They just put in their name and their picture.

A MEMBER: One of them said he was happy that Spivak was elected.

MR. DOERN: Well, yes, if he said that he was happy that that minister was elected, he said that he's happy this minister . . . it's really like fill in the blanks. It hurt him a bit; it hurt him a bit, Mr. Speaker, to put down the Member for Wolseley and a few others but he just did it as a blanket gesture. He didn't want to assess each and every member.

But listen to what this says. "This is my report on the first four months of your Progressive Conservative government." And he says, "We still have a long way to go to make sure that government continues to provide the services people need but that we do it without waste or without extravagance and that already," he says, "we're going to meet this challenge," says the Premier. We're going to buckle down (1) to control government waste in spending, (2) we're going to create the jobs.

See, my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, are skeptics. They're hard-nosed, pragmatic skeptics and they don't believe this when the Premier says that he is creating jobs by firing people. They fail to grasp the logic. But I'm sure that the members on the other side, they understand it.

A MEMBER: They do?

MR. DOERN: The Premier is now creating jobs and income opportunities for young people, the kind of jobs that they have the right to expect. Third, he's going to make sure that those who need help receive it as quickly and generously as possible.

Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, if they have fulfilled their election promises and if this is how they are going about it, this is implementing what the people of Manitoba voted for, right? They voted. Well, you know, maybe they didn't vote for a Conservative government but some of them voted against this government so they must have got part of the message, part of the message, part of the vote, less than half, not quite a majority went to the Progressive-Conservatives and they have been busy little bees that they are implementing their program.

MR. WILSON: Practical government.

MR. DOERN: You know, a knife in one hand and a sword in the other.

A MEMBER: A scalpel.

MR. DOERN: So I say this, Mr. Speaker. If they have been fulfilling their election promises, if that's true, why are there thousands of unemployed Manitobans and hundreds of unemployed civil servants, more than there were when we left office? Why are essential services being cut? Why are demonstrators marching on the Legislature and why is the public angry and perplexed? Because, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba were had. This government's credibility is shot already. It failed to act on its promises. What they said they would do in '77 and what they are doing in '77 and '78, there is a vast discrepancy. There's a credibility gap. And you know we've seen evidence, evidence of that in the last day or two, in the last 24 hours. There's been this trail of broken promises: Marital Law, education funding, what's next? How about Autopac? Is that going to be dismantled? Are there going to be deterrent fees introduced in this House? Honesty is the issue and credibility is the question.

Now you know if the Premier were honest, if the Premier were talking straight from the shoulder — and he does this on occasion, Mr. Speaker, — if he was talking about staff cuts he would give this answer for the rationale of cuts in the Civil Service. He would say it's because they want a limited government; they want a smaller government; or they want no government; that the Tory line is as follows, the Tory philosophy, historically is this: "That government is best which governs least." And that's a position that is honest and straightforward. But does the government use that as their rationale? No, they invent. They invented, they perpetuate the fiction that it is waste and mismanagement that necessitates their actions.

You know one thing about our Leader and about our government was that it was honest in word and deed. When we said we were going to introduce a program, Mr. Speaker, you can check what we said in 1969 and what we did in the next 8 years and it matches up. You can just have a check list. We said we would do the following things; you could check them all off. And there were no kickbacks; there were no lies but what about this government? You know, if you press the members of the Conservative Government — I'm talking now about the Ministers because I can't as easily talk about the backbenchers still bushy-tailed and bright-eyed — (Interjection) — still sitting there slowly becoming disillusioned, but still feeling flushed with the victory of October. Boy, those were heady times, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — Eight years in the wilderness, five months in office — just about blew it all in five months — but still a little bit left, still a little bit of powder in the gun. But if you push them, you know if you ask the First Minister questions — probing questions — well, he was asked on television about his \$3,000 a month subsidy. He said he didn't get such a subsidy. Then he said, "Oh yes, oh yes, I forgot, I did get such a subsidy," and then he corrected his statement.

Now today we see the spectacle of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. He is asked about building, giving approval to a set of condominiums in the Big Whiteshell; and about a road that connects to it that is part of an agreement, that is a requirement, that is a condition fulfillment in that agreement. But yesterday, yesterday, 24 hours ago, this Minister said he was astonished that there was this agreement. He couldn't believe it. He was really dumbfounded when he learned that there was such an agreement. You know, yesterday he didn't know about such an agreement. He implied and stated, both, that all that was happening was he gave approval to some individual who came into his office or contacted his department to build a road. And he was excited about this, Mr. Speaker, because here's some good citizen of Manitoba coming forth with a gift to the people of Manitoba.

He said he wanted to build a highway. Well, why should the Minister stop him. I mean, if a man wants to donate a highway to the people of Manitoba, clear some bushes, I think that he should be allowed to do that. If a man wants to give a bridge to the province, or a building, he should have a right to do that. And that is what the Minister would have us believe yesterday. That's precisely what he said. I was hoping that under Ministerial Statements that the Minister might have come forward and announced any new gifts or legacies that had been given to the public, out of the goodness of their heart, by individuals who just came forth. This is what he told us yesterday. This is what he was quoted on radio, possibly on television and so on, that he just thought some stupid businessman came along and wanted to spend his money to build a road leading to nowhere. Well, you know, that's quite a story. That is a very remarkable story.

And then he said that he would like to see this document, that he wanted to get hold of his Deputy Minister and he wanted to ask him whether that was, in fact, his signature; whether or not that signature was a correct signature, a forgery, a fabrication or what? He said he wanted to have a word with Mr. Gallagher. Well, I can see why.

You know, Mr. Speaker, there's a thing called ministerial responsibility.

A MEMBER: Honesty.

MR. DOERN: There's something called commitment. There's something called honesty. When a senior civil servant, on behalf of the government, makes a commitment and has his Minister's approval which we now find out, that commitment has to be honoured, otherwise that Deputy Minister was acting on his own. He went out on his own recognizance and if he made a mistake the ground should be cut from under him. So we're going to find out with this soul-searching statement, this semi-confession that we had today, exactly what the facts are. We're going to get it out of the Minister because he certainly wasn't volunteering.

I'd loved to have been in the Tory caucus today. I'd like to have been in on the meetings with the top advisers; people saying to the Minister, "Boy, man are you in trouble. Now here's what you have to say." — (Interjection) — Boy, there must have been a lot of sweating, a lot of phone ringing in the last 24 hours, because he put the whole government on the hook. And if I was a backbencher I would have

had something to say about that because this man, Mr. Speaker, either misled the House — which I think is 100 percent correct as indicated by my colleague from Rupertsland and the Member for St. Boniface — he said “No” to this simple question one day, he said “Yes” the next day. That to me is misleading or else he’s totally naive.

Now you know, Mr. Speaker, if he’s that naive, I think that that would be an example of mismanagement and that we should call on the Minister responsible for the Task Force to look into it, another incidence of Tory mismanagement, and maybe the Task Force should be kept on, given to the Minister of Education so he can use it against school boards in Manitoba and other instances of mismanagement, according to the Conservatives.

Now talking of credibility, I asked the First Minister yesterday whether he had lunch with a Mr. Horsford, the President of Royal Insurance, Chairman of the Insurance Bureau of Canada. Well, he said he didn’t know. He didn’t realize who these people were. I’d like to ask Mr. Horsford whether he knew who he was having lunch with, whether he thought it was a couple of fellows from Winnipeg, or a couple of MLAs, whether it was told to him that one was the Minister of Highways and one was the Premier, because obviously they didn’t ask these other fellows who they were.

A MEMBER: That’s right, it’s true.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, it was just a chance meeting, a chance meeting in the cafeteria, you know it could have been anywhere, it could have been anybody; it could have been Wayne and Shuster or Laurel and Hardy, Abbott and Costello, it could have been anybody. The Premier’s quote on this, I think, was “I don’t believe we’ve been introduced.” Didn’t know, didn’t know who these fellows were. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Premier has a very bad memory. He has a selective memory. And I think that we have seen since the elections, through the election, through the CFI stuff and debate, through the period since this government has been in office, right up until today when we see the actions of the Minister of Industry and Commerce and so on. One thing is clear, Mr. Speaker, if you corner a Tory, he lies. If you corner a New Democrat, he fights. I think that’s a substantial difference.

Mr. Speaker, I tell my friends today — and they won’t believe me when I tell them but I will tell them this just the same — I will tell them the source of my information, that if an election were to be held today this government would be out of office. You talk to people in your riding and you talk to people who are following the actions of this government and they say a couple of things, one is they say, “What are they doing? What are they doing? Why are they acting like this?” This is what they want to know. They see a government that is acting in an irrational way.

You know, Mr. Speaker, a lot of Manitobans voted for a change, that’s true. They voted against this government, and they voted for a policy of eliminating waste and mismanagement. You know we used to hear the Minister without Portfolio from River Heights, he used to stand up in this House and he used to always say, “That’s where he’s getting the money from. He’s going to get the money from waste and mismanagement in the government.” So that’s what people voted for, but now that they get in we have a different policy, what I would call a “Weirian” policy, in the sense of Walter Weir, a Weirian policy of socialism for the rich and free enterprise for the poor.

You know we used to listen to my honourable friend from River Heights and he used to say he would find this extra money out of waste and mismanagement. You know that wasn’t a very bold or imaginative answer. I’d say it was a chicken-livered answer in fact because he was going to find millions, hundreds of millions, tens of millions of dollars from waste and mismanagement. Well, I don’t even think that was a fully honest answer, but you know it was a good line, it was a good line and it was used. But you know, Mr. Speaker, everyone is against waste and mismanagement, even New Democrats. Even Federal Liberals. If my honourable friend were here from — the one and only — he would tell you that even Federal Liberals would be against waste and mismanagement. Even Ontario Conservatives, Mr. Speaker; Alberta Conservatives, B.C. Socredits, they’re all against waste and mismanagement but they all have some, and so does the Great West Life Company, the CPR, the P.C. Government of Manitoba. And my friend from Wolseley, even in his firm, I don’t know whether he wants to indicate that he’s 100 percent effective or whether he would go for 99 or 89 or something else. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record as being against waste and mismanagement. You know it’s also a bit like being against sin, and for motherhood, it’s the same category. Although you know that was a good standard that we all used to have to fall back on. Now again it’s not so secure because there’s a lot of people around today, they’re against motherhood and they’re for sin. So I think we’re going to have to watch that particular one.

But instead of providing us with a government that’s both progressive and efficient — like our government was in its term in office — they revert back to the days of Campbell and Weir. And I’ll give those gentlemen this credit, Mr. Speaker, that they were not known to deceive or mislead the public; that they were I think more honest than the present Premier; more independent than the present Premier and they were not in the hip pocket of the business community. Neither was a welfare recipient, like the present Premier.

Walter Weir was against Medicare. He was against public housing and he said it — and he had the guts to say it. Premier Lyon — he is against them too, but he doesn’t have the guts to say so because he knows what happened to Walter Weir in the election of 1969.

Mr. Speaker, if you can’t be liked or loved in politics there is one consolation: you might be respected. I would say when this government was elected five months ago that the Premier was

respected, but he wasn't liked. Now it's a few months later and I would say he is neither respected nor liked. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that in another year or two he will probably be the most hated man in Manitoba. —(Interjections)— No, Mr. Speaker, not the Minister of Health, no; the Minister of Health, I wouldn't call him lovable but I would call him likable.

He starts out with a reservoir of goodwill but he'd better watch that he doesn't dissipate it all. Some start out negatively and some start out positively. But in his case he starts out with a reservoir and we will see how long he goes or whether he spends that rather quickly.

But you know this government already is beginning to feel these shots from the public. I read with great interest how they already had their first meeting in the bunker or bombshell at Shilo. You know they already get this sense of frustration and disillusionment and hostility. And this, Mr. Speaker, really was a security measure. They're trying to condition themselves for the day when they have to move the government to Shilo, just like in France many centuries ago the government was always at Versailles. They feel a little better when they go down there. You know it's a little closer to the southwest and I suppose that Shilo is at least partly in the old Tory bedrock area.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we have watched in the past few weeks and months this performance of the government Task Force: a whole series of silly and superficial proposals leaking out of the government day after day, week after week. I don't know who is formulating these policies but I can only guess. My guess is this: Daffy Duck. Daffy Duck because they are really . . . —(Interjection)— I have Goofy here — a volunteer that Goofy is the man who is writing these policies because they are so silly and stupid that they just make one scratch one's head.

You know we get this group that comes into government in a few weeks; my honourable colleague from Burrows asks to meet with some of these gentlemen . . . I don't know whether he has already spoken of this in the House but he will . . . he tried to locate these men. Well I'll let him discuss his experience in trying to find these people and where they were at that particular time — all sorts of outrageous proposals.

Then we see in the press a couple of cartoons from Mr. Kamienski of the Tribune backing up — supporting — Conservatives in their reasonable quest, their rational policy which as I say everyone will agree with, to ferret out waste and mismanagement in the Civil Service. Mr. Kamienski has been very kind to the leader of the Task Force and the Premier because he always shows a fat civil servant who needs a little trimming in the gut, or in this case a fat civil servant . . . —(Interjection)— No, I don't have anything against fat people; no. Could I substitute the word "large"? A large stout-hearted civil servant and here's the head of the Task Force snipping off some of his pants. You know because look the man is so bloated you've got to do some trimming. This is all they are doing is trimming.

Well you know, Mr. Speaker, I say that the indiscriminate firings of this government are masking their clumsiness with wholesale firings and mass layoffs. That's all they're doing.

This to be properly drawn . . . If I were a cartoonist I would draw that differently. I would draw a civil servant in a second picture standing there on crutches with one leg missing and one arm missing. Because that's what they've done. They haven't eliminated waste. They have cut bone and marrow away. Still with all that they have done I bet you there are some areas in the Civil Service where there is still waste and mismanagement, and in other areas they have simply slashed programs and indiscriminately fired hundreds of people. They have cut programs. They have reduced services.

Layoffs are not equivalent, Mr. Speaker, to the elimination of waste in the Civil Service. Layoff is not equivalent to cutting the waste off. I think that attrition is one of the worst. There has been attrition and more than attrition, but attrition is a poor means of attacking inefficiency. Because what you do, essentially, is lay off newer, the younger civil servants, and the older deadwood higher up the ladder is still intact and can watch. I guess it's last in first out, eh; that's the policy — last in first out. It doesn't matter whether you have brains or ability or a good record, you've got to go. Why? Because we're cutting off all the new people.

Mr. Speaker, the government promised to eliminate waste and maintain programs. That was their promise, but what have they done? They have eliminated people and they have cut programs. They have cut Public Works construction. I'm told that they have cut the salting of highways. They are considering eliminating Day Care and they cut staff at Portage and Brandon and Selkirk. You know in the process a peculiar psychology has developed. The Ministers can very quickly see what the name of the game is; I mean anybody can do that. And what they have decided in their own minds — each and every one — is this. Let's please the Premier. I'm going to enhance my own position by laying people off. Because the following will happen. Every staff-man-year cut means two things. One, it proves that the NDP was inefficient in having that person on the payroll and, number two, it proves that the Conservatives are efficient in eliminating that waste.

So it proves inefficiency on the part of the Opposition and efficiency on the part of the government. Well if that's the name of this game, Mr. Speaker, then people know what to do. We are now being treated with the spectacle of Tory Ministers scrambling to fire staff to demonstrate their efficiency.

Well, the Premier led the way. He started. He wasn't even in office. He was barely the Premier designate when he called in three Deputy Ministers — ten minutes a shot — and told them to clear out. He gave them the model. He said, "Look, you guys, you want to know how to get ahead? Follow the leader." The leader fires people. Well what are these other guys supposed to do? Especially the new Ministers. Well they've got to take the cue. The name of the game is fire; well, let's fire everybody. Who can we fire today they say every day. They talk to their Deputy Minister. "Who have you fired today? Have you been doing your job? Have you been giving me a list of people that I can boot out?"

The Minister responsible for the Task Force is going to do best of all although I think there is a trap there. He is going to be the hatchet man. He is the hatchet man or the fall guy. The man with the axe.

You know Bobby Kennedy and Jack Kennedy, Mr. Speaker, I remember them very well. I really began to follow politics at that time and Jack was very clever. He used his brother as the hatchet man. So when the dirty work had to be done his brother did it and the result is that his brother became unpopular but he retained his popularity.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier leads the way. The Minister of Industry and Commerce runs up to the Premier and says, "Sir, I think we can eliminate a thousand to two thousand civil servants." Well, who is going to top that? I mean he got the message.

Now the Minister of Health decides that he has to do his bit, and we're going to debate this later on in his Estimates. Last session we discovered and uncovered 100 staff-man-year layoff in the three instances of Portage, Brandon and Selkirk.

Now then we get our friend, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, whose star is crashing as each minute goes by, and he decides he is going to beat the Task Force to the punch. He is going to beat them to the punch. They're going to come in here and say, "All right, lay off 50 or 100 guys." Well, he is no dummy; he knows he is going to get that. So he beats them to the gun. He fires a bunch of people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't fault these Ministers for doing that because they are reading the rules, they understand the game and they're playing by the game of the Minister.

Then we get my friend, the Minister responsible for MHRC, the red-neck from Sturgeon Creek. You know he is going to outdo everybody; he is going to self-destruct the entire agency. There is only one problem, Mr. Speaker. When he is finished the Premier is going to say, "I'm sorry, Frank, I'm going to have to let you go because there is nothing left for you to do." Mr. Speaker, he is no friend of mine but I would like to suggest he fire up to one employee — everybody except one employee so he at least has an assurance of his own job, so there will be at least two jobs there.

Mr. Speaker, the result of this Tory madness — the newspapers . . . Every day you pick up the newspapers and it is plastered with insanity: layoffs, crazy proposals, pay-as-you-go proposals, lessening of safety and security in some institutions adding to unemployment, programs slashed and services reduced.

Mr. Speaker, they do little things that they know not what they do. They decide they're going to slash maintenance. Those of us who know something about Public Works always know that this is the hardest thing to defend to your colleagues because they all say, "Oh, let's cut the maintenance. You know maintenance-schmaintenance. There is no glamour in that: collecting garbage, cleaning the floors. You know all that sort of stuff. It's low-grade stuff."

But then, Mr. Speaker, what happens when you do it? Ask the Minister of Health. The next thing you know the nurses are scrubbing the floors, cutting patients' hair, carrying laundry around and so on. You can't do without it.

So, Mr. Speaker, since I'm running out of time and I'm going to have to end in the next minute, I would simply say this. The result of these policies to date is that we are seeing the first visible signs of discontent — public meetings and demonstrations, 11,000 letters today. University students marching here from all the universities next week. And when they introduce their pay-as-you-go policies, if they were to fully implement them, Mr. Speaker, I would be fearful that there could be rioting in the streets.

So, Mr. Speaker, I simply conclude at this point and say that the government started with a lot of good will; the government started with a mandate and I believe that in five months they have seriously damaged their credibility and seriously damaged their popularity.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. ABE KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Over the last few years there have been many remarks about football referees with poor judgment and failing eyesight. I would like to point out at this time that it is untrue. I would like to also point out that the lighting in this Chamber is inadequate and I have brought a device to assist me with my notes.

A few years ago I was refereeing a Western Canadian final at Regina and a big defensive tackle made a remark something like, "You blind son-of-a-gun," or words of a similar nature. My answer was, "Blind, no; deaf, no. That'll cost you ten."

A MEMBER: That might even work here.

MR. KOVNATS: I'll try. Today I couldn't penalize him as I am losing the hearing in one ear since a starting gun was fired close to my ear, so if you are going to make any remarks, I would ask you to please speak up.

A MEMBER: Which side, which one, Abe?

MR. KOVNATS: Any side. This one.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election as Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition made a remark on Monday as to being a little reserved on your appointment but was now finding the Speaker to be gaining in stature. I can only agree as to his remarks about you, Mr. Speaker, being fair and unbiased. Commendable qualities.

I would like to congratulate the Mover of the Throne Speech, the Member for Crescentwood, and thank him for his kind remarks about me. He and I have been friends for a long time, having served on the Winnipeg Enterprises Board together and now serving the people of Manitoba together.

I would like to congratulate the Seconder of the Throne Speech for his informative observations of the constituency of Portage. I won't go into detail as to why but I would also like to express my thanks to the following: the Premier, the Minister in charge of the Task Force, the Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for Inkster — and I just noticed that the last four people that I mentioned that I wanted to thank just got up and walked out — the Honourable Member for Elmwood, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, Russ Paulley. These people gave me the initiative to run for the Legislature and win. And the Member for Roblin, do you know what advice he gave me after my appointment as Deputy Speaker? "Well, Abe, you get a package of Dominion tobacco and Vogue papers and start rolling your own cigarettes." He advised me it would save a lot of money as it was a lost art and nobody would be asking me for cigarettes. Wally, my wife wants to tell you that we've got tobacco all over the house where I've been practicing rolling cigarettes.

Mr. Speaker, I would be very remiss if I didn't thank all the people who worked for me during the election. Without their help, I could not have been elected. Our member for the past eight and one-half years, Harry Shafransky, served our constituency well and I would like to pay special tribute to a worthy opponent. Harry will long be remembered in this Legislature. God Save the Queen and Prince Philip.

Mr. Speaker, this is an occasion of overwhelming magnitude, personal coincidence and deep reflection. It causes me to reflect on my family ties, the history of my province, its future and the future of my country. I was born in St. Boniface 50 years ago today . . .

MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. KOVNATS: . . . two days after the beginning of Spring. It was a time almost midway between the two great World Wars when the roar of the Twenties was fading into black bankruptcy. It was a prelude to poverty and depression that never really marred my childhood because my parents, like many of the deprived area, sheltered me from the imposing reality of disappointment and despair that I would have to face too soon with the coming of adulthood. Norwood, in those days, was a village of gravel and dirt roads, wooden sidewalks, limited streetcar service — that was a part of St. Boniface but separated by its own neighbourhood unity and its own melting pot of nationality and races. My parents, Mike and Mary Kovnats, operated a landmark corner grocery store that my father continued to operate for 40 years, even after the passing of my mother.

Four days after my mother passed away, I was to referee a football game in Vancouver. I certainly didn't want to leave my family at that time but my dad insisted, telling me, "Your mother was very proud of the goals you reached in football." I would believe that she would be very proud of me today.

My dad and his brother, my uncle Alex, share an apartment together in St. Boniface. I am proud to draw your attention to the fact that he is still vigorous in mind, if a step slower at 91, and is vicariously sharing this honour given me by the constituency of Radisson in October.

Although my father was not born here, he had the foresight to choose Canada as a permanent home and the birthplace of his children and grandchildren. In turn, I have been favoured even more in my personal and commercial life in this land of my father's choice. I think it was inevitable when I met and married Donna Maloney, who happens to be sitting up in the gallery today, that she should be called, "Abie's Irish Rose." I received a reprimand for not wearing green on St. Patrick's Day last Monday and I apologize. No matter, we survived all the family and friendly needling and found happiness together with our children, Jill, Larry and Gordon. My wife's maiden name is Maloney and it's a good Manitoba stock that came from the Elgin and Belmont area.

In my early years, what we now know as the Radisson constituency was open country, dotted by small farms that was bracketed by the Speers Ranch with the stockyards our main commercial centre and employment support, while Elmwood, on its northeastern perimeter, was much like Norwood, a principality itself with mixed population, neighbourhood characteristics and well renowned for great athletes who would carry the name of Elmwood and St. Boniface to magnificent feats on the national and international playing field. I believe there are members in this House today who are descendants of these men and women who were household names and bastions of the community I knew during my formative years.

I wish I could name the men of vision — French, Anglo-Saxon, those who came from Eastern Europe — who created commerce and tilled marginal land and endured hardship to leave us a community legacy of accepted luxury east of the Red River and beyond the Seine, that was once a main avenue of travel past Radisson and what became post-war Windsor Park.

The establishment of Symington Yards, the foresight that resulted in the St. Boniface industrial area, and the various levels of industry and services in the Radisson seat are evidence of the tenacity and vision of our fathers and forefathers who faced many hopeless years when our country and community stood still.

Wednesday, March 22, 1978

I approached this allotted period of my first speech in the House with some temerity. I think we are all somewhat humbled at being chosen by a majority to be the single voice of thousands in a gathering of legislators who must make momentous and minute decisions that can greatly change or disturb the even flow of expectation of the individual or group. However, we seek this responsibility and many of us had inadvertently or purposely channelled our education, community participation and energy towards those goals.

Obviously, the function of a legislator is to bring the discipline of his social and business background to bear on the affairs of government or opposition with all the confidence invested in him by the majority who share the community of his constituency. Fortunately, I come from a generation that is not marked by the scars and fears of the Thirties. This generation was born at a time when parents dared to hope that a better education could be a reality, that we could live in better surroundings and enjoy amenities that were once luxuries. Of course, we see a time when dreams of decades ago are now taken for granted. Some of our children know the price of everything and the value of nothing.

I went to elementary school at King George V School on Eugenie Street in St. Boniface. The teacher was a combination figure who held the magic key of knowledge and offered it in conjunction with qualifications that had to be met if you were to earn this passport to learning. It was a time when demarkation still was clearly defined between the role of the teacher and the duty of the parent. At home I learned the value of work. A corner store is like living in the White House. It is a combination home and a place of business and involves all the family. The example of my parents in dealing with people with tolerance and patience, coupled with formal education at Norwood Collegiate and at the University of Manitoba across the street, where Mr. Doern built his public convenience on the old university site, was not only an introduction to business but my first grounding in politics because it taught the importance of dealing with people and to recognize problems and solutions.

A major part of my life has been spent on the football field, for ten years as a player and eighteen years as an official of the Canadian football league. I have managed to leaven my business life with sport, community club activity and service club participation and in the process have criss-crossed the country and kept in close contact and touch with the moods and aspirations of Canadians in other provinces. Travel was an enjoyable experience until the last few years when I sensed a restlessness and growing intolerance with governments and citizens of other languages and characteristics. It is though the isolationism of our neighbours to the south, so evident when domestic and commercial problems evolve, has become a Canadian characteristic inherited along with all the fads and trends that eventually cross the southern border.

I think some of my conclusions are common to my constituency and many Canadians. There is evidence that members of the Federal Government, while building enclave empires in such places as the Prime Minister's office and between such massive portfolios as Transport, Northern Affairs and Welfare, have allowed senior civil servants to really control the throttle of our country. There is hard evidence that Federal Government members and senior civil servants have reached a stand-off and possibly a hands-off policy as each pursues separate routes to power and consolidation. Government has become a very expensive item, especially in view of the little governmental control that is evidenced at the national level.

We are seeing a period of undeclared war between the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premier of Quebec while we appear to be only paying spectators at this spectacle. The Federal Government also appears to have a love-hate relationship with the RCMP. The postal workers seem to be barricaded in buildings surrounded by technology that they refuse to use, while the taxpayer is asked to meet their ransom demands, and the Minister stays on neutral ground.

During the seventies all or parts of the country have been caught in the crossfire between unions and pressure groups and Federal Government. At various times we have seen police and pilot strikes, walkout by air traffic controllers and ground crews, farm protests and struck ships, and had to stand by in dismay without any recourse but to pay the forfeit of higher prices for service and utilities as well as product and services. Civil servants seem to have short memories, as to those in transportation. During a depression these jobs are highly prized as security against the fluctuations of the economy.

I think many Canadians are past being tolerant with the demands of those who take us captive with the pressure of their key positions in the flow of the economy. It seems ironic that with the number of unemployed, and so many fighting to work, there is such protection for those fighting to work less for more money. We seem to have become a nation that believes the country owes them something, that everything should come easy. I believe everyone has a right to be affluent if they earn it, either with brain power or callouses or willing hands. Unfortunately, the myth that all men are created equal in the material world does not hold true. A person interested in material gain has to earn equality.

Canada is still a land of opportunity, as has been proved by not only those who came here in periods of mass immigration, but now by small groups of individuals who see this country as a promised land. There seems to be a segment of our society that has a death-wish and can't stand seeing the country prosper. Some seem set on destroying it by their demands for things that they will not earn. The work ethic has been supplanted by the envy ethic. As a result of the absence of dedication, loyalty or whatever you label it, there are indications that those making excessive demands have been frightened by their own arrogance. In some cases the taxpayer has called their bluff. I think this was evident last October and there will be more evidence in June, or whatever month Mr. Trudeau goes to the people for the next election. —(Interjection)— I'm trying not to.

Governments long in power start believing that they are beyond the law, and the law in generic terms is really the ballot box. When governments become lawless there is a tendency for police and

security agencies of that government to abandon the traditional rules and operate sporadically in bewilderment and disarray, even at times breaking the laws or bending them to conform to their own aims. We worry about traditional values being abandoned by our children. Ironically, it is not our children who are shattering accepted standards, it is adult government, adult police forces, adult commercial criminals and adult labor leaders who have thrown out all the restraint and accepted practices of a civilized country.

In the 1960s the practitioners of civil disobedience were the young, and it seems that in the seventies the mantle is being worn by those of an age that should know better. I am an advocate of a smaller civil presence, whether in Ottawa or Manitoba. However, I think any Task Force seeking to cut the fat should look closely at where it accumulates, in the higher echelon also of the Civil Service, where those who are enjoying the good life can hide incompetence within the old-boy network. There are signs that the tail is wagging the dog. Once a prototype civil servant presented a dim image, was clothed in off-the-rack suits and did not have a salary expense account to match the private sector. This is not true today. Governments can hire people away from industry with large salaries and generous expense accounts and let them afford the most far-out and expensive fashions of the day. I'm not against anybody enjoying the salary he deserves or earns, but I am against free rides, in or out of government service.

During the session we can look over and have a daily reminder of what waste and extravagance can do to a party that is elected to operate administration with reason and restraint as well as good judgment. On the other hand, it must have been a relief when the Opposition was defeated because they ran out of new ideas or policies and their government was at a standstill; it was time for a change. During the previous administration there was much emphasis on how it had taken the initiative in Northern Manitoba and it did establish a heavy NDP presence in that geographical majority that has been a challenge to provincial and federal administrations since native Manitobans began to have a greater voice in how the public dollar is spent.

The NDP contribution to service and development in the inland and far north of the province has been misleading. The airstrip development program which was really the key to contact with isolated reserves and settlements was started by a Conservative government in the 1960s, as was a development of the pulp and paper complex at The Pas. —(Interjection)— Nothing to be ashamed of.

The main airports at Thompson — which is the staging place for Hydro development and exploration — and the airport at Churchill have been mostly Federal preserved. While the NDP parachuted party members into Northern activity and kept community activity in a state of conflict and publicity, it isolated and alienated mining companies, mineral prospectors and commercial aviation operators, who were the real vanguard of northern progress, and will be again under this administration. Hydro development in the North was activated early in the 1960s under a Conservative government, and its long-range plans have gone forward even until today, although they have been diverted and impaired by the NDP administration. Much of the activity in the North with the natives being cited as the beneficiaries is under Federal Government direction, and some ways the Federal tax dollars have been used have been questionable. While these funds are labelled as Federal, they are still yours and mine as we are Canadian taxpayers and should have some say as to how they are allotted or squandered.

Mr. Speaker, I think that some native Manitobans have acquired such control over the Indian Affairs Department that Ottawa can no longer control its administration, or how its funds are being disbursed once they have been allotted to the Indian Bands. I think the average Band member has no voice in its own local government just as the average Canadian has no voice in Ottawa with the Trudeau government dictating the direction of our dollar or the language of our country.

There is also the question of public information that pours in an endless stream from government departments and agencies to further complicate actual developments that the public already find conflicting and confusing. With the saturation of coverage, if not overkill, given government and departments by broadcasting stations and newspapers I find it hard to understand why a government has to keep a large staff of information and media specialists. I can understand the previous government having a large number of people to feed the media because of its philosophy of exploitation of radio, television and newspaper as part of its left-wing approach to manipulation of the taxpayer dollar. At the risk of disturbing the relationship I have had with the news and sports people over the many years, I find there is an increasing trend for newsmen to more than report facts or developments. They are now inclined to impose themselves on the stories by commentary and opinion. It is as though everyone wants to get into the act since Woodward and Bernstein opened a hole in the Nixon Administration through Watergate.

I suppose there are many things I will eventually learn to live with in the give and take of politics, but I hope I am entering at a time when there is a return to quality writing and reporting. Certainly the quality and expertise, the educational credentials of newsmen have never been higher, but high standards and integrity are much a part of the past, even without formal education as a normal qualification. I think a combination of both the old and the new should be the target of today's members in the Press Gallery. As most news on television and radio is originated by newspaper reporters, I look to these people to set the highest standards —(Interjection)— and I look to them.

I would just make one other remark, Mr. Speaker, that I received 180 letters today — I'm going through them all — and so far I haven't found a Happy Birthday card among them, but I would like to thank all the people in the House for giving me the opportunity of saying a few words about myself, my family, my constituency and a little bit about my philosophy. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Firstly, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on continuing in your office as Speaker of the House. I am amongst those many members of the House who has been most impressed with your ability, with your impartiality in the conduct of our business and I certainly do wish you well in the weeks and months to come that this Session may continue.

I also at this point in time would like to congratulate the Mover and Seconder of the Speech from the Throne; however, having said that, Mr. Speaker, in listening to the Seconder it became quite apparent that the government's caucus is having a problem. You know, reading the Speech from the Throne wherein — in the first or the second paragraph — it was stated that the government is committed to the development of a strong and competitive private sector, and I would have thought that the Seconder of the Speech from the Throne would speak in a similar vein in support of that position of his government.

But you heard his speech, Mr. Speaker, when he spoke he spoke about the involvement of the public sector in his community, about the contribution of the public sector toward keeping his community a viable one economically. I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps he is trying to tell his caucus something that he has been unable to tell them in the Caucus Room so he chose the Legislative Chamber as a forum to express his views. Here he knew that no one would be able to muzzle him, to shut him up, he would be able to say his peace and thus enable his colleagues over there to realize that in addition to the private sector that there is also the public sector that plays a very, very vital role in our economy.

And, you know, of all the communities in the province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, you know Portage la Prairie is probably one — certainly not at the head of the list wherein one could say that it is dependent strictly, or even largely, on the contribution of the private sector. Portage la Prairie is quite the reverse, because I believe that the Honourable Member himself had indicated that there are something in the order of 2100 persons employed in the public sector in a community of about 16,000 - 18,000. That really accounts for something well over 50 percent of the labour force because in a community of that size there would only be between 3,000 and 4,000 persons in the labor force and the vast majority of them employed in the public sector.

You know I just checked quickly through the telephone directory and the list goes on, and on, and on of public institutions providing employment and some of the spin-off benefits — the multiply effect that this creates by opening opportunities in the service industries — you know the Aggasiz Centre For Youth; the Provincial Building, Department of Agriculture; the Attorney-General's Department; the Court House; the Jail; Health and Social Development; Lab. X-ray Building; the Highways Department, that is quite a large operation there; Industry and Commerce; the Manitoba School for Retardates, amongst the largest providing employment for . . . well at one time it was about 750 and I think that was reduced by 12 by the present Minister of Health and Social Development, so it now provides employment for 738; Mines, Resources and Environmental Management; Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. All these government agencies are located in Portage la Prairie, Mr. Speaker. The public dependent upon the involvement of the public purse to this extent for their livelihood. Manitoba Hydro, Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, even the MGEA maintains an office in Portage la Prairie.

Autopac and a number of agents who sell for Autopac who are dependent upon the public's involvement for their livelihood. Manitoba Telephone System, Portage la Prairie School Division which to a very large extent is dependent upon financial support from the province, about ten schools in town. I cannot recall offhand how many teachers it employs but I would suspect just off the top of my head that it's something in the order of a couple of hundred, perhaps, and my estimate may be somewhat low — not counting the support staff which may again add up to about a hundred.

The Portage Housing Authority, the Portage General Hospital, and then of course the federal departments: DREE, Agriculture. The largest of course is the Canadian Forces Base at Portage. And Health and Welfare, Indian Affairs, Manpower and Immigration. All of these public agencies contribute toward the welfare and the success of the Portage la Prairie community.

And not only toward it, Mr. Speaker. But you can look at other communities. You can look at many communities south of No. 1 Highway and you'll find that story repeating itself in practically every town. If you remove the involvement of the public sector you'd be left with a ghost town. If you would remove the involvement of the public sector from Portage la Prairie, Mr. Speaker, you'd be left with a handful of people remaining in there. You'd be left with a few hundred people residing.

So I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie in this way was trying to tell the members of his own caucus something. I hope that they have listened and if they were absent at the time that he was speaking I hope that they would read his speech because really I suppose in whatever way he could, that was what he was really attempting to tell them.

I was going to ask the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation but I notice that he is absent from the House, so perhaps I may find another opportunity to enter into a more meaningful and a fuller debate with him. Nevertheless at this point in time just for sake of the record — and I'm sure he reads Hansard and he may find an opportunity to answer me at another point in time — I would like to know what other stimuli to the private sector he proposes to put forth, such as some of those which we have seen in the past, what other give-aways this government has — as they put it —

"to stimulate" the private sector.

It's a very nice way to stimulate the private sector, Mr. Speaker. For example to give them a boat for next to nothing; to give them a computer company. You know to give away a boat which at that price is a beautiful tax write-off for anyone who had bought it. Now I'm not sure whether that boat was . . . I should be very careful in using the terms "bought" and "sold" because I don't know, at this point in time, whether the boat in fact was sold. This is something that we may want to find out and information we may want to obtain by way of Order For Return. It may be interesting for the House to see the actual documentation and the instruments by which ownership and/or possession of this boat has been transferred from the government of the Province of Manitoba to whoever is the owner or is in possession of the boat at the present time. But that I would hope that we will learn later.

The other day — on Friday as a matter of fact — I asked the Honourable Minister without Portfolio to some degree responsible for the Task Force . . . And again I must repeat this, Mr. Speaker, "to some degree responsible" because I'm not quite sure to what extent he is responsible for the Task Force, being one of two co-chairmen. I don't know just what the division of responsibility is between himself and the one who co-chairs it with him, Mr. Culver Riley.

But anyway he has been described as the one responsible for the Task Force, by the government. I had asked them on Friday, with reference to a statement contained in The Throne Speech Debate wherein it was stated that the Task Force will be tabled in this House, and I wanted to know whether it will in fact be the actual recommendations of the Task Force or whether it will be some edited revised version prepared by him or by someone else — whoever may prepare it. His reply was that a report of the Task Force will be tabled. Well, I wasn't quite satisfied with that answer. I have some doubts as to what in fact it is that we eventually will see, and after seeing the front page of the Saturday issue of the Winnipeg Tribune I have even more doubts than I did then as to what we can expect to see contained within the Task Force Report.

In this article on the front page titled "500 Jobs May Go If Services Cut" the second column reads as follows: "Refusing to comment on specific proposals by the review team, he" — meaning the Honourable Minister without Portfolio, the co-chairman of the Task Force — "said the final recommendations to Cabinet will be known when the report is tabled in the Legislature. He cautions that the Thompson Review Team proposals may have been either accepted, rejected or modified."

So we don't really know, Mr. Speaker, whether the recommendations of the various sub-committees of the Task Force will be placed before us, or something else. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Task Force is the sum total of its various component parts, and that the component parts of the Task Force are the eight sub-committees and that the recommendations of each of the sub-committees — the sum total of those recommendations — should constitute the report of the Task Force. But the Honourable Minister has already indicated, has given notice that some may be accepted, rejected or modified.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we had become aware of that likely happening a couple of weeks ago — in fact, two weeks ago today — at which time one of the chairmen of one of the sub-committees, namely Mr. Fulcher, took it upon himself to publicly comment on some of the recommendations of his sub-committee and comment upon some of those about which he was questioned, and also it would appear, even going a step or two beyond that and volunteering some information on his own about some of the recommendations contained therein.

Well, Mr. Speaker, here is a committee of government that this government would have wanted us to believe was to operate under some veil or oath of secrecy to government, report to government. But here is one chairman of a sub-committee who had chosen to go public. So having disclosed the recommendations which he did, and in particular those with respect to the possible fate and future of Brandon University, Assiniboine Community College, Keewatin Community College, the likelihood of tuition fees having to be increased — but all of these recommendations concern me, Mr. Speaker, for a number of reasons. One, because of the effect they would have upon my constituents and in fact on the people in Manitoba in general. So I thought that what I should undertake to do is something that all of the members in this House would want to do and that is to acquaint themselves with all of the recommendations of all of the sub-committees and thus be able to assess and analyse them in their proper perspective, and on that basis to evaluate the course of action that may subsequently be proposed to us by government.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I located the addresses of the chairmen of the sub-committees. I went to that trouble although I didn't have to because I could have found a majority of the sub-committee chairmen members of the Manitoba Club. So I think what I really could have done was addressed all of the letters of invitation c/o The General Manager of the Manitoba Club, and no doubt he would have seen to it that the letters would have been delivered to the appropriate individuals.

But anyway, I addressed them to their places of business and that, too, wasn't all that difficult because there again a majority of them are either in a senior managerial capacity or as shareholders and directors of the vast conglomerate of corporations tied in with Federated Industries, Great-West Life, The Investors Group, and the Power Corporation. —(Interjection)— Yes, that whole structure.

So I wrote to them as follows. This letter I wrote on March 9th, and I'm quoting from it, Mr. Speaker, which I'll be prepared to table. —(Interjection)— Yes, of course, I'm going to table it when I'm through reading it. "A news item in the March 8th issue of the Winnipeg Free Press, a copy of which is enclosed herewith, indicates that a chairman of one of your sub-committees has commented publicly and in fact disclosed some of the recommendations of his group. Although it was reported that one chairman of your group was reluctant to comment in detail because of the confidential nature of the team's work nevertheless the point is now established that reluctantly or

Wednesday, March 22, 1978

not one of you did in fact publicly disclose and comment upon some of your recommendations.

I am certain that you would agree that that act by one of you removes the cloak of confidentiality from your deliberations. If you felt free to disclose some of your recommendations, I feel it is unfair not to disclose all.

In fact, I think it would be only proper and essential that you do so to enable the public to examine and assess all your recommendations in their full context and proper perspective.

This becomes all the more essential in view of the fact that as one of you had stated in the newspaper story herein referred to, that many of the sub-committee reports may never get beyond the discussion stage. Therefore not only may the public never be apprised of some of your recommendations, but entire reports may be scrapped.

I am certain that you would agree that I am entitled to the same access to information as that enjoyed by any other citizen of this province, including a newspaper reporter.

In view of the urgency of the matter in that the next session of the Legislature is about to open, and recognizing the fact that your recommendations will undoubtedly have some bearing on The Speech From The Throne and on subsequent proceedings of the House, I request that you attend on Monday, March 13th, 1978, at 10 o'clock in the forenoon in Room 228, Legislative Building, to meet with me and with other members of my caucus who may wish to attend and with others whom we may invite, and to bring with you all relevant documents and reports in order that we may have a full discussion of:

1. Those recommendations already publicly disclosed;
2. The remaining 120 or so recommendations contained in the said report, and
3. All recommendations and all other reports that you will be submitting.

And this meeting will continue from day to day until we shall have completed our business."

The co-chairman of this committee who sits in this House did not respond. He was unavailable for comment. The other co-chairman from the private sector did respond to the effect that such a meeting will not be held.

I should also mention that I had informed the Minister without Portfolio of my intention to hold this meeting. I had written him as follows:

"Enclosed herewith for your information is a copy of a letter addressed to the chairmen of the various sub-committees of your Task Force.

My reason for writing to them directly is made clear in the third paragraph of my letter, particularly in the last two sentences thereof wherein", and I'm departing from the text of the letter, wherein I had mentioned in reading the previous letter that Mr. Fulcher had indicated that some of the reports may never see the light of day, so therefore I wasn't quite sure, and I'm still not quite sure just what it is of the various sub-committee reports that the Honourable Minister without Portfolio may choose to table in this House and what he may not choose to table.

"In view of the time constraints to ensure that each Chairman would receive notice, which I had mailed to them, would your office be good enough to see to it that each Chairman receive a copy of the letter to him. Same are enclosed herewith and I am certain you appreciate the urgency of the matter and I hope you will assist me in this regard."

These letters went out on March 9th, and within 24 to 48 hours after having sent out the letters of invitation to the various sub-committee chairmen, I suddenly realized that perhaps prior to sending these letters of invitation out, I should have done some preliminary checking as to establish a most suitable date, a most suitable time for such a meeting. You see, I had gone on the assumption that here are these individuals who were either summoned by government or on their own initiative volunteered their services to assist government in overhauling its operations to make it more efficient and so forth, that they are giving of their time and that they would be available to government at all times until their assignment is complete and that they would not allow anything else to interfere with that particular assignment that they had taken upon themselves. Well, as I've said, I discovered differently.

I discovered that three of the eight chairmen — and I don't know whether those three would have been willing to meet with me or not, perhaps they would have been because I haven't heard from them directly at this point in time — one of the sub-committee chairmen, Mr. Benham, is in the Caribbean and he is going to be away for two weeks as of that day, so I presume that he's back about today or will be back tomorrow. He's somewhere in the Caribbean. His Executive Assistant did indicate, did name the island Bermuda, Barbados, I've forgotten exactly which, but nevertheless he did make it quite clear that he's in the Caribbean. Now it could be that he's in the Caribbean pondering over the recommendations that his sub-committee wishes to make, I suppose. It's probably more conducive to thought and deliberation of that kind, you know, in a hotel on some attractive beach in the Caribbean than going through a similar exercise in an office on Broadway Avenue. I don't know' because I've never had an opportunity to compare and to enjoy both so I'm not in a position to make that comparison.

I'd received a letter from a Chairman of a very important sub-committee and one that I note may be quite seriously affected by whatever recommendations the Task Force is going to make, the Chairman of the Health sub-committee. And I have a letter on Monarch Life Assurance Company letterhead stationery, Harold Thompson, President, and the letter is addressed to me, dated March 10th, and it reads as follows:

"Your letter of March 9th, 1978, addressed to Mr. Harold Thompson has been received. Mr. Thompson is presently out of the country till the end of March."

Now, Mr. Speaker, and his sub-committee has a very important report to submit and recommendations to finalize and he, too, is out of the country. Mr. Benham, he is out of the country. Now, I'm not blaming these gentlemen for being out of the country, Mr. Speaker. It could well be that these, and one other that I'm about to come to, are away from the country on very important business, very necessary business, but the point that I am making — and I wish to repeat what I had made earlier — that this government that called upon these gentlemen to assume this responsibility and someone forgot to ask them whether they're going to be available to serve the government until they've completed their assignment.

A letter from United Grain Growers —(Interjection)— a letter addressed to me — and this is not via The Winnipeg Tribune.

A MEMBER: Oh.

MR. HANUSCHAK: It has nothing to do with The Winnipeg Tribune. This is a letter addressed to me.

"In the absence of Mr. Runciman, I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter, March 9th, with regard to the comments of a Chairman of one of the Provincial Task Force's sub-committees. Mr. Runciman is in Geneva as part of the Canadian Delegation to the International Wheat Agreement talks and is not expected back until early April."

I can't fault him for going to Geneva, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that as the chief officer of the United Grain Growers Limited, it's important and essential that he be there at this time. But the fact still remains that he had also accepted this responsibility or this responsibility was either foisted on him or given to him — in what manner we don't know, Mr. Speaker. I hope that we will find out if someday the Minister without Portfolio will enter into this debate. He is not expected back until early April, and continuing from the letter:

"Upon his return to the office, your letter will be brought to his immediate attention."

So, Mr. Speaker, I wish to table these letters. Now I really don't know about the remaining five, whether they're available or maybe it doesn't matter whether they're available or not. In fact that's another possibility we have to consider, Mr. Speaker. But perhaps it doesn't matter what the various sub-committees of the Task Force are doing, what recommendations they intend to bring in and I rather suspect that it doesn't matter a hell of a lot, because I think, Mr. Speaker, that somebody on that side has really made up their mind what they're going to do and how they're going to proceed. In fact they've done it, they've done it.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, commencing even two days before they took office, two days before they took office, before the gentleman who was formerly sworn in as Premier of this province, as President of the Executive Council, took it upon himself to call in two Deputy Ministers and one Assistant Deputy and fired them.

A MEMBER: No authority at all.

MR. HANUSCHAK: And at that point in time had no authority at all.

A MEMBER: No authority at all.

MR. HANUSCHAK: So I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that this whole Task Force exercise is going to turn out to be nothing but a sham.

A MEMBER: A farce.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, a farce. The government has made up its mind what it's going to do and it's proceeding accordingly. But they hope that somehow or another they will convince the public that all of this was done after a tremendous degree of involvement by people from all sectors of the community, from input from all, from the Civil Service, from the private sector and so forth, and on the basis of all those recommendations this is the course of action that the government is going to venture upon. But that will not happen at all. That will not happen at all. There is someone — now I'm not sure whether it's on that side of the House or whether it's on that side of the block, on the west side of the block — that's already made up his mind as to the course of action this government ought to follow. And it could well be over on the west side of this block. —(Interjection)— No, what's on top of this dome, that will never be changed, that will never be changed as long as this remains a seat of the Legislative Assembly, which is a meeting place for ourselves as well as you. So that will not be changed. But somebody over there may be trying to change it.

It brings to mind, one day I was working in my office and the telephone rang and the voice on the phone asked if this was something medical records, and my reply was, "I'm sorry, you must have the wrong number." So she says, "Well, is this the Great West Life?" And I said, "Well, no, ma'am, but you're close, you're very close in ways other than geographic," so thereupon she hung up and I wasn't able to continue the conversation any longer. But I suppose it's a psychological effect that this already has had on many of the public. You know, that they equate this government with the power corporation investors group, Great West Life, by whatever name one wishes to call the corporate structure over there because they're all interconnected as being one and the same.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, there is one statement that's attributed to the Minister without

Portfolio somewhat responsible for the Task Force wherein he said that the Minister also warned that bits and pieces of information could be misinterpreted and some assumptions may be very incorrect if there is not a complete understanding of the overview and of the total perspective. You know, Mr. Speaker, I agree with that and for that reason. You know I'm surprised that he did not call upon his co-chairman and say, "Look, we've got to look at everything, at all the recommendations in their proper perspective and then make up our minds" because he himself admits that that is so, that that's the only way that the Task Force report could be properly assessed.

You know, Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that I have remaining I will only want to touch upon this and it's a matter of extreme importance, and that is some points related to education in the Province of Manitoba.

If someone were to have asked me a week ago, or a couple of weeks ago, to speculate on the length of the Estimates Debate dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Education and Continuing Education and Manpower, and now it's amalgamated into one, and the type of debate that I may predict may occur, I think I would have said at that time that our prime concern would have been one to attempt to identify program cutbacks that will be reflected in the Estimates but that there would not be any opportunity to review the performance of this government, that to do that we'll have to wait until next year.

However, this Minister has, particularly during the last few days, last Friday when speaking to the Trustees Association, made a number of comments, that I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, have created the feeling of uncertainty, have put the entire education system in the Province of Manitoba under suspicion, and the Minister cannot wait much longer to clarify some of the comments that he had made. You know, Mr. Speaker, comments such as, the do your own thing philosophy has had its day. I wish he'd tell us, what does he specifically refer to as the "do your own thing philosophy" in education?

He said some educators in schools and in the department have adopted sloppy and slack attitudes toward the curriculum. Who? Which educators? In which school division? Which civil servant in the Department of Education has adopted sloppy and slack attitudes? Which one of the 11,000 teachers has adopted sloppy and slack attitudes? He's putting the entire teaching profession under suspicion. Now he ought to clarify this statement very quickly, Mr. Speaker.

When he says we do not intend to spend money on flighty programs, frivolously conceived and carelessly administered. Which flighty programs? Which carelessly conceived and carelessly administered programs, Mr. Speaker? Let him tell us. Let him put up or shut up.

Then he says — and here I agree with him, I agree with him on one point when he says, "There is no money available for import of Messiahs who have pet schemes which they want other people to finance." I agree with him, that they ought to have no money for any pet schemes that the guys from Federated Industries or Great West Life or Monarch Life, they want to implement. I agree with him.

A MEMBER: Or Junior Achievement.

MR. HANUSCHAK: That's right. I agree with him. And when he says that — I think it was either in this article or in The Free Press when he also made a similar comment about sidewalk superintendents. He's got no time or use for sidewalk superintendents — I agree with him. That's exactly what he ought to tell the boys from the corporate sector that are attempting to review his education program, that he has no time for them and put that whole exercise to an end. I presume that's what he's referring to because he hasn't really named, you know, what sidewalk superintendents he's referring to; so not having named any I presume he's not excluding the Great West Life boys and Federated Industries and one of the Richardson Corporations, whichever one it is that Mr. Fulcher. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: So, these are points, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Minister for Education ought to clarify and ought to clarify quickly to the satisfaction of the school trustees, to the satisfaction of the teachers, to the satisfaction of the public at large in the Province of Manitoba. They are deserving of a clarification from him very promptly because otherwise, as I've indicated a moment ago, it puts the whole education system under a cloud of suspicion.

You know, Mr. Speaker, you will recall some of the charges that were levelled at us when we were government. But I suggest to you that what this government is attempting to do really smacks of dictatorship, that really smacks of dictatorship when this government tells the universities, increase tuition fees to make up the balance of your fiscal requirements. When this government warns the school boards. He said that government does not intend — and this is quoting him — to be reduced to a grant paying body. In other words, that he is going to be out there policing each and every move that each and every trustee, each and every school teacher makes. Well, Mr. Speaker, who is being dictatorial? Who is being dictatorial? The government that allowed the school trustees, the boards of trustees, duly elected by the people whom they represent, to exercise the powers given them under the Public Schools Act or this government and one of its ministers who was telling them that he's going to walk in there and he's going to tell them what to do and how to do it and relate it to his department.

Mr. Speaker, this will be rather interesting when we get to Estimates, you know, who's going to take the blame or who's going to answer for this, for many of the programs in Special Projects. Our

Wednesday, March 22, 1978

field-based teacher training programs, our New — Careers program and the like which are being let's face it, Mr. Speaker, in a couple of years time they're going to be scrapped because we're told that there's no provision for intake of new students, of new trainees for the forthcoming year so as soon as those trainees presently on the program complete their course of training that's going to be the end of those programs. It was reported in the press that the cost efficiency study shows that these programs are very expensive, that they cost \$16,000 per student, per trainee.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like — and I will give this government time until we get to dealing with the Estimates — I would like the government to present this House with both sides of the ledger, not only what it costs to provide this training, to provide the people a means of subsistence, of living subsistence, while they're pursuing this course of training, but also what it would cost if this program were not provided to these individuals, what it would cost the public purse.

Let's take a look at from whence many of the trainees came from and did we take them out of some other gainful, meaningful employment? By and large no, Mr. Speaker, because that wasn't the intent of the program. The intent of the program was to assist people to become independent, productive citizens of this community. That's a sector of society that these programs are aimed at. Now this government is saying to these people, "Put them back on welfare." Without using those words that is exactly what this government is saying. "Let them go back on welfare."

A MEMBER: That's exactly what happens to them.

MR. HANUSCHAK: It's cheaper. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say to you, let us look at both sides of the ledger and thus determine the true cost of the scrapping of the programs that I have mentioned, of the cutback in education, of leaving universities open only to the sons and daughters of the rich, which is in fact what they are saying. They're saying let the tuition fees increase; let the student aid ratio of loan and bursary reverse itself to what it was during our years of administration; let the students assume a greater debt load; let them pay a higher tuition fee and let those who can afford to come to university under those conditions, let them come and the others stay back at home where they were prior to 1969, where they were in this Province of Manitoba for 100 years. They want to drive the people of Manitoba back to the position of where we were in 1870 and not where they are entitled to be in 1978.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, that the debate for the day be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you would call it 5:30?

MR. SPEAKER: I want to say first that we have a Motion here that I think we should deal with.

A MEMBER: What Motion?

MR. SPEAKER: The Motion that debate be adjourned. We've heard the Motion from the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake that debate be adjourned. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder if you'd call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, according to the rules the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning. (Thursday)