

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, March 30, 1979

Time: 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my left where we have 10 visitors of Grade 8 standing from the Audobend High School of Minnesota, under the direction of Pastor John Andreason.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this morning.
Presenting Petitions . . .

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

MR. CLERK: The Petition of The Investors Group, praying for the passing of An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Investors Group, and the Petition of Bel Acres Golf and Country Club, praying for the passing of An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Bel Acres Golf and Country Club.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. DOUG GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills.

MR. CLERK: Your Committee met on Thursday, March 29, 1979, and recommends that the time for receiving Petitions for Private Bills be extended to the 26th day of April, 1979, and the time for receiving Private Bills by the House be extended to the 3rd day of May, 1979.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. GOURLAY: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that the time for receiving Petitions for Private Bills be extended to the 26th day of April, 1979, and the time for receiving Private Bills by the House be extended to the 3rd day of May, 1979.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a Return to an Order of the House, Number 49.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table three reports: The Auditor's Report and Financial Statements, for the year ended March 31, 1978 re Minago Contractors; the Auditor's Report

and Financial Statements for the period ending October 31, 1978 re Minago Contractors, it's the final statement; and the Auditor's Report and Financial Statements for the year ended March 31, 1978 for Mistik Creek Logging Company Limited.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Acting Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. Johns): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the First Minister, I would direct my question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the First Minister's statement on March 21 that an Order-in-Council is a matter of public record, will the Minister of Finance confirm that Order-in-Council No. 152, which is not on the record, was signed on or between February 15 and February 22, and would he advise the people of Manitoba the contents of that Order?

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the member's question, I'm not aware of what Order 152 is about, but if it's the practice of Orders sometimes not making their way across the hallway immediately upon being signed, that seems to me that has been a practice that has been carried on by governments for years, and that the important matter is that it be tabled across the hallway in its usual spot. But with regards to the specific Order, I'll make inquiry and take the question as notice for the member.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this order has been outstanding for well over a month, then is the minister saying that there are certain Orders-in-Council that are not put on public record at any time?

MR. CRAIK: No, Mr. Speaker. That wasn't what I said.

MR. CHEINIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, then can I assume that the Minister of Finance will look into it and report to the House on the status of Order-in-Council 152 and would he also indicate that it is not a matter dealing with his department with which he would be familiar?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've already answered it. I haven't the slightest idea of what Order 152 is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that certain Conservative backbenchers have indicated an immediate desire to have the minimum wage increased by 25 cents an hour, would the minister consider making an immediate announcement to the effect that minimum wages will be increased by 25 percent an hour effective immediately in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, we're giving consideration to the minimum wage right now, whether it should be increased or held as it is, and that's under consideration.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that certain Conservative backbenchers have desire to have an immediate increase of 25 cents per hour, would the House Leader consider requesting unanimous consent to deal with the resolution now on the Order Paper asking that the minimum wage be increased by 25 cents per hour with the same unanimous consent that all other parts of the resolution be abandoned at this time so that we will merely be voting for 25 cents per hour increase immediately, which I have reason to believe that unanimous consent will be given to both of those features and we can dispose of it right now or as soon as the Question Period ends?

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the House Leader heard the question, and whether he will consider getting the cooperation of all honourable members to deal with only that portion of the resolution which refers to 25 cents an hour, in which case I'm advised and I have reason to believe that it could be dealt with immediately and both Conservatives and New Democrats and the Liberal, who may not have a chance to vote on it if he doesn't vote on it soon, would like to vote on it immediately.

MR. SPEAKER: The Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN, (Morris): Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend perhaps knows better than anybody that private members business is dealt with during Private Members' Hour and he also knows, perhaps better than anybody, that when consideration is given to the matter in which he has raised, it will be done by the Cabinet and will be announced in due course.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I thank the honourable member for his compliment that I know better than anybody and I tell the honourable member that I obviously know better than anybody that with unanimous consent we can deal with this matter now or at 10.30 as soon as the Question Period ends.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I am forced to withdraw the compliment that I recently paid to my honourable friend. He also knows better than anybody that that is not going to happen.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, several days ago the Member for St. Boniface directed some questions to me regarding EPF Established Programs Funding. With regards to the specifics of the question with regard to the amount, the amounts for 1977-78 are shown in the Public Accounts and the amounts for 1978-79, the current fiscal year, are contained in the Estimates Book which he has, the revenue book that was tabled which shows the comparison.

More recently, Mr. Speaker, the member has quoted figures for 1979-80 which of course, are not yet public information and are in fact part of the Budget of the Province of Manitoba, but the member is using I presume federal figures that have become available to him in making his projection.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that furthermore that the EPF moneys which were re-negotiated by the Minister himself, I presume, the former government, come into the Consolidated Fund of the province under block funding type of category, and therefore Mr. Speaker, go through the usual process of most of the funding of the provincial government in that manner. I want to point out that, whereas there has been an increase in this particular category, this isn't certainly the case in all the funding that we have on cost share programs or on equalization payments or on other arrangements we have with the federal government which do go up and go down depending on the particular circumstances, and in this particular case, Mr. Speaker, the issue or question seems to be centered around as to whether or not there hasn't been a proportionate pass-through into the Health field.

I simply want to point out that on another aspect of the type of funding that did fall into the same category, or will fall into the same category as the EPF, the Social Services type of funding that was also to have gone into block funding in this particular year but has been now postponed a year. The current government, as has been elaborately outlined by the Minister of Health, supported the general principle of block funding but in that particular case, Mr. Speaker, the effects of it are going to be that the province, the Provincial Government, will not by immediate impact but by the impact stretched out over a period of years will, in fact, lose by moving in that direction, but that particular program is held up for one year by the Federal Government by their so-called restraint program.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that, while in this category, there will be an increase shown in the funds forwarded to the Provincial Government. There are other categories where that is not the case, and as I have said on other occasions, we learned as early as three or four months ago that the likely impact for 1979-80 would be a reduction in other categories of some \$30 million which still has to be integrated into our budget.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that you would take this statement

from the Minister away from the Question Period and not reduce that amount, and I would surmise then that the Minister, although he didn't ask for leave, made a statement that one member from this side could answer that statement because it was a statement. He didn't answer my question at all.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the Honourable Minister of Finance was providing answers to questions that had been asked previously.

MR. DESJARDINS: The question that I asked was — I asked for figures and we received a speech, an explanation, which I don't mind, but I feel that at this time if you allow the Minister to make such a statement that a member from this side should be able to respond to the statement, Mr. Speaker. No, he didn't give me any answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I point out to the honourable member that, while every member of the Chamber has the right to ask questions, Ministers also have the right to answer questions and I don't believe any member of the House has the right to dictate how a Minister answers a question. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface with a question.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, are you now ruling that the Minister can say anything, make any statement instead of answering questions, and nobody could say anything, and that members on this side of the House could not respond to a statement of a Minister. Is that what you're ruling at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm saying that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, if he wants to ask a question, will be recognized by the Chair. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: On the point of order, when the Minister of Finance branched into discussions on the funding to be received in regard to social allowances, I was inclined to stand up and object to his continuing on the basis that that was nowhere near an answer to the questions asked, but since it was obvious the statement was a matter of courtesy, although he was late in making it, it seemed that he should be allowed to continue and complete his statement. But surely, Mr. Speaker, having heard that his statement went way beyond an answer to the question, then you should, in all courtesy, allow a reply to the statement.

MR. SPEAKER: One of the problems that we face in this Chamber, and I think we will probably continue to face, is when we get long questions with long preambles, and we also have an equal amount of problem with long answers to questions. I would hope that in the future, questions will be fairly short and the answers will be fairly short. If they are detailed, lengthy answers, I would suggest that they be given in writing. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to direct my question either to the Minister of Environment or the Minister responsible for Safety and Health. In view of the dangerous radiation leak at the American Three Mile Island Nuclear Power Plant near Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, can the Minister reassure the House that he has made certain that there are proper precautions being taken to prevent such a danger at the Atomic Energy of Canada Plant at Pinawa.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm sure that the Honourable Minister was not able to hear the question asked by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, and I would ask him to repeat it.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In view of the dangerous radiation leak at the American Three Mile Island Nuclear Power Plant near Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, can the Minister reassure the House that he has made certain that there are proper precautions being taken to prevent such a danger at Atomic Energy Plant at Pinawa?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and Environmental Management.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the question of the atomic energy situation at Pinawa is under the control of the federal government, and we are assured, in consultation with the federal government, that the situation is adequately in hand.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Since the provincial government is also responsible for our safety and our health and the environment, would the Minister indicate whether he is satisfied with the procedures, and can he inform the House how often these procedures are carried out in respect to safety.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the knowledge of the detailed procedures at hand. But I would question first of all whether the two systems in place, the one in Harrisburg and the one at Pinawa are even comparable, but I certainly will be asking my staff for a comment on the situation that has developed in the United States, and if there is any cause for concern, then we, naturally will be raising that with the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan with a final supplementary.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister undertake to acquaint himself with the review procedures in respect to safety and report to this House when he has found out.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think if the honourable member would have been listening to my reply that is exactly what I said I would do.

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

MR. A.R. (PETE) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. I would like to ask the Minister if it is correct that the creamery at Glenella has been closed down?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge. I don't have any information on that important matter but I will certainly check it out.

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

MR. ADAM: Yes, I wonder if while the Minister is checking into this very serious matter for the people at Glenella and the producers there, could he also investigate if the buttermaker has been refused a license to make butter? And, I would also ask the Minister if he would undertake to discuss this matter with Manco and the producers at Glenella to see if there's any possible way of keeping this creamery open.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I will look into that urgent matter that the member brings to the attention of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health and Community Services. I wonder if he would like to take this opportunity now to answer my previous questions in regard to the construction of a correctional facility at The Pas. Does the Minister have an answer to that question yet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): No, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I don't have an answer but I'll certainly deliver an answer to the House as soon as the government has one.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could tell the House why he or the government has not applied for the extension of the permit to operate temporary trailer facilities within the town boundaries at The Pas since their present permit expires this weekend. How come the Minister has not applied for an extension of that permit?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would imagine that my colleague, the Honourable the Minister of Government Services is in contact with the town council at the The Pas on that very subject.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would the Minister then in consultation with his colleague to check why the town council, the elected representatives of the community of The Pas have not been contacted since the Minister's visit there a number of months ago when he promised an answer within 10 days and that they have been ignored in terms of the extension of the temporary trailer permits? Could he answer the question why his government has sought to ignore the town council in The Pas?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I reject the charge. The government has been in touch with the town council in The Pas and in fact there have been meetings between the Minister of Government Services and the Mayor of The Pas since my visit to The Pas. We have had department officials in The Pas looking for solutions to the problem. In fact we've had two rotations of department Ministers in The Pas looking for a solution to the problem. It is a complicated problem as the honourable member knows, but there certainly has been contact with the community and with at least the Mayor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ft. Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In view of his comment or statement that the provincial government has not continued the proportionate cost-sharing in the health field under the extended financing program, is he prepared to concede, as well, that the same holds true for the post-secondary education financing proportion of that same program in that the provincial government is not continuing its 50-50 arrangement but in fact is giving far less than it is receiving from the federal government to post-secondary education?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the provincial government is giving far more to post-secondary education than what is received from the federal government, and this is the general impression that is attempting to be put across, I get the impression. And I think the members opposite know much better than that. All that has happened is that the EPF, which contained the medical, hospital and post-secondary education, money comes into the provincial government, as of 1977, by way of general funding rather than specific, and as a result it goes into the consolidated revenue. But even if it hadn't, Mr. Speaker, I can only assume that it would have gone through directly and then it just would have been a case of the province topping up the difference.

But, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the suggestion is coming from across the way that . . .
—(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I can only say that if we were to do as suggested . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please, order please. May I suggest to all members that they give the member the courtesy of the floor while he is making his reply. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it has been outwardly and I doubt if it would be outwardly advocated that we ought to follow a program of being locked in to doing such and such type of funding with health or with education, because you'd find out that you had massive changes in what was occurring in other sections of the government. I doubt that that is being advocated, but that is what would happen if in fact we were to try and match dollar for dollar or in some formulas.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he could probably give his answer in a shorter period. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I thank you. I hope I will be able to call upon the same courtesy, but I would like to ask the Minister this: Is it not true that under the EPF, which was assigned for health and education, not for general purposes, but assigned for block transfers in health and post-secondary education, that the percentage increase in this year's Estimates that comes from the federal government is substantially higher than what the provincial government itself is adding in those two areas of health and education, and that if you add up the arithmetic on it it means that in fact the provincial government is not increasing it by 6 percent, it's own percentage of revenues going into it is substantially even smaller than the 6 percent; it's probably less than 1

or 2 percent?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe we may be getting into a debate rather than a Question Period here. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'll try and answer as briefly as I can. The proportion of government spending in the health field this year has not gone down, out of our provincial budget. The proportion of provincial spending has gone up out of the total provincial expenditures, and I don't know, on a proportionate basis, the exact percentage for education but I suspect it has too.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the member is trying to say, Mr. Speaker, let's just leave it. It has gone up. The proportion of the province's spending in the field of health has gone up consistently every year, including the last year.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me put the question in another form, that while the percentage of spending in the health fields and post-secondary education fields have gone up about 6 percent, considering that the federal transfers have gone up on an average of 14 percent, does that not mean that the provincial proportion that have gone into those two fields has in fact gone down?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the money that the member is talking about was a system that was negotiated in 1977-78; it goes into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, just like multi-other-shared programs do with the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, the allocation of those into the fields of health, education and any other area of activity of the provincial government, is a matter of government policy.

MR. AXWORTHY: Just a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, on the statement of the Minister that these funds are simply to be folded into general purpose revenues. Is it not true that when those agreements were signed that every provincial government committed itself to transferring those funds directly into the fields of health and education and not to fold them into general revenues, and that this government is therefore breaking its agreement?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the case of medicare funding, Mr. Speaker, the accusation has been levelled that the province has not lived by the original intent of the agreement, but the agreement and the conditions on the medical doctors has not changed since the whole program started some 10 years ago, and also the percentage of doctors that have opted out have not changed to any significant degree.

So, Mr. Speaker, the conditions have not changed, but my friend from Fort Rouge, and also his colleagues in Ottawa, are trying to give the impression that the ground rules have changed. They have not changed in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General and ask him whether he has any concern about the remarks of Mr. Cox that judicial sentences of week-end jail sentences at Headingley are not working, and people are not reporting.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I did not see that particular statement.

MR. DOERN: I would direct that question to the Minister of Corrections and ask him whether he is aware of the remarks of the Inspector-General that half the people on week-end jail sentences have failed to show, and one man has phoned in 98 times to say he was ill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, like the individual on temporary absence that the Member for Elmwood was sleuthing earlier in the week and gum-chewing through the city and seemed to have some indication as to his whereabouts, if he has information of this kind I wish he would pass it on. The Inspector-General has not made that statement to me.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to direct a question to the Attorney-General and ask him

whether it is true that his department is now studying information with a view to laying charges concerning additional prosecutions in this homosexual ring or scandal in the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, if the department were making investigations into any particular matter, I would not make any announcements of it in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, responsible for the Rent Stabilization Board. I have here a press release dated March 27th whereby the Minister announces six new appointments to the Rent Stabilization Board, the majority of whom are businessmen or retired businessmen. Could the Minister indicate why none of the new appointments were tenant's representatives?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, as far as I'm concerned, it's the government that is making the appointments to this Board and it is none of my honourable friend's business.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary to the Minister. Since the people on this side of the House feel that the Legislature represents all the people of Manitoba, not just the business community, I would ask him therefore if he intends to appoint tenant representatives to the rent stabilization body, or is he just going to appoint business representatives.

MR. JORGENSEN: Perhaps it has escaped my honourable friend's attention, that six members of the board, that are still on there, were appointed by my honourable friends.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, with a third supplementary, the Minister has avoided answering my question twice now, and has ducked the issue of whether he will appoint tenants representatives. I would like him to stand up here and tell the people of this House, and tell the public who on this board is a tenant representative. He is the Minister responsible for the board, he should be able to tell us who they are, who are they?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the balance on that board has not changed. There are still tenants on that board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister responsible for MHRC. Could he indicate to the House when he will introduce the Homestead Act promised the people of Manitoba by the First Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice and investigate it and try to give the honourable member an answer. I'm not quite sure of the Act that he's speaking of. I'll check into it.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the same Minister. In an attempt to refresh his memory on some of the campaign promises which that side of the House have made to the people of Manitoba, would he take the trouble to read an article in the October 12th issue of the Free Press, titled "What the PCs Promised Us." And would he also refresh his memory on the commitment made to pass a new Homestead Act under which loans could be made available to first home buyers, and those planning to renovate existing housing, and funding for the program could be diverted from the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, now that he explains what he was talking about, and if he had done that in the first place he might have got an answer, but Mr. Speaker, the article he refers to, I know very well, and my department is continually working on these things, and are working on a program of that type.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Finance. Further to his often-expressed concern about the international exchange rate and the effect that it has on Manitoba's debt position, can the Minister inform the House by how much Manitoba's debt position has improved, due to the rise in the dollar's value to 86 cents?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if the member wants to use a rough rule, he can use one cent equals \$25 million on the American, if he likes.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the Honourable Minister have any studies, has he done any research to assist the effect on the inflation rate of the rise in the value of the dollar to 86 cents?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, it's generally assumed that the rise in the Canadian dollar value will reduce the inflation rate.

MR. WALDING: Has the Minister any figures as to the effect on Canadian farmers, Manitoba farmers and manufacturers on the change in the exchange rate to 86 cents?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think the member is asking for . . . his question is of obtuse enough nature that it defies an answer, specifically, and if I were to try and answer, I would get in trouble with the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. WALDING: Let me explain, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Honourable Minister of Finance. It's been widely recognized, Mr. Speaker, that when the value of the Canadian dollar declined, that this resulted in increased revenues to manufacturers and exporters in this country. I am asking the Minister of Finance if he has any figures to show the detrimental effect to manufacturers and exporters in this country of a rise in the exchange rate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Honourable, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, and I don't want to be intimidated by the Minister against asking questions, because I know that the Minister who says he's a parliamentarian doesn't believe in people on this side asking questions of him. I ask him if he will meet the commitment that he made to us a month ago to provide data to us on the Rent Stabilization Board, how many people applied for de-control, what the rent increases were, he undertook to provide that information to us one month ago. Is he now in a position to keep his word on that commitment?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to be providing that information for my honourable friend. But I don't want to run afoul of the rules of this House by extending an answer, and the question that my honourable friend asks will require some length and time, and I think it could be more appropriately answered during the consideration of the Estimates.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary to the same Minister. Over one month ago, the Minister undertook to look into the whole question of gas prices increases in Flin Flon, on behalf of my colleague from Flin Flon, and in Winnipeg on behalf of my colleague from Burrows. Is he now in a position to keep his word on that undertaking?

MR. JORGENSEN: I'm not sure what my honourable friend means by "keeping my word" on the issue. The matter is being investigated.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary to the same Minister. Over 2 ½ months ago, the Minister gave us an undertaking in this House that he would look into and report on the matter of drastic bread price increases. Is he now in a position to keep his word on that undertaking?

MR. JORGENSEN: My honourable friend's curiosity will be satisfied within a very short time, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Community Services again. I wonder if he is in a position to keep his word that he will make an announcement in regard to the correctional facility at The Pas before March 31st? Will he be making that announcement before March 31st?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have assured my honourable friend time and time again that we will make an announcement with respect to the correctional institute at The Pas just as soon as we have a very complex problem resolved. A problem that includes arrangements with the town council itself, that includes regulations that we are up against, that includes an inheritance from the former government that is too expensive for the taxpayers of Manitoba, that includes juveniles, adults, courthouse and problems of that nature all rolled into one challenge. It is not resolved yet. It will be resolved as quickly as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister may be unaware of the fact that the problem was resolved a year and a half ago and that in fact his delaying is going to cost \$1.5 million if he proceeds with the same project. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister if he will in fact be instructing someone to apply to the Town of The Pas for extension of their temporary trailer permits before the end of today because on Monday it will be too late, their permit will have run out.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly be in consultation with my colleague, the Minister of Government Services on that point to ensure that that situation does not arise and does not cause us an insoluble problem on Monday.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Parks and enquire whether the downhill ski areas operated by the province will be reopened now that we have so much snow?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The hour for questions having been completed, we're now dealing with Orders of the Day.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

BILL 26 — THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1979

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Will you call Bill No. 26, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Government House Leader, Bill No. 26. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you for your courtesy, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Premier of the province yesterday rose in his seat and said that the speech made by the Honourable Member for Inkster wasn't one of his best ones. Well, I can say that the Premier's speech certainly wasn't one of best ones. It was to be expected. It was one of his usual arrogant lectures. He talked down to everybody on this side. That's his style. Everybody on this side is stupid. They can't understand. They are uneducated. And then by his statement, just the statement of his that whatever my Honourable friend from Inkster said was stupid. That meant that it was laid to bed and you couldn't discuss it any more. Mr. Speaker. Now, I think that the Honourable Premier forgot that we have a responsibility and I think that this is what we exercise and my friend from Inkster was doing exactly that, showing the priorities that seem to be part of this administration of this government.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance got up today and with your permission made a speech and did not answer my question at all and the only reason why he did that is because finally I had to get the information somewhere else or we'd still be waiting for an answer. Now let me say to my honourable friend that he cannot juggle forever and that he could not mislead forever. It is absolutely correct that legally they could build only roads in Manitoba with this money for the time being until a federal government will change that and this is what they were ed threaten Legally we are not debating that. That money is going in a consolidated fund and you can use it the way you want as of now. That certainly wasn't the intent and the spirit when it was negotiated and it doesn't change. If you want to do that, accept the responsibility. We are not saying you can't do it, but accept the responsibility and don't have any member of this Cabinet blame the federal government because the doctors are not getting more pay or because there is not money spent on hospitals because there is less money coming from Ottawa because that is not true.

Mr. Speaker, in the past, in the field of health the formula was always health and social development or social welfare and it's the same in social welfare so we will leave that. But it was always a cost shared at 50-50 contribution from the provincial government and the federal government and it was intended that it would continue but — so the government at the request of some of the government that wanted to be able to prioritize themselves, where they wanted to spend , it became block funding. Well, block funding for that field, that money in health was to be spent on health. That's what it was for. Oh, technically the Minister is saying, yes, it is being spent on health but that's only part of the deal. The other was that the matching contribution would come from the province, matching increase. And you can say what you want, the Minister of Finance can say what he wants, this is not the case and I will take your figures . In the field of hospitalization the Minister is apparently sticking to a global budget to all hospitals of an increase of 6 percent. And if you're getting 14.5 percent increase from Ottawa, you multiply your 6 percent by two. That'll give you 12 percent, so you've got enough of an increase in Ottawa to pay their increase of 6 percent and your share of the 6 percent and you've got 2.5 percent left.

You can't change anything. And 15, 14.5 percent this year, that's only part of the story. That follows a year of an increase of more than 15 percent where you talked about 2.9 percent. Now, I'll be honest. I'll be honest and I'll help and I'll even argue partly for you or recognize certain things. I don't think, I know, that the increase last year was not 2.9 percent or 2.2 the way it should have been. I know that there was all kinds of juggling going at the base and that they received much more than that. I know that this is a figure to be able to tell the people, look, we said 2.2 percent or 2.9 and look, there's no damage. But certainly you haven't spent, having said that and I know that this year there is no way. You've got as much chance as a snowball in hell of making it stick, the 6 percent increase in the hospital. There is no way. And the Minister who says that 6 percent will be taken globally and what you will do then is that if there's not enough for St. Boniface, if after review they need more, it will be deducted somewhere else. There is no way that could be done and I say that all that because you might save 35 cents in some small hospitals somewhere, well that's not going to help with the \$4 million, at least \$4 million that St. Boniface needs.

And the city hospitals, I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that all of them will have a deficit, maybe not Misericordia, because they closed beds and that was allowed last year and they kept the money. They might have a surplus but I would say that the other hospitals will have a deficit. Why? You know have I got spies that are telling me that? No, Mr. Speaker, because first of all you are dealing with about 70 percent of the budget is staff. The way they're firing staff it might be less than that. It used to be 75. Now it's approximately 70 percent and they are stuck. They have to go along with a contract in good faith and that's at least 7.5 to 8 percent. Then they have supplies, surgical supplies, which is approximately 20 percent of their budget and that, Sir, is an increase of 30 percent because of the dollar. They're getting most of these supplies in the United States.

I wish the Minister the Finance would stay here but, of course, I can't force him because I'd like to have some information. —(Interjection)— Yes, well okay. Write me a "sorry" note and everything will be forgiven. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's fine. He can do what he wants, but he made speeches in the House. I was not given a chance to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Finance on the point of order.

MR. CRAIK: Since the member's raised the question of my leaving the House, I can tell him only that it's for an important meeting that he would agree with.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . point of order but being so courteous we extend him the right to make any statement that he wants, and I'll accept that. But, Mr. Speaker, I was saying that 70 percent of the increase in the budget of a hospital deals with the labour situation, with the staff, about 20 percent with surgical supplies that have gone up to approximately 30 percent, the dollar being

what it is and most of these supplies come from the United States and Japan and Europe, and then the food — that I'm taking the story in the Free Press. They say the food has gone up 21 percent. So, Mr. Speaker, there is no way that they can stay within 6 percent.

But the point is that there were statements made in this House, there were statements made outside the House, that the doctors were not receiving more, that they could not give more to the Hospital because it was the Federal Government's fault that they were not coming across because of their restraint position and that, Sir, is absolutely wrong. We do not doubt, we do not quarrel, we do not disagree with the Minister of Finance that this money is going into a consolidated fund, and apparently they can do what they want.

Now, last year one of the Ministers — I'm talking now of the Minister of Health and the Minister of Finance — one of the Ministers told me that all this money was earmarked, as far as they were concerned, for Health and the other one didn't know, and I never received the information. Now, the information is, Sir, that there was, and that is only in the field of Health, calculated for the field of Health, calculated for the services and the increase that should be done.

In 1977-78, the first year — and I'm not going to compare the last year — it might be quite revealing because there was quite a jump, but I want to be fair and I don't want to take a chance of maybe comparing apples and oranges because there might be something covered somewhere else, so I will start in 1977-78 which is the first year that we had block funding, and then we received from Ottawa \$214 million. In 1978-79, which is this current year, it'll be \$246.7 million for an increase of over 15 percent, and in 1979-80 it is anticipated that it will be \$282.2 million for 14.5 increase, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the Minister seemed to say, "Well, this year, you don't have to know. You, know, this is in front of the books." Well, how can any government in its right mind, people that say that they're such wonderful managers, and they talk about how things were mismanaged in the past, how can they say, "This is what we want from Health", without knowing what they're getting from all their revenues.

And talking about revenues, Sir, if you want to make the comparison between the previous government, not only are they getting 15 percent more from the Federal Government, from the senior government, but they are getting all kinds of added revenue that we didn't have. They are, for instance — they now, because of this block funding, they have been able to do something that we've wanted to do all along, that we agree with — they have said that people occupying acute beds, General Hospitals who had been panelled and had been found to be acceptable, or to be panelled for a Personal Care Home, have been treated as Personal Care Home patients and they have been charged the per diem rate. But that's another revenue.

Then talking about the rate of Personal Care Homes, which has gone what — \$1.50 or \$1.25, I don't know since they took office — that's an increased revenue, although in the field of Personal Care Homes they are talking about a 3 percent increase, not even a 6 percent increase. And Mr. Chairman, increasing the semi-private from \$1.00, I think, or so, most of the hospitals had, that's another revenue. Doing away with giving free drugs in the outpatient department, that's another revenue. Increasing the maximum from \$50.00 to \$75.00 for Pharmacare, Sir, is another revenue. So there is no point trying to be made that they are breaking the law, you know, but what is that saying, "I'd sooner hurt you with the truth than mislead you with a lie", or something. This is the point here. If that is their policy, and if they want to talk about cutting down in the field of Health, which we're saying that they're doing, because they had made commitments that that would not happen. There was not one program that they did not accept, that they didn't say was a good program. They said that, if anything, they would increase their programs.

And then they are talking about "Big Brother", the government, getting away out of people's lives, and their policy, they stated, is less government, less services — they say it on one side and then they say the services will stay — but we know what they want. But you will have more money in your pocket to pay. It'll be some kind of a block funding. You will choose your priorities. You will not be forced by a government to do this and that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what has happened with all this restraint since this government is in power? What has happened? We have seen that they've increased costs, that they've reduced services, and they're flirting with the idea of more users' fees. It's not a restraint; it's a redirection, like I said. It's a redirection of putting the load on municipalities, on users, on the individual. That's all it is. Well, that's fine. If that is the doctrine of a Conservative Government, fine. Come out and say it loudly, and then keep on and prove that you can do it and that you will leave the individual with more money to spend as he sees fit. Well, we could see on one side all the reductions and the added costs, but let's see where the people got a break. The minimum wages are exactly the same. You know, there's no increase there. I think that there was a tax for the individual, the middle road of about \$33.00 — \$33.00 with everything that has been added — and is that a true picture?

There is also, for those driving cars or going in a taxi, or in a bus, I guess, added cost on the gas of two cents. That goes into the General Revenue. That is an added tax because Autopac was replaced with — the increase in premium replaced that 2 percent tax. So this is the government, and led by a man who yesterday, in his arrogant lecture, told us that it represented all the people, all the people of Manitoba, and that, after his name calling talked about — but it's just like a little McCarthy — talked about that everybody on this side are Communists, and that's the impression . . . that he's like to leave, that we were doctrinaire, well I think I'm probably the one that could speak about doctrinaire the most, because if anything' I'm certainly not doctrinaire probably to a fault, I'm not enough doctrinaire.

Some would call doctrinaire . . . my honourable friend when he's on this side talking about the Member for Inkster calls him a Red and a Doctrinaire and does he love that word, but when he gets up on that side to talk about himself, it's principle. It's principle. You know, yes, because doctrinaire is a person who would put political and social theory into effect without worrying about the consequences. So on this side they're doctrinaire — that scares the people when you say doctrinaire — when it's on that side it's principle. Well, I don't know, I don't know, Mr. Speaker.

Then another thing that was said yesterday by the Leader was that and I think that's, that we should look at that for a minute, that statement. He said that people around 18 were socialist and about 30, 35 became conservative in general. And, Sir, I think that in many ways, that's right and that is why I'm afraid for society, I'm not talking about political parties, I'm talking about a social conscience because the tendency seems to be, take care of yourself, and if we accept that as the base and money is our god, well then we have a very healthy society and we can go ahead forgetting about the individual, you know, and worship at the altar of big business and privileged class in society. We can do that because many people before they've got it made have a social conscience, and once they've got it made well, to heck with it.

And there's a tendency. . . you know, we don't talk about what should be right here, we talk constantly for instance of setting a climate where big business will progress and that is at all cost. You know, even in the field of Medicare for instance, we look at the individual and we feel that we have to keep him and that is the way society is going. And until that, all the world or the free world accept and has a social conscience, there'll be problems or unless somebody has got the guts to say okay, maybe we won't, the economy of the pro. . . I say maybe, I kind of doubt that but the economy of the province might not be able to rival that of another country, but we feel at least that our people are dealt with as human beings and isn't that the aim, Mr. Speaker? Isn't business to create jobs and to give people a chance? And to say that we have crocodile tears like was said yesterday because we dare worry about the minimum wages. You know, the way we are looking now the minister apologized for giving the doctors only 8.2 and I agree with him. I agree with him, I think that they should be well paid. That has never been any problem with me at all, but if you do that, if you look at your top class in society and say we must give them this in all fairness, you should not announce with pride and happiness that you're giving 6 per cent to the workers that are working on Home Care, Mr. Speaker.

Let's look at 8 per cent of somebody receiving \$75,000.00 I think it's about \$5,600.00. Compared to 6 per cent of somebody getting \$10,000.00 that is \$600.00. There's a difference of \$5,000.00. No, do we want a kind of society that will encourage in going more in that direction? You know, they speak of —(Interjection)—I beg your pardon? At least, if he'd turn around I'd know what he was saying. So, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I'd like to answer my honourable friend but I don't know what he said. I am saying that, you know, when I used that word the people laughed and I was exaggerating and come on Larry, be reasonable and when I said that the ideal climate for business would be to bring back slavery, and it would be. There would be lot more money made and we had people in those days, it was probably the elite of the times, the respected people in that society believed in slavery and it took somebody, probably some Socialist, doctrinaire Socialist or somebody to say, they are human beings, they were created by the same Creator that created me in His image also, and we must treat them as individuals. You know, I defy and challenge anybody from that side to think that the individual is not important. The Leader, before he accepted the position of Leader wanted a guarantee of over \$30,000.00. I don't blame him at all, but I mean he wanted to make sure that his family was provided for, but he's not ready to extend that to other human beings. You know, and if you have problems in your family, if you have problems in the family, what kind of a family would you have if the father said, well, all right we have problems, we have restraint, while I as the head of the family as the most intelligent one, as the leader, I intend to keep on with my golfing, my Crown Royal, and I'm going to replace my Cadillac, but you the kids, you're not going to get anything, you've got to understand that we're in a period of restraint and you've got to tighten the belt.

Could you do that? Can you see. . . you shake your head, you're right, no father worth the

name of father would do a thing like that, but that's exactly what you're doing in society. And you can shake your head all you want when you practically apologize for increasing people that might be getting \$75,000.00 by only 8.2 per cent and where you're so happy and so proud of announcing that a 6 per cent increase is going to be given to people getting \$10,000.00. Mr. Speaker, if that's doctrinaire, well then I think I'm a doctrinaire. —(Interjection)— Well, the Cabinet Ministers can give long answers and the MLA can't ask questions, that's one of the answers. You know, we have a government that talks about confrontation and they love that, it was a ready made, a very good plot, it was so easy because it was a Socialist government and Socialists always, always argue and always try to hurt the people at the top of the ladder; which I certainly say is not true, there was no changes in there at all but it was the pleasure, the sport of members when they were sitting on this side to say that I had a confrontation with Doctors because I had to go along with the Price Control Board.

Well, Mr. Speaker, do you remember the Honourable Member for Rhineland during the campaign spoke, and he was asked the question, what will you do when you'll be in power in the field of Health? Oh, he said, we'll get the money then we'll turn it over to you because you know how to run business better than us. We will talk with the nurses, we will talk with the doctors, we will talk with the dentists, we will talk with the psychiatrists, we will talk with the LPNs, no LPN was a little too. . . we will talk to these people and you will decide, and you will decide this is what's going to happen. And now, Mr. Speaker, you remember how many times we were taught that it was confrontation, Well, Sir, look around, there's confrontation all over. There's confrontation with the medical profession. I had the audacity not to have a contract signed, a contract that was due January 1, and on January 7 I didn't have a contract. There was a big strike — 7 days. We waited 3, 4, 5 months. It's common now. We don't discuss with the medical profession about the minimum, about how many nurses and so on should be in the hospital, should be working — that's not done. We have a confrontation with the administrators of the hospital, the staff, the medical profession, the ladies of course, when they want change, when they want to better their lot. And of course, well, I don't know if you can call it confrontation with the people on the minimum wages, because they don't exist. How can you have a confrontation with people that don't exist, Mr. Speaker?

No, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is going to lecture, like yesterday he tells us again, but he's never here to get the answers. I challenge you, I challenge you to tell me if you would bring back the Succession Duty Tax. And mind you, I think he's a convert because he sure likes Saskatchewan. Yesterday, Saskatchewan was his model for everything. I think he's becoming a Red. I think so, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— I know he's lying, I know he's lying, I know he's lying, you don't have to tell me, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— No, no, I respect him, he's my Premier, his name is Rufus, and never mind this.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you know we — my honourable friend also challenged us to say, you know, just with a statement, and that's nonsense. You know, — that's nonsense, that's finished, you don't argue, the boss said it's nonsense so everything that we say is nonsense. He talked about, what is it about, about giving jobs to our friends in the Civil Service. Well I accept that challenge, and they have all the figures, they have the books, and I very honestly and I'll pick up any bets that they want to make, we'll give it to their favourite charity, no, that would be themselves. I'll chose the charity if I win, and they chose their charity, Mr. Speaker, and I defy anybody to tell me anybody that I put in boards, and I had a lot of boards in the Department of Health and in Fitness and in the Lottery. And any from my Deputy Minister on down to any position that I made myself, to tell me how many NDP card carrying, — better still, I'll guarantee that there is at least three to one people that were carrying or known members of other parties. And I challenge that, — I challenge it, and if you want to prove it, accept my challenge, and put up your money . and we'll see. We'll see how many NDP I named to any boards. Oh, not me, it's always not me. Well, dammit, I had the majority of the boards, I had practically half of them in the Department of Health and Social Development and Fitness and Amateur Sports and the Lottery. — (Interjection) — Yes, that's right, I'm part of the team and I'm talking about the mandate that I had, and I challenge anybody. — (Interjection) — Sure, I knew — I hope I knew what was going on. I knew, I hope I knew.

Now, this is a challenge that I'm picking up and I'm asking you to make it good. I was challenged.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has ten minutes.

MR. DESJARDINS: Ten minutes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's so many things I wanted to say but in ten minutes. . . Then, we, you know, we talked about hypocrisy, and we talked about my honourable friend lectured us again, and he talked about, he talked about the bankers, that they wanted to be bankers but they didn't want to be managers. And — but they have no idea what a banker is all about. Because they think a banker should not take any security at all. Now,

Mr. Speaker, I understand that there was a suggestion made by the Chamber of Commerce, and I understand from my friend from Inkster that the Attorney-General was one of them, that agreed on a policy that the bank should make the loan and the guarantee would be given by the Provincial Government. Do you understand that? That a bank will make the loan but this government is ready to make guarantee because they felt it was a policy, a good policy, to guarantee the loan of a bank.

Well, unfortunately, I must have about seven or eight minutes — I wanted to say until the Minister of Finance stood up today, and I felt that I should talk about that, I wanted to say a few words on national unity, which I figured is very important, and I'm not running for office, Mr. Speaker, but I'm a member, a double member, members of two minority and I feel that we are going through a very important cross-road in the history of our country, but unfortunately, there's no point, I'll try to make that speech later on and I'll use the few minutes that I have left to go back to the funding from Ottawa. And I would say that I'm asking now, Mr. Speaker, and we'll get the figures the way I got the figures on the Department of Health. If it's not coming from the Provincial Government, who were stuck and who were embarrassed and had to have a statement made by the Minister, who tried to mislead the people of Manitoba, and the members of this House today.

And who said that this money — I received a note that apparently on the Warren program the Premier said that the federal block funding is not designated for health expenditures, and he will determine spending priorities. All right. Well, now we're in the arena where we can fight, Mr. Speaker. And in effect, what is the Premier saying? He's saying that the priorities are not in the field of health, and that's his right. He has a mandate to govern. Mind you, he has misled the people. He told them that — you remember when he was sitting there, and I was sitting here, and he leaned across and he said, we are keeping all these programs. Of course, it would be nonsense to say that we're going to stop them. Besides 80 percent of these programs were brought in by the Roblin government. You remember when he said that. You don't, well I do. That's what he said, that 80 percent of these programs came —(Interjection)— I don't care who gets the credit. I know for a fact that there were more programs, but I don't care, but he said that he would keep all these programs. And now he is saying that they are going to have priorities. But at least, don't open that second envelope that you opened long ago and blame another level of government, the Liberal government, when you're not spending the money they are giving you. Where you're not matching the increase that they are giving you for health, which is so important to so many citizens of Manitoba.

MR. EINARSON: Tell the whole story, while you're up.

MR. DESJARDINS: About what?

MR. EINARSON: About Medicare.

MR. DESJARDINS: I don't know what you mean. Tell the story about what? That I didn't believe in Medicare?

MR. EINARSON: No, no, no, no. You were talking about the previous government, Roblin government.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, what do you want me to say about the . . .

MR. EINARSON: Tell the full story, you're starting, but tell the full story.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Sir, — is it the suggestion that I have leave to recap the Roblin years in the field of health? I'm ready to do it.

MR. EINARSON: Oh, no you don't.

MR. DESJARDINS: They brought in Medicare.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest that we have one speaker at a time in the Chamber. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would love to know, I sincerely would love to know because I'm not going to evade anything. What my honourable friend means, if he wants to say that Medicare

was brought in by Roblin, he's absolutely right. No, sorry, I'm not right and he's not right. It was by Weir. But it was a Conservative government. It was brought in reluctantly, and I'll even go further, that I wasn't sold on Medicare because I thought we had a good plan here. Is that what he wants me to say? Does he think it embarrasses me? It doesn't embarrass me a damn bit. I thought the program we had was a good program. I was reluctant, I wanted the federal government to widen this thing, I wanted them to give us the money so we could — I believed that everybody should cover it, and I thought we could do it in another way for Manitoba. I guess they looked at all the country, and they brought Medicare. I'm not ashamed of that.

But I'm going to do every darn thing I can to keep Medicare, to retain Medicare, because there is no country that should be without Medicare. There is no country that should be without Medicare. And when the Minister of Health, a few weeks ago stood up and tried to involve the House in chastising the federal Minister of Health because she was playing politics, because she was warning that that money wasn't being spent, and therefore that there was danger of scuttling the Medicare program, and she wasn't going to stand for it, she's got my support. Any Minister of Health is going to have my support, because just imagine, all of you, you might not believe in it, but you would certainly not accept my challenge of saying to your constituents, we're going to do away with Medicare. Because you know what would be happen. It would be foolish on your part, and you're not that foolish. You're not like the members on this side, you're not all foolish. You've got some brains or you wouldn't be here. You're human beings with some education and some brains, sometimes you're blind to certain things, but you've got your high points and your low points. You're fortunate. Because when we sit on this side, we're stupid, we're Communists, you know anything bad, just throw it on this side, that's where it fits. So Mr. Speaker, if you want to talk about the way this

government, and apparently the Premier of this province said, we're going to decide priorities, we're not debating the fact that legally you can do what you want now. But there is no government, be it an NDP, federal government, a Liberal or a Conservative, or a Social Credit, there is not one that will allow, that will be able to allow leaving this like this if the provinces use that money to build highways, or use that money to encourage racing, or use that money for anything else. There's not one government, federal government, that will stand for that. So that's going to change.

But in the meantime, legally, morally, is another picture, is another story and I can't tell you how you feel morally, that's up to you. I know how I would feel. But don't misrepresent things to the public. Come straight like your Premier apparently did on the Warren program this morning, and said, "I will decide the priorities." And health is not a priority, health is not a priority here at all. —(Interjection)— It's not silly, those are your words, how can you have it both ways. You cannot have it both ways. If you are getting money from another level of government — all right, let's use an example. You have changed, you have said this year, we will give block funding to the city of Winnipeg for the health program. And what if the health programs go down in the city of Winnipeg, what will you say then? You'll shake your head? Oh, you'll still say I'm silly, but that's not going to help the people of Winnipeg. You might get a medal from some of your friends for saying I'm silly, and your leader might find you very attractive, you might even get a Cabinet post because you'll be following an example, but it's not going to change, it's not going to help with the problems of the people of Manitoba, or the people of the city, if you say to them, here's money, you have the responsibility of administering health services in Winnipeg in certain areas in the city of Winnipeg, we're doing that in the rural points, but we were giving you money. Now we're giving you a lump sum and you do what you want. You prioritize.

And if you feel that the Minister of Health and the government of Manitoba will not have any responsibilities, that they can do like Pilate and wash their hands, and say, that's not my problem, if the health programs and the health of the people of Manitoba is eroded, because money is used somewhere else.

Why should the taxpayers, because the money that comes from Ottawa comes from your pocket and my pocket and the pockets of all Canadians. Why should you have restraint here, but then they should give you extra money for health when you don't want to spend it on health.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is up.

MR. DESJARDINS: Fine. Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to rise and offer my support for Bill 26, the Interim Appropriation Act for the year 1979, and especially Mr. Speaker, to follow the great orator from St. Boniface, whose record and history in this House has been well documented

over the years. I've seen him rise, tear paper, upset furniture, he's a rowdy character in the heat of debate, and as you well know, Mr. Speaker, very seldom needs a microphone. Unfortunately, he always thinks that he is right and he is the only member that has any answers, he's the only member that can administer, he's the person that should know how to put all the pieces together and have the last say in most matters. We've watched that performance go on in this House for many, many years. We've seen him put on different political coats, the legend of this man, it's unbelievable, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure he'll be here likely for a long time yet because he's a very colourful member. I used to play baseball with him, an excellent athlete, and a very good politician.

But Mr. Speaker, regarding the matter of health, before I get into the other matter of my Estimates, let's just take very briefly a look of what kind of dollars are being spent for the Health and Social Services in this province, and correct this priorities thing once and for all, Mr. Speaker. This year, I look from the Estimates that the government this year, the budget will be \$1.774 billion. \$702 million of that is going for health, in other words, 39.6 percent of that budget is going for Health and Social Services. Can anybody, in his wildest imagination, tell me that that hasn't got a high priority in this government, when there's almost 40 percent of the budget going to the Health Department in this province? That's a bunch of hogwash that the Member for St. Boniface is dragging into this Chamber.

Let's look at it last year. Last year, the budget was \$1.656 billion. . Health got \$656 million, 39.5 percent of the budget. And I have no quarrel with the performance of the government before, the year before, 1976-77, the budget was \$1.176 billion. \$395 million went to Health and Social Services, 33.7 percent went to Health and Social Services. The year before, 1976-76, \$1.274 billion. \$309 million for Health and Social Services, 30.1 percent went for Health.

Now whose priorities are higher, of that little period of time that I'm relating to you in the matter of Health and Social Services. That former Minister can stand up here and tell us, while he was spending 30.1 percent in 1975-76, and 33.7 percent in 1976-77, this year there's almost 40 percent of the budget going for Health and Social Services, last year 39.5. Now, let's get your priorities straight and let's find out who is telling the truth in this matter.

Now, I know, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has a tremendous memory and a way of screwing things up and changing them around. But that is a fact. Forty percent of the budget this year is going for Health and Social Services. In 1975, it was only 30 percent. That's a ten percent increase in a matter from 1975 to 1979. —(Interjection)— I'm just talking about Health and Social Services. —(Interjection)— It's the whole department that's functioning in that way. And there's those kind of dollars being spent. Mr. Speaker, sure, you can twist the figures around, you can make percentages read anything they want. I'm talking about the total budget, of the money that was spent. Forty percent is being spent. And you think that that isn't a high priority of any government, regardless of whether it's this government, the government of Saskatchewan, the federal government, when you're voting 40 percent of your budget dollars to one department, that must have a pretty high priority in the minds of that government.

I would say the next highest priority with this government is Education, where this year there will be some \$368 million expended for Education. You put those two items together and we have over a billion dollars being spent by this government. So you can quickly realize where the priorities of this government stand, Mr. Speaker. Over \$702 million is it, for Health, \$368 million for Education. I would say, in my mind, and the mind of members opposite, those are the number one and two priorities of this government, Health and Social Services first, Education second, because of the dollars that we're expending.

Now, I'm sure there will be other members come on the scene and twist the figures around and change it, but don't let anybody kid you, Mr. Speaker, those are facts, those are figures and those dollars will be spent in this province. I'm not quarrelling about the quality of Health care, as I said in my remarks earlier in the Session, I was in the hospital last year. Anybody that drags up this business about dirty sheets and the bacon and the quality of food — the health service in this province is maybe not a Cadillac system, Mr. Speaker, but it's pretty good. And if you trace back and see where the health has gone in this province over the ten years that I've been here, I was looking at it in 1966, where roughly Health was \$68 million and the Welfare, or Social Services facet of the department was \$30 million, so it was roughly \$98 million in that year. That's a little over ten years. It's risen from, say \$100 million to this year, we are spending \$702 million in health. That's a pretty good increase and I congratulate the former government for what they can put into the development of our health services in the province. Maybe it wasn't perfect, and maybe we're not perfect. But I'll tell the Member for St. Boniface again, when you're spending 39.6 percent of your budget for Health and Social Services in this province, that is not bad. And that's why I ask the honourable members opposite to stand up and support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, last year in this province, even with the economic problems that are facing Canada

and many of the western countries, our real rate of growth last year, was more than twice that of the year before. I'm not bragging about that record, or not bragging about that statistic, but that was in a period of restraint, Mr. Speaker, which stands pretty well in the eyes of the people that reside in this province. I don't intend, Mr. Speaker, to stand up here today and to boast about a mere two percent increase in our rate of growth last year, or to even brag or to stand up and try and make a point on the fact that it's calculated this year, it'll be what, 2.3 percent by the Economic Council of Canada from their recent forecast.

But Mr. Speaker, you can't get away from the fact that those increases are in the right direction. They're not going backwards, those increases are going up and they're in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, 13,000 new jobs brought on in the labour force last year. And no make-work projects. Nothing out of the taxpayers' pockets to create those jobs. The former government couldn't achieve that goal, unfortunately, no, they couldn't make that. I say that's an excellent bench mark, that's an excellent bench mark to show that the economy of this province is starting to tick and starting to become buoyant. Farm cash sales last year, Mr. Speaker, the one statistic I looked at, was I think for 9 months of the year, was up 24 percent over the same period last year. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I think in 1977, the last year of the former government, I think there was a decline of 5.4 percent from the year 1976. Farm implement sales, Mr. Speaker, from that same statistic was up 34 percent compared to a decline of more than ten percent the last year the members opposite were the government of this province.

And those statistics can go on and on, Mr. Speaker. There's all kinds of information to show what this government is doing and they way that they're handling the affairs of this province is starting to make some marks on our society and our economy.

Let's look at the manufacturing shipments. An increase of 13.5 percent in the first nine months of 1978, compared with 4.6 percent the year before, Mr. Speaker. Retail sales, and certainly the retail sales may be misleading in many ways because of the inflationary factor, but nevertheless they were up 11.5 percent in 1978, compared with the 4.1 percent that was shown in 1977. And it goes on, Mr. Speaker, housing starts, private capital investment, all increases. So I do, Mr. Speaker, think it's very important that the members opposite stand up and support this bill that is before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I came across something in yesterday's paper that rather strikes me in a funny way, and I just wonder how the members opposite are going to deal with it, not only in this session but in the federal campaign that's facing us, where the Canadian Labour Congress, under the President, Mr. McDermott, has decided to come all out and back the New Democratic Party — not this Party, not the Liberals. This 2.3 million labour force, these big labour bosses, have decided that they're going to come out and support the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, I just wonder what's going to happen to this Party over here. What kind of an alliance are you making with the Canadian Labour Congress? What kind of a deal have you made?

I would wonder, like the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, how he could go out in his constituency and march in line with this group that's now going to be the new left-wing political force in this province.

Are they going to change their name from the New Democratic Party to the Labour Party? Because now with the Canadian Labour Congress and Mr. McDermott heading up your group, I suspect that they likely will change the name of the party to the Labour Party.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, it mentions also the muscle that this group now intends to impose upon the union people, the 2.3 million members of that particular union.

The article went on to say that only one out of four, from their past experiences, one out of four voted New Democratic. The other three out of four, for some reason, decided to vote otherwise. What tactics are they going to use with these activists that are apparently going to be infiltrated into the system with this new brainwashing scheme to get those other three that have avoided voting for the New Democratic Party, or will they now vote for the party because of the fact that McDermott is heading up this new left-wing party?

So, Mr. Speaker, I think the story has got to be told to the people of this province at the earliest possible date that our friends opposite, who always said that they represent the little people, the small, the underdeveloped, now have been taken over by the Canadian Labour Congress under the guise of this man McDermott. He has taken over. He is going to apply his muscle and they can't stand up any longer, after reading this article, and tell me that they are only little people now and they represent the little people. With that type of union leadership and the labour bosses patting them on the back and walking hand and hand with them, I just wonder how they, especially the rural communities of Manitoba, will deal with that in the forthcoming election.

So I hope some of the members opposite will — maybe the Honourable Member for Elmwood will, in his eulogy later on today — tell the House what kind of an alliance that the NDP have made

with the Canadian Labour Congress and Mr. McDermott.

A MEMBER: A holy alliance.

MR. MCKENZIE: A holy alliance. Well, I would like to have more details of it, especially because of the fact that I'm already getting phone calls today to try and ascertain how it's going to affect the people in our constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I am really pleased that the First Minister entered the debate yesterday and gave us the thrust and the drive, and the exciting comments that he brought into the records of this House and this province, and showed the members opposite where we are going and how we intend to get there.

In comparing the comments of the First Minister yesterday with the statements of their leader, the Official Leader of the Opposition, who spoke in Brandon the other night, it was very interesting to read some of the things that the Leader of the Opposition said in Brandon regarding . . . Apparently it was an NDP Council Meeting or something. Mr. Speaker, he went on and said that the Tories are shuffling responsibility from the provincial level to the local level. And I wonder why he would say that, because does he not understand that that's what Conservatives believe in? We believe that the municipalities in this province have all the right to rule and should have all the right to rule that they can possibly have and ask for, or the same with our school divisions. Do the members opposite still insist that they want to be a one state system, supreme ruler over them all, give them what crumbs are left on the table and we'll call the shots, such as they did with the City Council.

I would suggest to the Leader of the Official Opposition that he put a bench-mark up for us that night in praising us for what we are doing, because that is what the school divisions of this province want. That is what the municipalities of this province want, to decentralize the power that's in this government here and put more power and teeth into the things that they can do by themselves out in the country.

Mr. Speaker, he went on and talked about the restraint that this government has been practising. I just wonder how seriously the members are opposite in their everyday attacking of the restraint policies of this government. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how far they have travelled in their constituencies. I wonder how many people they have talked to who today are paying more tax dollars than they ever paid in their lives and are fed up with paying tax dollars into the coffers of government for the services they are getting. I have not found one person yet in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, that hasn't stood up and praised this government and patted us on the back for the restraint policies that we are practising.

Maybe Roblin Constituency is unique. I did have an unsigned letter from a gentleman the other day, who I suspect would be a New Democrat. Now, what we will call him under this new alliance; we will call him a CLC'er, I guess maybe it would be. A CLC'er or . . . —(Interjection)— Well, somebody told me it meant the Canadian Labour Congress and that they had 2.3 million members. So they're a fairly big group and they are fairly well known.

But I wonder, and I just suggest to the honourable members regarding restraint, sure I know Socialists don't believe in restraint. They believe in forever taxing the people, over-taxing the people, spending government dollars on make-work programs, bleeding the people for everything, and when you get them down to a certain level and they have no money, then they move in and look after them; we will provide you with all the services. That's the way the Socialists like to operate.

Mr. Speaker, we want the people to be able to stand on their own two feet and pay us the least taxes possible for the most service possible.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few brief remarks, I do seriously urge the honourable members to stand up and support this legislation, this Bill No. 26, The Interim Appropriation Act for 1979.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to enter the debate and to make some comments in relation to the performance of the government, and also to relate it as to the possible effects on the federal election.

I was somewhat disappointed when the First Minister spoke that he didn't give us the benefit of his advice and experience and thoughts on the federal election, because I know that the First Minister is tremendously interested in the outcome of that election and he has spent the better part of the past 18 months doing things which, in his judgment, would benefit his federal colleagues and both, I suppose, in the manner in which he operates the government of this province and also taking the opportunity, as a debater, at federal-provincial conferences in an attempt to score points

off of the Prime Minister of Canada.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I listened with considerable interest to the speech yesterday of the First Minister. I regard him as a good debater but he has made about three major speeches this year, perhaps four, and I regard two of them as being dismal failures. Now, last night was really a prime example of that. I think in an hour or longer he had about five or 10 minutes on the Crow's Nest freight rates that maybe was worth listening to. I would have to ask my colleagues who represent the rural areas whether he was saying anything worth listening to or whether he was completely off base. —(Interjection)— Oh, he was reading a speech written for him, I see. But the rest of his speech, Mr. Speaker, I think was very disappointing. And, since he is not here, I won't deal with some of the points. Which is just typical; the First Minister is hardly ever in the House. He is particularly never here when there is a debate going on. He makes his attack and runs away. So we, unfortunately, don't have the opportunity of having him seated there and being able to debate with him or at least talk to him, because I don't know what he is doing but, at any rate, I know that he isn't here.

Mr. Speaker, you know the Member for Economic Development — and we will be getting to him pretty shortly — he doesn't consider the House important, and he doesn't consider the role of the opposition important. He only thinks that what comes from the government side is important. I tell him that this is a process and that there is a group that is in government and a group that is watching the performance of government, and that is the parliamentary system. There are two groups or two sides, and that the system will not work if you do not have input and debate that criss-crosses, because out of that debate and out of that dialogue will come better government and better policies.

Mr. Speaker, if the federal election, which I say is related to what we are doing and will reflect the performance of the provincial government in terms of the impact on seats in Manitoba and perhaps across the country, if the election were held today and if the results rolled in today, there is no doubt in my mind that we would have a majority Conservative government. I believe that that is the starting position. I believe that if the ballots came rolling in right now, in the federal election — I'm not talking provincial because there I believe exactly the opposite — I believe that if there was an election today, provincially, that this government would go down. And all it would require, Mr. Speaker, is a 3 percent swing in the vote. If there is a slight shift in the voting pattern of 18 months ago that government will sit here and this group will sit there. Because it only requires a small shift in percentages. And we know why we were defeated. We know that we made some mistakes, but we also know one thing, and that is that it was the collapse of the Liberal Party that elected the Progressive Conservative government. That is how they got elected. The Liberal vote disintegrated. Well, it certainly did in my riding and it certainly did in all the ridings that I looked at. Where they had 20 percent of the vote . . . —(Interjection)— It went Tory. That's what we said; that's what I'm saying.

I'm saying that the vote shifted essentially and went behind the Conservative Party and elected them. Well I say right now if you examine what is going on and you talk to people and you take poll samplings right now you will see that the middle-of-the-road voter, given a choice — given the two so-called extremes — will vote for our party. Go and ask. Go and talk to people.

Mr. Speaker, I make this prediction as well, that in the two by-elections that should be called shortly — and I'm happy to see that the Conservatives are going to nominate in April; I'm happy to see that. —(Interjection)— Well, there might be three. You know, I should expand on that point. The Honourable Minister of Government Services, who has no interest in this government, who is completely out of tune with this government because he is a leftover, a leftover from the Roblin days of progressive, or relatively Progressive Conservatism. Now those were in the days when there was an activist, an activist spirit in the party when Duff Roblin was Premier. Well, that's gone. That's ancient history. And, you know, here's a man who's a red Tory sitting in a group of blue, true blue Tories and he sticks out like a sore thumb and he's not very happy. He has to go to Cabinet. Nothing happens in Cabinet.

You know, when I think of the workload that we had, when I think of the meetings that we had, the papers that we worked on, the committees that we sat on. I mean, it was a tough job, Mr. Speaker. It was not an easy role to be a Minister. Nowadays it just strikes me that the whole meaning, the whole meaning —(Interjection)— No, they don't. They do more than drink coffee. They make appointments. You remember the first part of the agenda dealt with appointments, Orders-in-Council and then later on we had position papers and studies and proposals. Well, they don't have that any more. They just have a meeting. It starts at 10 —(Interjection)— 9:30 and between 9:30 and 10 or 11 they argue over appointments as to which Conservative supporters should go on which boards and then I guess late morning they knock it off and go back to their offices. So, I'm saying that there are three potential openings. Three potential openings. Well, thank heaven one of my friends has just come in from Hawaii so I at least have a supporter here.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that in Rossmere Riding, Rossmere Riding, which I hope we'll have a by-election in shortly, and Fort Rouge, this party will win both those seats, win both those seats. River Heights, forget it. I mean, you know, we'll run and we'll try but you know, I always say that when we win River Heights, Mr. Speaker, we'll have all the other 56. So, you know, I put it down there. Pembina is a cinch in comparison. So, I'm speaking now politically, Mr. Speaker, about the Member for Pembina and so I say that we will have all the other ridings before we have River Heights, so I write River Heights off. I don't worry about River Heights and I don't worry about some of the seats in Southwest Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I say that there is a nervousness on the part of my honourable friends across the way about the results of May 22nd, that they know today, they know today it's in the bag. Now, last night I was watching the news and I was watching the Prime Minister. You know, the Prime Minister is a capable man. We may not agree with him, we may not like him, we may not like the direction he's gone in, but when you boil it all down, Mr. Speaker, he is a man of considerable intellect and of considerable skill. And I watched him last night on television debating in his best aggressive style, and there is a man to be reckoned with and he is going to fight this campaign from the first day to the last, uphill because he is, right now in my judgment, out of office. So he is going to fight. You remember the way "Dief the Chief" used to fight in the early '60s. You remember Dief. They wrote him off and he was all alone and he had all these spears in his back from his supporters in the Conservative Government from his colleagues. But he fought on and he could continually deliver 95 seats. Even alone he could still deliver. And now we'll see whether Prime Minister Trudeau can do as well.

Now I say as well, it's an admitted fact, that Ed Broadbent is going to make significant increases in the share of the vote for the New Democratic Party and in the share of the seats. —(Interjection)— Yes, the Labour vote and the middle of the road vote and the urban vote and a whole lot of other people will vote for the New Democratic Party. And I'll tell you something else, Mr. Speaker, there will be some Liberals voting for us and they'll be some Conservatives, not many, but they'll be some voting for us. And I'll tell you why. Because there's going to be a lot of Liberals who can't stand the Prime Minister, who've had enough of him. We've seen a few of them, a few of them pull out and, Mr. Speaker, a few of them will pull out in terms of their support of the party just as a couple of candidates named McCaffrey and Brunka withdrew from the race and they will vote NDP. Why? Because they don't want to vote Liberal, their natural resting place; they cannot stand the thought of voting Conservative so they will vote NDP.

There will be a few Tories, not many, maybe you can count them on a few hands and a few feet, but they will say they are not going to vote for Joe Clark because he's a bumbling, incompetent person and that is his problem. Well, you know, my friend the Minister of Tourism doesn't agree and I wouldn't expect her to agree. But I say this, Mr. Speaker, when you listen to the Leader of the Opposition, federally, speaking and debating, I mean, what are you hearing? You are hearing another ancient — this guy is ancient for 39. You know there's an old song about no one wants to be old at 33. But he's old at 39. He's still doing his John Diefenbaker impression. You know. He grew up when he was in his early 20s or teens in the days of Diefenbaker, the days when Dief was the Chief.

Well let's go back — 1957, that's 22 years ago. Joe was 17. He was an impressionable youth. You know, he always wanted to get into politics. When he was six years old his mother said Joe, what would you like for your birthday? And what did Joe say? He said I'd like an attache case, Mom. So his mother bought him that and you know, he began to develop his career and looked forward to the day when he would be the President of the P.C. Youth. I think he made that, didn't he? Then he became an assistant to Stanfield and then he eventually — God knows, nobody knows, Mr. Speaker, he became leader of the Conservative Party.

And all my friends opposite, Mr. Speaker, I hate to cause you a twinge of embarrassment, but because you may have felt the same, but all my friends opposite, who did they back, who did they back the block core vote, who was their man in that leadership race? Jack Horner. Little Jack Horner. The Minister of Highways, the Minister of — I know, I would ask this gentlemen and the Minister of Consumer Affairs to deny, to deny that they did not support Jack Horner. I believe they told me that and I know they were very upset when Jack Horner lost because they thought nobody, nobody represented the Tory, the hard core Tory Southwestern Manitoba better than good old, rugged Jack Horner. Now, unfortunately he was bought off. You know, I really do believe that he was bought off and the federal Liberals can dangle all kinds of marvelous goodies before members of parliament and people in every walk of life. They have all kinds of goodies, Mr. Speaker.

What I'm saying essentially, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a considerable nervousness on the part of the members opposite in terms of the ability of their federal leader to deliver the vote.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, there was a really a terrific cartoon that appeared last October 20th, my birthday as a matter of fact, it was my birthday. And it's a picture of, you know, the

more cultured Tories, one or two will recognize this cartoon because it comes from the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel. It's based on the great painting by Michael Angelo of God touching the finger of Adam and a spark of life going from one to the other to set man alive. And if you look closely you see this bewildered and stunned looking person here, Joe Clark, getting the spark from John Diefenbaker. And you'll also notice the fig leaf. I have to point out the fig leaf to my honourable friend.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier of Manitoba has tried for the last 18 months to help the federal Conservative cause. You know, he almost from the first day that we sat in this Chamber he began to make speeches knocking the Prime Minister because he believes that by attacking the federal Prime Minister he could help Joe Clark. It might not help Manitoba very much, it might not do anything for benefits in terms of our people, but he was determined, Mr. Speaker, to do what he could and he made a lot of pretty nasty comments to the Prime Minister and you know, I really wish, I really wish, Mr. Speaker, that we had seen a debate between the Premier of this province and the Prime Minister of Canada. I mean, I really wanted to see that. —(Interjection)— I know he's not in that league but he was attacking the Prime Minister, he was attacking the Prime Minister on television because I watched a lot of these conferences. But the Prime Minister, the Prime Minister just gave him a steely look. He did not say anything back. He gave him a very nasty, icy look but never said anything back because he was the Chairman, because he wasn't going to engage in a debate with the new man from Manitoba.

In fact, you know, it's very funny, Mr. Speaker, in one of the articles in McLeans Magazine it mentioned that the Prime Minister confused the present Premier of Manitoba with Walter Wier. He called him Mr. Wier a few times. It was a slip of the tongue but I think he was identifying the two men in terms of their approach to government. But, you know, he said things to the Prime Minister like I was never very good at mathematics. He told an obviously irrate Mr. Trudeau what is 12 percent of 4 seats? Made comments like that and so on and he did his best to torpedo some of those conferences and he made many insulting references to the Prime Minister but he was always very clever in doing so. He always said, Sir. And so I can't stand you, Sir and can't stand your government, Sir and I disagree with your policies, Sir. You know, and so if you didn't listen, you had the impression that he was being very polite and agreeable but if you listened to what he said, it was obvious it was a direct frontal attack.

And my complaints, Mr. Speaker, about the performance of the First Minister at federal-provincial conferences is this. He was not there to advance the position of Manitoba. He should be there to attempt to feed in to the national debate the positions of this province, number one. And number two, he should be attempting to get from the federal government whatever grants, whatever programs, whatever assistance he could to benefit the people of Manitoba. But did he do that? Did he go there to advance our position? Mr. Speaker, I submit that he went there to attack the federal government and that his whole performance has to be judged in that regard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to deal with the Member for Pembina other than to say that there sat the new backbenchers of the Conservative Government, the Member for Pembina, the Member for Emerson who has been shifted, and the Member for St. Matthews. The big three. The three men. The backbone of the government. Then if you take the three of them, Pembina, Emerson and St. Matthews, you take their first initials you get PEST. P.E.S.T. And that's really what sort of a role we get from those honourable gentlemen, a harrassment of the members of the Opposition.

And, you know, Mr. Speaker, no matter what we say, no matter what the Opposition does in Question Period, no matter what devastating attack is made on the Government Benches, those three members always see it as a victory, a victory for the Conservatives. I call that "The Fearless Fosdick School of Politics." You know, when you shoot a cannon right through one of the Ministers, they just say, "It's a mere flesh wound," you know, "It didn't hurt. It wasn't a direct hit." You know

MR. ENNS: No. No. It always hurts me. It always hurts me. I'm crying while I laugh.

MR. DOERN: Only when you laugh, it hurts. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk about one price tag that we can lay on this government, one price tag that I think can be attached to their particular actions. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is left?

MR. SPEAKER: 12:22.

MR. DOERN: Thank you. You know, one of the problems that we have dealing with the present Administration is we can't get any answers out of them. We can't get any answers from them. —(Interjection)— No, no. The Member for Wolseley asked for the piano. Right. —(Interjection)—

Well, he doesn't know where that prisoner is. He doesn't know whether he's dangerous or not and he doesn't know whether he's in jail or out. —(Interjection)—Pardon? But do you have him in jail? You don't know where he is. That's right.

MR. SHERMAN: He's not dangerous, and I don't know where he is.

MR. DOERN: You don't know where he is. That's right. They just let him go and they feel that, you know, sooner or later the sheep will come home. You know, just leave them alone and they'll come home wagging their tails behind them. You know, I don't know why the Minister isn't out there right now looking for that man. —(Interjection)— Well, I appreciate that.

MR. SHERMAN: As soon as you finish I'm going out to find him.

MR. DOERN: As soon as I finish I want you out there with the police looking for that character.

Mr. Speaker, one year ago I asked for information on the notorious Jarmoc papers. You know, Mr. Speaker, I know where those papers are. They're in the office of the Minister, and any secretary worth her salt —(Interjection)— well, my colleague says they're in the shredder. Now, that would present a problem. If they were put in the shredder then, of course, we'll never see them. They'll destroy the information, but you know, if there still is the information, any Minister could ask his secretary, and I tell you within five minutes she could pull that file, she could photostat the relevant information and, you know, we could have had that information a year ago. My colleague, the Member for Rupertsland, could have made some interesting comments on that particular information. It's taken a whole year. You know, they're still looking for that information, still looking for it, and you know, they're studying everything.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I will get personal to this extent and say that I have a personal respect for the Minister of Health as an individual. I do. But as a Minister, I am not so certain, Mr. Speaker, because he will not give us an answer and he will not come out with a clear statement. He will never say no. He will never admit anything in this House, Mr. Speaker. He has a standard answer that he's studying that problem. If you say, "Are you concerned?" He said, "Yes, I'm concerned." "Are you working on it?" "Yes, we're working on it." "Are you reviewing it?" "Yes, we're reviewing it." "Are you monitoring it?" "We are monitoring that situation now." And I say, that if that was — true . . . How many employees, may I ask, do you have?

MR. SHERMAN: 4,983.5.

MR. DOERN: And, you know, Mr. Speaker, with roughly 5,000 employees, if what he said is true, I suggest that he'd have to reallocate his entire staff or hire an additional couple of thousand more people to do the research that he claims they're doing because the whole department under the Minister of Health is studying things. They're not doing anything. They are studying problems. And they are studying them and re-studying them, but they're not making any decisions and they are not acting on anything. And the same goes for all the other Ministers.

But I want to put a price tag on a couple of delays that these gentlemen before us have given us, and I also want to say to the Minister of Health that I regard his actions in Brandon as peculiar in terms of deciding to double and triple the population of the Brandon jail. I regard that as very peculiar, and I would say to him that if he can do that with a pen, or with just a word to somebody, if he can do that, why doesn't he do that in the hospitals. I mean, why doesn't he double and triple, put in more and more people, put bunk beds, bunks, double bunks or triple bunks. I mean, if there's no holds barred, if there's no limitations, if there are no standards, then you know, shove in more people, save money. And we're getting to that stage.

MR. ENNS: They have to get sick first, Russ.

MR. DOERN: He's doing that. Yes, assuming they're sick. Assuming they're sick. What he is doing is, he's doing it the other way round, isn't he? He's not shoving in more people; he's cutting staff. He's doing it in reverse. Where you had maybe one person in charge of 15 or 20 20, he now has one person in charge of 30 or 40, and we're getting to that kind of a mentality. Push in more people. Reduce your standards, reduce your space, add in and add on, and I say that that to me, Mr. Speaker, is a deterioration of quality, and it's a deterioration of care.

And what did he do in terms of Brandon? He delayed that project and then he told us the other day that it cost \$2 million more. —(Interjection)— Oh, the Construction Strike delayed it. There was no delay in terms of a review? There was no delay at all. But the price went up considerably.

And The Pas jail, which you did delay, you and your colleagues, and your friend, the Minister of Government Services. In that case, Mr. Speaker, their price tag for delaying that project was \$2 million, and they have other projects which they are delaying on and holding back on and so on, which I think a price tag can be put on. You know, they told us a long time ago — the provincial garage — they said it wasn't needed. Why did you build it? What have they done since? They've kept it empty. They pay the heat and the light and the security, and they pay the cost of the money, but it's just a political decision. Why don't they sell it? Why didn't they renovate it? Why didn't they use it for its original purpose? No. No. They weren't going to do any of that. They're just going to pay for the maintenance.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm simply saying to you that we're getting inaction from the government and reaction in terms of whatever actions are taken. And they're following the First Minister in that regard. If you listen to the First Minister in the House, he laughs. He laughs at everything that the Opposition says. You know, no matter what the Opposition says, he sits there and he chuckles. I'm beginning to get worried about him, Mr. Speaker. I'm worried about his state, his mental state. A man who chuckles all the time at anything that is said from the Opposition, it seems to me he has a problem.

The other man who has a problem is the Minister of Economic Development. He snorts at everything that we say. He comes in with a red face and he leaves with a purple face, so you know, we have the two extremes, one person's laughing and the other one is snorting. You know, there's steam coming out of his ears and out of his nose, and then inbetween we get the rest, but the rest of them take as their model the First Minister — (Interjection)—Yes, yes, The Laughing Cavalier is pretty good, and his prime Lieutenant in terms of the most capable in terms of saying nothing is the Minister of Health. The Minister of Health always says, "Oh, we're looking into that. Oh yes, I tell you in all sincerity that we are studying that problem." Yes. And he asked me to believe him.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think I'll conclude at that point. I will simply say this, that the government — one of the interesting things that we're going to watch in this particular election is whether or not there is an effect of the Conservative Provincial Government on the fortunes of the Federal Party, and my friend who's the Member for Fort Rouge, just came in. He must be pretty happy because the Honourable James Richardson, one time Liberal, one time Minister, has withdrawn from the race so it's a wide open field. It's now him against the Minister of Government Services and Vivian Rachlis. Now I want you to keep an eye on her because if you don't pay attention to her, she may run right up the middle, so I mean you're going to have to not only watch the Member for River Heights but you're going to have to watch the New Democratic Party candidate.

And I say this, Mr. Speaker, that I expect the Member for Fort Rouge in his campaign to say to the people of this province, as our candidates will say to the people of this province, do you realize what you're going to get if you get a Clark Government? They will say, No. 1: You are going to get similar policies to the Lyon Government in Manitoba. And Mr. Speaker, nobody in their right mind wants that. The second thing you're going to get is Joe Clark, and that's going to be the killer. That is what is going to make or break the Tory Party because, you know, if Joe doesn't kill himself by election day, then it'll be a miracle is right. He almost got hit by the RCMP yesterday, yanked out of the way of a cruiser car at the last moment. He tried to commit suicide when he was in the Middle East by jumping on a bayonet and, you know, we don't know what's going to happen next. We don't know what's going to happen next.

But I say this, that in the Federal Election the Tory fortunes in Manitoba will be adversely affected by the Lyon Government and by the leadership of Joe Clark, and I hope, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that they win a majority — I hope that they do win a majority because it will help our Party, it'll help us in the By-Elections and it'll help our Party get re-elected in two years. When we have a Federal Tory Government and a Provincial Tory Government the pendulum will swing back very quickly. The pendulum will swing more quickly than before. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words in this debate, but considering the hour I wonder if the members would like to call it 12:30 and reconvene. 12:30?

MR. SPEAKER: I've heard conflicting reports from both sides of the House on whether or not you want to call it 12:30. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: In the absence of the House Leader, without in any way attempting to put any undue urgency on the matter before us, but the matter is one of some urgency, dealing with the Interim Supply. —(Interjection)— We're asking for the Item to be passed. If the honourable member wishes

to contribute to the debate, please contribute.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite prepared to proceed. I just thought that we'd help the digestion of the Minister of Highways who likes to have those long sort of Friday afternoon luncheons and I thought we might provide ten minutes upon that time, but if he feels a sense of urgency, I do as well for other reasons and would be quite prepared to enter into this debate.

Let me first start by saying, Mr. Speaker, that the issue that is at stake in this particular debate and as it has emerged in the last two or three days is a very fundamental one. It goes back to maybe the whole heart of the federal system which is the establishment of fairly equal health and social and educational services across the country unrelated necessarily to the respective wealth of large provinces versus small provinces. And one of the matters that is now becoming of increasing concern to many people is signs of there are evidence of the dismantling and erosion of the programs in the health, social service and educational fields by certain provincial governments, and they are doing it in a variety of ways, through a variety of means, but there has been no more dramatic and perhaps repugnant way of doing it than the way this government is beginning to finagle the issue of fiscal transfers and block transfers under the established Finance program.

Let me read, Mr. Speaker, to you from the statement that was made at the Federal-Provincial Conference in June, 1976, when the proposals which to first came forward, stating the objectives of the EPF' maintain across Canada the standards of service to the public under these major programs and to facilitate their improvements. And if one goes through the transcripts of the discussions that took place at that conference and in subsequent negotiations, it was quite clear that the provincial governments were making a commitment in the field of Medicare, Health Insurance, and post-Secondary Education, that they would be maintaining their commitments on a par or with some degree of equality to the cost-sharing that the federal government was introducing.

It was reported, Mr. Speaker. . . I apologize, Mr. Speaker, I was not in my own seat, I guess I'm too anxious to change my seats. The issue which is at stake is one that was stated by the First Minister this morning apparently on a radio program and I don't like to quote from second hand sources, but he was saying it's up to us to choose the priorities. That if the federal government wants to give us this money we can do what we want with it. Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, that that runs directly contrary to the spirit of the arrangements that were made under the Extended Financing Program. That it was not a matter of simply, pure unadulterated revenue sharing with the federal government was going to take one block of money and give it to the province and say now, go forth and do your good works.

It was very clear under any documents, transcripts that I've seen on those negotiations, that money was clearly prescribed for the purposes of the established programs in Health, Medicare and post-Secondary Education. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have to use second-hand knowledge, I can now take the Minister of Health and Community Services' statements from his Chair, but there were no strings attached and if they do have the right to choose any priorities, but, and I come back to the article which is written in a Tax Journal about the understanding and commitments. It's right that in the actual legal document it was never said, because the provinces at that time were committing and saying that the programs are so established that we're already committed to them, that no one would try to undermine them. Heaven forbid that we should try to do such a thing. And yet, what we're seeing now across this country is the slow undermining of those programs by the fact that the provincial governments, including this one, are taking advantage of those transfers, substantial transfers, and using them not for the purposes for which they were intended, but for whatever purposes they so decide. And that, Mr. Speaker, if it continues is simply going down the road to fragmenting this country, to creating a bifurcation of the rich and the poor, of ensuring that there is inequality in services and perhaps, most serious, that we're also moving towards the fundamental concept of equality of access to those services in each of the provinces, because it isn't simply a matter of saying there's now going to be a difference between Manitoba and Ontario or Alberta, although there is increasing differences because of their substantial or heavier revenues than we have.

It also means that within our own provinces, the question of access to those services will be under some cloud, that the ability to get proper medical and health care regardless of your income seems now to be under some question, under some doubt, and that the demonstration of that comes in the way in which these financial figures are being manipulated or subject to a kind of black magic sleight-of-hand that this provincial government is using.

And it's quite clear, Mr. Speaker, no matter whose mathematics you use, the First Minister likes to talk about Socialist mathematics, well let's talk for a minute about Tory mathematics. Let's talk

about, sort of, the school of arithmetic that is practiced by members opposite which is to proclaim with some degree of pride that Expenditures provincially in Education and Health are going up 6.2 per cent, or whatever it may be. But never saying that, in fact, that that increase is substantially being covered by federal transfers, not by provincial transfers. And if you really add up the amount and percentage of provincial revenues going into the field of Health and Education, it's actually going down.

Let's go back in history, let's go through, I don't want to go through Tory mathematics, I would like to go through Tory history. It used to be a 50 cent dollar under the Share Grant Programs, let's in Health Insurance, Medicare and post-Secondary Education, although it was weighted somewhat differently. 50 cent dollar. What I would say we have now, Mr. Speaker, is not a 50 cent dollar, its a 60-40 dollar and if that dollar being spent on Health care, the larger dollar that expands because of the increased cost, a higher proportion of it is now being covered by federal transfers than under the previous program. That the provincial government has not maintained its commitment to do a 50-50, it's saying that any increases, any new expenditures that the federal transfers will cover a much higher proportion of those costs and that, Mr. Speaker, is the duplicity of it and it is also why in fact the ability to pay is being eroded because the kind of revenues going into support those services are not keeping up with the kind of cost demands that are being there and therefore the services are being retarded.

We're beginning to see the signs of how that works out, we say we're now going to do some new negotiation with the doctors on the new fee schedule, and we're going to hold the line. But what they're not saying is that the provincial government is not putting in its share, it's not doing its partnership arrangement. And as a result, you're getting an increasing frequency of opting out, special deals, doctors leaving, medical and health services being crimped, charges on beds going up, all kinds of additional surcharges on fees being introduced so that the ability that we had thought that hard won battle, which was fought during the '30s and '40s and '50s and finally got tabled down '67 and '68, which said that in these fundamental requirements where there has to be portability across the country, equality across the country, and equality of access for individuals, the dark '70s are beginning to see the signs of those principles and objectives being removed.

And Mr. Speaker, it's not right that this government should be doing that way. It's not right that they should be attempting to use that 14-15 per cent increase in federal transfers simply to try to provide this fiction that restraint is now working and that we can still maintain services without charging more. You know, there is a fundamental principle in government which is that if you're going to introduce a service, then you have to be prepared to take the tax for it. You shouldn't be able to have it both ways and now, for two years, since the last election, this government has tried to have it their way, they've tried to say we can cut taxes and still maintain services. Well, we've seen that they can't do that, that they can't cut the corporate tax, and the succession duties and the personal tax, and . at the same time say we can maintain a level of services. They're going to have to confess that they're not doing it, Mr. Speaker. They are doing it really at this point in time on a peculiar aberration boout in the way the Extended Finance Program is working for a two year period, where there is a substantial increase of 15 percent of federal transfers to establish a base and then, at that point in time, it will go up more slowly from that point in time. It will then come down to a 5 or 6 per cent, and then what are you going to do? How are you going to pay for your increases now because if we've gone from a 50 cent dollar to a 60-40 dollar, then that's when the reckoning is going to come, when that sort of particular bulge in those transfer payments sort of begins to even out after two or three year period.

I agree with the minister that that's a key point. But why are we saying these things at this point in time? Why are we trying to hide the fact and say at this point in time how shall we best use the increase that we'll receive through the EPF at this juncture in terms of developing services and facilities and the proper fee structure? We should be using those moneys to build up the proper base, not to erode the base, which is what we're doing.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour being 12.30 pm, I'm leaving the Chair to return at 2.30 pm which time the Member will have 30 minutes left.