

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the Speaker's gallery, where we have two eminent jurists from the Province of Quebec, Mr. Jean Alarie and Mr. Jean Allaire, who are here as two of the translators who have been loaned to the Province of Manitoba by the Quebec government.

We also have 14 students of Grades 5 and 6 standing from General Vanier School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Tony Dreidger. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

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

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make comments on the daffodils that all members have in front of them today. You will notice they have a little sign of them that says, "The Compliments of the Greater Victoria Chamber of Commerce". These daffodils are also with the compliments of the Honourable Pat Jordon, the Minister of Tourism of the Province of B.C., who is sponsoring what they call 'Super-Spring', promoting springtime in British Columbia. And the Chamber of Commerce of Victoria are right behind this program, and they are in Winnipeg today. They are travelling across western Canada visiting all of the provinces and making the same request in all the Houses.

I might say that I had the privilege of having breakfast with the Honourable Pat Jordon this morning, and Mayor Bill Norrie was with us, and had a very fine breakfast and we were able to talk about Tourism generally in western Canada. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister without Portfolio.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement concerning the City of Brandon. I wish to advise the House that the City of Brandon has been chosen by the Canadian Curling Association as the site of the 1982 Canadian Curling Championships.

Mr. Speaker, some members may already know 1982 is Brandon's centennial year, so that these events will coincide with other events which will reflect and recognize the hundred years of the City of Brandon.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the decision to hold the 1982 Brier in Brandon was based upon not only the fine curling facilities that Brandon does possess but also the dynamic presentation that was made by a young, energetic group from the City of Brandon who journeyed to Calgary last weekend.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the House and Manitoba will be pleased to know that the City of Brandon is being honoured in that fashion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I apologize to the House. I was in error in not asking for a written copy of the Ministerial Statements that have been made.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to join with my colleague, the Honourable Minister without Portfolio, who represents Brandon West in this particular news item.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

All of us in western Manitoba, particularly the City of Brandon, welcome this particular event. I, for one, who loves curling am particularly pleased to see it being held in the Wheat City.

I can't help but remark however, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons, apart from the spirit of the people and all those involved on the committee and all their activities, nevertheless one of the key factors was the Keystone Centre. In other words, we have a facility in Brandon that is superior to the facilities available in the City of Saskatoon, and I understand that that was the key factor and I'm very pleased that as one facility that was built when the New Democratic Party was in office. --(Interjection)-- Another one at Churchill.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the New Democratic Party will be in office in 1982 so we can help officially open the Brier. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a number of reports:

The report of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board for the year ended March 31, 1979.

The returns under the Controverted Elections Act for the period January 1, 1979 to December 31, 1979 from the Court of Appeal and the Court of Queen's Bench.

And the Auditor's report and financial statements for the year ended March 31, 1979 in regard to the Liquor Control Commission.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before I go on to the Oral Questions, I have just had a note that there are five people in the gallery from Victoria, B.C. including the Mayor of Victoria, His Worship Bill Tindall.

On behalf of the honourable members, we also welcome you here this afternoon.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Premier)(Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be appropriate, as we embark on Oral Questions, to take note of the fact that the new government of Primer Minister Trudeau is at this moment in the course of being sworn in and I am sure that members of the House would wish to join in issuing congratulations to a former colleague of ours, Lloyd Axworthy, who has been sworn in as Minister of Immigration in Mr. Trudeau's Cabinet.

I am sure as well, Mr. Speaker, that we can all put partisan feelings aside long enough to express the sincere wish for success of this new administration, and certainly on behalf of the government I can express the desire of this government to work in co-operation with the new government of Canada and with the new Minister representing Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the First Minister as well in expressing pleasure in respect to the announcement of the appointment of Lloyd Axworthy to the Federal Cabinet. We are pleased that insofar as Manitoba is concerned there will be representation in the new government, and we look forward over the next number of years to progress that can be made hopefully on the part of the new government in ensuring that there are improvements made to the benefit of all Canadians, both west and east.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Agriculture, and it refers to the building at 1500 --(Interjection) -- I'm sorry. Did I do something wrong? I'm sorry, I didn't mean to do that. I was afraid of not being recognized, Mr. Speaker. Should I continue with my question, or am I stepping on someone's toes?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member may proceed.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

MRS. WESTBURY: It refers to the building at 1500 Regent Avenue, which I think is still listed in the Provincial Telephone Directory as the Rural Water Services Warehouse. I understand that the contents that were not required by other departments were disposed of by tender, and my question is: what was the inventory value of the remaining contents of the building, and were they offered publicly for tender?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I'll have to speak to the Minister of Public Works about the telephone number still being listed under Rural Water Services, in fact, the material that was sold would come under the Minister of Public Works so I would refer to him to answer the question or else take it as notice.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. What was the amount of the highest tender; by whom was it submitted; and was the highest tender accepted?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you'll recognize this as a kind of a question that avails itself to an Order for Return, or indeed, discussion during the course of my Estimates.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, may I request that in the Order for Return the Minister also advise the House as to what relationship the offices of Triple M Sales have to Peter Masniuk, the former Conservative M.P. for Portage, Raymond Masniuk, who ran for the Conservative nomination in the 1980 federal election.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member is filing an Order for Return I would hope it be handled in the ordinary course of events.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the House Leader. In view of the fact that this next Thursday evening meetings will be held throughout the city of Winnipeg, organized by the Winnipeg Teachers' Society, pertaining to the cutbacks introduced by the City of Winnipeg School Division, brought about as a result of the restraint policies of the present government that is in office, I ask the House Leader whether or not consideration is being given to those Members of the Legislature that represent Winnipeg ridings, within the Winnipeg School Division area, to attend those meetings to hear the concerns of parents pertaining to the cutbacks which have been brought about as a result of the actions of this government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition had that concern I would have thought he would have asked me prior to the opening of the session.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, just so there need be no misunderstanding between the House Leader and myself, is the House Leader aware of the fact that the announcement pertaining to these meetings was only made yesterday, not prior to the opening of the session?

MR. MERCIER: Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I meant prior to 2:30 today.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Education. In the Throne Speech reference is made to substantial increases by way of grants to the school divisions in Manitoba; would the Minister advise whether the words "substantial grants" relate only to those grants which have already been announced insofar as the school divisions are concerned in Manitoba, or whether the words "substantial increases" relate to future unannounced grants in order to assist the increasing burden upon the ratepayers of Manitoba pertaining to increased school costs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, obviously the Leader of the Opposition doesn't think that \$20.6 million is a substantial increase and, as far as additional grants are concerned, that have not been announced to this point, we will be discussing those at such time as my Estimates are before the House.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the Minister of Education. Does the Minister of Education feel that a 20 percent increase in school costs to be borne by the ratepayers of the City of Winnipeg and additional increases that are taking place in other parts of Manitoba, whether or not those increases are not of a substantial nature as well?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, certainly we can go into all of those details during my Estimates but I would suggest to the Leader of the Opposition, in his great enthusiasm, it would seem to say that any diminution in the size of a teaching staff must be linked to provincial government grants; it does not take into consideration one of the most significant things that exist in our society today, and that is called declining enrolments. And when you look at a declining teaching staff that doesn't necessarily mean that the teacher/pupil ratio is declining, nor is quality declining. But if the students aren't there, Mr. Speaker, then I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition it is rather difficult to have the teachers there.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education. Is the Minister of Education indicating to the House that the only reason for the present situation faced by the Winnipeg School Division relates to a problem brought about by reduced enrolment, or is he prepared to acknowledge that there are other problems which go beyond that of decreased enrolment and that programs are being cut out that pertain to more than simply a reduction in the number of teachers within the school division level, such as counselling and other services?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, through you to the Leader of the Opposition, I accept as the main reason for the diminution in teaching staff that that can be attributed to declining enrolment. If a school division chooses to take certain programs off its curriculum and replace them with others, certainly that is its decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Minister of Education. Could the Minister of Education advise whether or not any consideration at all is being given by this government to the revision of the formula by which grants are provided to school divisions, so as to take into consideration the fact that declining enrolment in itself is not necessarily reason for a similar reduction in the amount of grants on the part of the provincial government?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, we are trying to take those things into consideration. In fact, we are studying very carefully some new system of grants that will perhaps update the way in which education is financed in this province. We have had two years to work on that. The Leader of the Opposition and his group had some eight years and made no move in that regard at all.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the First Minister. I'd ask him whether, in the light of the unprecedented net out-migration in this province which, amongst other problems, causes houses to be put up for sale in a depressed real estate market, and in view of the high increased cost of mortgage renewal interest rates and the highest rate of foreclosures in at least the last thirteen years, will the government consider some form of emergency legislation such as the possible re-enactment of the Debt Adjustment Act, which would protect owner-occupied residences.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, no one in his right mind would accept the basic premise of the Member for St. Johns that the out-migration in Manitoba is unprecedented. In

Monday, 3 March, 1980

fact, the average out-migration in Manitoba in the last two years has been considerably less than it was during all of the years that my honourable friends were in office. —(Interjections)— Mr. Speaker, that happens to be a full truth, not a half truth that we've heard from the other side.

With respect to the other matters of mortgage interest rates, this government has stated on a number of occasions, Mr. Speaker, our opposition to the high interest rates that affect small business people, homeowners, investment, farmers, and so on, in Manitoba and certainly we will be advancing that proposition again to the Trudeau government, as indeed we did to the Clark government when they were in office.

With respect to the third facet of his comment with respect to debt adjustment legislation, the Minister of Housing has . . . If my honourable friend from St. Boniface would like to carry on, Mr. Speaker, I am quite happy to have him do so.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to be given this chance to warn the people of Manitoba. In fact, my honourable friends will be very pleased with the change of government; now they can go back to blaming/../..

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please. Has the Honourable Member for St. Boniface a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . avail myself of the opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I realize it is probably a losing cause but the reinjection of a bit of civility into the debate, I think, is well worth the odd pause in our proceedings. I realize that most of it lost, however, on the member who just sat down.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the debt adjustment situation that my honourable friend is trying to conjure up from the 1930s, I remember the Debt Adjustment legislation even though I'm not as old as he.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Housing is reviewing situations that have taken place with respect to mortgage interest abatement in the Province of British Columbia, where a new plan has been announced by that progressive government; and I may say as well, Mr. Speaker, that if my honourable friends collectively, across the way, had not been so quick to defeat the Clark government we would have had a mortgage interest abatement program in effect in Manitoba in 1979, which would have left in the pockets of Manitoba taxpayers \$22 million that they haven't got because of the new government.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, before I ask my supplementary I do want to correct a phrase I used. I used the phrase "net out-migration"; I should have said "net loss in population" and that, I think, is a fact which the Minister will be able to make another righteous speech about.

My supplementary . . . —(Interjection)— If the First Minister wants to speak I will not sit down to give him the opportunity to do so until I ask my supplementary.

Mr. Speaker, now that the First Minister had indicated that the Minister for Consumer Affairs is apparently looking for some emergency legislation to deal with the problem which rests with owner-occupied residences . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I have listened with some interest. I was wondering if the honourable member was coming towards a question or whether he had passed it.

The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the first thing I did was to clarify a statement I'd made which was not correctly understood because it was not stated. This was on a point of order.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

The second statement, Mr. Speaker, I started to say, now that the Minister has, then obviously that is an introduction to a question - and it may be difficult for you to follow that but I certainly do intend to ask the question - that now that apparently there is some effort to look for emergency legislation dealing with the probable owner-occupied residences, a problem which could not have been helped by the Federal Conservative proposal which applied to all people, regardless of the problems they may have with their mortgage housing, can the First Minister, or the Minister for Consumer Affairs, assure us that that legislation will be brought very quickly before us and not studied by way of commissions, committees or any other form which would delay acting on behalf of those who are amongst the very large number, almost unprecedented number, of foreclosures that are taking place today?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the short answer to my honourable friend's convoluted question is, no, we cannot give him such an assurance. But what I said to him and what he was not apparently able to digest was that the Minister of Housing, not the Minister of Consumer Affairs, was looking at plans such as the British Columbia plan.

I fully expect that the new federal government is looking at a plan; and for his further edification there was a plan in existence which he and members of his party chose to vote down in the Budget of Mr. Crosbie back in December.

What quick memories we have to forget those things we do not wish to remember, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question which I would like to ask after I comment to the Honourable First Minister that there are many times when he makes statements that are difficult to digest. And I might say I have as much confidence in the Minister of Housing as in the Minister of Consumer Affairs. The question, Mr. Speaker, is whether the First Minister's answer means that there is no expectation of legislation in this session since it is a matter that is now only being studied by the Minister of Housing.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, the question is out of order. Orders of the Day.  
The Honourable Minister of Fitness.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like clarification; on what basis is my question out of order so that we would have some idea of the base of your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: It's out of order on the basis that I fail to realize it's a question.  
The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

HON ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, the Leader . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a point of order.

MR. PETER FOX: Mr. Speaker, I have no recollection of any rules saying that because the Chairman doesn't comprehend that it isn't a question that is in order. Now, possibly you may reconsider and ask the Member for St. Johns to reword his question so that it will catch your attention. But there are no rules that say you have to comprehend a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, on Friday last the Leader of the Opposition asked me a question with regard to the moving of some employees the possible relocation of some employees in the closing of the mail order system for WCLF located at Selkirk. I'm informed that the general manager of WCLF met with employees of the plant that is affected, met with them on Monday; the press release, I understand, was issued a day or two later. The letter was supposed to go to Miss Klassen, I think the lady that the Leader of the Opposition mentioned, she is the business agent of the union that we're dealing. I understand that instead of the letter being hand delivered to her it was mailed, and unfortunately our mail system

Monday, 3 March, 1980

isn't quite as fast as our courier services yet, so there was a bit of confusion there. I understand that she has been contacted now and that the foundation tells me that one paragraph in the press release should have said "will be" instead of "is", and I hope that will clear up the misunderstanding that we had the other day.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's more than a matter of simply misunderstanding. The press release issued to the Minister, and the Minister I ask him to confirm, did in fact state that there had been discussions with one Anne Klassen of SEIU; the result of those discussions, there was now a relocation taking place pertaining to the employees. My question to the Minister, is whether or not that statement is true, and whether or not, when he reference to discussions with employees, was he suggesting that there had been a discussion with the representatives of the employees or simply with a group of employees without their bargaining agent representing them?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the general manager of WCLF met with the employees on Monday, February 25th, to discuss this particular matter. There was a letter to go out simultaneously with the press release to the business agent who is Miss. Ann Klassen, and the press release refers that the Winnipeg staff is working closely with Miss Ann Klassen, the business manager, and that will be happening - and it should have said "will be," - and there was an error on their part with regard to the press release. But, Mr. Speaker, it was not that the employees in that particular area did not know what was going on; they were informed and had discussed the problems with the general manager.

MR. PAWLEY: One final supplementary pertaining to the Minister's response. Could the Minister advise whether or not the Manitoba representatives on the Wescan Board, in fact, supported the transfer of the offices from Selkirk to Winnipeg?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, it was a decision of the Board. I understand it was an unanimous decision because of the economies that were involved in this particular move, and I think, rightfully so, our board members felt that it was unfair to keep a plant open that had problems in coming up with the amount of money that would be required to make it a viable operation. As I mention on Friday that scenario was developed in negotiations a number of years ago, that should the viability of that particular plant become questionable it would be then phased out, and that is what has happened now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable First Minister. In view of the fact that the new government is being sworn in today, and in view of the various difficulties that have arisen since the federal government changed assist in the financing Medicare, would the First Minister, on behalf of the Government of Manitoba, the people of this province, request the federal government to go back to the position that they were in when they were a full-sharing partner of the Medicare program, and that funds from now on be based on cost-sharing between the federal government and the provincial government rather than block funding which is what the federal government instituted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend was a distinguished member, may I say one of the few distinguished members of the former administration, that participated in the accession to the principle of block funding under the previous Trudeau government, number one.

Number two, there has been no demonstration to our satisfaction that has showed that block funding has in any way, shape or form impaired the delivery or the availability of health service to the people of Manitoba.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

Number three, my honourable friend will take great comfort from this, of course, the matter was committed for study by the previous Minister of Health, the Honourable David Crombie, to a commission under Mr. Justice Emmett Hall who is well known to my honourable friend.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the First Minister will tell me whether his government, on behalf of the people of the province of Manitoba, will ask the federal government to go back to the position where they were sharing partners in the provision of medical services on a cost-share basis, which is the position that our government always took, rather than on the block funding basis. My honourable friend says that we acquiesced or agreed in the block funding, that is not correct.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the question period is hardly the time to revive old debates or to remind my honourable friend as to what the posture and position of his government was prior to 1977, but I'm sure the record is quite clear. What I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is this, that if we could be satisfied as a government that there would be greater benefit to the individual man, woman and child in Manitoba from a different system of funding than the present system we would be the first to go after that system. We have not been so satisfied with respect to the operation of the block grant funding system over the past two or three years, it is true; it has become a form of political football to be used primarily at election time and then forgotten in between by a number of people, of whom I must say I do not believe my honourable friend was one of the most outspoken. But I must say, Sir, that the matter is receiving consideration by Mr. Justice Emmett Hall and as and when we could be satisfied that a better system for the people of Manitoba could be devised by the federal government, then we would of course be seeking that better system.

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

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, just so that the record is clear, I have never blamed the Conservatives in this area. I have always blamed the Liberals for emasculating and ruining this program, not the Conservatives.

Now I ask, Mr. Speaker, will the First Minister also reverse the Fund Blocking Program that his government has instituted, vis-a-vis the City of Winnipeg, and go back to the position where the province and the city are full cost-sharing partners in certain programs which are consistent with the mutual interests of both the residents of the City of Winnipeg, as residents and as citizens of the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, again my honourable friend, I think, is carried away with a form of structure rather than with the good sense that lies behind the structure.

In the case of block grant funding for the City of Winnipeg, that was done with the full concurrence of the Council of the City of Winnipeg - if not full, a majority concurrence - and the average payments being received today, Mr. Speaker, by the City of Winnipeg and benefitted ultimately through to the ratepayers, are greater than ever before, under any seriatim grant system that was used by all previous administrations prior to the block grant system. So if my honourable friend is suggesting that we should go back to a system that would give less support to the City of Winnipeg, our answer is "no".

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface on a point of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: The First Minister made a statement here that the former government, of which I was the Minister of Health at the time, agreed to the block funding. Just to set the record straight, this is not correct. The block funding was requested by Alberta, Ontario and B.C., and Manitoba did not agree. We had to accept it because we had no alternative.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I am quite happy to accept my honourable friend's recollection at this moment. I am happy to accept it because I know that it is in direct contravention with what his Premier was saying at that time.



Monday, 3 March, 1980

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the block funding was decided at a meeting of Ministers of Health and my First Minister wasn't there at the time.

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

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, this is Question Period, if I may kindly note.  
--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Did the Honourable Member for St. Boniface have a point of order?

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: I am on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and this is what I was speaking to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Finance who is also responsible for Mines and Energy, and my question is very brief and to the point: Does the Minister agree with the conservation of energy in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that I think I'm perhaps answering a leading question, the answer would be, generally yes.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a second question which I would like to direct to the Minister of Public Works and, I believe, Government Services. It pertains to the revolving doors to the north side of this building that have not been in operation for about a week and a half, and I am getting some complaints from some of the civil servants who are employed here. Particularly a day like today it's rather significant when, Mr. Speaker, I direct my eyes to the gallery of your guests and would like to feel that the civil servants in this building would be as much at home as the people who are enjoying the weather in B.C. And I ask the Minister of Public Works if he's prepared to do something about the repairing of those revolving doors?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, perhaps if the doors were revolving I wouldn't have the problem.

I can also indicate to him that I get a similar complaint like that from the First Minister just about every morning that he walks in and finds those doors not working.

The truth of the matter is that we have difficulty with the nature of the heavy doors just being too large for the lighter automated equipment that was installed some time ago, and we are looking at a different operation for those doors.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: That is myself I presume, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for recognizing me.

My question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister confirm that a telephone survey of ex-Swift workers showed that less than 10 percent of the 243 respondents to that survey were employed either on a full-time or a part-time basis as of mid-January?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): I can't confirm, Mr. Speaker, the details of the survey that took place in mid-January. If the member would like me to get him some up-to-date or relevant figures as they relate to today, I'd be quite willing to try and provide that information.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I certainly had hoped that the Minister would take the opportunity to provide any updated information that he has.

In the meantime, a supplementary to the Minister. Can the Minister confirm that both government representatives and union representatives on the Joint Manpower Adjustment Committee have reported and I quote: "that there is considerable difficulty in establishing the requirements" - and that is the employment requirements - "of Canada Packers", and they state further that there is a need, "to encourage Canada Packers to employ Swifts workers rather than untrained personnel", and can the Minister indicate what action his department is taking to investigate these very serious allegations that would lead one to believe that Canada Packers is not doing all that it can to employ laid-off Swifts workers and is not employing those workers to a significant degree?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that, as Minister of Labour in the Province of Manitoba, I am not in a position to compel any employer to employ any particular people.

I can give the assurance to the member opposite that our government officials have done what I consider an admirable job, working with the union and the management, as it relates to relocating and retraining and finding jobs for the people at the particular plant. It isn't over yet, Mr. Speaker, there are still in the neighbourhood . . . And in the next few days I'll be in my Estimates so we can have a more accurate figure, but for the information for the Member for Churchill, there are still in the neighbourhood of approximately 100 people - and I say that approximately because it might be down or up today - who we have not been successful in getting employment for or, employment that we have found for them, they were not particularly pleased with it for geographic or financial reasons.

But we are continuing to work with the employees. We have just recently established, and I think it's to a great deal of credit to our Pension Commission people, that all people who worked with that particular plant - not just 15 years and over as the original position was - all people will be getting vesting rights as it relates to their pension. I think our Pension Commission people deserve a tremendous amount of credit for the work they have done in this area.

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

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I believe that most of the civil servants, who did work on this committee, do deserve that hand from the people of this province and from the Legislature. Unfortunately, they have had to deal with a government that has blocked them at different steps during the whole process.

Can the Minister confirm that the joint Manpower Adjustment Committee of the Swift Canadian Company Limited and the Canadian Food and Allied Workers Local, P219, has ceased holding regular meetings and that a final report of that committee is currently being prepared, and can the Minister indicate what role this committee will play in the placement of these still unemployed Swift workers of whom he says there are at least, or approximately, 100 as of the present date.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Some day, Mr. Speaker, I suppose, members that stand up and make irresponsible statements are going to have to sort of pay the price for that. The comments about our government standing in the way of the particular workers, I don't think they can find a particular worker that would agree with that concept. Certainly the Union does not agree with that concept, Mr. Speaker, and I think the Union in this particular case speaks for the people, not the Member for Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, we are still working with the particular people, we are still working with the Union. All the people that are not, at the present working, are registered with Canada Manpower and we'll continue dialogue with all the parties that are involved. I should say, Mr. Speaker, we've had good dialogue with the actual people involved in the plant. There is a breakdown when you get to people such as the Member for Churchill who hasn't had too much experience working in plants or with unions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: I have a question to the Minister of Economic Development. Does the Minister consider it fair, in light of the doom and gloom from the members opposite and the pessimistic Member for St. Johns, of withholding major expansion announcements in the aerospace industry, such as possibly Boeing and Westinghouse, and what it means to Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the honourable member to clarify what he means by the withholding of announcements, I'm not clear on what announcements were withheld.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, certain people from Seattle claim that Boeing is moving equipment and technicians to Winnipeg. Is it a fact that, a Union informant told me that Westinghouse is working on two stages of expansion for 1982 and 1984, and a machinist told me that Air Canada is moving back its maintenance equipment to Winnipeg from Montreal.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, as it was announced previously, and it was in the paper, that Boeing expanded their manufacturing facilities in Manitoba, in the Constituency of Sturgeon Creek; I might also say that in that expansion there has been a large amount of equipment that has been purchased, to be supplied in that plant, which is a very high technology equipment. Air Canada, it was announced quite a long time ago that Air Canada planned to do more of their maintenance work in the Province of Manitoba. And as far as Westinghouse is concerned, as the honourable members know, the Department of Economic Development has sort of labelled electronic research, electronic development, electronics generally, as the area that the Province of Manitoba should be really looking into and we are dealing with all companies involved in that industry.

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

MR. WILSON: Then, Mr. Speaker, in light of the charges of the Member for St. Johns of the massive out-migration, could the Minister give us a guesstimate of approximately how many new jobs will be created and what it means to the economy of Manitoba.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would be making, as the honourable member says, a "guesstimate" if I were to give an answer today. I think it would be possible to get the exact numbers as far as Boeing and Air Canada are concerned, but as far as the Westinghouse or other electrical companies are concerned that wouldn't be possible. I can only say that the DREE grants alone in the Province of Manitoba last year created 2,000 jobs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: My question is directed to the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that the record number of house mortgage foreclosures is being caused in part by house owners being forced to renew five-year closed mortgages at these atrociously high rates, would the Minister indicate if the government will bring in legislation requiring mortgage financing institutions to allow people renewing mortgages at this time to refinance those mortgages when the rates fall without having to pay a penalty?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, this general question was addressed earlier in the question period and if you want to deal specifically with this question I think that, first of all, we can all agree that we want to see as much action taken as fast as possible across the country in this regard. It's a problem that affects not only Manitoba, it affects all of Canada and requires federal attention. And certainly the member is right and that on the re-financing, on the renewal of terms on mortgages, is where people are falling into substantial difficulty at the present time. There are some temporary measures that can be taken and are being taken by people who are caught in that trap, nevertheless, it isn't getting around some of the serious problems that still exist.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

But, Mr. Speaker, to repeat, the problem is one that is national in scope and is going to have to be faced immediately by the national government primarily.

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

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the question that I raised was not raised previously in question period, and I ask specifically of the Minister, is the government going to bring in legislation which will enable people renewing mortgages not to be penalized by mortgage-lending institutions by being locked into a five-year mortgage which is closed and which requires them to pay a monstrous penalty if they try and refinance that mortgage when the interest rates drop. Will the government bring in such legislation on behalf of the homeowners instead of protecting the mortgage-lending institutions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, that question is strictly hypothetical. It is in fact, Mr. Speaker, the options referred to are ones that are generally available at the present time and are not at the root of the problem.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour for question period having expired, with the agreement of the House, we can let the member have a final supplementary.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the Speaker's gallery we have the Mayor of Victoria, His Worship Bill Tindall; Helen Beirness, President of the Festival Society; Mr. Mel Cooper, past president of the Victoria Chamber of Commerce; Jill McGuffie, Chairman of the Victoria Flower Fest; and Barry Riebeck, member of the Victoria Chamber of Commerce.

On behalf of the members we welcome you here this afternoon.

#### THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River Heights and the amendment moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and further amended by the Honourable Member for Inkster.

The Honourable Member for Springfield has 32 minutes.

MR. ROBERT ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to resume my contribution to the Throne Debate. However, before I do that I wish to bring greetings to this Thirty-first Legislature from the Twenty-sixth Session of the Springfield Youth Parliament. This past weekend, young people from the rural municipality of Springfield gathered in the village of Oakbank to debate five bills which were presented by their Ministers. The activities consisted of the Throne Speech, the debate on their bills, the theme address, a banquet well attended by the community, and finally, an interdenominational church service conducted by the young people themselves.

It is with pride that I report on the successful completion of their Twenty-sixth session for I have been involved in one way or another with virtually all of those 26 sessions. All of us can take some pride in the calibre of our young people, and I never fail to be amazed as I watch the progress of Springfield's parliamentarians from one year to the next.

I must draw a comparison between our House and that of the Springfield Youth Parliament. I notice, and this is no reflection on you, Mr. Speaker, but the Youth Parliament seems to have far fewer procedural wrangles and disruptions than this one. Perhaps our young people have a greater respect for authority and tradition than this generation gives them credit for. I've no reservations about the younger generation following in our footsteps, Mr. Speaker. They are already far ahead of us.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to discuss the Speech from the Throne. I wish to congratulate the Member for River Heights on his fine address in moving the adoption of that fine document. His speech indicates that the new Member for River Heights brings to this House the same high standard that has been characteristic of all the Members for River Heights. I look forward to serving for many years as his caucus colleague and he will have much to offer to his constituency, to his caucus, to his House and to the people of Manitoba.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

Mr. Speaker, I also extend congratulations to the Member for Emerson on his fine address in seconding the Motion. I had originally intended to apologize for the strong language he used in describing some of the agricultural policies of the former Minister of Agriculture and their application, however, upon discussion with some of my farmer constituents who suggested that the terms aired on the side of discretion, I have had to reconsider my position. After all, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Emerson and others in this House, myself included, owe some of their electoral success in 1977 to the former Minister of Agriculture.

I must inform the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Inkster that I'll be unable to support their amendments to the motion by the Member for River Heights.

Members opposite have suggested in their remarks that the Throne Speech is a worthless, trivial document. Upon examination, however, I find that quite the opposite is the case. Mr. Speaker, I found the Throne Speech to be an appropriate document by a government at the midpoint of its first mandate. It is a time for reviewing the commitment made to the people of Manitoba; it is a time for reviewing the progress to date; and a time to outline the steps proposed to fulfill those obligations. Mr. Speaker, these three steps are in the Throne Speech and I am proud to speak in favour of it.

Mr. Speaker, some two years ago my government gave a commitment to the people of Manitoba to begin to restore the ability of our Manitoba people to compete within the national economy. In addition, my government undertook to manage the operations of government prudently so that Manitobans would not bear an undue burden of taxation. The people of Manitoba are now bearing taxation levels that are comparable to the levels of taxation imposed in other provinces. The small business tax rate has been reduced, the succession duties and gift taxes have been removed, and the corporate capital tax has been adjusted to the benefit of our small businesses. The government has removed itself from large and small business enterprises throughout the province; it has removed itself from the forced partnerships in the mining industry; and of particular importance to my constituency, there is no longer a state farm program here in Manitoba. In other words, Mr. Speaker, my government has removed itself from those sectors of our daily life where, in my opinion and in the opinion I believe of most Manitobans, governments should not be.

These measures and others, Mr. Speaker, now mean that the people of Manitoba can grow and invest and prosper without feeling the heavy oppressive hand of government as was the case when my friends opposite formed the government. The Leader of the Opposition in his contribution to this debate seems to feel that Manitoba has a sick economy, and that the major export of a Tory Manitoba is people. A quick examination of the facts proves that such is not the case. Statistics Canada tells us that from 1969 to 1977 the average out-migration from this province was 34,643 people on an annual basis; from 1977 to 1979, the average out-migration was 33,333 people. There have been less people leaving the province on an annual basis during the last two years than left during each year of the administration the Leader of the Opposition was part of.

Let us look at the so-called sick economy. What about jobs? Between 1977 and 1979 employment increased from 429,000 to 452,000, an increase of some 23,000 jobs. What about their wonderful administration? From 1974 to 1977 employment rose from 419,000 to 429,000, an average increase of some 2,500 jobs per year. That is quite a difference, Mr. Speaker, from an average increase of 2,500 jobs, under their administration, to an average of well over 11,000 jobs per year under a sound Tory administration. And furthermore, those jobs are in the productive, disciplined private sector and are not government make-work jobs, hardly I suggest, the symptom of a sick economy.

Mr. Speaker, let us examine the conference board projections for Manitoba as compared to the national average. Agriculture is expected to go up 9.9 percent as compared to 3.2 percent nationally; Mining, up 7.7 percent as compared to 5.3 nationally, Manufacturing, up 2.4 percent compared to -2.9 percent nationally; and utilities up 5.6 percent compared to 3.5 percent nationally. Does that sound like a feeble, ailing economy? I think not, Mr. Speaker.

The Leader of the Opposition in his pronouncements of real and imagined problems with the Manitoba economy reminds me of the lifelong hypochondriac who died at the age of 96. The inscription on his headstone read, "See, I told you I was sick." Manitoba's economy will continue its steady growth contrary to the pronouncements of the Leader of the Opposition.

That brings me to the third commitment. Now that Manitobans and their economy have the ability to compete nationally, and indeed, internationally; and now that government's burden on the taxpayers of Manitoba has been brought to a more acceptable level my government can now turn its attention to further encouragement of economic growth and to the enhancement of the social services available to all our people.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

I would take a few moments to catalogue some of those measures in the Throne Speech that fulfill that third commitment, to encourage the economic growth that all sound economies rely on to provide the funds for the people programs my government will provide. For example, create the Manitoba energy authority to provide for, among other things, planning and supply monitoring, as well as expanding the export marketing of our hydro utility. Once those markets are secured, orderly expansion of our generating capacity can occur.

All of us are aware of the benefits to Manitoba's economy of resuming hydro construction. However, just as the people in Alberta are not drilling oil wells and building refineries for the sake of jobs but to produce a commodity for which there is a market, so our hydro construction must be geared to the market opportunities.

My government will continue the work begun in striving towards substantial improvements in the grain handling system. In an agriculture-based economy such as ours, any improvement in the ability to service our grain markets has a far-reaching benefit to all sectors.

My government's commitment to minimize the disruption to the agricultural sector of rail-line abandonment will be well received throughout Manitoba. By an accident of geography, my constituency is served from end to end by two main lines, so we are not directly affected by rail-line abandonment. However, most rural people understand the possible disruptions and support the arguments put forward last Friday so ably by the Minister of Highways.

I will also catalogue a few of the people programs I referred to earlier.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite seem to have some concern about this government's commitment to medical services. Surely the Throne Speech and the announcements by the Minister of Health are seen by Manitobans as evidence of our commitment.

The continued development of the Seven Oaks Hospital and of the Health Sciences Centre hardly indicates a government with no concern for medical services.

The announced program of building and renovating of rural hospitals and personal care homes will be well regarded by Manitoba's people.

The revised doctors' fee schedule is an appropriate step in ensuring the continued high standard of medical service in Manitoba.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, this government is committed to continued economic growth and to continue enhanced service to all our people. Those measures have been well documented in the Throne Speech and I will be very pleased to support its adoption. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a great honour and pleasure once again, Mr. Speaker, to be able to participate in the Throne Speech Debate in this Assembly.

As a prefatory to my remarks, which will of course be more specific and deal directly with the Throne Speech, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the recently elected members of the Assembly on their addition to our ranks. Directing my remarks to two of my former colleagues, both of whom I had the pleasure of sitting with as colleagues on the Winnipeg City Council, I would say that once again I look forward to hearing from them, to sharing with them the experience of public participation in this House.

I might say that, if I might reflect on what I've learned in the past three years of service, I might say that I would pass on to them the sentiment that it is important that we not direct ourselves to our differences but rather, in the exercise and conduct of our duties, look to what we share in common, in order to provide a supportive base for decision-making. And I say that because although often this Assembly and this forum is used as an antagonistic platform for political debate, very often bordering on diatribe and rhetoric, there are, I think, certain constructive elements to the format which underscore the importance of liberal democracy.

In order to emphasize that point, Mr. Speaker, I would say that during the Member for River Heights' speech I couldn't help but think that we shared many things, not only past histories on Winnipeg City Council but youths spent, obviously, in the north end. I enjoyed his recollection, as well, of the area which he represents. I might say that I did enjoy it because for some years I lived in that area and I could also appreciate his feelings for it and his understanding and empathy for its people. It should be stressed and accentuated that very many fine individuals, not necessarily all elites, do live in River Heights, and he's quite correct.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

With respect to the Member for Fort Rouge, I can say that not only do we share former records as councillors but I know that she's married to a lawyer, and once again there is some connection insofar as I have occasion to deal with her husband from time to time and we've always enjoyed very good relations that certainly have transcended any political differences there may be.

I also, I suppose, should mention that all three newly elected members would appear to have grave responsibility cast upon their shoulders insofar as all three of them, I think quite fairly, have replaced exceptional members of this House, one of them today has joined the ranks of the Federal Cabinet. But I think in all three cases, three different party members, but nevertheless all three were fine contributors to this House and all made a substantial contribution to the affairs of this province.

As well, Mr. Speaker, prefatory to my remarks directed to the Throne Speech, I would welcome the new Deputy Clerk, who sits with us today. I would indicate that I welcome him. I look forward to working from him. I know him as a colleague at the Bar. I can say that I have great respect for his abilities, his skills, his capacity shown in that regard and I'm sure that in the fine tradition of his family he will serve this House well in the future. So I look forward to learning and growing with him in the upcoming years.

Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, my responsibilities in this House and this session will be with respect to the areas of urban affairs and housing. I had the honour of being asked by my leader to steward the critics portfolio with respect to those two areas and I can tell you that I did so with some relish and appetite, Mr. Speaker. Having served on Winnipeg City Council for three years, participated not only with the new members, as I've cited, but also the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs in that forum, I can tell you that recently I have had, and I think we have all had, reason to become alarmed and concerned about the situation that presents in that field.

So, Mr. Speaker, today I will not attempt to direct my remarks to the full totality of the Throne Speech Address but rather I will isolate them and deal more specifically with the recommendations and representations made with respect to urban affairs and housing.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I think all members of this House who emanate from the City of Winnipeg are sharing a common concern about the city. I think all of us have, of course, had occasion to see the recently developed statistics about Winnipeg's growth and growth patterns and I think there has been good reason, in reviewing those statistics, to concern oneself with the future of our city.

I can tell you that although the pattern of growth, particularly economic growth, in this city has not been spectacular, and which seemed to be leading to some cynicism on the part of many people. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I, for one, am an optimist. I'm not a foolish optimist in the sense that I think Winnipeg can become, in the next 10 or 15 or 20 years, a Calgary or a Toronto; but I am an optimist in the sense that I'm not sure that Winnipeg has to become a Toronto or a Calgary in order for its citizens to enjoy a full quality of life. I think that working within the confines of slow growth we can reasonably expect many benefits to be derived from that particular situation as well.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, it is important to examine some of the areas of decline in order that we can assess what sort of strategies the government should be developing in order to address themselves to the problems of slow growth that are presenting themselves to the Winnipeg urban economy.

Mr. Speaker, I was alarmed, for instance, to realize, and somewhat shocked to find out that in areas - and I'll perhaps refer to some statistical data - in areas where Winnipeg had previously enjoyed a major sector of the Canadian economy, and as an example, the areas of transport and communication, that while employment was up in Canada by 21 percent from the years 1957 to 1976, in Winnipeg it declined by 15 percent, a gap of 36 percent. That's not necessarily, Mr. Speaker, the responsibility of any one government but, Mr. Speaker, it's something that we all deplore and it's something that we must address ourselves to.

In the area of trade, wholesale and retail trade, statistics derived from the Greater Winnipeg Development Plan Review indicate that although the employment in this country was up by 80 percent in the last twenty years, in Winnipeg it only rose 33 percent, a gap of 47 percent as between the growth enjoyed in the urban areas of our country generally and that experienced in the Winnipeg milieu.

In the areas of finance, insurance and real estate - an area which at one time I think Winnipeg held a supreme ascendancy in because of our very strong grain trade - employment for Canada was up 103 percent in those twenty years, only 61 percent in Winnipeg, a gap of 42 percent.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be negative in addressing myself to these concerns but I can say that it is alarming, that we must take note of them, and I think we must ask why? And, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the reasons for the decline are real economic constraints, I don't think they will magically disappear. I think we can all accept the fact that our rivals in other provinces have now assumed the rightful responsibility of producing their own goods and services for their own citizens. We're no longer servicing the so-called hinterland of western Canada. Now Alberta and Saskatchewan and British Columbia have taken their rightful place in the economy of this nation in that regard.

Also, Mr. Speaker, Winnipeg is not enjoying the benefits of corporate concentration as are Toronto and Montreal and the Alberta cities. The corporate sector has directed itself, oriented itself, to the larger centres and Winnipeg, of course, is suffering shortfalls as a result of that. And probably most important, Mr. Speaker, the massive resource development projects in western Canada have of course greatly strengthened the other urban economies to the detriment of Winnipeg.

Unfortunately, our capital, the capital that sustained our economy's expansion in the early years of this city, is now being directed to other western centres. We are in fact experiencing a capital outflow in deficit that far exceeds the outflow and out-migration of our population. And this, Mr. Speaker, is a very serious problem which must be addressed.

On this point, I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I think we should look at some of the figures developed by a Winnipeg economist, Mr. David Young who, I think, is known to members of this Assembly. Mr. Young is by no means a partisan political player but I don't think that anybody would represent that he was a member of any left-oriented faction. I think philosophically he would describe himself as being a small 'c' conservative and certainly a small 'c' conservator. Now Mr. Young, in developing his study, he did I think an excellent impact study last year, on the question of the effect of energy prices on the Winnipeg and Manitoba economy, the question of capital outflow to Alberta's energy productive economy indicated that in ten years it was to be expected that Winnipeg's energy bill was going to double. And that, Mr. Speaker, is on a household by household basis. He postulated that an energy which today is set at approximately \$500 million will reach the figure of \$1 billion by 1990.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is cause for grave concern. Mr. Young's study tells us that rather than spending \$2,700 per household on energy consumption - and that includes direct and indirect consumption, Mr. Speaker, - he suggested that we will be spending something in the order of twice that in the year 1990. And that, Mr. Speaker, is going to have a very dramatic impact on the way Winnipeggers live and the way Winnipeggers perceive their quality of life.

I think some of the statistics he provided are very illustrative of that point, Mr. Speaker. He derived some data based on 2.5 percent real growth in incomes, which I think we would all agree after inflation is very strong, very very bullish growth, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Young found that on that basis and that basis alone would there be any real growth in the actual take home pay accorded to Winnipeg residents. That, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Winnipeg has not for some time enjoyed that sort of growth beyond and over inflation is again reason for grave concern.

Mr. Young says, and I quote, Mr. Speaker, from his report, he says: "If real incomes grow by only 1.25 percent, as opposed to 2.5 per year, then after energy consumption constant incomes will decline by \$886 over ten years. If there is no real growth in incomes" and, Mr. Speaker, the reality is that of course addresses the situation as it now is. He says, "that personal incomes per household, after energy costs, will go down by \$3,411 in ten years."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is cause for I think serious pause and concern. It's a very grave presentiment and prediction that Mr. Young makes, and Mr. Young, as I said, is not the sort of person who would be inclined to give cause for alarm if he didn't feel it was necessary.

At Page 50 of his report Mr. Young summarizes his findings as follows: he says and I quote, "In short the probably scenarios all indicate a decade in which personal income per household could be expected to decline perhaps by an amount in the neighbourhood of \$1,500.00."

Mr. Speaker, we are obviously going to have to look to ways to ameliorate that situation. We're going to have to and here we depend on provincial/urban initiatives to provide us with antidotes for the slow growth situation which we will be experiencing in conjunction with the continued appreciation and inflation of energy costs.



Monday, 3 March, 1980

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, and I have suggested before, that it is absolutely imperative that if anything substantive is to be done in this regard that there be a restructuring of revenue-sharing arrangements between the federal and provincial governments. Later on I will deal with the question of the restructuring of the revenue-sharing arrangements between the provincial and the civic governments but I think before I reach that point in my address, Mr. Speaker, I would indicate that something must be done, and I would stress, Mr. Speaker, that nothing was mentioned in this regard in the Throne Speech, to deal with this very important problem.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear and it's obvious I think to all persons in this province that a disproportionate amount of capital is being allowed to outflow from our boundaries and borders.

Mr. Speaker, I think the statistic is, and I don't quote it with any precision or certainty, but I think generally I can say that 25 cents on every energy dollar finds its way to Alberta. Now, Mr. Speaker, what we're doing, in effect, is we're subsidizing a boom economy in a province that is enjoying a very healthy aggressive economic climate at the expense of our own people. We can't afford that, Mr. Speaker. It is simply intolerable, it's inequitable and it's unjust. There is no reason why this economy - which is indeed today, unfortunately it's regrettable but it is a weak sister economy, in the confederation of our country - should be sustaining such a strong economy as Alberta's.

In order to attain redress I would encourage the Minister of Urban Affairs and his counterparts to make strenuous efforts to reform the current federal/provincial revenue-sharing agreements and arrangements; it's absolutely imperative. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, we're going to continue cyclical decline on an unprecedented basis in the next decade.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the government to do something realistic and real in buffering the high impacts of energy by providing alternatives, particularly I think, by continuing the development of hydro; by making serious attempts to become a net exporter of hydro-electric energy and using this as a foundation for economic growth in our province. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is absolutely imperative and essential and I think that although platitudes appear in the Throne Speech we have yet to hear anything again substantive in this regard from the government in the last three years.

We must, Mr. Speaker, have some redress of the current situation. I know currently we're still selling energy to the United States industrial areas for something like half the cost of what it costs Manitobans, and that to me, Mr. Speaker, seems somewhat wrong. I know it's an interruptible service that bears that sort of tariff, but it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there's something wrong with providing windfall energy to American industry essentially subsidized by our taxpayers.

Also, Mr. Speaker, and most important perhaps of all, we must in this province fight for a national industrial strategy so that Winnipeg is given a place in the sun. It's absolutely imperative, given the fact that we're not in a dominant independent position, that recognition be given by the governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan, and the government resident in Ottawa, that Manitoba does deserve special treatment. Manitoba should not be accorded anything but special status. In fairness there are certain problems which are endemic to this economy. We all know it because most of us participate in the economy on one level or another; we know that we're not in a competitive position and, Mr. Speaker, the only way we can redress this problem is by having a national economic strategy that will recognize these deficiencies and obtain a sort of parity as between Manitoba and its stronger brothers and sisters.

Perhaps the other thing we have to do, in addressing myself to the quality of life, is we have to be more positive in our thinking and, as I said before, we have to be more realistic in our outlook. I'm sorry to say that many of us, unfortunately, fail to realize the benefits of living in a place like Winnipeg. There is negativism, cynicism that is not really responsive to the true quality of life in this city and I would, in this regard, address people in this Assembly, and throughout the province, to living conditions of our native people and to the living conditions of the people in the Third World which, of course, are by our standard very spare indeed, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with specific items. I want to deal with specific policies that I feel have injured the City of Winnipeg, and I invite the Minister of Urban Affairs, Mr. Speaker, to participate in this debate, either later today or tomorrow, in order, if he can, to rebut what I have to say. Because, Mr. Speaker, I intend to use statistical data in order to prove that the city has not enjoyed equitable treatment at the hands of this government.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

Mr. Speaker, specifically dealing first of all with block funding. We heard today from the First Minister that the City of Winnipeg is enjoying today a greater share of revenues than it ever did under the former NDP government. Mr. Speaker, that remark is apocryphal. It's what I would term pure prevarication. --(Interjection)-- In short, to the Member for Wolseley, Mr. Speaker, it is untrue.

Mr. Speaker, in 1977 the former government gave more money to the City of Winnipeg than was given to the City of Winnipeg in 1979. Mr. Speaker, in that year the New Democratic Party government gave \$33.3 million to the City of Winnipeg as our share of the nine items that have now been consolidated into the block grant. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm willing to concede that a lot of that was induced as a result of our cost-sharing policy and as you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party used to assume 50 percent of many operational expenses. I can think of at least six and those six, Mr. Speaker, were all justified then by the civic government and in our own minds as a matter of correct policy, humane policy, directed to the urban residents of our province.

Mr. Speaker, we always participated rateably with respect to inner city health care; we accepted the fact that health care, as a matter of principle, as a matter of policy, was essentially in the provincial domain; we accepted our responsibility as an equal partner, with respect to Assiniboine Park and the zoological gardens, and we did so because we recognized as a fact and as a true statement that park was essentially a provincial resource.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to regional street maintenance we shared 50/50 and we did so because we recognized that the citizens of the City of Winnipeg participated disproportionately in the funding of provincial highway construction throughout this province. That was the justification for sharing 50/50 with the City of Winnipeg with respect to regional street maintenance, because we didn't believe that urban citizens should, through their property taxes and income taxes, subsidize the development of rural highways. We believe that there should be some parity, some equity, as between citizens living in the City of Winnipeg and citizens resident in rural situations. So we took our fair load and, Mr. Speaker, in doing so we took it off the backs of urban taxpayers. --(Interjection)--

Mr. Speaker, we had a policy with respect to transit deficits. We shared 50/50 and we did so, Mr. Speaker, because we believe that public transit was an amenity that integrated well with energy policy, and, Mr. Speaker, we had an energy policy. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. We have a longstanding rule in this Chamber that we only allow one speaker at a time.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, members on the opposite side have always shown a decided interest in economic madness. Mr. Speaker, we had a policy to sustain economic growth and development in the city. We subsidized the tourist-oriented Convention Centre 50/50. That no longer pertains, Mr. Speaker, that's all been rolled into a so-called block grant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable First Minister stood in his place this afternoon and suggested that his government was providing more funding assistance to the City of Winnipeg than had been the case under the New Democratic Government. Well, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister should address himself to the Provincial Government Task Force Report tabled in this House in 1978. Mr. Speaker, if he does that he will find, under the area of Urban Government, he will find a section, and I read, whereby the authors of the report noted, "that Provincial Government grants had been up an average of \$12 million a year over the last four years of the NDP administration."

Mr. Speaker, I remind you, and I know you need not be reminded, that in 1980 the grant was only increased by some \$3 million. Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, members on that side can't have it both ways. They have been sustaining a restraint policy on the backs of urban taxpayers. The Member for River Heights knows that, the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs knows that, I daresay the First Minister is aware of it too, Mr. Speaker, but there is no recognition of that.

Let's look at the facts, Mr. Speaker. The so-called adequate block funding arrangement that was provided to the City of Winnipeg in 1979 required a further supplement of \$4 million on the \$30 million of funds provided in order to meet the expenditures of the city for 1979. This year when the Minister announced the increment to the block grant he had to also announce that not only would there be a \$3 million increase in 1980 over 1979 but there would also be a supplement of \$4 million to make up for the shortfall from last year.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

Now I ask you, if you include the \$4 million in the 1979 grant, Mr. Speaker, that means in 1979 the block grant to the City of Winnipeg was \$34 million. So is an increase in 1980 to \$33 million an increase or is it a decrease or is my arithmetic wrong? It's a decrease, Mr. Speaker, a \$1 million deficiency.

And, Mr. Speaker, when the First Minister utters statements such as he has during question period today, very bold, very assertive, very aggressively, he should have at least checked the figures. He should be accurate in his perceptions of reality. Perhaps his Minister of Urban Affairs has told him that everything is okay, but it's not true, Mr. Speaker, they haven't done their homework, they haven't done their research, it's not true.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when you look at how that block fund was created; it was based on 1978 expenditures. Now, Mr. Speaker, you should know that in 1978 regional street construction was down \$5 million from 1977, \$5 million. Sure, it represented an increase but you had to know that in 1977 the City of Winnipeg had spent \$5 million more on regional construction. It was an off-year, and the reason it was an off-year was because the Budget was frozen in 1978. When this restraint-oriented government took office in 1978 they simply locked up the purse and they said everything would be held pending the Task Force Report Review. So there were no additional funds made available and the civic government did the responsible thing in not expanding its growth in that year. It actually restricted, in the area of regional streets as I've said, its budget by \$5 million.

The contribution to the transit deficit was frozen to 1977 levels, we all remember that 8.04 or 8.4 millions of dollars; and in 1978, Mr. Speaker, \$700,000 fewer dollars were spent on the Assiniboine Park area. So, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Urban Affairs and his First Minister make representations about the adequacy of the block fund they should be aware that what they based it on was a bad off-year. It was a year when we had lower expenditures pertaining to the City of Winnipeg than virtually any other year in a decade.

Now, Mr. Speaker, don't believe me, let's look at what members of council have been quoted as saying. Just after the conclusion of the February 28th Budget meeting, this was the meeting that was held last week in order to deal with the striking of the City's capital budget for 1980. Mr. Speaker, they noted, and this I think is germane, in 1977, Mr. Speaker, we had capital expenditures in the City of Winnipeg of \$81.5 million. That was the year the New Democratic government left office. Mr. Speaker, in these ebulliently bouyant times, sustained by the hot air of members opposite, we see that Winnipeg has this year, 1980, only struck a budget of some \$83.8 million. Three-and-a-half years later, Mr. Speaker, we only have a increase in the capital budget from \$81.5 million to \$83.8. Is that 10 percent a year, Mr. Speaker? Is that keeping up with inflation, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, in that marvellous year, the austere year of 1978, when restraint was very much in vogue, we only had civic expenditures - and this shows you how far they cut back to the bone on that base year of 1978 - we had a capital budget struck of only some \$69.4 million, down from \$81.5 million cost-shared in 1977.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the Minister of Urban Affairs account for that. How can he explain that? Does he really think that the City could experience such a reduction in terms of its growth prospects, and not have sustained an injury. Mr. Speaker, in 1979, in order to maintain a mill rate that was acceptable to the people of this city the capital budget was held to \$75.4 million. And in order to accentuate and emphasize the point I'm making, Mr. Speaker, that means now, in perspective, 1977 we had a capital budget of \$81.5 million; 1978, 69.4; 1979, 75.4 and only in 1980 does it again up to 1977 levels of 83.8.

Mr. Speaker, the city has been stagnating. That is why a recent report that found its way to the front page of the Winnipeg Tribune chronicled the fact that Winnipeg had the worst road system in all of North America. That is why, Mr. Speaker, we have the highest accident rate in all of North America, that's the reason.

Members opposite, the Minister of Highways, if he were in his seat, should address himself to that problem, it's a substantive problem. The Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation should ask his colleagues why more money is not being allocated for the City of Winnipeg in order to reduce expenditures.

Now, Mr. Speaker, also important, the question of the total omission of any reference to the provision of new areas of tax revenue to the City of Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, when I sat with the Minister of Urban Affairs in Winnipeg City Hall he was the most assertive member, by far the most aggressive activist member, with respect to attaining of what he regarded as a more equitable share of growth tax revenues from the provincial government.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

Mr. Speaker, what has he done? What has he done, Mr. Speaker, to regress the problem? Absolutely nothing, absolutely nothing. Taxes in this city, Mr. Speaker, are not intolerable. They are becoming so because of education tax, but because of a policy of restraint by the civic government they're not yet intolerable. But, Mr. Speaker, the policies or the non-policies of this government have created a situation where the city has been increasing its deficit. The deficit at this city is exceedingly high. The per capita debt of this city is up 27 percent between the years of 1974 and 1979.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite were concerned about the size of the provincial deficit. Let them be concerned about the fact that the City of Winnipeg's deficit has grown to an extent that's almost three times the deficit in the cities of Toronto and Edmonton over the same years, let them show concern. But no, they'll beggar their counterparts, their friends on Main Street, in order to resist the obvious logic of providing more equitable sources of revenue to the city taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, we've had the passage of all sorts of new user fees, we've had fare increases with respect to public transit, and, Mr. Speaker, I'd be remiss if I didn't remind you that some of those fare increases had the effect of killing some of the most beneficial programs with respect to transit. Mr. Speaker, let's look, in the last few minutes I have, let us look at what's happened to Dash Transit as a result of the regressive policies, non-policies of this government. Mr. Speaker, I would remind you that in 1975, with the encouragement of members on this side of the House, then on that side of the House where they belong, there was a free service put into place in downtown Winnipeg. That was done, Mr. Speaker, in response to the expressed wishes of business people who thought it would be an incentive to commercial relations in the downtown core. And, Mr. Speaker, they had a good point because they were losing territory to the shopping centres that were being developed in the periphery of the city. It was also done, Mr. Speaker, because this government then believed in energy conservation. We were trying to take as many cars out of the downtown area as possible, and, Mr. Speaker, we succeeded. By directly funding and subsidizing that program we succeeded in implementing true policy with a substantive concrete program.

Mr. Speaker, in June, 1977 there is a study that shows, and the survey demonstrates, that the parking requirements in downtown Winnipeg were reduced by 500 to 600 spaces as a result of Dash Transit. Five hundred to 600 fewer cars parked in downtown Winnipeg as a result of that service. In June of 1977 it was carrying an average of 22,400 people weekly, including 1,035 a day who said that they previously had used other forms of transportation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the per passenger cost on that system was only 19 cents a ride, less than 50 percent of what it was on the rest of the system. And, Mr. Speaker, until 1978 there were no fares on that system. Now, Mr. Speaker, what happened when fares were imposed on that system was dramatic, and it's the same thing that happened with respect to the general system. With the higher fares came the cyclical decline in ridership. Mr. Speaker, in 1977, in the general system, we had 65.5 million riders; then we had 60 percent fare increases in the next two years and we found ourselves having a decline of some 4.5 million riders to 61.3 million in two years. That is what the shortfall in provincial funding has done to the City of Winnipeg. Rather than inducing energy conservation it is discouraging it and destroying all efforts and initiative in that respect.

But, Mr. Speaker, addressing myself to Dash, when the 10-cent fare was imposed - I should emphasize that, it was imposed when the transit grant was frozen in 1978 - the usage declined by 25 percent by December of 1978, 25 percent in a few months on a system that was the cheapest to ride anywhere, I daresay - in Canada, 19 cents per ride. Now by April, 1979 the ridership has come down from a peak in 1976 at 5,250 a day to 2,030 or around 50 percent. Mr. Speaker, they killed, they killed, what was a bold experiment in energy conservation, an experiment - I just heard the jingle, one of the shoe stores was encouraging people to come downtown and ride Dash in order to shop. They could park their car in the periphery, in one of the major parkades attached to the large retail stores, and they could use Dash to come around and shop half a mile away.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time has expired.  
The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues. I'd like to add my best wishes to you, Mr. Speaker, for continued success in your very formidable task.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

However, it must be very heartwarming to hear all the nice things that were being said to you from all sides of the House and very justifiable, I must say. I also would like to congratulate the three new members that are gracing our House now: the Member for Rossmere, the lady for Fort Rouge, and my Member for River Heights. Being comparatively new myself, I'm sure that they're going to experience many apprehensions and frustrations from time to time. I feel quite new when I look at some of my colleagues, such as from Lakeside, Roblin, Morris, Virden, I feel very new and very inexperienced, however, I wish them all well also.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, the Member for River Heights, who was the Mover of the Throne Speech and the Member for Emerson, who seconded the Speech, I'd like to commend them. They did us proud, not only in their deliveries but also in the texts of their speeches.

I'd like to begin, Mr. Speaker, by thanking the Leader of the Opposition for his kind expressions of concern for the fact that, as a result of the latest Cabinet reorganization, that the tourism program was transferred to my colleague, the Minister of Economic Development. While I was enjoying the Ministry of Tourism I was then, and I still am in full agreement, that it belongs in that department in order to give more focus to the economic potential of tourism. Therefore, while I am touched by the Leader of the Opposition's solicitude on my behalf, I know that my colleague, the Minister of Economic Development, is doing and will continue to do a very admirable job.

What I would like is the members opposite to view the creation of a department exclusively dedicated to Cultural Affairs and Historical Resources as a very positive and creative step of this government. By giving such high priority to Cultural Affairs Manitoba becomes only the third province to have a full-time Minister, the other two being Quebec and Alberta. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that this clearly indicates the importance my government places on the quality of life in this province. Just as the physical health of the people and their economic welfare are a priority of this government, so is their spiritual and cultural health viewed as most important. Mr. Speaker, it's a known fact that companies or people do not move into new areas, new provinces, without having a real grave concern and interest in the fact that there are social amenities available to them, such as music, dancing, ballet, the symphony, that they can enjoy in their leisure time. And with the advent of many new technical improvements people are finding themselves with more leisure time today than they ever have before.

There are two major factors which argue in favour of government support to cultural activity; the first is the immediate economic impact which culture represents or could represent - and I'd like to read something that was taken out of the United States Conference of Mayors in their position paper. "The arts, a new kind of currency to be spent in pursuit of a sound urban economy. For every one dollar of funds spent for the arts it has been estimated that between \$3 and \$4 are generated for the city directly or indirectly. Direct expenditures include monies spent for salaries, buildings and services. These, in turn, cause a ripple effect throughout the community in payroll cheques received, re-expended and retaxed. If the arts were suddenly to disappear from the city the losses to restaurants, hotels, taxis, etc. would represent only the first layer of those affected. Others who derived income from these enterprises would consequently have to tighten their belts and they, in their turn, and people who cater to them would suffer losses in demands for their products, and so down the line.

The second reason, Mr. Speaker, and in the long run probably more significant, is the effect that such support would have on the quality of life in the province and thus the long-term vitality in the province.

The department's role and the purpose is to provide incentive, support, encouragement, and information to and for the people of Manitoba. The government's role is not to try to blueprint and think society should be, and spend public moneys forcing evolution in that direction. But we must and we are acting as facilitators and supporters of our society that we serve.

This raises the question of the funding crisis in the Arts. Some of our major Arts are having severe problems these days and one, in particular, is still in an economic difficulty. While it's of little comfort to the members in this Chamber that we aren't the only ones that are suffering these, all the other provinces and national institutions are experiencing several kinds of difficulties. Manitoba, I think, is very fortunate that we have strong management on the boards of these various major cultural institutions and, as a result, they are becoming on a much more sound financial footing.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make reference to two of our major cultural centres, the French and the Ukrainian. They have my deepest admiration for the manner in which they operate. Our ballet, the theatres, the contemporary dancers, and many more, are in a much healthier state to date because of their realistic and prudent management and also because of their very successful fund-raising expeditions thereon.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not naive enough to think that any of these groups will one day reach a plateau where they will be self-sufficient and they will not need government help, but I do think that they are looking at their individual organizations and making every effort to be as independent as possible. The economic realities of the Arts business are such that complete self-sufficiency for the major cultural institutions is totally out of the question.

Mr. Speaker, this raises the issue of the government's support to the Arts. There are many people who argue that in these times of restraint in the 1980s that there will have to be a curtailment in the spending of public funds for Arts organizations, that these groups will have to reduce their overhead expending; they'll have to curtail the growth of cultural bureaucracies and have better public relations.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can say that this is the direction they are taking now, re-examining their programs, improving their public relations, and I think they are to be commended.

Some of these issues were raised very explicitly, Mr. Speaker, in the report of the Cultural Policy Review Committee. The preparation and the submission of this report represents a major event in the cultural field during recent months. It will have a major impact, a continuing impact, Mr. Speaker, on the Manitoba cultural scene for many years to come.

And, Mr. Speaker, I'd be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to thank, on behalf of the members of this Chamber, the five community-minded citizens who, I must say, worked very diligently for six months without any fee or honorarium to bring this report to us. And everyone agrees that they showed dedication, foresight, and wisdom. Mr. Claire Miller was the chairman of this group and I would like to give him a great vote of thanks on behalf of all of us.

I am, as my colleagues are, in general agreement with the basic philosophy in the report. They have charted a critical path for the future of culture in Manitoba and it is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to give serious consideration to each of the 44 recommendations in the report and to implement as many as possible, as resources and community consensus become available.

As you know, the main recommendation is that the government strengthen its commitment to cultural development. I am proud to report that the request of the committee to government to raise its level of expenditures to .40 percent of the total budget will more than meet that requirement. It will be a 25.3 percent increase over the previous year.

Another major area of concern, not only for the government but for the municipalities and many interested groups, is that of Public Library Services. As Minister responsible for the Public Library Services, I was delighted to be able to recently announce several programs outlining details in which the Government of Manitoba is going to improve the quality and scope of the libraries in our province. We started some improvements in October, 1978, when we raised the per capita grant to \$2.50. Recently we announced a \$250,000 grant to the City of Winnipeg for the upgrading of their book collection.

However, Mr. Speaker, our principal concern has been the role of the province in sharing with the municipalities the burden of supporting libraries in the rural areas. Over the past few months, we have worked out a formula, a new sound workable formula, for library support. The basic three-part formula will significantly improve the current situation of 27 of the 32 libraries that are presently serving the province. Four of the remaining libraries can upgrade their situation by raising the levy of their library services and thus they would be entitled to larger provincial grants. Only one that has an insufficient population base, and that's namely Rapid City, will be taken into consideration and they will have special treatment, so all 32 will be improved.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, this government has given \$1 million directed to the Public Library Services in Manitoba and three-fourths of it is for the rural areas. We feel that they should be given a much better opportunity to be in a more equitable position with the services as they are now in Winnipeg.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the provincial archives and, in particular, the Hudson Bay archives. It's a matter of public knowledge and a matter of criticism in the press that the government has not been honoring its commitment, as agreed to by the contract with the company in 1973. Since that time it is the consensus that the government has been guilty of neglect and, Mr. Speaker, I think the people that are sitting on the opposite side of the House will have to take some of the criticisms because they had four years in which to rectify the situation and they neglected to do so. But I am pleased to report that in one quick step we are taking measures to correct this situation.

In my Estimates for 1980-81, we have provisioned for five additional staff members to serve the Hudson Bay archives and the budget for those archives will be increased by \$115,000.00. This is the level of staffing and funding recommended and requested by the archivist.

Ministers of Cultural Affairs met last year, Mr. Speaker, twice to be specific, and that was the first time ever that any Cultural Ministers had a get together and it was a very important initiative. One thing that we found, regardless of whether we were from a have or a have-not province, we found that the biggest problem with us was our lack of liaison with the former Liberal government. They would be very quick to hand out grants to all the little people in the country, the museums, little groups, and just as quick to pull the mat and take the moneys away from them leaving, them in very dire straits.

We were very happy last May when the Conservative government was elected and we had a Secretary of State who had an interest in the Arts and a concern for the other provinces, not just in Ottawa. So now, Mr. Speaker, I am just hoping that we won't be back to the same thing now that the Liberals have got back in power. I hope we're not going to be subjected to the same cruel treatment that we've had in the past.

I'm proud to report, at Manitoba's suggestion, 1984 has been declared The Year of the Arts for Canada. It will be an opportunity for Canadian artists to be recognized from coast to coast and border to border. And a response from the cultural organizations in Manitoba, we've contacted them all and the response from them has been most enthusiastic.

You had the opportunity to meet two of the people that were in the gallery today that the Government of Quebec has so generously agreed to provide on loan. There's three; there is a second one coming in about a month's time. They are going to help meet the requirements of the recent Supreme Court decision concerning Article 23 of The Manitoba Act.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure members of this House that while I'm proud of the achievements of this government in the area of responsibility assigned to me as Minister of Cultural Affairs and Historical Resources, and while I'm looking forward to even bigger and better things for this coming year, I do not underestimate the difficult problems that we in the organizations in culture have to look forward to in the coming year. But I'm sure that more and more we are finding our rightful place in the scale of priorities of the government and it is not my intention to pretend nor will accept the argument that the government alone is responsible for past ills and weaknesses. Neither is it true that government alone can correct or solve all of our problems, present and future.

It is my hope that by showing our own commitment, by creating a climate conducive to private community and corporate efforts, that Manitoba's cultural institutions will flourish and Manitoba's population, wherever they may be, will participate and benefit. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to take part in the Throne Speech Debate with a sense of, not heavy heart, Mr. Speaker; I'm glad that the Minister of Public Works is in the House because I intend to relay some of my remarks to him and unfortunately the Minister of Health is not in the House because some of my remarks will be directed at those two gentlemen on the opposite side.

But before I enter into the debate, Mr. Speaker, let me, along with the traditional motions of congratulations from all the members of this Chamber, also congratulate you on being the Speaker to this Chamber. I think, Mr. Speaker, by what we have evidenced in the last few weeks, or the last few days of the House's beginning, you are certainly going to have to put your patience to the test in dealing with members on both sides of this Chamber and I wish you well for the duration of this session.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

To the new members of the House, the Member for Rossmere and the Member for River Heights and the Member for Fort Rouge, I welcome you to the Chamber and I certainly look forward to having good relationships with yourselves, as well as all the members of this Chamber.

To the Mover and the Seconder - and the Seconder of the Speech from the Throne is here this afternoon - I certainly congratulate him on the remarks that he made and so eloquently put forward his party's position with respect to their Throne Speech; as lacking as, in my mind, it is, he did a commendable job.

Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate, I wish to direct comments that have been made in this Chamber primarily with respect to the health care situation in this province. The Minister of Public Works, during his debate, one of the statements that he made is that his government, the Conservative government of this province, was a government that were doing more for health care than the NDP ever did, if I can paraphrase his statements. Those are the statements that he made.

Well, Mr. Speaker, yes, the Conservatives are doing more for health care; they are doing more to dismantle, downgrade and disrupt health care in this province than any other government in this province's history, Mr. Speaker. That is what the Conservative Party is doing to health care in this province. And the best example, Mr. Speaker, that I can give to this - and it happens to be right in the Minister of Public Works own constituency and my constituency - and that deals with, Mr. Speaker, the proposal of his government in bringing forth a proposal to the area that has not been wanted, is not necessary - not only not necessary but is very expensive - that the people of the area have not agreed with.

Now I want to go into the background of this, Mr. Speaker, as I have been asked by residents in my constituency to bring this matter forward. It certainly has been brought forward in the last couple of days by an article in the Winnipeg Tribune over the weekend and I intend to raise this in the House today during the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the best way to bring forward this issue is to go back in history and bring to this Legislature how the whole matter of the nursing home and health care in the west Interlake has evolved over the last number of years.

Going back to 1975 when we were in government, the west Interlake region, what is known as the Lakeshore District, was formed by three municipalities and one local government district joining together. They were the municipalities of Coldwell, Eriksdale and Siglunes and the local government district of Grahamdale.

During the formation of this board it was generally agreed to and accepted by this government, recommended by the board, that there be a number of improvements in the health care system made in that area.

The communities of Eriksdale and Ashern were two communities, one within the municipality of Eriksdale and Ashern within the municipality of Siglunes, both had existing hospitals within that district. The recommendation of the board and the acceptance by the government and the Manitoba Health Services of the day recommended that there be 20 personal care beds built juxtaposed to the hospital at Eriksdale and 20 personal care beds built juxtaposed to the hospital at Ashern, along with a health clinic in Lundar and along with a health clinic in the Gypsumville area, as well as improvements to a clinic in the Grahamdale area. That was pretty well the program that was agreed to by this government and was put into effect.

In the fall of 1977, between 1975 and 1977, functional plans were drawn up by the board for the personal care homes in those two communities. The Ashern project was tendered, however, at the time the costs came in somewhat high and were to be retendered. However, as history shows, a change of government occurred and the project did not go ahead, it was frozen by the present government. Well and good, the freeze lasted for approximately a year on that project and last session we had an announcement, on February 22 by the Minister of Health, which indicated that there would be 20 beds of personal care built on the west side of the Interlake, not mentioning which community or anything, leaving it to the board and those communities to decide for themselves.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that announcement was made and I believe on March 26, 1979, the board met, the district board met and they passed a resolution, virtually unanimous with the abstention of one member, virtually unanimous. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works laughs and I will quote for him the minutes of the March 26 meeting of the Lakeshore District Health System, and I will read it to him:



Monday, 3 March, 1980

"Moved by Mr. Gordon Smith, seconded by Mr. Whitney, that this board seek commitment from the Manitoba Health Services Commission for the construction of a clinic in Gypsumville, a clinic at Lundar, a personal care home at Eriksdale and a personal care home at Ashern.

"And further, that if a priority list is required", and that was the stipulation of the Minister of Health that they prioritize their construction because they were only going to get one home, Mr. Speaker. And I go back to the resolution and I quote: "That if a priority list is required this board agree with the construction of the two clinics and a personal care home at Eriksdale this year; and with further construction of a personal care home at Ashern to proceed in 1980. Carried, one against, Mr. N. Marquardt." That was the only member on the board that voted against the proposal.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what really happened? What happened? The province and the Minister of Health and the Minister of Public Works were caught with their pants down. They were surprised, Mr. Speaker, they were surprised because they had different plans for the area. Their plans were not to construct a nursing home as agreed to by the previous government, juxtaposed to hospitals; their plans were to construct a nursing home in a community that had no services, in a community that was 12 miles away from Eriksdale. And where was that community located, Mr. Speaker? Well, it just so happened it was located in the Lakeside constituency represented by the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Speaker.

Now, what happened? Now that the board had made its decision, Mr. Speaker, the government was caught by surprise, they thought that the board would go with Ashern, and Lundar in the Minister of Public Works' constituency would be free and clear and the government could go ahead and build the second nursing home there.

But they didn't. The board said that the roof needed rebuilding on the Eriksdale hospital and that they prioritized the Eriksdale construction first. Now, what was the government going to do? They couldn't in their Cabinet decision decide upon what they were going to do so what did they do? The phones started ringing, Mr. Speaker, and I will speculate that the phones started ringing from Winnipeg to Lundar and from Winnipeg to Ashern and the Reeve of Ashern was encouraged; and who was the Reeve of Ashern? The Reeve of Ashern happened to be the Tory candidate in the 1969 election against myself, Mr. Speaker. The Reeve of Ashern was encouraged to put a scuttlebutt to the board's proposal, to make sure that the board's proposal that was put forward to the government was not now acceptable, so a petition was struck up in the Ashern area. A petition was sent to the Minister of Health of some 500 names indicating that this was not acceptable, Eriksdale was no good, Ashern should be first. What a beautiful diversion, Mr. Speaker. Now we had the government off the hook who froze the entire program creating a fight between communities. What a beautiful diversion.

Now we had two communities fighting themselves for facilities that should have been built in both communities; but no, they were fighting amongst themselves and just what the Minister of Health and the Minister of Public Works wanted. Now they could get up and say, "Well, look there's no agreement, there's no agreement amongst the communities, how can we build there?" Because they then had a petition from the Siglunes municipality. Well, Mr. Speaker, the area prioritized itself, the government was caught by surprise and then the fun began.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened since then is that now we have a virtual split on the board, but it just so happens that the areas with the largest population on the District Health Board are the ones that are sticking with the original proposal of building care homes in the two communities that I've mentioned and they are rejecting the government proposal. So, what happens? Nothing happens from March or April, well, even from June, even when I questioned the Minister of Health as late as last June in the dying days of the last session, he said an announcement was imminent, he would be announcing this shortly. Nothing happened, nothing happened, Mr. Speaker, till November 8 and we have a letter, we have a letter to the Chairman of the District Health Board, Mr. Gordon Smith, from the Executive Director, I believe is his title, yes, of the Manitoba Health Services Commission and I would like to read from this letter. I'm sure the Minister of Public Works has a copy of it that he won't need my copy of this, and I will read from it:

"Following the meeting between members of the Lakeshore Health District Board and the Executive Committee of the Manitoba Health Services Commission, I was to confirm the decisions made by Cabinet respecting the new health facilities that have been approved for the Lakeshore Health District. Details are as follows:

Monday, 3 March, 1980

"A 20-bed personal care home is to be juxtaposed to the Ashern hospital together with the related renovations to the hospital. It is hoped that this project can go to tender almost immediately with prices being requested both for a fall and spring start.

"A 20-bed personal care home to be built in Lundar with the architect to be hired immediately to prepare functional and architectural plans; construction hopefully to begin in the summer or fall of 1980.

"A medical clinic to be located in Gypsumville, details subject to further discussion with the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

"The existing medical clinic in Lundar to be officially recognized as an approved health facility with the Manitoba Health Services Commission assuming the liability for the existing debt. Rental income from the existing or other tenants would continue to be collected.

"The roof repairs for the Eriksdale Hospital are to be proceeded with just as soon as weather conditions will permit. Debt incurred by the district board in connection with the acquisition of the hospital, the physicians' residence in Eriksdale, the architectural fees incurred to date, will be repaid by Manitoba Health Services Commission, details of which are subject to further discussion with our staff.

"It is our understanding during the meeting that you would communicate all of the above to the district board and the rural municipalities of Coldwell, Eriksdale, Siglunes and the local government district of Grahamdale.

"Would you please advise me of the decision of your district board with regard to the above approvals as soon as possible in order that we may arrange for the necessary staff meetings that will be required to get the projects under way."

Mr. Speaker, that was a Cabinet decision that was sent out by the Manitoba Health Services Commission. Mr. Speaker, it is a Cabinet decision, a proposal that is being foisted on those people. It is a case, I believe, of Tory-poor economics that will result in higher costs and deficits that will be paid for by the local people; it will result in poorer service, a waste of money and, Mr. Speaker, I make those three charges. And how do I indicate and how do I justify those charges? Well, Mr. Speaker, the higher costs. What we will have is that we will have 20 beds, not adjacent to a hospital, where, when I call the Health Services Commission and I ask them, "When we were in government you were advising the government of the day that unless you had 40 beds free standing it would be uneconomical because if you had only 20 beds you would not have use of the kitchen facilities; you would not have use of the laundry facilities; you would not have use of the nursing facilities." Those facilities would not be there for you, Mr. Speaker, and that's why the costs would increase. And, Mr. Speaker, I said: "Have your recommendations to government changed since we left office?" And they said, "No, no, our recommendations haven't changed." Still the Commission is recommending if you are going to build free standing beds that there be at least 40. Well, what did the government do, Mr. Speaker, for political expediency, for pork-barrelling?

Mr. Speaker, they are prepared to build 20 beds in a community that the local people do not want. That is how they are downgrading the health facilities, Mr. Speaker, and it is going to be, Mr. Speaker, a waste of money. Why? Because, Mr. Speaker, the elderly who require hospital care quite frequently, what will have to happen, the hospital happens to be 12 miles away, they will have to have an ambulance service that will have to transport the people back and forth from Eriksdale to Lundar, unless of course the next move will be to close out the Eriksdale hospital. That may be the next move.

But what has happened since the board has rejected the government's proposal? We had a number of phone calls in the last few days, Mr. Speaker, from whom? None other than the Minister of Health to several board members. Do you know what he told them, Mr. Speaker? He said, "Look, if you will accept our proposal that we have written to you on November 8 we will give you another 40 personal care beds in your area."

Mr. Speaker, we started with 40 beds in our area and now we have the Minister of Health phoning board members saying, "Look, we will give you 40 extra beds if you will agree to this proposal." Now, isn't that nice, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please, order please. Order, order please. We can only have one speaker in the Chamber at a time.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks on a point of order.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: On a point of order, I'm listening or trying to listen to a debate by one of the members. The Minister persists in raising his voice and ignoring you. I wish you would either control him or ask him to leave the Chamber.

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I hope you don't throw the Minister of Public Works out. I want him to hear my finishing remarks on this topic, Sir, but I hope that you will not deduct his outburst from the time that I have allotted to me, Sir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the phone call was made to several members on the board by the Minister of Health now promising two extra homes. Well, Mr. Speaker, we certainly, in that area, will not tell the government that they should not build an additional 40 beds. Certainly not, Mr. Speaker. We welcome that announcement. But you remember on Friday, Mr. Speaker, when you ruled me out of order and I asked for a confirmation from the Minister of Health whether he made that statement. He wouldn't answer me, Sir, he wouldn't even say boo, but he did come over after the question period and said, yes, well, we'd certainly consider it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if they are really considering that, I will give them a proposition. They have already spent \$6,000 on architectural plans for the beds in Eriksdale which they don't want to build now. It will take them at least a year to draw up the functional plans for Lundar that they want to go ahead with now. We will be very open about this and very reasonable. Why not go ahead with the original plans of the board since you are already indicating that you are prepared to build another 40 beds. Those plans are ready. They were ready to tender in '77 which you froze, now you're saying you are going to give them 40 more beds. Well, come on, let's have it. I mean, look, if you are as reasonable as you say you are, take away the dogma, that bribery, Mr. Speaker, because that is in effect what the government is intending to do. They are trying to bribe the people of the western Interlake with the proposal of having 40 extra beds. That is how the health care system in the Province of Manitoba is being run, for political expediency, pork-barrelling and bribing. That is how the Tories are running the health care system in this province.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated before, the higher costs will result in the lack of not being able to utilize the nursing facilities, the cooking facilities, the laundry facilities, and the extra costs will have to be borne by having ambulance facilities to bring those people back and forth from the nursing home to the hospital area. The poorer service will result in the elderly, Mr. Speaker - there will be no backup staff in the area because the hospital staff is twelve miles away - they will have to, as I stated, transfer those elderly by ambulance.

But not only that, Mr. Speaker, if they do not go ahead with the plans as requested by the local board as has been worked on for now five years, it will be at least a waste of money, Mr. Speaker, a waste of money of approximately \$86,000 on the plans that have been drawn up for the Eriksdale and Ashern home. But not only that, Mr. Speaker, this government prides itself on volunteerism and community involvement. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to give you some community involvement.

The Community of Eriksdale has in its reserves through the hospital guild, some \$70,000 which can be made available to place into the care home for equipment and the like. More so than any other community. I don't believe Lundar has any money put away for it, Ashern has about half of that money, and that is in my constituency as well, but the Community of Eriksdale has been committed for at least 15 or 20 years to have a total health care system in their community.

Mr. Speaker, if this government prides itself on volunteerism, they should recognize the efforts put on by the residents of that community and go ahead with the wishes that they have expressed, and, Mr. Speaker, and stood behind by the majority decision of the board, because there is a majority decision, albeit a simple majority. But the majority of the board decision is to stand behind the original plan, and this government is preventing them, Mr. Speaker. This government is creating a political football in the western Interlake, the likes of which the area has never seen.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

There were shades of that, Mr. Speaker, in '69 in the school issue. Now we remember the school issue very well, Mr. Speaker, when all the high schools were settled in every community, if you scratch my back I'll scratch yours, and everything was about finished and settled until there was a change of government. The school issue in that area was settled fairly amicably, and it works, and it works, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, and it works, Mr. Speaker, yes, and it works. I want to raise it, I want to give the member an opportunity to respond, that it does work, Mr. Speaker. And I tell the Minister of Public Works that if his government is sincere they will proceed with those plans and they will build if they so desire when they have the plans ready for the Lunder area. I don't think anybody is denying the area that kind of a service, Mr. Speaker, but that is what is being intimated, at least by the outbursts of the Minister of Public Works. The area is not denying that the government should build if they so desire in the Community of Lunder; I think it can be supported. But, Mr. Speaker, not in the manner that they are going about handling this, not in the manner they are going about handling this matter.

Mr. Speaker, the Province of Manitoba, and now I again have to deal with the Minister of Public Works who happens to be the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. He was the . . . not the architect but he at least was the supporter and mover of the report of the Ministerial Insurance Review Committee headed by Mr. Burns, Mr. Speaker. It was a study, Mr. Speaker, by people who were, to say the least, lacking in credibility, the report is biased and most of all there are a number of inaccuracies in that report, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, the credibility of the members of the board, Mr. Speaker. We had the chairman of the board, Mr. Michael Burns, who was a former executive of the IBM Corporation, Mr. Speaker. The IBM Corporation, for your information, Sir, was the corporation that set up the computer program for the insurance corporation of B.C., and would you know, Mr. Speaker, that insurance program, although there are only three times the amount of drivers in that province to put into the computer runs, that program cost at least ten times the cost that it cost Manitobans to set up their computer program. And it didn't work, Mr. Speaker. I visited British Columbia in the second and third year of its operation and they were still getting 40, 50 renewals out to people and they were having such a hodge-podge of problems with that computer program that they didn't know whether they were coming or going, Mr. Speaker. That is the fellow who worked for the IBM Corporation who put in that computer program.

Mr. Speaker, he was also the chairman that mouthed the very similar comments that our Premier mouthed about the Quebec insurance plan, that this was going to be a - it was the most exciting, I believe his statements were, it was the most exciting auto insurance scheme that was presented anywhere in this country. Of course, Mr. Speaker, we now know why he was mouthing such remarks because how the report was being presented was certainly along the lines that the Conservatives wanted, only they hadn't had and don't have the political guts at this time to implement its recommendations.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, and it was mentioned during the session, where was the chairman found during the last federal election? He happened to have been found in the Tory headquarters in Vancouver, B.C. That was the chairman of this study, Mr. Speaker; his lack of credibility is certainly evident.

Now we have a Manitoba member, Mr. Speaker. The Manitoba member who was on this board by the name of Mr. Cox, Mr. Speaker, who it was announced had sold his business in 1977. And I am quoting from an article in the Free Press where it said that he had become an agent for the government plan, and achieved ranking position in sales. It also said he sold his firm in 1977. And that certainly wasn't what was brought out by reports and statements by members on this side and reports to the media that he was still selling insurance. Well, Mr. Speaker, would you believe he is still selling insurance? He is still selling insurance in the 1979-80 renewal period. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cox even today, or not today, on February 13th, came to a business on Notre Dame Avenue and was going around stamping and validating insurance statements, after he had said, look, I sold my insurance and I wouldn't have taken the job if there were any preconceived ideas by the government. And he also said that he sold his firm in '77, that he no longer was an agent. Now why is he going around still selling insurance, Mr. Speaker? The Minister Without Portfolio, who sits on the other side who said he investigated it and the agent. . . he agreed that the committee member had sold his business and everything was hunky-dory, that there was no conflict of interest. He's still selling insurance today, Mr. Speaker. So much for the credibility of the members on that commission, Mr. Speaker.

There was a clear conflict of interest, Mr. Speaker, and there is no doubt that the Tories shrugged it off. They shrugged it off because they knew what the end result of the study would be, Mr. Speaker. What they didn't realize was the public reaction to it. That's what they didn't realize.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the report as I stated, has a lot of inaccuracies in it, and I want to raise four or five of them just to show you how inaccurate this committee and this commission was. Mr. Speaker, that report that cost Manitobans \$300,000, Mr. Speaker, that report, even the Agents Association indicated that. . . and you know, I would like to quote from one of the agents. One of the agents said, Nate Sarbit from Sarbit Insurance Agency, "The government is throwing \$300,000 out the window". In my opinion they could find out everything they want to know from the agents for nothing, and nobody knows better than the agents about what the problems are, Mr. Speaker. Did they ask the agents? Did they ask the agents? No, they had to blow \$300,000.00.

Mr. Speaker, when I was on television and I debated the Minister of Public Works, the Minister responsible for the Insurance Corporation, I said that he could buy the Ontario report for I think \$15, I quoted. Well, Mr. Speaker, that was a very conservative estimate. He could have bought the Ontario report for \$8.00, half the amount, and he could have learned, Mr. Speaker, as much as this report provided him. Mr. Speaker, he could have learned, he could have at least had the financial analysis that the committee did not do and the Ontario report concluded without a shadow of a doubt on page 94 of the report, the 1978 Insurance Industry, Second Report on Automobile Insurance, by who, Mr. Speaker? By members of the provincial parliament in the Province of Ontario: Gregory, Cunningham, Kuritz, Germa, a number of whom I am sure are not New Democrats, who are Tory members of Parliament, who concluded, Mr. Speaker, without a shadow of a doubt, that the expense loss ratio or the payout per dollar in claims in the private Ontario industry and I quote from it, "that the total expenditures returned as claims as 63.6 percent in Ontario, MPIC in Manitoba", Mr. Speaker, "82.8 percent", Mr. Speaker, "SGIO 82.7 and ICBC 75.9", Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, a clear indication that the administrative costs in the private sector are a hundred times, 100 percent above the costs of operating a public system. --(Interjection)--

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Minnedosa says, what are you trying to tell us? Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation during that debate with me, mentioned, you know, when he said that the report was just a report, but he made mention that we had a study, and when we had that study we did what we wanted to do, Mr. Speaker. That really really zeroed in on what the government really wanted to do. They had a study but they didn't know what they wanted to do. They blew \$300,000 and he intimated as much that our study, in 1970, was in the neighbourhood of \$300,000.00. Drop that by at least \$250,000, Mr. Speaker, because that's much closer to the accurate figure. But, Mr. Speaker, they had a study and they didn't know what to do with it. Mr. Speaker, the cost is exorbitant, a waste of \$300,000. . .

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, thank you. Mr. Speaker, the Tories can go around this province telling people how much they love Autopac. Their statements lack credibility. Mr. Speaker, what we've seen -- the Minister revealed their bias on television. When I said that you had a study and you did what you wanted, well, Mr. Speaker, you do what you want. Mr. Speaker, now don't reject a study, don't reject a study that costs you \$300,000, and say that was a waste of money, because that's what you're admitting to do.

Here's what the Tories said that they will do with the study, Mr. Speaker, and there are a number of things that they said that they will do with the study. Substantially increasing injury and death benefits, they have done, Mr. Speaker. They had the opportunity of doing that, in 1977, only when public pressure became too great, and during the federal election, when they were in hot water, that they moved to increase these benefits..That's the reason, they had that opportunity, they didn't need to spend \$300,000.00. One step accident reporting to eliminate, Mr. Speaker, that's been an ongoing work of the corporation since 1975 that they are trying to get agreement between the City Police and the Attorney-General's Department as to who will pay for the cost. Because if they're going to save \$400,000, Mr. Speaker, I want to know who's going to get stuck with the bill. Will the motorists of Manitoba have to pay that bill directly if those are the costs that are going to be saved?

Monday, 3 March, 1980

That's been going on since 1975-76, Mr. Speaker. They didn't need a study for that now. That's a continuation of the tort process, allowing traffic accident victims to receive compensation. That's a fact of life in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, there's no change necessary. You didn't have to spend \$300,000 in the report. Possible expansion of programs to reward fault-free drivers, well, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I can some small credit in at least bringing forward and putting into motion the merit system, which got into the computer program, and was announced in 1977-78 by the then Minister of Highways. That was begun before the report, that's been in motion.

Now, separation of the General Insurance Division of MPIC from Autopac for accounting and reporting procedures, Mr. Speaker, that's been in effect from Day One, that the accounting procedures are separate and reported separately. They can argue all they like that they are not separate, but let the Provincial Auditor, and he should have shown that when he was auditing the books, that there was anything wrong with it, Mr. Speaker, and it was acceptable accounting procedure that was established. You didn't a report for that either. Mr. Speaker, separating the roles of the general manager and board chairman - well, who combined the roles of the general manager and the board chairman if not the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. They were separated before '77. Who combined those roles? They did, now they're going to separate - well, la-di-da, I mean we had it before '77. That's the expense of the report.

Now, payment by MPIC to the Manitoba Health Services Commission. Mr. Speaker, those were also ongoing negotiations between the Corporation and the Health Services' Commission. It was recommended that those bulk payments be made, but I believe, if I recall correctly, Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Health Services Corporation was not at all certain that they wanted to move in that direction in terms of direct billing rather than a lump sum payment. So, Mr. Speaker, we have spent \$300,000 on the recommendation that this Minister says, these are the great things that we will accomplish. We've accomplished nothing; we have blown \$300,000 down the drain; we now go around this province and pussyfoot on this Autopac report for the next two years, saying, "Look, we love Autopac, we love Autopac, we're not going to do anything about it." Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba know better. They know that in the back of the mind, the little mind of the little Premier of this province, that he intends to rid this province of Autopac, Mr. Speaker. They do not believe him any more, and, Mr. Speaker, the motorists and the people of Manitoba will deal their verdict as soon as this Premier has the courage to call the next election.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity to participate in the Throne Speech Debate, an annual event that all of us, as members of the House, look forward to. In the last several days, Sir, you have been commended time and time again, and I say deservedly so, for the invaluable contribution that you have made to this House. You have fulfilled and you are fulfilling your responsibilities with distinction, and there is certainly no doubt, that the stature in your office has been elevated by the objectivity, by the common sense, by the good humour which have marked your presence at the head of this Chamber.

May I, Sir, at the outset, add my own personal congratulations, and welcome in a formal way to the newly elected members who have joined us at this session. As others have said already, you all have the honour to succeed members who played an important role in the development of public policy in our province, and I have no doubt, that you in turn will make a contribution and will represent your constituents most ably, regardless of the lengths of the terms that the public of Manitoba made in time accord to you.

The comments of the Mover and the Seconder of the main motion, the Honourable Member for River Heights, the Honourable Member for Springfield, deserve warm congratulations - I'm sorry, the Honourable Member for Emerson - deserve warm congratulations that they have received from both sides of the House. I think it is not without significance that both gentlemen in question are legislative assistants in this Chamber to the two respective Ministers, and I think that they have, during their -- in the case of the one member, his short time in the House, and in the case of the other member, his time since 1977 amply demonstrated the quality that was manifested in the speeches that they gave at the opening of the session.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

May I, of course, as well, Sir, congratulate the Honourable Member for Selkirk, the Leader of the Opposition, on being confirmed as leader of his party and Leader of the Opposition, at that hard-fought contest that took place several weeks ago. We like to see him in his confirmed position, and we know that he will continue to render service to this House in that position for many many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, probably more than any other regular debate in this House, I look forward to reading and listening to and occasionally participating in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, along with the Budget Debate that provides all of the members with an opportunity to present a wide range of concerns, and for all of us to raise our sights beyond some of the day to day business before us to the broader questions, to the goals, to the priorities and to the options for not just the weeks ahead but for the years ahead and for the decades ahead. This debate offers a chance to address first, principles, for all of us to define what we stand for, if we are not ashamed of what we stand for and what we want to achieve, and how we propose to go about it. This kind of debate, Sir, is essential as a basis for a reasoned and an honest approach to parliamentary government, not only here in this Assembly but in Legislatures across the country and in the Federal House as well.

Along with the vast majority of members in this House, I am sure, I witnessed with some concern I must say and regret the lack of candour which marked the recent federal election campaign, particularly on the part of the newly elected federal government. And I am not, Sir, in any way withdrawing my comments and congratulation to the Prime Minister and his new Cabinet this afternoon. I'm merely saying that what we have witnessed in this country during the campaign, which terminated on the 18th of February, was I think an unfortunate development, not in the results so much, but in the manner in which the result was achieved in terms of political campaigning, in terms of the lack of candour, the dodging of issues, that took place during that campaign. A government was elected on a non-platform of non issues, and that, Sir, does not bode well for the integrity of political life in this country. And as I said before, it worked.

The end result was that the party without a platform, the party that chose not to discuss the issues, won the election. And I merely suggest to you that it should make every legislator in this country, including all of us in this House, who have dedicated his or her careers to genuine, conscientious public service, ponder the very severe implications of that kind of a campaign upon the public of our country and indeed, the public of our province. I can only hope that this victory for the politics of cynicism - and I can think of no better term for it - will soon be revealed to be for what it was, and that it will not undermine still further, the sometimes fragile credibility of governments and legislatures in our whole western parliamentary system.

Because of my concern, Sir, about some of the tactics used by the successful party in the last few months in the federal election, I've been disturbed, to say the least, by some signs, and I hope that they die a-borning, that the members opposite, in some desperation, are feeling compelled to adopt the same approach. Throughout this debate, the comments of the members opposite have lacked consistency, they've lacked substance, they've lacked really any sense of reality, with respect to what is happening in Manitoba in 1980.

The new Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, talked boldly about setting a new direction for his party, but what have we seen so far. We have seen no new direction at all. What we have heard is an untidy, lack lustre rehearsal of their aimless wanderings in the general policies of this government, but not a new idea or a new thought put forward by them at all, what I would prefer to call, Mr. Speaker, a dustman's collection of old, worn-out ideas based on old discredited theories and packaged in old and increasingly irrelevant rhetoric. Seldom have I seen demonstrated, Mr. Speaker, as vividly as in this past week, the absolute bankruptcy of new ideas, the lack of any sense of priority among the opposition and the complete disorganization of thought and action that we have seen manifested in the various speeches, with one or two notable exceptions.

And I take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to point to one of those exceptions, the speech of the Honourable Member for Inkster, wherein he set forth what his own political creed was, and set it forth very very clearly; and wherein he set forth why he sits today as an independent member of the New Democratic Party and set that forth, perhaps not as clearly and as explicitly as he did in some of his earlier statements, but set it forth in language that we could all understand, and said what he believed in.

But looking to the party that he has left, and that party obviously is much the poorer for his leaving it, we see no such candour. We see no such attempt to formulate plans and ideas for Manitoba in the 1980s. How often have you heard me, Sir, in this House say, that one of the fundamental jobs of a good opposition is to provide good opposition, because if they provide good opposition, then they help to provide better government. And one of the things that an opposition party as a basic responsibility, is to provide new ideas, because as I've said before and many others on this side of the House have said before, the 33 men and women on this side of the House do not have any monopoly on new ideas. We don't have any monopoly on wisdom; we need help. Any government needs help from time to time with constructive criticism of its policies and with ideas that can be knitted in to the policy framework that it attempts to provide for the benefit of all of the people to whom we are ultimately responsible. But we're not getting that from the NDP - a dustman's collection of old rhetoric, based on meanderings through old tracks such as the Regina manifesto and the other kind of pervasive ending, that seems to afflict all of the public statements that are made by most members on the opposite side.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I need not read any lesson to my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition. He can see from the reading of Hansard in times gone by that there is an important role for him to play and I would suggest that he read some of those debates.

I would suggest that he read some of the debates or look at the news clippings of the debates that took place back in the late Fifties when the then Leader of the Opposition, Duff Roblin, was trying to indicate the policies that would be followed by his party if it were to succeed the Liberals in office, and he will benefit from that kind of discussion and from that kind of reading.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in all modesty, that he might even read the speeches that were delivered by the Member for Riel as he then was, when he was Acting Leader of the Opposition in 1976. And heaven forbid, he might even read a speech that I made in 1977 when I sat in his very position, as Leader of the Opposition, and expressed ideas and thoughts and improvements on government policy in this House, and ideas as to what we would be doing when we came into office. But we listened in vain, Mr. Speaker, as we listened to the Leader of the Opposition make his contribution to this debate, for anything new, for anything other than the usual old socialist rhetoric, the short-term myopic view that is so often brought forward by them.

We had an example of it in Question Period today. The quick trick type of mentality, as I call it, Mr. Speaker, trying to look no further than the end of your nose. What he said in his worked-up concern, which was not too terribly genuine, what are we going to do as a Legislature about the fact that School Division No. 1 is cutting back on the number of its staff people?

Well, first of all that is a responsibility of School Division No. 1, because the Legislature of this province has given School Division No. 1 the right to run its own affairs.

Secondly, by his deft sort of sleight-of-hand, he avoids the fact - and the Minister of Education had to point it out to him. And may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that when I'm talking about this I'm talking about a question of debating integrity in the House. I suggest my honourable friend might pay some attention to it, because he is a person of integrity. But I hate to see him slipping into sloppy ways in terms of how he uses his facts. He has enough colleagues on that side of the House who do that already.

And I suggest with the greatest of respect, Sir, that he has a responsibility as Leader of the Party and Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, not to use the quick trick type of approach that was manifested regretably today in the question period, when he chose to ignore, quite conveniently, a demographic fact of life that faces every jurisdiction in Canada, and indeed most jurisdictions in the western world, namely that we have a declining school population. And if you have a declining school population, it would seem syllogistically that sooner or later you are going to have a decline in the number of people who are required to teach that declining population. Even a cursory tip of the hat to that fundamental fact I think, would be more in keeping with the personal integrity of the man which I accept as being high. And I suggest that his debating techniques in the House will improve considerably if he would, from time to time, acknowledge the fact that the quick trick is not the way to win elections; the quick trick is not the way to win debates. The quick trick, the sleight-of-hand, the deftness and so on, is not the way to win the confidence of the people of Manitoba.



And at the risk of sounding paternalistic, Mr. Speaker, I can really say to him that I say that earnestly to him because I believe he is a person of integrity and we want to see that integrity manifested in the debates in this House, a little better than we have to date.

Mr. Speaker, in that connection without worrying the point, I call to my honourable friend's attention another — just a slight example — of what I call the quick trick type of debate tactic. You know it's the kind of thing you can get away with occasionally on the platform, the hustings, but my honourable friend has yet to learn that you can't get away with it in this House, and pray God you never will be able to get away with it in this House.

My honourable friend said in his contribution to the Throne Speech Debate on Monday, the 25th of February, quoting from the Throne Speech, he said and I'm quoting in part. . .this is on Page 41:

"But only a few paragraphs prior to that statement within the Throne Speech, we are told in an unequivocal manner, and I quote, 'Economic growth and job creation were lagging behind the rates achieved in other parts of Canada.'" Continuing, the Leader of the Opposition said:

"Mr. Speaker, this blatant admission of the sluggish performance of the economy over the past two years is the only honest economic statement contained within this Throne Speech." And then he goes on to talk about other things.

I said to him across the House at the time, "Read the preceding paragraph. Be fair to yourself," and I take a moment in this debate, Mr. Speaker, to read the part of the Throne Speech that he was presuming to quote from, and here is what it said. And I am quoting from Page 4 of Hansard, of February 21, 1980, at the bottom. Here is what the Throne Speech said:

"At the time of the first session of the thirty-first Legislature the ability of my government to undertake significant reforms or improvements of the services provided to people in Manitoba was severely limited by the harsh financial realities my Ministers had to face.

"Because economic growth and job creation were lagging behind the rates being achieved in other parts of Canada, government revenues were growing slowly. Resources available to government were committed in many cases to purposes which, in the view of my Minister, did not operate effectively or usefully in the interest of Manitobans." And then, Mr. Speaker:

"Because of the measures my government has taken over the past two years while carrying out the first part of its overall process of recovery for Manitoba, my Ministers inform me that we are now in a much stronger position to continue additions and improvements in services to people in the province."

Mr. Speaker, you may say it's a small point, and I agree it is a small point. But I think it is indicative of the kind of debate that my honourable friend should avoid, trying to get away with a quick trick in the House, because really the position and the office that he fulfills deserves better. And I merely suggest to him, Mr. Speaker, that the House will be better and he will be a better Leader of the Opposition, a better potential premier some day, if he will avoid that kind of tactic and debate and if he will just state the facts as they are, especially where the contradiction of it is so very very easy.

These are not the political hustings that my honourable friend has been on in the last several weeks where he could get away with saying anything. In here, Mr. Speaker, from time to time we are all held to account for what we say. And, Mr. Speaker, I merely pass that along in the best of goodwill to my honourable friend in his first year of confirmed position as Leader of the Opposition, in order that he may — and his party as well — benefit from that kind of improvement in debating technique.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what I was saying earlier about the contributions to the Throne Speech, I think are self-evident, and it should be self-evident to my honourable friends that sloganeering, that half-truths, that mental sloth, if I may use that term, are no passports to responsibility in this province. Mr. Speaker, left-wing nit-wittery and tomfoolery translate into political quackery of the worst kind, and really that's what we've been hearing in a lot of the Throne Speech.

So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that members of the opposition will shape up a bit and will respond to this new face that they're putting on under their new leadership, and will start to act like an opposition that has not a myopic point of view, that is willing to consider the real problems that face Manitoba, and is willing to carry on in that regard in the course of the other major debates that will take place in this House.

Monday, 3 March, 1980

Mr. Speaker, I suppose no one should be surprised that some members opposite are trying to emulate their friends in Ottawa who are the majority party. It would be to their advantage, I suppose, if the people of Manitoba were to forget the past and were to overlook their real goals and their real plans, because of course, Mr. Speaker - and this has been said in this House before - my honourable friends can keep dodging and weaving as long as they want, but sooner or later in this Session, certainly before we have to meet the people again, there are a number of fundamental questions that my honourable friends are going to have to answer to:

No. 1. What kinds of increases in taxation do they intend to impose upon the people of Manitoba when they start resuming the spending spree that they were engaged in up until the 11th of October 1977? Just what taxes are they going to raise? Where are they going to get the money, Mr. Speaker, to build all the extra things that they want built, to do all of the other things that they want to have done, and if they're not going to raise the taxes, how much are they going to raise the deficit by? Because there are only two alternatives. You've either got to raise taxes to increase revenues, or you've got to increase your deficit, that is assuming some stability in the economy.

And Mr. Speaker, under my honourable friends, we could not even assume stability in the economy because they drove out hundreds of millions of dollars of investment capital by their confrontationalist and their expropriative types of tax laws that they had while they had the responsibility for public office in this province.

I see, Sir, it's now 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock.