

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, March 20, 1975

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to my gallery, where we have 12 guests who are retired railway supervisors from the Mechanical Department of the Canadian National Railway. These gentlemen have made it a point to meet regularly every month and come for an annual visit to the Legislature. They are the guests of the Honourable Minister of Labour, the Member for Transcona.

We also have 45 students, Grade 11 standing, of the Churchill High School, under the direction of Mr. Sabeski and Mr. McKenzie. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Osborne, the Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services.

And we have 17 students of Grade 9 standing of the Andrew Mynarski School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Bonin. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster, the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

And we have 50 students of Grade 6 standing of the Yellow Quill School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Cuthbert and Mrs. Wright. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Economic Development.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee to Economic Development met for organization on Thursday, March 20, 1975, and appointed Mr. Shafransky as Chairman. In accordance with the Rules of the House, the quorum of the Committee was set at seven (7) members.

Having received all information requested by any member from the Chairman, Mr. Albert Koffman, the Annual Report of Manitoba Mineral Resources Ltd. for the period April 1, 1973, to March 31, 1974, was accepted by the Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Land Value Appraisal Commission for 1973-74. And for the convenience of members I would also like to submit the 1975 Government Telephone Directory.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education)(Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report for the year 1973-74 of the Department of Education, and the Annual Financial Report of the Board of Governors of the University of Manitoba to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council for the year ended March 31, 1974.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RONALD McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report for Minago Contractors Limited for the year ended March 31, 1974.

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

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster) on behalf of the Attorney-General, introduced Bill No. 14, an Act to amend the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.) Also Bill No. 15, an Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

MR. GREEN introduced Bill No. 16, The Metallic Minerals Royalty Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Questions? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he can inform the House whether he and the Minister of Industry and Commerce met with the people involved in the consortium who are considering a pipeline from the Arctic Gas Lines through Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, affirmative. Yes.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I wonder if the First Minister is in a position to indicate to the House whether consideration will be given to a pipeline that would come through Manitoba down to Winnipeg.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, clearly consideration will be given, consideration is already being given. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition I'm sure has a pretty good comprehension as to what the structure of decision-making with respect to a project of this kind. Insofar as the Province of Manitoba is concerned, we have indicated our interest all along, we met this morning by way of formal briefing and clearly this matter will be pursued. But I want to make the obvious even more obvious to the Leader of the Opposition, that the decision-making involved here is not provincial in terms of jurisdiction, it's quite national in scope.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. Well I wonder if the First Minister can inform the House whether the people that he met today confirmed with him that there is no study being undertaken of a pipeline to come through Manitoba to Winnipeg.

MR. SCHREYER: That would not be a correct assumption at all, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe there is any secret any longer about the fact that the alternatives are much more costly and therefore there would be no justification for any alternative other than a pipeline that follows the least cost alternative by several billions of dollars.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether at any time he or his government ever requested of the people involved that a study be undertaken to determine whether there was a feasibility of the pipeline coming through Manitoba to Winnipeg.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the matter of the cost analysis was something which I was assured quite some time ago would be carried out in all of its various alternatives by those directly responsible, and I'm satisfied that this has and is being done.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. I wonder if he can advise if the study group is still giving equal weight to the routes, one which comes through Manitoba and the other which goes across the Hudson Straits into Quebec.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the only way I can answer in brief to the Honourable Member for Riel is to indicate to him that which is already a matter of public knowledge, I believe. That the alternatives as between east of the Bay and west of the Bay have a differential of something in the order of 1.5 to two billion dollars, and therefore one assumes that the least cost alternative involving a substantially lesser cost will be the one that will be followed in the overall public interest.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, can I conclude from that that the 1.5 billion advantage is on the west side of the Bay? --(Interjection)-- Billion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Affirmative, Mr. Speaker. I can only in this context relay what I believe to be the official and responsible figures and estimates from those in a position to

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) know, those that are in direct decision-making responsibility in this matter, that the cost differential is indeed in the order of 1.5, 1.7 billion dollars, lesser cost west of Hudson's Bay.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. It is with respect to the Crocus Food plant proposed for Selkirk. Is it the intention of the government to have that plant manufacture anything other than a product that can be derived from whey?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the plant does proceed it will be involved in the processing of whole milk as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister inform the House as to whether or not the raw milk which will be diverted to the Crocus Plant will be diverted at the expense of present dairies and producers?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, that is a question I think that should be properly put after the decision is made. I don't anticipate a diversion program. I think we have to work on the basis of the expansion of the dairy industry in Manitoba.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister inform the House as to whether or not there's been any type of a feasibility study carried out to ensure that there will be no loss of employment at present cheese plants and dairy plants in the province by this program?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think for the benefit of the Member from Portage he should know that the main function of the plant is indeed to keep some plants viable that would otherwise not be.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I have further information that we have 15 students of second-year standing of the Brandon University in our gallery, from Brandon West or East, I'm not certain which constituency this university is in. Anyways I welcome them here this afternoon.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. Can he indicate to the House whether or not he has any indication of living up to the specific sections of the present Dairy Act which spells out certain responsibilities on the part of the government, before any further expansion of the processing aspect of the dairy industry takes place?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would think that whatever the laws of the land provide for, that we must follow or we must change the law.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. I take it that the advisory board that is indicated, that shall be set up prior to this expansion, prior to any decision-making, will in fact be set up, and the whole question of further expansion of the capacity of a dairy plant will be discussed in the public forum.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Member for Lakeside should know that what we are dealing with is an environmental problem in the building of that plant. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. USKIW: . . . and whatever must be done to accommodate the facility that is now being discussed shall be done, whether it means an amendment to legislation or whether it means some obligation under existing legislation. I think we must take all of those things into account.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the same Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if the Minister could advise the House what the present proposed capacity of the Crocus Plant will be? At the present time what are they proposing the hourly capacity of dried whey or dried powdered milk will be per hour?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't give him that specifically at this point in time. I recall the figures used for the feasibility study, somewhere in the order of 185 million pounds

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. USKIW cont'd) of whey. Now that's sort of from memory, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether you said 180 million pounds of whey per what?

MR. USKIW: Per year.

MR. MINAKER: Per year. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management. I wonder if the minister could advise the House if the land-use program for Crown owned lands mentioned in the 1974 report, whether this program has been completed, and is there a map available for the members of the House to have on the particular land-use of the Crown owned lands.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the report would have to speak for itself. With respect to responsibility in that area of the department, that it now rests with the Minister for Co-operatives. Just in response to your question, that the minister now responsible in that area of department activities is the Minister for Co-operatives and lands and forests, etc.

So he is here and I will let him take the question as notice or deal with it as he sees fit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-operatives.

HON. HARVEY BOSTROM (Minister of Co-operatives) (Rupert's Land): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture, and it pertains to the questions that have already been asked in regards to the dairy policy of this province. I'd like to ask the Minister if the Milk Control Board under his jurisdiction have given directions to the various dairy processing plants in the Province of Manitoba that they would be compelled to direct a percentage of their processing milk to other plants other than their own?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rock Lake should be aware that the milk once it leaves the farm gate is the property of the Producer's Marketing Board and they have the powers of direction.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, then, do I understand from the answer the minister has given that if a dairy processing plant in any part of Manitoba is producing, or drawing in say 50,000 pounds of milk a day, that the board have directed that plant to direct 20 percent of that volume to another plant, say, in Winnipeg?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think that I should tell my honourable friend that one of the objectives of the restructuring of the dairy industry is to meet the daily demand for fresh milk on the part of consumers; unlike was the case in the past. And if that means from time to time a diversion of milk from one use towards another, and of course the consumption of whole fresh milk is the highest paying use, then I would think it's in the best wisdom of that board to allocate it accordingly.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I direct another question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him if any of the dairy processing plants in the Province of Manitoba have directed to him the attention of the very seriousness of this particular aspect of the dairy industry, as to their concern as to their viability of future continuation of their program - and it relates to the Crocus Food Plant that he is contemplating building at Selkirk? Have they brought to the attention of the Minister the seriousness of their particular business?

MR. USKIW: Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, that I would have to say that there have been some discussions with different people in the industry. No one has brought about any dramatic revelation as to the consequences to anyone if the province goes ahead with the building of the Crocus Plant. Because the main purpose of the plant is to alleviate an environmental problem which, if it is not done, may result in the closing down of some cheese plants.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I have further questions.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has had three questions. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. Can the First Minister confirm whether he has received a letter from the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg requesting provincial sharing of the cost of a uniform pension plan for city employees in the City of Winnipeg, and has he yet returned a reply to the Mayor?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, such a letter has been received. It's been referred to the Ministry of Urban Affairs. I believe that a reply has either been sent or is in process of being prepared.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the First Minister confirm whether in fact a Task Force headed by the former Minister of Finance reported in 1971 that a uniform pension plan should be included as part of the unification of the City of Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't confirm offhand if there was such a Task Force recommendation, but lest there be any suggestion that such a recommendation would therefore presuppose some senior government funding of it, if that's what my honourable friend is implying, I reject it.

MR. AXWORTHY: I've a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the government consider its obligations under the City of Winnipeg to cover transitional cost in terms of developing a unified pension plan and to provide the moneys at least for that portion that was incurred as a result of the transition period in the new City of Winnipeg?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, again there is an assumption there which takes a good deal for granted. Whether or not the matter of pension funding is a transitional cost or whether it is a cost that relates more to the concept of equal pay for equal work within the bosom of one urban community, those are two very different assumptions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Labour. I wonder if the Minister of Labour could tell the House if it is the intention of the government or the Minister of Labour to take a positive position in regard to the grain tie-up because of strikes in Vancouver. Is it the intention of the government to take a positive vocal position in regard to the tie-up at Vancouver as it relates to Manitobans?

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

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Agriculture then, if the Government of Manitoba now have changed positions that they took in 1969 that a tie-up in Vancouver did not affect Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. WATT: The question is . . . All right, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking the question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is it the position now of the socialists on that side of the House, who in 1969 said that we had no reason for . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. WATT: . . . interfering with a tie-up in Vancouver. The question is, have you changed your position?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think that it's reasonable to suggest, or to inform my honourable friend that I did not mind that he took a trip out of the province in 1969. The only question at that time was that if he wanted to do it and he made it a holiday, that that was quite proper and it should be put in that context.

MR. WATT: I never heard the report from Rome.

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. WATT: I ask the Minister now if he agrees with his counterpart, the socialist, the Honourable Mr. Lang, when he stated the night before last that we had not significantly lost our world trade because of the strike and the tie-up in Vancouver, does he agree with his counterpart, the socialist from Ottawa?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think everyone agrees that if there is a strike that there are problems that result from a strike and that it's not a happy situation. So if my honourable friend wants to know whether I am in favour of strikes, I will tell him no.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Resources. It's in relation to the Garrison Diversion project. Can he advise the House on the status of the environmental studies in Canada with regards to this project?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that's a vague question. I know that there are various studies, I believe that we have made them all public. I will undertake to see to it that the studies that I have available to me are made available to the Member of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I did have a supplementary to it, and that was whether or not sufficient environmental studies had now been completed to allow the Manitoba Government and the Canadian Government to state with some definite scientific information what the impact of this project is likely to be.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that that was so in the Fall of 1973. And in the Fall of 1973, the Canadian Government as a result of being requested by the Manitoba Government, stated that the environmental studies then on hand produced by the United States themselves proved that the Garrison Diversion as then conceived would be a violation of the Boundary Waters Treaty. The Canadian Government did so and the United States Government in response sent a commitment that the treaty would not be violated.

Mr. Speaker, that then involves an argument as to what the word "pollution" means, what the violation encompasses, and I have no way of guaranteeing to my honourable friend that our position will be upheld. All I can suggest to them is that the best means possible have been taken to try to uphold the Canadian position.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I would then ask him, we conclude that there are no present studies being undertaken of an environmental nature; and secondly, if they are basing their position on the American studies, can he now advise whether this has been referred to the International Joint Commission, or who is presently negotiating on the matter.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that there is no Canadian input into the studies. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member can read my remarks in Hansard and see whether I am now contradicting myself. I said that in 1973 on the basis of their studies alone, we were able to assert that there was a violation of the treaty. There has since been additional studies which I have tabled in this House, both from the American side and our analysis of these studies.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is always the most damaging evidence to be able to produce what the defendant or the opposing side themselves have said, and Canada has been able to rely on the United States' studies plus Canadian and Manitoba input with relation to those studies and data which we have collected on our own to make a position contrary to the Garrison Diversion being pursued in such a way as to affect Souris or Red River waters. The status of the matter at present is that the Canadian Department of External Affairs appears to be or has suggested that there be a reference to the International Joint Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed towards the Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the Minister tell the House whether his policy of ignoring the Manitoba Medical Association when formulating health policy is to continue in future?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I'm sure the honourable gentleman realizes that when he expresses opinion or prefaces a question with an opinion he's going to get an argument. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Public Works. Can the Minister tell the House, or indicate to the House whether the Minister or his department is currently involved in negotiating to purchase the Great West Life building?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Only in the sense that it has been discussed for the past several years.

MR. PATRICK: Do the present negotiations revolve around the province's co-operation for the Great West Life to relocate in another location?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. DOERN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education, Colleges and University of Manitoba Affairs. Have negotiations broken off at the University of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is well aware that the government is not involved in any negotiations on behalf of the University of Manitoba. Therefore, ask the university.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the situation and its effect on possible exams, can the Minister advise the House whether he is keeping himself abreast of the situation on the campus?

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, what particular situation the honourable member is referring to.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister aware of his department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Very much so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin. I'm sorry.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I thank you. I have a question for, I guess the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs. I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise the House of the policy of the government. Is it to subsidize or offer financial assistance to any or all provincial or municipal or privately owned parks in the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister for Urban Affairs) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, parks normally fall under the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. If the question is with regard to the Assiniboine Park and zoo in Winnipeg, then I must inform the House as they already know, that discussions have been held with Winnipeg, because Assiniboine Park and zoo is provincial in nature, it's very unique, it's the only botanical gardens in the province, and the province did undertake to lease the Assiniboine Park zoo and have the City maintain it for them under an agreement. That has not yet been promulgated or finalized. And if that's the question, it relates to this one particular issue.

MR. McKENZIE: A supplementary question then. Can I assume from the Honourable Minister's remarks that the privately owned parks or the privately owned zoos are not included in that policy?

MR. MILLER: The member is 100 percent correct.

MR. McKENZIE: A supplementary question to the Honourable Minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if he can advise the House if the terms of reference include the establishment of fees for the people that like to utilize the zoos or the parks in this province.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, there are no admission fees to the Assiniboine Park and zoo and there will not be any admission fees to Assiniboine Park and zoo.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. It pertains to the Horned Cattle Trust Fund. I would like to ask him if he was in consultation with the beef producers of this province before the decision which he did to make the allocation of that fund.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think I answered that question about a week ago. I believe the question was put by the Member for Lakeside.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a second question and then ask the Minister, could he indicate to this House on whose advice did he receive before making that decision?

MR. USKIW: Well again, to help my honourable friend, I want him to know that we did not allocate the funds to this day, we are awaiting a reply from the various interested parties as to how we might spend those dollars.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the Minister indicate whether acupuncture treatment is presently considered under the Manitoba Health Care Insurance program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development) (St. Boniface): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate whether such acupuncture treatment has been considered in the past either by the Department of Health and Social Development for social assistant recipients or by the Manitoba Health Commission?

MR. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Speaker, neither in any other provinces in Canada.

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary. Can the Minister indicate whether he is presently planning to consider such treatment being considered under the Plan, or are there any review committees set up to examine its feasibility, medical review committees in particular.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, after being informed by the National Minister, all the Provincial Ministers of Health agreed that this would not be considered at this time in any province in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. It is with regards to the Garrison project. I wonder if he could advise what the position - I would gather in his previous answer that the Department of External Affairs of Canada has recommended that it be referred to the IJC. Can he advise the House what the position of the authorities in the United States is on this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my impression is that they would agree to a reference. I also am of the impression that the two parties have not agreed as to what the reference would state, but that they, tentatively both the United States and Canada agreed to some sort of reference.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister advise whether the Bureau of Reclamation in the United States has agreed with the other federal departments of the United States for this referral?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that similar to the Canadian situation, that ultimately the position that is taken is taken by the State Department, as is the Canadian position determined by the Department of External Affairs. And I do not believe that all of the other agencies then second guess and fight with the State Department so as to undermine the State Department's position vis-a-vis the reference. I would expect a similar procedure to be adopted in this country.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and Environmental Management relating to Garrison. I wonder if he can indicate whether the Provincial Government has hired any consultants, or retained any consultants to assist in evaluation of the environmental impact that will take place if the diversion is completed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, both Canada and Manitoba have expertise in the area. I cannot suggest that we have hired outside consultants, I cannot suggest that we have. If I had it my way, we would hire the expertise that exist within the department and not spend money on outside consultants.

MR. SPIVAK: Again I ask the question of the Minister. Is the Province of Manitoba relying entirely on its own in-House expertise with respect to this matter?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am not certain, but I've already indicated that the province and Canadian authorities both are relying on expertise. I would hope that the expertise is in-House, I would prefer it that way. I am not certain it is that way. But my understanding, Mr. Speaker, with regard to outside consultants as the honourable member full well knows, is that when you hire a consulting firm, their general attitude is to then hire your staff to work for them and then charge you for it. We would prefer that that not take place.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister's not very sure himself, I wonder if he could report back . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I again caution all members that if they're going to express opinions prefacing a question, it will be ruled out of order whether the question is valid or not. I think that if the members can't adhere to the rules that they have developed over many many years, then we'll just have to revise the rules. But in the meantime we'll have to abide by the ones that we have. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: A further question in regard to the Garrison Dam, I direct to the Honourable Minister. I would like to ask him, are the expertise involved in the Qu'Appelle Watershed Commission, which he indicated the other day was involved also in the Souris or the Mouse Valley Watershed which is directly connected with the Garrison Dam proposal?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm that the Qu'Appelle-Souris study directly relates to the Garrison Diversion, although certainly there is at least locational reference. But if the honourable member asked me if there are expertise associated with these studies, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: A further question then. I ask the Minister, did he not reply to me the other day that the Commission on the Qu'Appelle Watershed was directly connected with the Souris, and the Souris is directly connected with the Garrison Dam project?

MR. GREEN: I cannot recall whether that specific question or that specific answer was given. But I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that I would not have said, because it is not my opinion and there would be absolutely no reason for me to give an opinion on this question which was not exactly so nor on any other question, that the Souris-Qu'Appelle study is directly related to the implications of the Garrison Diversion. I could not have said that. And if I did, Mr. Speaker, I'll be very surprised, and if the honourable member will produce it for me I will have to say that I erred very badly. --(Interjection)-- Well then, show it to me.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - BILL NO. 7 - INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to proceed to Bill No. 7 please.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Proposed Motion of the Honourable First Minister. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this Bill for my Leader the Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 7 is an Interim Supply Bill for \$ 250 million. When many of us entered the Legislature for the first time in 1966 we were faced with a budget for the period of 1966-67 which in total was just a shade higher than the \$ 250 million that we are being asked to approve as an interim budget or 25 percent of the total budget that we will be dealing with in the Estimates. And this just, Mr. Speaker, indicates how much the provincial budget has grown and how more formidable the workload is for the Members of the Legislature to be able to supervise the program of public spending and to understand the very involved way within our economic life that government . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . has proceeded in the last period of time.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that in the last few weeks two issues have really become the issues that are the topics of conversation of the public at large. They are of course inflation, and the fact that it is not abating, while the forces of recession are gathering strength; and the second is the atmosphere of constant and growing labour unrest and demands for higher and higher wages. And along with this, Mr. Speaker, is the growing concern of the taxpayer for the increasing cost of government that the taxpayer has to bear.

Almost daily different labour groups are attempting to fight the ravages of inflation by demanding higher salaries and wages. Mr. Speaker, these demands when met may ease

BILL NO. 7 - INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) their burden somewhat for themselves as a select group within our society, but in the long run I suggest it only serves to fuel the fires of inflation for everyone.

Mr. Speaker, this phenomena is not entirely new. There has probably never been a point in our lifetimes when there weren't a great many people who were concerned about the rising cost of living. But what is new and what is alarming is that matters appear to be deteriorating and that no one, management labour or government seems capable of dealing with the problems, and indeed that in some cases each may be doing things to make matters worse.

In the case of governments, Mr. Speaker, and I talk of all governments, it's not enough to wait until the problems land with a crash at the doorstep as in the case of the recent dilemma with the Manitoba nurses. Instead, the government must take the initiative to seek out a solution; for if the government does not, Mr. Speaker, who indeed will? Mr. Speaker, we are at a time when the government must speak with one voice. You can't have some members of the Cabinet saying, "We are just catching up," and others saying to labour, "You can't have what you want".

Two weeks ago in the Throne Speech Debate I drew to the attention the massive increase in public spending by the Provincial Government. That increase has been reinforced by the Estimates which have been tabled with us this week - really at the end of last week. The Premier in his speech during the Throne Speech Debate replied to me by drawing attention to the fact that all governments in Canada are spending vastly increased amounts. Now, he's right, but he's also missing the point. Mr. Speaker, it is precisely because all governments are continuing to spend wantonly, that there is no coming to grips with inflation nor with the labour unrest that inflation has helped to create. To say that Manitoba is only doing what other provinces and the Federal Government are doing is not an answer. Mr. Speaker, it is an excuse. We cannot be responsible for what other governments do or don't do; but we can or should try to be responsible for what the Government of Manitoba does or does not do.

Now, in the speech of a few days ago the Premier said that there was a kind of lunacy rapport abroad in this country over inflation, and I agree with him. I think he's right in that. But I go further in saying that I believe that the public patience with inflation and with strikes as well, Mr. Speaker, legal and illegal, private sector or public, is wearing very very thin. And I come back, Mr. Speaker, to my earlier point. What is government - and I mean the present government, not the Government of Canada, not the Government of Ontario, not the Government of Alberta or British Columbia - what is the present government doing to deal with the root causes of inflation? And I emphasize "root causes" because this government is very fond of rebate programs which while serving certain political purposes rarely if ever reflect the way and the degree to which people have actually been overtaxed. So I ask once again, where is the attack on root causes, and by root causes I mean two, high taxation and high government spending.

We've proposed on numerous occasions selective cuts in both sales and income taxes. Neither have been forthcoming even though the honourable gentlemen opposite when they were in opposition denounced the sales tax. Selective tax cuts are important and necessary, but except in the very short run they will help but little unless they are accompanied by reductions in spending as well.

Mr. Speaker, we are told while there has been no reduction in spending that the newest Estimates are an attempt to hold the line. Well, Mr. Speaker, if these Estimates represent an attempt to hold the line, then we may all shudder to think what they would have been if caution and prudence had been thrown to the wind.

The Premier made the point last week that all opposition parties tend to accuse governments of overspending, and all governments usually respond by demanding to know which programs the opposition would cut or reduce. Such at least are the normal source of exchanges. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these are not normal times and that overspending in this province is fast becoming a serious situation.

Without having access to the records that the government has, without knowing what cost benefit analyses studies have been conducted, without knowing the full extent of contract hiring outside the Civil Service, and without knowing in many cases the financial alternatives

BILL NO. 7 - INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) the government has faced, it's very difficult for an opposition or even government backbenchers to cite chapter and verse with respect to government spending.

The cases for waste and inefficiency in overspending exists. We know that they exist. We also know, Mr. Speaker, that the procedures in our legislative system do not provide the kinds of checks and balances needed to control non-productive accounts. We know from the Provincial Auditor, and he remarked on this this Tuesday at the Public Accounts Committee, that he is not equipped, nor does he see it as his function --(Interjection)-- he's adequately staffed to examine the books according to the function as it is interpreted in the Provincial Auditor's Act, but he does not see it as his function to make the assessment on non-productive accounts.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that in the manner in which the Estimates are presented, and in the manner in which the debate on the Estimates takes place, and the procedures that we are operating now, it is impossible in this legislative forum, or in the Parliament of Canada, to effectively deal and provide the checks and balances that must exist in our parliamentary system to provide a protection for the people from the degree of waste, inefficiency and lack of productivity that can occur under any administration.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to accept the statements by the government that somehow or other they have applied restraint with respect to the Estimates that have been presented. Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to accept that what is being proposed today comes forward as a result of a study of the cost-benefit relationship and an attempt on the part of the government to analyze properly programs and to be prepared to provide the reduction in government spending that is necessary to try and curb inflation.

We have instances already on record where the government has overspent. The Premier has already admitted to an over-commitment to Saunders. Whether they admit it or not the same is true of the Manitoba Development Corporation.

The Provincial Auditor has demonstrated the problems with the Department of Co-operative Development and with the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation. And when the auditor said yes, Mr. Speaker, as he did on Tuesday, that hundreds of millions of dollars of provincial funds can be spent without his scrutiny, then I suggest again that the potential for waste and overspending is immense. So these are those areas that are already on record as being areas of waste and overspending. Mr. Speaker, these are symptomatic of an attempt on the part of government to try and give the impression of restraint when in effect that restraint has not been exercised.

When we look at line departments and the proliferation of boards and commissions and agencies and secretaries and all the rest, one has to ask, where is the evidence that with all of these new agencies, with all of this extra-centrally co-ordinated research and planning, where is the evidence that as a result of all of this rationalization costs have been reduced or eliminated in the department or that productivity has been increased.

There has in fact been great expansion of hiring people under contract. We know that, Mr. Speaker, and that information in total has never been presented in this House. Nor will it ever be. There is great expansion in the hiring of consultants through a variety of different programs and through the various agencies as a means to provide additional staffing. For what? For evaluation of programs, for the constant exchange of paper back and forth from various departments to other departments who are involved in planning procedures. And all of this is said to be on the basis of being in the interests, Mr. Speaker, of the people of this province. But the interests of the people in this province, Mr. Speaker, would have been better served had the government decided to stop spending; had the government decided to start to reduce taxes; (Hear hear) had the government started to stop stoking the fires of inflation by its continual spending progress program. We have no evidence that the hiring that I suggested has been reduced or controlled in the department. I suggest that evidence will not be found.

Let me deal with some specific examples of spending in recent years. Mr. Speaker, I calculate this from the Estimates. I recognize as well that they do not contain all the information with respect to government spending, and I'll come back to that in a moment. Nor do they contain specifically those areas alone that I'm going to mention, because there are a number, a whole range of programs which are jointly sponsored with the Federal

BILL NO. 7 - INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) Government which are included within the Estimates but whose breakdown and breakout we do not know.

In 1970 the Department of Agriculture in salaries had \$3 million. These are approximate figures, Mr. Speaker. In 1976 the Department of Agriculture has \$8 million in salaries. The Department of Public Works had \$3 million in salaries in 1970 and has \$10 million in 1976. Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs had \$900 thousand in 1970 and it has \$7,500,000 forecast for 1976. The Department of Youth and Education and Colleges and Universities had \$9 million in salaries in 1970, \$21 million salaries in 1976.

Mr. Speaker, the total increase for all departments of salaries as referred to salaries in the Estimates - and I suggest that this is not all the salaries of government, I'll come back to that in a moment - the total increase from 1970 to 1976 is \$83 million. The total percentage increase for all departments in salaries alone from 1970 to 1976 is 153.7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to reiterate that these do not include those who are on contract, they do not include those who are hired as consultants, and they do not include those people who are on a variety of different boards and commissions that I'm going to come to in a few moments. This is with respect to the Estimates of the department in the Main Estimates that have been forwarded.

Mr. Speaker, the total increase in the Civil Service from 1970 to 1974 was from 9,622 to 12,138, or 2,516 people. Which represents a percentage increase, Mr. Speaker, of 26.1 percent.

Well again we come to a very basic factor. --(Interjection)-- Well you are in isolation. I want to say this. Who is going to lead in this province, who is going to take the responsibility once and for all of recognizing that government you do it all. Who is going to stand up and say to the taxpayer that the burden you are being asked to bear to run the cost of government is too high and that what we are doing is causing the inflation to continue to run rampant, and that we are prepared now to cut and recognize that there are going to have to be restraints exercised here and we're going to ask the rest of Canada to do the same.

MR. MILLER: What programs would you cut?

MR. SPIVAK: Oh, what programs will we cut? Well what programs we'll cut, I'll come to just two programs in just two minutes. Mr. Speaker, I'll come to two programs, and I cite them just as a symptom and as --(Interjection)-- Oh yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I'll come to programs whose relevance to our particular situation can be evaluated and where in effect there is the possibility of some saving.

A MEMBER: Start on the Estimate . . .

MR. SPIVAK: No, I want to tell the First Minister, you're not prepared for the knife and you will not cut this program because the program has too much political meaning for the New Democratic party. I'll tell you you won't cut it because the relevance of the program is for political purposes and not for the people itself.

Mr. Speaker, when I talk in terms of salaries and employees one has to recognize that in the main it does not include the salaries or the number of employees in the various boards, commissions and government agencies. And I refer the honourable members to Exhibit 7, Page 1 of the Provincial Auditor's Report which lists the boards and commissions that he is responsible for. And I want to indicate those boards and commissions who employ people, who are government employees who are not included in the statistical data that I referred to. And it would be interesting, Mr. Speaker, to be able if we had proper public accounts in these various undertakings to be able to evaluate the actual increases that are taking place there.

And I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the Agricultural Credit Corporation, to the Communities Economic Development Fund, to the Manitoba Development Corporation, to the Manitoba Health Services Commission, to the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, to the Manitoba Hydro Electric Board, to the Leaf Rapids Development Corporation, to the Liquor Control Commission, to the Manitoba Telephone Commission, to the Manitoba Public Insurance Commission. Mr. Speaker, they all employ people who are on the Government payroll and there have been substantial increases in salaries there, and in numbers. And, Mr. Speaker, it is all being borne by the taxpayer. The same taxpayer who pays the real

BILL NO. 7 - INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) estate taxes, who pays the sales taxes, who pays the liquor taxes, who pay the income taxes, both federally and provincially.

And, Mr. Speaker, the question at this point is, is the government prepared to do anything?

MR. SCHREYER: Let's hear it.

MR. SPIVAK: Well let's hear it, let's hear it. You know last year, Mr. Speaker, we had a budget of about \$850 million, we had capital borrowing requested of \$700 million, we now find from the Provincial Auditors Report that there was \$262 million of unexpended legislative authority for capital purposes. That meant, Mr. Speaker, that with the \$262 million that was available at the end of the last fiscal year, and with \$700 million that was authorized, that in effect the Provincial Government was given the capacity to be able to borrow for capital purposes a billion dollars. Now, Mr. Speaker, where is the restraint?

I want to refer to a couple of programs, and I do this only - I cite them as an example. I want to refer, Mr. Speaker, to the . . .

A MEMBER: Do you know the difference in authority to commit and authority spent.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I know the difference between authority to commit and authority spent, and if the billion dollars wasn't necessary I may suggest to the Honourable First Minister then there was no necessity of coming to this House and asking for \$700 million last year. --(Interjection)-- For commitments.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if each year the First Minister as Minister of Finance can come back to this Legislature and ask for authority, it is not necessary for him to ask for \$700 million last year if in fact he wasn't going to use it. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that either his commitments were to be made or he came and asked this group to give him authority which was not needed; and if that's the case then I think that that was a dishonest way of dealing with this Legislature.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I now want to deal with the Canada Northlands Agreement and I bring this because I think this is one example of the problem areas we have in trying to analyze these estimates and try and assess really the restraint that's exercised. Mr. Speaker, I want to say something to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and I have to say this. I was Minister of Industry and Commerce some five years ago. I have some idea of the workings of his department. I know the people who are involved. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, without any question, there is absolutely no justification, absolutely no justification for the increase in spending that's occurred within his department. And I must tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Industry and Commerce in carrying out his responsibility every day is taking money from the pockets of every taxpayer in this province unnecessarily. And I can say that without any fear. Mr. Speaker, I can tell the First Minister that I could go into his department and I can cut that right down. There is not justification, there is nothing in his programming that would justify the kind of increase or percentage that has taken place. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you something. You may have a few businessmen friends but I don't think that the businessmen friends that you're talking about are going to listen very much to what you say.

Mr. Speaker, the Government signed a \$21 million contract with the Federal Government of which the provincial input is \$8.5 million, and it's contained partially within these estimates, both in the sense of salaries and programs and it's contained throughout. But I want to deal with a couple of them and try and talk about, you know, the ability on the part of the government to restrain its spending. One of the undertakings in the Northland Agreement and in the main, Mr. Speaker, not in the main but a significant part of the Northland Agreement, consists of studies, always studies. We're going to continually study to study, study and restudy what we studied. Mr. Speaker, one of the programs is a Northern Transportation study for \$250,000, of which \$100,000, Mr. Speaker, is to be paid for by the province. Mr. Speaker, we need another northern study. We have a northern study called the Mauro Report. It was a massive study, it was a massive undertaking. Mr. Speaker, this government didn't even, the exception of maybe the Minister who read the report, did not even follow any of the recommendations of that report, did nothing with that report. It was undertaken during the period of our administration and completed during their administration, published and forgotten about. And now we're going to have another study of \$250,000 of which \$100,000 will be taken from the provincial coffers, to do what?

BILL NO. 7 - INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) To basically restudy what has already been studied, an action of which could have been undertaken. Because I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the Mauro study on northern transportation is as complete as any study had to be for a program for northern Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, there is another program called the Information Communication Program.

A MEMBER: You aren't concerned about northern Manitoba.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes I am concerned about northern Manitoba. But, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that all this is doing is employing some people who are going to study about what's going to happen in northern Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, there is another program Information Communication Service, a million and seventy-five dollars. \$600,000 comes from the Federal Government. Now I have to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial people are tremendous at conning the Federal Government into programs that are absolutely useless and, Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult for one to understand, you know, the salesmanship that exists on the other side and the foolishness of the Federal Government. But we are going to spend \$400,000 on this program, and this program is only going to benefit the very few people who are employed, and I would suggest as well the New Democratic Party. That's why that program is being funded. And, Mr. Speaker, there's just no justification for that program to be undertaken, none at all. There's no cost benefit at all, there's no way in which that program can be justified when all one has to do is look at the bulletins and realize what this is all about.

A MEMBER: How much did we spend on that . . .

MR. SPIVAK: How much have you spent on that to date? This program is in the Northlands Agreement here in this program which would have a \$400,000 amount, but I must suggest, Mr. Speaker, based on the \$5 million that was spent before in the last few years we've probably spent \$2 1/2 million on it, \$2 million on it. That's a lot of money, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: For basic communication.

MR. SPIVAK: For basic communication. What communication? Mr. Speaker, you know there's just no point. It's horsefeathers on the part of the Premier to suggest, really, at this point, Mr. Speaker, that there's any value, that there's any value to this program. This is a political program which the people of Manitoba are being asked to pay, and I say to the First Minister who is going to show restraint, who is going to show leadership, who is going to tell the people once and for all that we are going to stop this with respect to inflation, we are going to stop this spending, we are going to stop asking you to pay the degree of taxation that you have been paying and we're going to allow you to be able to hold the money, to be able to be in a position not to demand the increases in wages that are required and in this way try and stop the inflation spiral that exists.

I come back, Mr. Speaker, to the point with which I began. --(Interjection)--

A MEMBER: The pigeons are smoking.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's of course another situation, the pigeons. And I guess the First Minister doesn't want to be reminded of that. And we remember that. The Department of Co-operative Development's recommendation that instead of two-way radio systems we'd be better to have carrier pigeons.

And, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether that was \$50,000 we spent on that or what we spent on that. It would be interesting for someone to take some responsibility to determine how much the taxpayer had to pay for that experiment, and at least find out who ate the pigeons. So at least we'll know, you know, who benefitted as a result of this experiment, in this creative program that was undertaken by the government.

MR. PAULLEY: That was a . . . it wasn't at public expense at all.

MR. SPIVAK: It was at public expense. Mr. Speaker, it was at public expense, the Ilford Co-operative paid for it and that was funded by public money and it's not going to be paid back as the First Minister knows. As a matter of fact, fortunately whoever supplied the pigeons if he was paid for them, he's not one of the creditors, if he's one of the creditors he's going to be stuck like most of the creditors who have dealt with the co-ops up north.

Mr. Speaker, the public is growing tired, and, Mr. Speaker, the public is becoming frightened by labour unrest in this country. And I think, Mr. Speaker, it's fair to say that

BILL NO. 7 - INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) many are staggered by wage increases that are now being demanded. But labour unrest and exorbitant wage demands cannot be viewed separate and apart from the inflation and the cost-of-living crisis. And, Mr. Speaker, if we are to avoid work stoppages and increase social tensions it seems to me that government must not only tackle inflation but be seen to tackling it. And I suggest that no matter how the Premier or the members opposite can suggest or will suggest that this is only an 18 percent increase and that this 18 percent increase really only represents a 10 percent increase, which was the direction I gave to every member and every department head. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this does not in any way, and cannot in any way, indicate a restraint or an example of restraint to be followed by private enterprise. The public involvement in the economy of our country is so immense and is increasing, Mr. Speaker, at such a degree . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, for purposes of clarification I don't want . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour have a question?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I don't think I . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Yes I have. It's just the timing of the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I really have no objection to the Minister of Labour asking me a question but I sort of resent him coming in in the last minute and then basically jumping up, jumping . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, I think . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Okay, forget it . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: I listen with great interest to some of the statements and pronouncements that the Minister of Labour says, but I think that I'm entitled, Mr. Speaker, to complete my remarks and allow the Minister of Labour to say whatever he wants to say, but I resent, Mr. Speaker, his coming into the Chamber today without knowledge of what I said before and basically now answers another statement.

MR. PAULLEY: I heard what you said.

MR. SPIVAK: Well unless you were in the press gallery, I'm not sure that you did.

Mr. Speaker, the size of the public sector in our economy is growing and the contribution that it's making to our economy is increasing. We are faced with a shadow of recession and the balance is a difficult one. But we have to seriously try and reverse and control the development of inflation. Without that we will fail not just with inflation but we will fail in coping with the labour problems of today which I suggest forecast what we may very well face in the future as a matter of daily occurrence. If we are to sit back and see larger and larger share of the gross national income effectively consumed by essentially non-productive activities of government, and if we are to see wage settlements constantly outstripping the actual productivity of the economy, then we face consequences, Mr. Speaker, that will be disastrous. And it is those persons to whom this government and most governments, Mr. Speaker, are addressing themselves who will be hit the most.

Mr. Speaker, governments and all governments have got to learn that they simply cannot spend their way out of economic problems. Governments have to realize that any and all programs of spending in which they are involved have now got to be subjected to the most ruthless examination in terms of costs and benefits. --(Interjection)-- I'm sorry? Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Keynesian philosophy, or Keynesian theory should apply now, and if the First Minister believes that today the Keynesian philosophy or Keynesian attitude should apply today without any restraint then I think he better go back to school again. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, then what we are talking about is the degree and emphasis, and I'm suggesting to the First Minister, as I suggest to the other members opposite, that you really have not done your homework, that these estimates do not reflect the kind of restraint that must be shown.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this government like other governments who are concerned about being elected to office and concerned at this point more with the political posturing that's required, are not attempting to do what is required at this stage which is to control spending and to control the involvement of the public sector in our economy. The reality is that the public sector through all the range of programs, whether it be MHRC, whether it be Hydro, whether it be any of the other levers that are used, when they pay for services, when they bid on services, will pay higher than the private sector. That's an accepted view - and I don't think the First Minister will quarrel with that - and the problem is as the degree of public

BILL NO. 7 - INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) involvement becomes higher the constant pressure as a result of the increasing demand and increasing costs that are paid for by government will have the effect of causing an upward swing in those services the private sector are competing with and will continue the trend in the inflationary spiral. So the problem is, Mr. Speaker, at what point are you going to be able to --(Interjection)-- I know. At what point are you going to be able to balance the need to meet the recessionary trend that is in front of us - I'm not suggesting that that does not exist - to balance the need for employment opportunities, and at the same time recognize that unless the taxpayer is relieved and unless the inflationary trend stops, that what we are witnessing with the substantial demands of labour for increases will continue and will accelerate even to greater extent than we are witnessing now and will become, as I suggest, a daily occurrence?

So the question is: who is going to take that responsibility to lead and where is it going to come from? And can it come from a provincial government? Well I suggest it can, and I suggest that leadership can. It's not entirely a . . . I'm not in the Ontario forum here; I am here dealing in this Legislative Assembly, with the government --(Interjection)-- Yes. I have a responsibility, Mr. Speaker, I have a responsibility as Leader of the Opposition to tell the First Minister that he has a responsibility, that the Minister of Labour has a responsibility, and it's not to pass around, all around with his hands in his pocket, saying "There's nothing I can do." Because I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, all that indicates is a complete ignorance of the very serious and real conditions that exist, or for him to say "Wow!" when increases are demanded of him, and feel that that's a political answer which is sort of self-satisfying to him. You know, that answer is nonsensical, because that government has to face the reality of a choice, of a choice that has to be undertaken. And I'm suggesting at this point, Mr. Speaker, that those choices have not been made correctly, and I'm suggesting at this session, with the estimates that have been provided so far, that we do not have a full explanation of them and one can only deal with them on the basis of the information supplied, and one must recognize, as I suggested before, that the proper review of these estimates for the times that exist today, is not able to be done within the framework of the parliamentary system as we've operated in the past. I want to stress that over again. That isn't a blame that is to be attached to the First Minister, to his government. I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that in the times that we live and in the serious nature of the economic problems that we face, that the procedures and way in which we operate are not sufficient, and continue, Mr. Speaker, to provide us with less and less information about more and more government spending. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a concern that we have to address ourselves to.

But I don't see any leadership on the other side, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the restraint that has to be exercised. --(Interjection)-- No, Mr. Speaker, I again say that the governments are to blame, but I do not believe that the taxpayers, who have had to bear this increasing cost of government, are going to accept that restraint can't be exercised, because their concern is with inflation, their concern is with the excessive demands as they see it and perceive it, that people in society are now asking as a result of the inflation, and they are concerned with the degree of government spending and the degree of high taxation that eats and erodes so much of their income.

Governments are going to have to have the courage to make some hard decisions, and they're going to have to make some hard choices, and they're going to have to tell the public that certain kinds of spending by government cannot and will not continue. And, Mr. Speaker, if the government had had the courage, they would look at its MDC's spending and it would stand up and say, "We've made some mistakes, and for crying out loud, in the interests of the taxpayers of this province, we are not going to continue doling out hundreds of thousands of dollars every day and millions of dollars every month." And, Mr. Speaker, that has to be done, because governments must be hard-hearted now, because if they are not, in this respect - and some may classify them as being inhumane if they do the things that I am suggesting - but because if they do not do this in the long run, Mr. Speaker, it may be such that the actions that they've undertaken will have caused more hardship, greater hardship, and greater concern for the very people that they are trying to protect.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached a point in our society in this country and in this province that, unless that restraint is exercised and demonstrated, unless those undertakings that I've talked about come about, we will face a choice of an escalation in wage demands that will be

BILL NO. 7 - INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) so severe, that what the MGA has asked the Minister of Labour this time around will seem like a reasonable settlement to the demands that will be asked in the future. And, Mr. Speaker, when that happens, the inflation that we have will only be controllable by the severest kind of governmental action, which in its application will again hit those who are the least able to cope with it, the very people with whom this government has tried to identify itself and with whom this government has tried to provide programs of assistance. And all the political trickery that is involved in their rebate programs, both of cost of living, both of education tax rebates, will not in any way allow the people to cope with the situation.

Mr. Speaker, the City of Winnipeg is faced with a possibility of a 20 to 25 mill increase, and whether they're able to lower it by five mills or not it's probably the most substantial mill rate increase that the City has ever witnessed at this particular time in our economic history. Can anyone believe that we should be put into a position where they could have the highest increase ever asked, and that the taxpayers will have to pay the highest increased amount? Now the demands that will occur from that and the effects that will occur from that, of course, are obvious. This will mean increased demands for wages, for higher wages, it will mean increased costs for all the commercial goods and services that are offered in the City. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the government provided a cost of living program, which is supposed to be a sales tax reduction program, but in effect they provided it for the following year, and, Mr. Speaker, we will have already had an increase in the amount of sales tax paid by the people of Manitoba of the amount higher than the actual amount that will be dispersed to the people themselves. So there's no benefit, Mr. Speaker. In all of the trickery that's involved, the government has really not provided the benefits for the people.

And I come back to the very basic point, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the programs of government, there is no choice. We face a situation in which government spending and government taxation has to be reduced. We face a situation where they are, along with other factors but they still are, an important factor in the degree and the rate of inflation that we face. And, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker --(Interjection)-- Well, I want to say to the First Minister, and I want to repeat again, I am now saying to him - and it is no answer to me, it is only an excuse - and I'll repeat it over and over again to him, I don't care what other governments are doing. I say to him that unless someone shows the leadership and starts to think of the people instead of the political posturing of the government, unless they start to think of the people, the reality is that the people themselves will find themselves in a situation - well, what they are going to be facing is far more inhumane, far more difficult for them, than the actions that would have been taken by cutting programs, by reducing spending, and, Mr. Speaker, by attempting at least to control what is taking place. And again I say, Mr. Speaker, and without . . . I'm repeating again, but it has to be said, that the demand for increases that we have now seen by the labouring force is symptomatic of the condition we live under and will be corrected by a number of actions, but one of which will be the reduction of government spending, both in the estimates and in the capital undertakings that are provided by government.

Inflation is a world-wide phenomenon, Mr. Speaker, and it may very well be that there are limited ways in which a government can do certain things, but I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that selective tax cuts are one way in controlling of government spending, controlling of government waste, controlling of government inefficiency and productivity. And I say to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, you know, he can talk to all the businessmen he wants and tell them that they should show restraint. He can say to all the businessmen, "You know, you should watch what you're doing and you should become more productive," and the businessman will say to him, "Well, you'd better start doing it first, and you look at Saunders, and you look at Flyer, and you look at the whole host of government operations that have lost money, and don't tell us about any restraints and don't tell us about what we should do in the private sector." And I say that because, Mr. Speaker, there has been no example set by this government, and they really, Mr. Speaker, have no other choice, and if they do not make this choice, then I say to them that the consequences will be severe and the impact will be felt even harder among the very people, Mr. Speaker, whom they'd like to try to identify themselves as being the ones . . . support of all.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is a strange thing, because in effect what they are doing by not taking this action, is hurting the very people with whom they like to say that they are there for.

BILL NO. 7 - INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) And that, Mr. Speaker, is our real problem in the dilemma and the economy that they're involved in. And I still recognize the balance that still has to be undertaken between an attempt to keep a full employment program and an attempt to be able to place the government in a position to assist and help in the economic system that we live under, but I suggest, as well, Mr. Speaker, that there are . . . --(Interjection)-- oh yes, I know what that means. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, we'll wait until we see the budget as to what the deficit will be. But I say, Mr. Speaker, at this point, that what is required is a restraint on government spending, both in its current and capital accounts and selective tax cuts, not trickery and not a sleight of hand, but in real terms, in real terms, Mr. Speaker. That's what's required. And at this point - and it may be that we'll be proved to be wrong when more information is provided when the budget comes through, and when we know what the Capital Account looks like, when we know what the unused Capital Account is estimated to be for this year - when we see all of this, Mr. Speaker, we may be in a better position, and it may very well be that I'm going to be in a position to maybe even congratulate the First Minister on some action. But I must say, well it's not likely, Mr. Speaker, based on the course of action, and it's not likely, Mr. Speaker, when I look at some of the programs and recognize that they allowed these programs to go through.

There's one other thing and I will finish, Mr. Speaker. There's a tendency on the part of the government, as I think in most governments, to go after 50-cent or 40-cent dollars from the Federal Government. --(Interjection)-- No, I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, there is a tendency on the part of all governments, and on this government, to go over every Federal Government program that would be offered, to try and draw as much money and to try and put so much money - of provincial money - in to be able to continue that program, and that's part of the expansionary program we have. And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the time has come to start to resist some of those programs. --(Interjection)-- Yes. Well, I don't see an example of that here. Well, I must say that the time has come to resist them, because the temptation to do that only increases the additional inflationary trend within the province and the fact that the Federal Government has not been able to control its spending, or the fact that the Federal Government does not know what to do with the gains that it has in its income as a result of inflation, is no justification for the Provincial Government to continue to operate in the way it has.

Again, Mr. Speaker, there is no other choice but selective tax cuts and control of government spending, and that's the choice that the government faces. At the present time we have not seen an example, and Mr. Speaker, until that happens, any statements by the Minister of Labour or others about the degree of concern, about the increasing wage demands within this province, is nonsense because it really means nothing, Mr. Speaker, because he speaks with nothing when he says that; because anyone can say to him, "Look what you have done. Look what you are causing within our economy, so don't blame us." And, Mr. Speaker, that's the problem the government faces. There are hard choices. They have to make them.

. . . . continued on next page

BILL NO. 7-INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I regret first of all that I came into the Assembly after I listened to a statement of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and I asked the courtesy of a reply from him in respect of a statement that he had made, and in his normal irascible approach to legitimate questions, he ignored that. At that particular time, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition had indicated that he, at some time or other, had indicated the possibility of a ten percent constraint or restraint--(Interjection)-- You! You made the statement! Now look, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, I appreciate his peculiar situation at the present time, that he is fighting as hard as he can fight for the continuation of his being the Leader of the Official Opposition, and I would suggest to his colleagues and . . . Goodbye, my honourable friend. Because you haven't got the intestinal fortitude to sit back and listen to criticisms against you, either here in the Assembly or within the Conservative Party of Manitoba, it is so wise of the Member for River Heights to evade responsibility . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hope this is relevant to Bill 7. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, it has, Mr. Speaker, relevance to Bill No. 7, because we're dealing with the whole question of the forward thrust of this government. Oh, I can understand my friend from one of the hinterlands there talking about this being a bunch of crap - and he is the one that can really bring it up.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right - and who is so knowledgeable about the word that he used, and I will not, except to attribute to him as a bunch of crap. He used the statement, Mr. Speaker, not I. But I do want to say this. We are dealing with the matter of Bill No. 7 dealing with Interim Supply, and in consideration of the proposition dealing with the requirements of the necessity of the provision to the government of a certain amount of money in order to conduct the affairs of Manitoba, the Leader of the Opposition, in his incompetent manner, attempted to use this to bring to the attention of the Assembly his ideas of what should prevail. It is that that I want to make comment on.

When I came into the Assembly I thought that the Leader of the Opposition, who is now absent because he cannot stand criticisms - and this is obvious - and is wont to duck his responsibility . . . As a matter of fact, he even not too long ago dismissed one of his more competent advisers, I would suggest, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, because there was a conflict between the Member for River Heights and the Member for Lakeside, and I'm not getting into the ways and means of which the Conservative Party in Manitoba operate. I do suggest that they have exhibited, at least for the last 10 years, an absolute incompetency of being able to make a contribution to the well-being of the Province of Manitoba. And if we needed anything today, Mr. Speaker, to illustrate that, it was as a result of the contribution of the present but fast-diminishing leadership in the Conservative Party by the Member for River Heights. Because after all, Mr. Speaker, what is the Conservative Party in Manitoba really suggesting at the present time through their present and, in my opinion, incompetent leaders? What are they suggesting?

A MEMBER: Wow!

MR. PAULLEY: Wow is right. Wow is right I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that as the Minister of Labour of the present administration I have my problems. I recognize that they are real, true problems.

A MEMBER: Created by yourself.

MR. PAULLEY: Created by myself, Mr. Speaker? The Member for Lakeside says created by myself. If I've created them and if he is correct, then I accept that. But what did the Leader of the Opposition say today in his remarks? He says, "You know, the civil servants in the Province of Manitoba recognize that they have to catch up insofar as their wages are concerned, their working conditions, and we have made certain proposals to the government, to the administration, as to how we could resolve these problems, and they made the request." That is fair game, but what is the solution of the Conservative Party of Manitoba? It's not to recognize that there may be some legitimacy of approaches insofar as working conditions in the Civil Service. But the Leader of the Opposition says, you know,

BILL NO 7-INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) the solution to the problem, Mr. Speaker, is not to agree to any consideration of resolving deficiencies salary-wise and insofar as working conditions are concerned, but to reduce the input of taxation on the people of Manitoba so that it will not be possible for the Government of Manitoba to even consider the legitimacy of the request of the Civil Service.

Mr. Speaker, I have stuck my neck out as Minister of Labour, and I recognize that. I have said in this House --(Interjection)--

A MEMBER: Some neck, some chicken.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right. Some neck, some chicken. But I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that there are chickens, that there are times when some of us in the area of responsibility in this Assembly have to recognize the problems with which we are being confronted, and all that we're getting from the Conservative Party in this House is "the poor civil servants," the poor this, the poor that, need an increase in their income, and at the same time we have to reduce taxation so that we cannot provide at the provincial level the increases that are being requested. I haven't as yet, Mr. Speaker, heard anyone in the Opposition realistically to turn around and recognize the problems with which we are confronted today, and many of the problems that we are confronted with today are not the result of this particular government in Manitoba but as a result of the inefficiency of previous governments.

Now I know the Member for Fort Rouge will turn around to me with tears coming out of his eyes and say, "Well, dammit all, Mr. Minister, let's not hark back to the years when the Conservatives were in power here in the Province of Manitoba. And I suggest that that is their game." He can say it because he hasn't any responsibility either. He is not charged with the responsibility of assessing the people of Manitoba, the taxpayers of Manitoba, on a tax basis with the requirements to provide for the normal, orderly conduct of the Province of Manitoba.

So I say to my honourable friend the Member for Fort Rouge, fault me if you will He said nothing? Well, maybe the Honourable Member for Morris is correct, that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge has said nothing because he hasn't any responsibility. His party is not any longer recognized as a party in the Province of Manitoba, a prediction that I made a few years ago when I was over there a couple of seats away from where the Member for Fort Rouge now sits, and I said that the Liberal Party in Manitoba were doomed to oblivion. I might not be able to prophesy in many cases, but I did prophesy that, and the Member for Fort Rouge, I think, if he would turn around and look at the past, would recognize that I knew of what I spoke at that time, I know of what I speak this afternoon.

The whole point, Mr. Speaker, is that the Conservative Party --(Interjection)-- they are a fine group --(Interjection)-- Yes, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I would agree with the Honourable Member for Lakeside that they're a fine group of individuals who are irresponsible and are not prepared to accept any responsibility for the conduct of the Province of Manitoba today. I agree with my honourable friend, even though he did get dismissed as the Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party. Yes, my honourable friend says, keep it clean. Well, I don't know whether by that my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside, says that his Leader did not keep it clean. I leave that to the judgment of the Member for Lakeside.

But what are we being confronted with today by the, in my opinion, irresponsible Leader of the Official Opposition? He stood up in the House, he stood up in the House and he condemned me, as the Minister of Labour, because I did introduce two or three years ago a labour code which would give equality to the labour people in Manitoba a proposition where they would be construed and considered as being equal to management. I'm condemned for that - something that I had fought for all of my political career. And the Leader of the Opposition says that one of the problems which we are confronted with today is not the problems in inflation, which go beyond the boundaries of the Province of Manitoba into the federal and international field, the Leader of the Opposition said that one of the problems which we're confronted with here in Manitoba is because of the fact that the Minister of Labour brought in proposals into this legislation that would give equal opportunity to the producers in the Province of Manitoba. He condemns that. We had evidence just recently,

BILL NO. 7 INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) Mr. Speaker, as a result of the Conservative Annual Convention, that the Conservative Party here in the Province of Manitoba are so damned reactionary that they would curtail any right of the labour movement or the labour community of having a free and equal voice in the operation of industry in the Province of Manitoba.

A MEMBER: Prove it.

MR. PAULLEY: Prove it? You proved it, Mr. Member for Swan River, by the resolutions that were adopted by the Conservative Party at their last convention. When I, as Minister of Labour, introduced suggestions of change in our legislation in 1972, there was "wailing at the wall" by the Conservative Party. But members of the Conservative Party at that particular time, individually stood up and said that it was time for a change, that we should recognize that the working community in the Province of Manitoba should have an input in the economy. And now, because as a result of inflation which we in Manitoba cannot control except with a limited input, the Leader of the Opposition is bewailing the fact that our problems are accompanied because of the labour legislation that was introduced in this House. And I can imagine my honourable friend from Swan River, he is wont to go back to the Little Red School House.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Damn right.

MR. PAULLEY: Damn right, he says, Mr. Speaker, and he'd also like to go back to the days prior to the Tolpuddle martyrs when the master decided exactly the working conditions that those in his employ or her employ would operate. Well I want to say to my friend from Swan River, I am not going to lead the people of Manitoba, and particularly the labouring segment, back to the days that the Member for Swan River would like us to go. And I suggest, I suggest that what we heard today from the Leader of the Opposition, now absent, is an indication that he and the Conservative Party would like to go back to those days so that labour suffered under the thumb of management. Well, dammit all, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to agree with that. All of my life I have fought, all of my life I have fought --(Interjection)-- Yes, and I would say to the Member for Sturgeon Creek that he is of the same ilk as the Member for Fort Rouge, the Member for Swan River - there's no damn difference. Because if my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, from Sturgeon Creek can screw an extra buck out of a worker for his own advantage, he will do it, and I make no apologies for that statement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: On a point of privilege Mr. Speaker, I request the Minister retract that statement that I would go to any end to screw an extra buck out of a worker. Mr. Speaker, I demand a retraction from the Minister.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm entitled to my own opinion and that is my opinion.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, that was an accusation against a member of this House. It was not an opinion, it was an accusation and I demand a retraction.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That point is well taken. I think the Honourable Minister can rephrase his statement another way.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, I will rephrase it. If the cap, Mr. Speaker . . . I will rephrase it. If the cap doesn't fit the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, then I withdraw. If the cap does fit, I hope it bears on his conscience.

MR. AXWORTHY: . . . included in that particular Rogues Gallery that the Minister mentioned, and I also demand a retraction. I think either that or he change the target.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, as far as the Member for Fort Rouge is concerned on a point of order, he had none. If he wants to be associated with my remarks respecting the Member for Sturgeon Creek, let him also wear the cap. I have suggested, Mr. Speaker, that if the cap doesn't fit the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, then I'm prepared to withdraw. If it does fit any other member, including the Member for Fort Rouge who rose, well then I leave it to him. It's not my statement, Mr. Speaker, in respect of the Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

. . . MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe the Minister of Labor

BILL NO. 7 - INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of privilege.

MR. PATRICK: Point of privilege. The Minister of Labour did indicate and called the Member for Fort Rouge. Perhaps he meant some other member from some other constituency, but in his remarks he was attacking, and he said, the Member for Fort Rouge. Perhaps he can make that correction.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll make that correction. If I alluded to the Liberal Party or the Member from Fort Rouge, or any other member, then let them decide as to whether the cap fits their head or not.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of privilege. The conditional manner with which the Minister of Labour has offered a retraction makes it incumbent, in my judgment, upon any individual member now to rise to indicate that the cap does not fit, and I so want to indicate that the cap does not fit as far as the Honourable Member for Lakeside is concerned.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, are we now to assume that those of us who do not rise has that . . . ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Are we now to assume that those of us who do not feel that we should even respond to the wild accusations of the Minister of Labour are going to be accused of what he has accused the Member for Sturgeon Creek and other members in this House for?

I think he should make an unconditional withdrawal, because it is a very silly and a very stupid and a very unparliamentary statement.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if anyone's going to deal with privilege, the statement of the Honourable Member for Morris when he said that my statement was stupid, allows me to rise on a point of privilege, but after all, I don't pay a damn bit of attention to any of the involvement of the Member for Morris, who is one of the most inept members of this House, and though he stands up here, Mr. Speaker, from time to time, and presumes that he is the Diefenbaker of this House, he doesn't sell it to me. So, Mr. Speaker, in order that it may be clear insofar as my recognition of the matter that I referred to, withdrawal, I don't want, I don't want really any honourable member of this Assembly to wear a hat that may be befitting them, but maybe I should say their respective political parties rather than they as individuals. If that's acceptable, then may I go on to indicate that the now present Leader of the Opposition, who in my opinion is fighting to retain that leadership, and now he's going again--(Interjection)-- Of course, it's his privilege to go and to come, but in all of the years that I've been associated in this Assembly, most members do give to those who may be criticizing them at least the courtesy of staying while the criticisms are being directed. I realize . . .

A MEMBER: I'll buy that.

MR. PAULLEY: You'll buy that, yes. Of course. But your leader won't, Your leader won't buy that. And I accept, I accept the buying or the selling by the Member for Swan River that this is no . . . No, no horse trading. It all depends on what end of the horse that you're talking about, and I know full well that quite frequently you talk to the wrong end of the horse. But apart from that, apart from that, Mr. Speaker, I do want to say --(Interjections)-- Oh, you keep quiet. Your contributions to any of the debates in this House aren't even worth listening to.

I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, it's so historical of the likes of the Leader of the Opposition with his diminishing numbers of adherents and supporters in this House - and they are going to diminish even further, Mr. Speaker - to not accept any responsibility at all. The Leader of the Opposition this afternoon condemned this government because of its budget, because of the request for Interim Supply in order to carry on the normal process of the government and the normal procedures required to supply the moneys for the conduct of government. He complained because of the fact that we have the responsibility for considering the demands of labour in the Province of Manitoba. I recognize that this is a trying period of time. --(Interjection)-- My honourable friend from Morris says which we created. Did we create the problems of inflation all across the universe? Did we create the problems, Mr. Speaker, because we gave to the employees of the Civil Service in Manitoba the right of being heard, and is the corollary to that, that having given them the opportunity, that we should

BILL NO. 7-INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) have carried on in the historic manner of the Conservative Party, that they should not be heard? Is this what the Honourable Member for Morris is saying, that we created the right of individuals to be heard? Is the Member for Morris saying that we should not have given the people in Manitoba a right to be heard? Should we go to the dictatorial methodology of countries in other parts of the globe, that people should not be heard? Is this what the Member for Morris is suggesting at the present time?

If that is what he is suggesting - and I sometimes think, Mr. Speaker, that he really believes in that, by his speeches in the House - then I want to say to the Member from Morris: if this is what he means, then it's alien to the democratic process of government and I will not accept it. If he wants to accept it, again I use that phrase, "Let him wear the hat." I'm not kidding at all, and I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Morris is kidding either, because after listening to his tirade from time to time in this House, I believe that the Member for Morris would be glad if the population, if the labouring forces in Manitoba, didn't have the right to be heard, but individuals like himself would be able to impose upon them conditions of labour and conditions of association in our community. That is what, Mr. Speaker, he said. --(Interjection)-- He didn't? Then you read Hansard tomorrow, or when it comes out, because that is what the Member for Morris said --(Interjection)-- Oh, you weren't here. Well, you're not here half the time.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do want to say that after listening to the Leader of the Opposition, it's very very evident to me that there is a total lack of responsibility on the part of the Leader of the Opposition, the Conservative Party in Manitoba. They want the best of two worlds. They want to be able to stand up in this House and criticize the government because we are endeavouring to legislate and conduct the affairs of Manitoba on a reasonable basis. But they want the best of two worlds. They want to be able to criticize us for what we are doing, and they do not suggest any constructive - and I emphasize constructive - they are not in a position, because of their lack of an intellectual approach, to offer any constructive alternatives. They want the best of two worlds. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, as one who had the opportunity of being in this House, you can't have it both ways. If and when the Leader of the Conservative Party, and his followers can stand and will stand up in this House and say, "We don't like what you're doing, but here we're suggesting alternative propositions," then I'll listen to them. But until that time happens, I think they're nothing more than a bunch of rabble who do not accept their responsibilities in a new democracy. Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, it's easy to criticize, it's easy to condemn, but boy oh boy, shouldn't the people in Manitoba expect more responsibility from the Conservative Party than they're getting at the present time, and I'm sure that many thousands of electors in the Province of Manitoba would join with me in saying to the Leader of the Liberal Party and to the Conservative Party, "For God's sake, be a little responsible and respectful."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We will now proceed to the Private Members Hour. The Honourable Minister will be able to continue after the supper hour. Private Members Hour.

PRIVATE MEMBERS HOUR - RESOLUTION NO. 5

MR. SPEAKER: The first item. The Honourable Member for Swan River, Resolution No. 5.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin: WHEREAS the incidence of lawlessness and an apparent decline in the respect for law and order throughout Manitoba are matters of growing concern to many citizens; and WHEREAS lawenforcement is becoming more difficult, particularly in Northern Manitoba because of the large area to be supervised by a limited number of uniformed personnel; and

WHEREAS many individuals, after being apprehended and after entering a plea are released on bail because of delays occasioned by heavy court dockets and the limited number of judges, clerks and reporters available; and

WHEREAS many such individuals, who are repeaters, are thus afforded an opportunity while out on bail to continue their lawless acts towards society;

THE REFERENCE BE IT RESOLVED that the government consider the advisability of

RESOLUTION 5

(MR. BILTON cont'd) . . . requesting the Law Reform Commission to examine the entire provincial structure of law enforcement with a view to strengthening our crime prevention machinery and the ability of our courts to deal expeditiously with cases brought before them, and to examine also the costs associated with our total law enforcement program.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I believe the contents of this resolution speaks volume and speaks for itself. I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that all members will agree that crime is reaching a stage that it has become a public disgrace to our society. True, Mr. Speaker, it's nationwide, and somewhere soon the curbing of this menace has to be found. The tragedy of it all, Mr. Speaker, is that our police forces, federally, provincially and municipally, are carrying a burden that is not too well understood. Society, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, are bending over backward on the side of those that rebel against our laws. All too often, Mr. Speaker, peace officers are accused of brutality, and many other instances that those they have arrested can bring before the courts. I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that they should be excused for brutality - not by any means. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe these do-gooders don't realize that the man that commits a crime, many of them habitual criminals - I'm not talking of the odd individual that breaks the bounds of law, but rather those that are brought in time after time and who have nothing to lose, Mr. Speaker, in their mind, and as a consequence just take peace officers to the extreme of their patience in handling them.

I don't have to relate some of the things that you have read and I have read over recent years, but somehow or other this story as to what the police officers have to do in the handling of criminal offenders must be brought home to the people so they will endeavour to understand what these men in uniform have to put up with.

Mr. Speaker, let there be no misunderstanding so far as I am concerned. I am for capital punishment as a deterrent toward capital crime that is plaguing this country today. I'm going to go so further as to say that the strap should be reinstated too, Mr. Speaker, not with the thought of giving abuse to those that commit wrongdoing, but rather as a deterrent, that they can see it before their eyes and in some way or other bring crime to a halt. No matter how small, it's important to our society.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have to tell you that our newspapers carry stories almost daily as to the sorry state that, not only in this province but across the nation, we have arrived at in this regard. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, crime is reaching down to our young people, down to our young people as never before, and society must be alerted in this particular regard. This problem Mr. Speaker, has troubled me as I'm sure it's troubled many more in recent years. Who would have imagined, Mr. Speaker, that in this day and age people are afraid to walk our streets at night? I do not have to recite to you many of the hideous acts that are happening almost daily, just for the sake of committing crime or for some paltry thing that a person may have in their possession.

Mr. Speaker, somehow or other, in thinking of this resolution, I am appealing through you and through this House for consideration in this regard, to point out once and for all that crime does not pay. I was very interested the other night and listened very intently to what the Member for Fort Rouge recited in detail in regard to this problem. I think what he said should be repeated over and over and over again. Something has got to be done, Mr. Speaker. Time is running out.

I must say at the same time that society in its own way is doing its part to provide in the protection of the people. I give you one illustration, the one I'm familiar with, that is in Swan River - 4,000 people, Mr. Speaker, and it costs us \$67,000 a year for police protection, or police surveillance if you like. The municipality Swan River has 12 and they have 16 men in that area. Flin Flon, Mr. Speaker, costs them \$175,000, 16 men. Thompson, a great deal more than that, Mr. Speaker, and 27 men there. The Pas, \$175,000 for the oncoming year. And in the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, the cost of police in this city in 1972 was \$11 million; today it's \$15 million. So it cannot be said that the people themselves are not providing the wherewithal in order to hold down crime.

To these figures, Mr. Speaker, can be added that the province paid the Royal Canadian Mounted Police some \$6-1/2 million last year, and it's going up to \$8 million this year. And

RESOLUTION 5

(MR. BILTON cont'd) . . . the meaning of this resolution fundamentally, Mr. Speaker, is that is this money being channelled into the areas where it is serving the best purposes in the prevention of crime? You've heard it said on occasion here that we have these \$18,000 Royal Canadian Mounted Policemen throughout the province, and many of them, Mr. Speaker, are nothing but highway jockeys, looking for speedsters, tying up expensive equipment when it could be very well used for the purpose for which it is intended. Not that I'm suggesting that these roadrunners shouldn't be prosecuted to the nth degree in the interest of cutting down the massacre on our highways. This should be done by all means. But somehow or other, it is with the idea of exposing these sort of things that I have suggested this resolution that we're discussing.

Added to these costs that I've endeavoured to outline, as brief as they are, Mr. Speaker, is the money that's provided by the people in free legal aid, aid to victims of crime, the maintenance of institutional housing for those that break the law. And we have been told on occasion, Mr. Speaker, that for every individual that are in these institutions the people of the province, or the people of Canada if you like, have to pay that abominable sum of \$10,000 a year. So altogether I'm suggesting to you that the people are doing their part.

I'm also endeavouring, Mr. Speaker, to ask for the examining of the entire provincial structure of law enforcement. If this is done, sir, I feel confident it will bring home to the public generally some of the enormous effort that is being put forward in the interests of life, limb and property of each and every individual in the province of Manitoba - anything, Mr. Speaker, anything that can be done, in my humble opinion, to bring it home to the people that something has got to be done. Mr. Speaker, we have to get the message into every home and into every school and into every church that a policeman is the guardian of the peace. He's not the fuzz, he's a man to be respected.

He must be better understood, Mr. Speaker, and he must be assisted at all levels in his task. Less than this, Mr. Speaker, is anarchy, and it's only around the corner. How I would like to see the man on the street again in uniform. Rarely do we see a policeman on the streets of Winnipeg. In days gone by, he was someone to speak to, even to say good morning to, and the very fact that he was in the vicinity, smartly clad and proud of his uniform, and an accomplished man, no one can ever tell the preventative of crime that his very appearance made on occasion. Now they're riding around in automobiles. Maybe they've got to get from point A to point B in a hurry, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if there was a little more humanness between the man on the beat and Mr. John Q. Public, it would go a long way to bringing . . . into the thoughts of adults and children and avoid many of the little things that grow into big things as the years go by.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the recent announcement by the province that it was going to sit down with the federal authority in the interests of training people of native ancestry on reserves and in the North. The Minister was good enough a day or two ago to mention that the personnel in the RCMP were going to be increased in the North. This is a good thought. Mr. Speaker, the history of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police speaks for itself in Western Canada. I feel honoured and privileged to have been part of that force, but those that went before me, Mr. Speaker, they depended on the native people of this country and they worked with them, worked with them faithfully. And I do not, for one, believe that the RCMP has lost the respect of the native population of this country. Mr. Speaker, this cannot be.

I remember a few short years ago when 50-odd members of the Mounted Police, 550 dogs policed the entire Northwest Territories, Mr. Speaker, and we were backed up by Indians and Eskimos respectively, special constables. And, Mr. Speaker, we couldn't have managed, we couldn't have lived without them, without their assistance as interpreters and without their assistance to fight the elements and maintain the peace in that great vast land. I mention only one name, Charlie Stewart, with the Mounted Police in Aklavik for some 45 years - a good, true and faithful servant, Mr. Speaker. What do we find today? A limited effort is being made by the province, it's true. We have one chief reported to have said at Rivers of the police effort being made by the province, that the native policemen would be nothing more than pimps for the RCMP. Mr. Speaker, I deny that. And on the other hand, we have Chief Stewart reported to have commented that these men would not generally measure up.

Mr. Speaker, in the last war, citizens by the hundreds of thousands volunteered. Were

RESOLUTION 5

(MR. BILTON cont'd) . . . they soldiers when they joined? No, sir. And I stand witness here today that many of those people, the Indian-Metis people, volunteered and served valiantly during that War and they'll serve their own people under these circumstances. Their people need them in the worst way. I say plague on the houses of those people that will talk the way they're talking these days. Let's get on with the job and work with these people. I'm told, sir, that there's some 450 students in the four universities of Indian and Metis parentage in the universities of Manitoba. Surely to God, amongst those people we can find the kind of material that the Indian people are crying out for on their reserves. They need this police protection. They'll understand that police protection. But we've got to understand them. We've got the Depot Division in Regina that's just got everything. The Saskatchewan Government are doing it, and I say to the Attorney-General, get on with the job, sir. Don't wait any longer. Let's do away with this bigotry. And I feel surely that nothing but success can come of it. You've got the Indians on the one hand saying no, and you've got the white people on the other hand saying no. Go right in between, pick them and go to work, and put them where they belong, and nothing but good can come of it.

Time is short, Mr. Speaker. I'm told by the Indian Brotherhood that they're willing and ready to help and they'll do all they can, Mr. Speaker, to assist the department to get this effort under way. I appreciate the efforts of the committee, Mr. Speaker, who recently submitted a report on the Northern Correction Report and its findings. There are some excellent suggestions and I trust the government will act on most of those suggestions. Mr. Speaker, the thrust of my resolution is simply arrived at with the view of airing the serious problem that is growing with the thought to bringing home to young and old alike, at all levels, that they must of necessity assist in helping our overworked policemen who put it on the line, put in on the line every day they don a uniform.

And with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the House to support me with this resolution to get on with the job. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a few words in response to the words uttered by the Honourable Member for Swan River.

First, I would like to deal under the general heading of Indian and Metis and the police. I think one of the most valuable experiences that I've had within the last year was the opportunity to attend a conference which was organized mainly through the efforts of the Solicitor General for Canada in respect to natives and the criminal legal system, which was held in Edmonton the early part of February. I think surely from that conference that one could not help but realize that there are some very basic problems that confront us in respect to ensuring that there is a development of a better liaison and understanding between the police and the native population, and particularly in respect to policing in our northern communities. One could not help but sense that the present system of policing in remote and in northern communities was alien to much of the native population. There was a great deal of concern and criticism expressed in regard to the present structure as it existed insofar as policing is concerned, in particularly our northern communities and also in fact our southern native communities. And a number of very sensible suggestions, I think, resulted from that conference. One is the realization that we must attempt to integrate into the RCMP those of native background. I had the opportunity last August 1974 to tour the RCMP Training School in Regina, and to my extreme disappointment I had to report that I did not observe a single native trainee at the RCMP School in Regina, so that we certainly have a long way to go in this entire situation of trying to bring into the policing in Western Canada, native people.

Now the province is presently, as the Honourable Member for Swan River made reference to, presently in the forefront of negotiating with the Federal Government an agreement which is commonly known as a 3B Agreement. 3B Agreement foresees and envisions the entry into the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, as an integral part of the RCMP, those of native background. In order to do this, there has to be some pretty basic changes undertaken in regard to present training program and recruitment program by the RCMP. One, of course, it is very important that the existing qualifications be examined in order to ensure that the existence of those very qualifications as they presently stand do not prevent the entry into the force of native people. And, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately they do. The standard of education that is required for a trainee in the RCMP is Grade 12 education. Height and weight requirements are also of such

RESOLUTION 5

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . a nature that they prevent native people from entering into the RCMP. So that under the proposals in respect to 3B Program that are presently being developed in order to ensure that there is the entry of native trainees into our police forces, the existing qualifications have to be altered in order to ensure that we do have a larger number of native people in our forces. For, if the present qualifications continue to exist as they are, without alteration, there certainly is no doubt that we will be very unsuccessful in attempting to obtain what we are seeking. And the honourable member says in fact that since the RCMP brought women into the force, then I'm sure that they can modify their - as I take from his words - the qualifications in order to ensure that more of our disadvantaged people have the opportunity to enter into policing.

Certainly the complaint that one hears from native people is that too often those that are policing in native communities, in northern areas, come from the south. They come from a background which has had very little understanding of native culture or language, and immediately you do have a gap which exists right from the very beginning. And unfortunately in too many instances in our northern communities the RCMP have not become involved in community liaison work, as the Honourable Member for Swan River mentions. One proceeds to some communities in northern areas where you are told that there is excellent involvement, where the young RCMP officer is involved in coaching the young boys in the community, for instance, in hockey and other sports, where he is deeply involved in community work, and one can see reflected in his work a proportionate percentage of decrease in juvenile delinquency in that community because of the example that officer is rendering to the community. In another community where you don't have this type of involvement, then unfortunately you have much greater difficulty insofar as crime and juvenile delinquency, and all the other problems occur. And I feel assured that if we can, in fact, bring native people into the courses under a program which will deal with recruitment, which will deal with training which will attempt to bring into the programming, insofar as students at the RCMP College is concerned, some better involvement insofar as understanding native culture, native language, and more emphasis in respect on understanding the native himself, that we'll be able to proceed a long way in order to meet the problems which presently occur insofar as developing a better relationship in that important area of our policing.

I would like to also just comment again in general in regard to crime. I think that, Mr. Speaker, there are no easy solutions to crime. I happen to believe that the rate of crime, the rate of incidence of violence, the rate of incidence of theft, relate, to a very large extent, to the economics of the situation at any particular time. I think, Mr. Speaker, one will note if you examine the incidence of crime from one part of Canada to the other, from one province to another, it will depend a great deal on, first, the pace of urbanization. Certainly with urban development in so many instances unplanned and uncontrolled, you have a distinct relationship to the increase in crime and juvenile delinquency. And of course, secondly, where you have high levels of unemployment. For instance, in our large urban centres, Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver, certainly we observe an increase in crime in direct relationship to the increase in unemployment. No question that if one finds himself frustrated and uncertain as to one's future, there is a greater tendency for that person to become involved in criminal activity of some sort or other.

So I say this, Mr. Speaker, only to emphasize that I think that if we are in fact to have a real marked impact upon the incidence of crime, then our objectives and goals must surely be, not to deal in isolation insofar as crime is concerned, but to deal with many of the basic economic and social problems confronting society. That, I say, in general.

Secondly, I think, Mr. Speaker, if I could again refer to some other influences, I think that certainly the example that we have witnessed, our western world this last couple of years, has not been conducive to a lessening of respect for justice and for one's word. One has to read, for instance, only a recent book that was published called "One Heartbeat Away" which dealt with the proceedings which led up to the resignation of the Vice-President of the United States, Spiro Agnew, and the source of --(Interjection)-- Yes, it's been mentioned here he was a law and order man and so was Richard Nixon; and there again, one can only sense the immense disillusionment that slips in when people speak bravely of law and order and then in fact sell out the very principles that they have spoken so proudly about within the community.

But in the reference to One Heartbeat Away, one of those that was involved in receiving

RESOLUTION 5

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . and paying kickbacks to the Vice-President of the United States and had been doing this for a number of years - well, before the Vice-President in fact was Vice-President but when he was Governor and Councillor in Baltimore County - was to the effect that how it sickened him to be in the office of the Vice-President of the United States, to observe that seal behind the Vice-President, on the wall behind the Vice-President, and to be handing to him bills contained in a blank envelope. And for the first time that individual was shaken, his nerve began to slip, when he began to realize how far in fact the hypocrisy and the loosening of integrity and honesty had in fact slipped within our community, when here he was in the offices of the strongest and the mightiest in the land, paying kickbacks.

So that I do think that, again, it's a very very large problem we're dealing with, and I want to say to honourable members that there is no simplistic answer. To suggest, for instance, that capital punishment is going to have a very direct influence upon the lessening of the commitment of murders, I think really is like whistling in the dark in a cemetery. One hundred and fifty years ago there were some 250 crimes that were punishable by death in England, and it's my understanding that every Wednesday morning the local inhabitants of villages and towns in England would turn out to watch the hangings. And this was the main point of entertainment 150 years ago, was to observe these hangings. But I'm told that there were probably more arrests that took place on those Wednesday mornings as hundreds watched the hangings, to result in further hangings later on from those that were pickpocketing the pockets of those that were witnessing the actual hangings; and pickpocketing was an offence which was punishable by capital punishment. So, Mr. Speaker, I say this to warn that there are no simplistic answers, but I do think that it's a long process of instilling within the minds and souls of our citizenry, an understanding and a respect for the property and the lives of others. And I say, Mr. Speaker, it involves society from the economic and social perspective.

Furthermore, I would like to just comment specifically on this resolution. I want to commend the Member for Swan River for having brought this subject matter to our consideration, and I would like the honourable member to consider a few specific points I would like to raise now in respect to the Resolution itself.

I have concerns, Mr. Speaker, about referring this matter to the Law Reform Commission. The Law Reform Commission was established by statute to reform the law, and I question whether or not we can properly say that the matters that are specifically referred to in the Resolution are of the type of subject matter that we can properly say should be referred to the Law Reform Commission which is involved in the question of reform of law. I leave that for the honourable member to consider.

As the honourable member knows, we do have in existence the Manitoba Police Commission, and the Manitoba Police Commission by its Act states among its various statutory duties is: To promote the prevention of crime, the efficiency of police services and police-community relations, and particularly to consult with bodies of police commissioners and Chiefs of Police and private agencies, and recommends respecting machinery and operation of police forces and techniques for handling such problems. To provide for meetings in various parts of the province where police forces are maintained, and to assist and co-ordinate the work and effort of police forces. To determine whether police forces are adequate, and examine and report to the Attorney-General whether police duties are satisfactorily being discharged for the maintenance of law and order.

I raise that so we can consider between now and the next time whether or not we could use a different instrumentality; and I would appreciate hearing the honourable member's comments when he's had an opportunity to consider that further.

I would also just like to say that the courts that are included in the Resolution and the problems insofar as having cases heard, are problems that we certainly have been trying to deal with during the past year, and unfortunately there has been very little administrative emphasis given insofar as our courts are concerned over the years. And let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the last person in the world, generally - generally - to entrust with administrative responsibilities, is a lawyer, and it doesn't matter whether that person's a judge or an Attorney-General or a lawyer out in the field, lawyers generally are not what you would call able administrators, because if they were administratively-minded they would have gone into business or management or some other field such as that. So in general - there are exceptions to this - lawyers are not good administrators. So I think this has been one of the problems, is

RESOLUTION 5

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . that in the administration of our courts maybe too much has been left to lawyers. And I know that this is not shared necessarily, Mr. Speaker, by all my brothers in law; that many would take sharp issue with what I'm saying here, but I think that is the general tendency.

So, in the past year, we have established the position of Administrator of Court Services, and the Administrator of Court Services is not a lawyer, but is one that is trained to deal with matters in an administrative and in a business management way, and he has been appointed since we met here last in session, to undertake as his primary responsibility on an ongoing basis to ensure that courts are equipped to deal as expeditiously as possible and within reasonable financial terms, the increasing caseloads in our courts. And I am told that there has been some improvement since this move has been taken, and the honourable members can assess that from their own sources of information as to whether or not in the past six to nine months since this move has been undertaken, whether there's been some improvement.

I understand too, that it's important from a court-management point of view that Metropolitan Winnipeg have a Central Provincial Judges Court recognized and discussed by politicians of all shades of view over the past ten years. I might also state that the Chief Provincial Judge and the Administrator of Court Services have been meeting with representatives of the Bar and other groups within the past year, in order to try to ascertain whether we can develop more efficient and maximum use of our courts.

I mentioned the involvement we've had with 3B. I've mentioned, too, that there is a committee of officials in the department presently negotiating with the RCMP with provincial counterparts across the province, the renewal of the RCMP contract that comes up in 1976. So that certainly I appreciate any remarks that pertain to any suggestions for improvement or change in that regard.

I leave these remarks with you, Mr. Speaker, to simply indicate that I welcome the Resolution and I think the sentiment is a correct one. It's a serious problem. I think there's no simple answers and neither has the Member for Swan River, I think, suggested there is. I do question the specific technique that had references made to the Law Reform Commission. I'm inclined to feel, insofar as policing is concerned, that we'd be better to charge the responsibility for most of the items referred to, to the Manitoba Police Commission. But I'll leave it at that at this point without amendments, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to say a few words on this Resolution: 1. Because I think it's one of those areas which it strikes me is providing a common meeting ground for people of different political faiths and different political ideologies to find that they share a common concern, and in fact are even beginning to arrive at common answers. There was a time a few years ago, I suppose, when the issue of law and order and police protection were one that would divide a Liberal from a Conservative or a Socialist, each providing a different range, and we used to look upon these as issues of partisanship. I think it's a healthy sign at the present moment that the consideration of the issue has now gone beyond those kinds of really false divisions and are now ranging into a pretty serious examination of many of the problems, and I think it's important to recognize it in this House. Bit by bit and piece by piece we're beginning to put together some fabric of an understanding, as we go through the Minister's Estimates and try to come at the problem from different ways. I think different members of this House are trying to move towards some set of recommendations or set of guidelines or set of proposals that would adjust itself to a problem that has a pretty wide and current interest. It strikes me again, and somewhat pause for thought, that I suppose the most basic responsibility of any government is the provision of order in society, and during the last 20 or 30 years that we've been running pellmell to supply all kinds of other needs and respond to all kinds of other conditions, that we have tended to neglect this particular area and have assumed that we've solved all the problems when you develop a police force and a court system and everything was done, without recognizing that as the conditions in our community changed, that it perhaps required a different range in order of responses than the ones we're providing. And I simply want to compliment the present Attorney-General for providing members of this House, I think, with a consistent understanding and open ear to the concerns that they have expressed. And I think it's to his credit that he has always been willing, not only to listen but to respond, I think, in a fairly humane and progressive way.

RESOLUTION 5

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd)

But I think there was an import in the Member from Swan River's Resolution that requires something more than a sympathetic ear and a sympathetic response. I think it requires action. I think that we have now reached the stage where perhaps there's been enough talking and not enough doing in terms of addressing ourselves to some of the specific areas of concern; and I think that one of the things we should be looking at is really, to my mind, very much the operative word in the Resolution that was presented, and that is the question of crime prevention. How do you prevent crime? And I don't think that, as the Minister well said, anyone has an easy or simple answer to that, but I think it certainly is one that requires some very immediate and direct intervention and activity by the Attorney-General and his staff, as the chief law agency in this province, to do more now than simply refer things for further study or to send things back for new appraisals or to ask for different kinds of investigation. I think the time has come for really a second stage of government action, and that is to begin developing the kind of program response and the actual policy response to take some of the directions and provide some innovations in the area of crime prevention.

I can recall, Mr. Speaker, that members of this group last year, and I think even more specifically this year, have recommended to the government that there are things that they should be doing in concert and companion with the Winnipeg City Police, to take a response to the problem of crime prevention on city streets. But one of the basic idioms that I think makes some sense is that a policeman is one of the few representatives of government which most citizens need, or should need, on a face to face basis. And yet the tendency in police organization and management has to, it seems, remove police further and further away from citizens. And I was struck very much by the presentation I heard, oh about a month and a half ago, when the officials from the City Police Department came to the Fort Rouge Community Committee meeting to describe the reorganization of the unified police force under the City of Winnipeg Act. And the one thing that struck me immediately, that they were talking about what kind of police force was available for the some 80,000 people that resided in, I think what they call Section 4 or 5, I'm not sure of the exact number, which includes Fort Rouge, River Heights, Fort Garry, and Charleswood.

Mr. Speaker, we have available to use one cruiser car, two men sitting behind a police car sort of travelling on those streets, and it simply points out to me probably unlike my childhood, when I remember growing up in the north end of the city, when we knew who the policemen were. We had an association, sometimes not the kind of association we would like, but we at least knew who they were. And one of the results of that is that the policeman became very much a neighborhood and community person, someone who you could rely upon and someone who was very much part of your community, and as a result, probably was far more effective in the prevention of crime simply by his mere presence in that area and because he knew what kids were going to get into trouble and what kids weren't going to get into trouble, that he was available for consultation. If you got into trouble, it wasn't some impersonal policeman in a cruiser car who'd come and give you a report at your front door. He'd go and talk to your old man and tell you that your son wasn't doing what he should be doing, you should keep an eye out for him. He became identified and associated with that neighbourhood.

Now, one of the things that we have certainly lost in our neighbourhoods of the city, is the policeman as a neighbourhood person, and therefore have lost them really, I think, as a form of crime prevention; that we are now assuming our police force to crime enforcement. They apprehend; they respond after the crime occurs, but in terms of providing that kind of basic informal presence that in itself is oftentimes as much a deterrent to the development of a crime as is the fact of any kind of measure I can think of at the present moment.

And so the point that we brought to the attention of the Minister last year and brought again this year, is that it does require, we think, some special programs on the part of the province to move into this area of developing a more responsive kind of police system, and that's of course, we're talking about dollars. We're talking about - and it goes back to really the question, which again we've tried to bring to the attention, and that is the shortage of funds at the level of the city to provide for the services that are expected of them. And we had the Chief of Police of this city saying that he was trying to get enough money to provide for 80-some-odd new police officers, and even if he got those he was still not going to be able to provide for the street patrol and the day by day contact that was required. That was simply

RESOLUTION 5

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . to bring his force up to a level where he could maintain full cruiser car operations.

So what happened is that it's not a problem that can be evaded, nor is it a problem that can be dealt with by simple nice words or rhetoric. It has to be dealt with in basic commodity and exchange of action, which is dollar bills. And you have to be prepared to put your money where your mouth is, and start providing for the actual support of kind of new programs of crime prevention so that we can get some action in these areas. And I think it means going back to your colleagues, going back to the Urban Affairs Committee of Cabinet, and saying you've got to take a hard look at what kind of dollars we're giving to the City of Winnipeg so they can offer the proper protection and the proper kind of service in the area of law enforcement. And that means not simply keeping up to, trying to mechanize and automate and use technologies, but to return in many cases back to a much more human response.

I don't think it's something that we should be ashamed of, Mr. Speaker, because again, as I discovered to my interest and actually enlightenment when visiting over in England or doing some work over there on some urban problems about two months ago, to find that in the City of London they have now reverted to a system where not only is the policeman taken out of the car, he's put back in the neighborhood and he's been taken out of the police station. And they have a system, by golly, I saw a policeman going out across the street on a bicycle, and my curiosity was aroused so I went to talk to him. I said, "What in God's name are you doing on a bicycle?" in fact. Well, it might have been an impudent question, but he explained to me that he only reports to his police station once a week, and that's why . . . phoned, to say that he's still alive and well. And most of his time is spent knocking on doors, talking to commercial businessmen, and was becoming very much an integral part of that neighborhood. He's the night watchman for that area, and I know who he is, and he knows what's going on in that area. He said that in fact the results in the City of London have been astounding, that the rate of crime has dropped something like 20 or 30 percent. --(Interjection)-- I'm not sure. Actually, I hate to provide any further education to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, as he's already so well educated, but the fact is that system was introduced by our Conservative Government. . . However, unlike some of its counterparts in Canada, the Socialist Government of London has had the good sense of keeping the program intact, which is not always the case of what goes on here.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to say that we also introduced in the Throne Speech a proposal that, again in concert with the City of Winnipeg, that this province try to sponsor a special program for introducing native people in the core of the city into the police services, and I think, I stand in very strong admiration and associate myself with the remarks of the Member from Swan River in terms of his very correct and I think very strong and needed statements that it can't be dealt with by saying, "Those people aren't good enough." I don't think there is anybody's services are not good enough. It may be that they need a special program to provide for the training and upgrading to bring them into the police force, but that will be required, and I would hope that the Attorney-General might initiate discussions with, say, Winnipeg officials to see how that kind of program could in fact be introduced. And I think they'd give as fine co-operation as the Member from Swan River said of the native organizations of the City, and I think that after some careful persuasion and quiet talk that the Minister is so able at doing, that he will find the Chief of Police of the City of Winnipeg on his side as well. And I would like to see that within three or four or five months, a special program, not just in the North or on the reserves, but in the downtown core of Winnipeg, to provide for the integration and recruitment of native people into the City of Winnipeg police force so they can begin to respond, particularly to the problems of their people. Because let's face one hard fact, and I know that we don't like to talk about it often in this House, but the existence of 30 or 40 thousand native people in the core of the City represents one of the major social problems that we all have to deal with, and that 50 percent of those who occupy our jails are native people, and that they are oftentimes those who provide for most of the prosecutions and most of the apprehensions in the core of the city. And if the experience from some of the American cities shows true, then we have to begin to provide special responses to that, and I would think that one of the ways we could do it is to provide a police force that would include native members to it so that they would be able to provide a much more directed community response in being able to sort of work with many of their own population. So I think

RESOLUTION 5

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . that that is a major . . . that should be taken and shouldn't be delayed, and I think that the Attorney-General has a responsibility in that area.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I think it's also important to take a look at some of the other kinds of problems that I fully expected the member for Swan River to talk about and he didn't, and that is that one of the other underlying and continuing problems that becomes a source of crime in this city is the problems of drugs, and that we are finding that while Winnipeg by no means or by any stretch of the imagination can be considered one of the 'hot spots' for drug sort of trafficking in North America, we have our share, and it is a growing problem in the use of heroin and addiction in the schools, and that in itself becomes a source of many of the crime problems in the city, that it has come to my attention - and I again don't pretend to have full knowledge - but that the epidemic of bank robberies and that kind of armed robbery which we are now seeing occurring in a period of every two or three weeks, has much of its source of origination in the drug problem of the city, that people simply have to rob to get the money to pay for their drugs.

I know that there has been some attention and the RCMP itself has gone into the problem with some real concern, and the Federal Government sponsors, I believe, an agency in this city for the non-abuse of drugs. But again, that is something, and it's of great concern in my own riding, Mr. Speaker, where again, occupying my constituency as it does, both sides of this river, and including perhaps about 35 to 40 percent of my constituency is composed of people under the age of thirty, that it is a problem of particular note in that area, and I have seen it and run across it in my own experience as I sort of talk to people in the area and operate out of the constituency office. You see the actual sort of victims of the drug trafficking problem before you and it's not a very pretty sight. It's doing ugly things to our young people and it's providing a deprivation and tremendous burden on the rest of society, who must pay through the stolen goods and the personal property crimes for the drugs that are going on. I think again, as we've suggested to the Minister on previous occasions, that it is again a problem that could and does require even more leadership on the provincial level, and that is, as we've suggested to him, the bringing together of those agencies, both law enforcement and social agencies which are directly involved, to see how they are in fact tackling the problem.

A third area that we are also concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is in the area of prison reform, because I think the other side of the coin with the problem of crime is in fact what is going on in the prisons and to what degree are they providing for some decent form of rehabilitation. And I won't labour that point, Mr. Speaker, because I expect that we will have the opportunity to discuss this with the new Minister of Corrective Institutions when his estimates are brought, as I hope they will be brought, before this House or that he will be answerable to them, because I think that one of the major areas of reform and correction that is required is in our prison system, because I simply don't think that we are doing a decent job in providing for the rehabilitation of many of those who are in, or even providing for the range of detention and work activities that should be introduced. But, as I said, I won't dwell much longer on that point.

One other area I would like to bring to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, and it ranges a little bit wider than the direct question of law enforcement but one that provides some concern to me as someone who's involved in education, and that is that I am becoming increasingly disturbed, I guess, by the, if you want to call it - and I apologize to members of the House for using the word - the sociological causes of crime, and that really goes back to simple things like the report of the C. R. T. C. which I read about four months ago, and I direct this comment to the Minister of Consumer Affairs who's involved for communication, that of prime-time viewing, weekly prime-time viewing of television, there's now something like 35 hours of violence programs that are seen daily, weekly, by Canadians. --(Interjection)-- Well, whatever the reason may be, and I think the Minister is being facetious when he says it's a cause of free enterprise. I am simply saying that, that's right, it's a Crown corporation which is the valued instrument of all good government owners, but the point is that there is, I think something that has got to be looked at, and that is, the degree to which that kind of external influence . . . the minds of young people, has got to be one of the major problems and one of the concerns we have to look at. I suppose that I have a pretty strong principle, and I have certainly no belief in censorship, really, of any kind, but I think it is the responsibility

RESOLUTION 5

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . of public authorities, involved both in the area of communication and law enforcement, to begin asking serious questions about what is the impact of the almost obsessive existence of crime, violence, detective programs that our young people are watching daily, and I was particularly struck by this when they pointed out that there are now - I guess some American academics are doing some research in the field and finding out that there is a direct cause, that the development of violent acts amongst young people are oftentimes situated by what they have just recently seen. And I would even go one step further, although I see that my time is growing short, Mr. Speaker, but let me make a case that probably requires a more elaborate exposition, but I'll try to summarize it in two or three minutes.

I would suggest to members of this House that we are building in our cities sort of the incubators of many of the crime problems that we have to face; that in the way that we build our suburban subdivisions, the way we build our highrise areas in the downtown area, we in fact are creating our own problems. I had a recent experience where I was asked to speak at a high school in one of the suburban areas of the city, a suburban subdivision that was just built about three years ago, has something like 2,500 families in it, and when I spoke to the students of the high school and asked them, "What do you do when you are not in school or when you're home?" They said, "Nothing." The only thing they really had to do was to go up and down Roblin Boulevard in their cars, because that's the only place that they have to go. There isn't any other kind of central meeting point, recreation centre, community responsibility in that subdivision. No one's supplying it, no one's requiring it. And so you begin to wonder why kids are speeding up and down Roblin Blvd. and sort of playing tag and playing games. You can begin to see it as a direct product that that community was not designed as a community, it was designed as a row of boxes for people, that may have been totally satisfactory to the adults in the community, but it had no consideration whatsoever of what does a teenage person require in terms of the way of outlets and places to go.

I would suggest that, as the Minister well suggested, there is no simple answers, and when he begins to look at the problem, I think he has to begin asking questions of the Minister of Urban Affairs and Housing, as to what kind of buildings are they putting up through Manitoba Housing and what kind of discussions are they having with the City of Winnipeg in terms of trying to arrive at the standards of design and layout and so on, to try and provide for better communities because better communities, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, lead to fewer crime problems.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those kinds of considerations we would like to raise for the Minister, I would simply like to close by saying that he has now heard a number of proposals and recommendations coming from different members of this House, and I would simply say that I hope next time we have the opportunity to discuss this question he will have some response in the way of answers, of direct action he has undertaken in the meantime.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, I am now leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 this evening.