

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, April 13, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): I should like to direct the members' attention to the Speaker's gallery where we have Mr. Ray Stokes from the Speaker Jerome's office in the House of Commons.

We also have 25 students of Grade 7 and 8 from Windsor School under the direction of Mr. Fraser. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

At the same time, we have 40 students of Grades 3 and 4 standing from Elwick School under Mrs. Jarco. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

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

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Health and awaiting his possible attendance here, I should like to direct my first question to the Honourable Minister of Labour and ask her if she can indicate to the House whether it is correct, and if so why, that she has reportedly received the resignation of Mr. H. D. Woods who has chaired the Manitoba Labour-Management Joint Committee since 1964, some 14 years, and who apparently resigned in some distress?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): I don't know his precise reasons for retiring, Mr. Speaker. He did use the excuse that he was leaving because it was his fault that the deputy was fired which is totally incorrect. Also, Professor Woods had expressed his doubts about running the committee to some of the members of it some time ago, long before I got his notice of resignation. A couple of weeks ago, I contacted the vice-chairman and I have asked him to continue and letters have gone out to all the members to continue.

MR. SCHREYER: A supplementary then, Sir. Given the Honourable Lady's reply that he resigned because of some alleged excuse or another; given the fact that the said Mr. Woods, who has chaired this committee for fourteen years, under two very different administrations, has not been known to indulge in excuses under either one of them — why he should be indulging in excuses now, I have no way of knowing. So I ask the Honourable Lady if she can indicate whether Professor Woods gave specific enumerated reasons?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: It was precisely as I have just said, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SCHREYER: Supplementary. Would the Honourable Lady be prepared to table the letter of resignation from Mr. H. D. Woods?

MRS. PRICE: I have the letter. If the member would like to see it, I would be happy to table it. I've nothing to hide.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs. It was reported that he has said that he intends to present before May 1st a proposal dealing with the decontrol period in the rental field. Could he indicate precisely when he will be presenting to this House or announcing to this House exactly what he intends to do in relation to the Rent Control program, and will it take place before May 1st?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Rouge is correct, I did indicate a target date of May 1st. I cannot indicate precisely when that proposal will be brought to the attention of the House.

MR. AXWORTHY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister indicate what recommendation or advice he would be offering to those tenants who are now receiving leases that will have to be signed before May 1st or by May 1st, wherein the rents are now being raised at the rate of 15 or 20 percent in many instances? Should they be signing those leases under the law, or should they be in fact waiting until the government does decide what it intends to do in the decontrol period?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I would hesitate to give any advice to tenants who have received leases which indicate that signatures should be attached by May 1st. I would think the validity, or otherwise, of the leases and their terms would have to await the decisions as to the policy of the government in the post-rent control period.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister then assure the House and those people who are affected, that any proposal that he makes concerning the revision of the Rent Control program would include guarantees that if there were to be a continued reduction or restraint on rent, that the affixing of a signature now would not require or bring about any kind of obligation on the parts of tenants that could not be changed by those recommendations? In other words, could we assure if there is to be less than that 15 or 20 percent restraint, that it would then be available to those tenants even though they have signed the leases in the meantime?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, that is an extremely hypothetical question. It involves a number of suppositions. You are asking not only for assurances involving legal matters, but also undertakings in respect to matters which would relate to our policy for the rent decontrol period. So I cannot give the member the assurances which he asks for.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Finance. Will the Honourable Minister of Finance consider financing on the same basis as was given to CCIL operations, if necessary, of Morden Fine Foods Limited, a company which provides employment in southwest Manitoba, and which is an integral part of the agricultural feature of this province, after that company is privateered by the Conservative Government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, the question is clearly hypothetical. If that question arises, comes before the government, it will be dealt with at that time.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Minister of Finance on a matter which, I understand, is imminent. Would the Minister of Finance consider financing, giving government financing on the same basis as has been given to CCIL, to Flyer Coach Industries, in the process of that company now being privateered by the Conservative Government?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the same answer applies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that, I believe, she also has a second resignation, can the Minister indicate whether the withdrawal of services by these two members of her staff of the Department of Labour constitutes strike or results from lockout?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Neither, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister of Labour assure the House that the mining safety will not become more disastrous with the resignation of the Executive Director of the Workplace Safety Health Act?

MR. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, for the honourable gentleman for Kildonan, I had a meeting with the steelworkers, the Manitoba Federation of Labour, members of the mining department and my own this morning. We have arranged to have a committee set up to look into it, so I'm sure that the mining will not be suffering because Mr. Rabinovitch won't be with us.

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

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK: Sir, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Finance. Would he favour us with Estimates of the amount by which equalization payments to Manitoba by the Federal Government will be increased or decreased because of the reduction, the

proposed reduction of sales tax. I'm sure he doesn't have the information with him but would he be prepared to let us have that information?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, as far and as close as we can estimate it I can provide that information. I wonder if I could also advise the Member for St. Johns on his question yesterday regarding the application of the Corporation Tax that it is on a pro rata basis depending on the time of year — of the fiscal year end — which information I think probably he has already availed himself of. In other words if a company's year end was the end of January that company would get the benefit of 1/12th of the reduction, of the small business reduction beginning January 1, and so on through the year.

With regard to the question by the Member for Elmwood, the sales tax commission rate remains unchanged for people who are collecting this tax.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Honourable Minister for his response in relation to corporate tax. I might inform him that yesterday morning I was told at the Income Tax office that they had not received clarification from his department and that was the reason that I raised it. I understand now and it's clear that it would be prorated as of the amount of the year within 1978 that the fiscal period exists. I understand therefore that the Honourable Minister has accepted my first question and I have a second question, a request of a similar type.

I wonder if the Honourable Minister could provide us with present estimates of the cost of collection of sales tax revenues in this fiscal year as to the cost to the government of Manitoba. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member that asking for details of that nature may better be served by an Order for Return.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I do thank you very much for your helpful suggestions, I did think of that but I also realized we are in the Budget Speech now and we're going into Ways and Means and it would be helpful to have the information earlier rather than later. If the Honourable Minister wishes it to be by way of Order for Return I would of course have to comply with his request, but if he is willing to accept my request verbally on the record then I assume that there would be no objection to that. I wonder if I have to start the request again — I guess I'd better.

I want present estimates of the cost of collection of sales tax revenues in this fiscal year: (a) the direct cost of staff and whatever overhead of government, and (b) the commissions paid to the government agents. I would also ask if we could have the present estimates of the cost of these two (a) and (b) items if there had been no reduction in rate from 5 percent to 2 percent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in attempting to give the member an answer if we can come to an approximation. It may be best to wait until the estimates are before the House and we will at that time have a chance to see what changes are taking place in the rate of purchases, and that will affect the amount of commissions and other things that will occur during the period of the sales tax reduction. It will be very difficult to answer that question in total until after the six-month period is over because there will be some doubt as to the rate of purchase that will take place after the six-month period. We can, however, use the Ontario experiment of some two or three years ago as I suppose some sort of a guideline to estimate. But whatever is done will be a very rough estimate.

May I also point out to the Honourable Member with regard to the corporation tax, the Department of Finance in Manitoba does not advise people on personal income tax or corporation tax, as to the requirements and the rules and regulations, that comes under Revenue Canada who provide that information, and who collect the tax on behalf of Manitoba.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I have to have two supplementaries, one for each direction that the Minister is leading me into. The first one, coming back to the corporate tax — the Minister misunderstood me. I said that when I phoned yesterday morning to the Income Tax office I of course meant the Federal Income Tax office because they are the ones that are charged with the responsibility as directed by the Honorable Minister. It is the Federal Income Tax office that did not know whether or not Manitoba would be prorating. Now that I know I assume it is not necessary for me to tell them but rather for the Minister's department to inform the Federal Tax office that that will be the case.

May I just clarify, Mr. Speaker, they said they don't know how to advise a corporation in preparing his tax return a for fiscal year ending between January 1, 1978 and whatever date they will acquire the instructions from the Provincial Government, until they know what the government's intent is, whether it's prorated or for the full year ending in the fiscal period.

If that's not clear enough, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take up time in the House — I can speak to the Minister direct if he would rather, whichever way he likes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Perhaps to advise the member, Mr. Speaker, Revenue Canada was advised in

November of the changes and they were advised then so that it could be brought to the attention of the individual and the corporate taxpayer. If in fact Revenue Canada has not advised the corporate taxpayer as to the rules and regulations, then we'll have to look into it and see whether there has been a slipup on their part.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns has had his allotted questions. With the leave of the House, he can proceed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Let's get it straight; the corporate question was raised by the honourable member, I am prepared to discuss it with him. I thought people of Manitoba should be informed as quickly as possible about their position. They're not being informed by Revenue Canada, and I think the Minister ought to check on it and clarify it. I have it clear, I'll drop it — if he's prepared to drop it, that's his problem.

In relation to the question that I asked him which he said he would try to work out, I said I was asking for present estimates, not for future actual. The present estimates of the cost of collection must have been calculated in some way in order to justify the government's . . . first the decision in preparing revenue estimates to present to the House, secondly, in deciding what the cost of collection is for a 2 percent tax as differing from a 5 percent tax, which would then indicate the extent to which the province is making a good deal or not. So that it's estimates I'm asking for, there must be present ones.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I dare say, Sir, that you have just qualified for the position of the first permanent Speaker of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Health, and that is to ask him whether he can confirm reports, I believe they are only reports to this stage, that the government has taken a decision to levy a \$7.50 per day charge with respect to such persons as may be panelled for nursing home care, but because of non-availability of space, will be provided extended care service in an acute care facility? That's question one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud)SHERMAN (Fort Garry): The answer to question one, which I assume implies that there are several questions, Mr. Speaker, is, yes. The government has approved the concept in principle. There has been no specific action taken by the Executive Council of which the Leader of the Opposition is familiar, in mechanical terms, yet. But the levying of a per diem, equivalent to the per diem paid by personal care home residents, against those persons in acute be active treatment beds, who have been panelled for personal care, has been approved by the government in principle.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, quite apart from the arguments pro and con of having a parallel or a similarity of per diem charge as between those resident in nursing homes and those resident in de facto nursing home beds, however, in an acute care hospital. Can the Minister indicate, quite apart from that, whether the amount that would be paid — \$7.50 per day — would be paid to the hospitals over and above the per diem or would it be a case of the \$7.50 per day being in lieu of the acute care bed per diem? I think it's very clear.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid it isn't very clear. I'd have to ask the Leader of the Opposition for further definition of what he means. What we're talking about is approximately 800 Manitobans — 775 I think is more precise — approximately 400 in Winnipeg, approximately 375 in rural Manitoba, who have been panelled for personal care homes but are occupying active treatment beds and, as a consequence of the universal medicare program, are not paying anything for those beds. They have been panelled for personal care homes and would be in personal care beds were there personal care beds available. They are receiving personal care service and that is the group we're talking about, therefore, the per diem would be the only per diem levied and it would be equivalent to the per diem paid if they were in personal care homes.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that that answer is quite clear. It's a case of asking the Minister for confirmation then that the \$7.50 per day that would be charged would be taken into the given hospitals' operating budget, revenues, and that however the hospital would not be in a position to have any reserve factor because, while it varies a great deal from one hospital to another, and one part of the province to another, as a matter of general average operating conditions hospitals operate at about 80 percent capacity factor. So now, if this 20 percent reserve will be filled or occupied by persons requiring extended, as opposed to acute care, if this is an ongoing policy of some duration, does the Minister not concede that this may, in a rather unexpected way, create further pressure for the construction of additional acute care beds?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, that's a complicated series of questions really involved in one. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of the question, at the point at which the government has arrived in looking at it, the charge that would be levied is being calculated into the budgets that the Health Services Commission is setting for those individual hospitals. As a consequence that charge would be offset revenue. They would not, under that program, directly get the money. That money would be calculated into the amount of money that is being provided for them through the Manitoba Health Services Commission. However, I'll have to take the question really as notice and give the honourable gentleman a firm answer on it. That is the point at which the government is studying the question at the moment.

The answer to the second part of his question with respect to pressure for additional acute care beds, I suppose theoretically, theoretically anything is possible, Mr. Speaker, but I don't translate or project that kind of a result. I am advised that the province is sufficiently bedded in terms of acute care beds. We need more personal care and extended treatment beds. The people who are in those active treatment beds who have been panelled for personal care really are personal care patients and I don't, at this juncture, foresee an additional pressure for acute beds.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Was Mr. Rubin Simkin, under whose direction the original Rent Stabilization Board report was prepared, was Mr. Rubin Simkin consulted with respect to all of these changes and did he give consent or agree to all of the changes in the revised Rent Stabilization Board Report which you tabled in the House recently?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, at the meeting at which we consulted with the Rent Review Agency and the people involved in the preparation of the report, Mr. Rubin Simkin was not present. He was represented by Mr. Allan Chisvin, the chairman of the Rent Stabilization Board. I believe Mr. Simkin was unable to attend for reasons of health, I'm not sure.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you. Were all of the other participants who are indicated in the inside cover of the revised Rent Stabilization Board Report, were all of these other participants consulted with respect to all the changes and did they agree to all the changes that were subsequently put in this revised report?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the representation at the meeting we had was composed of the director of the Rent Review Agency, the secretary of the Rent Stabilization Board and the chairman of the Rent Stabilization Board. They were consulted with and agreed to the amendments and what action they took subsequent to the meeting was not reported back to me. However, they were the persons responsible for amending the report.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In the light of the fact that Mr. Rubin Simkin . . .

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

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the light of the statement by Mr. Rubin Simkin over the phone to me today to the effect that he was not consulted regarding all of these changes and that he did not agree to all of these changes, and in light of the fact that Mr. More of the CBC is quoted as having been told by one of the members of this study that he was not consulted regarding all of the changes, nor did he agree to all of the changes, would the Minister, in light of these facts, correct his statements of yesterday whereby he said that the people who wrote this report, namely the five people listed on the inside cover of this report, agreed to and consented to the changes in this report? Will the Minister, in the light of the known facts, retract his statements of yesterday regarding this revised report which it turns out he wrote and not these people.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't retract any of the statements that I have made. We consulted with the people who represented the Rent Review Agency and the Rent Stabilization Board. I did not at any time say that all of the members were present at that time. The people who were there presumably represented the board and the agency and discussed the changes we had suggested to them and agreed to them and agreed that these amendments would be made. Now what further conversations they may have had with any of the other people involved were not reported to me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Labour. Can the Honourable Minister indicate to this House the reasons given for the recent resignation of the Executive Director of the Workplace Safety and Health Division, Mr. Victor Rabinovitch?

mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Perhaps I can rephrase my question then to the Honourable Minister. Is it not true that as outlined to you by Mr. Victor Rabinovitch on numerous previous occasions, and in his letter of resignation, that he resigned because in his opinion the Division was being inadequately funded and inadequately supported by her government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: By whose standards, Mr. Speaker?

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. That was a question to me, I guess I'll answer it. To answer that, by his standards. I'm wondering if the Minister —(Interjection)— no, he's not the Minister. I was wondering if the Minister then can investigate — (Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'll have to ask the Honourable Minister of Highways to kindly restrain himself. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. ENNS: It's a sure thing you're not going to be the next permanent Speaker.

MR. COWAN: Can the Honourable Minister assure the House, and in that way the workers of this province, that her department will investigate the specific shortcomings in implementing the Act as outlined in Mr. Rabinovitch's present correspondence to her, and can she further assure the same parties that she will take the necessary appropriate action to rectify the problems if they do exist.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, at this point we don't feel there are shortcomings, as Mr. Rabinovitch has stated. There is no decline in the number of employees that are in the Workplace Safety as when his government was in office.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to direct a question to the Minister of Health concerning his comments to the Leader of the Opposition. Part of the problem, I guess associated with levying a charge to senior citizens under acute care, is the availability of beds in nursing homes. Could the Minister describe the present government plans for the construction of additional beds in this fiscal year, in nursing homes?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, we have only one plan, Mr. Speaker, and that is to do it when we have the money. We have said that we don't have the money to do anything in the capital construction field this year other than what has been announced at the present time. Now, that's under continuous review; if it's possible to separate individual projects out from under the deferment and move ahead with them, I can assure the honourable member that I would be the first to press for that, but I'm going to have to press for it item by item.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. How many additional beds, given the financial constraints that the government has imposed on itself, how many additional nursing home beds are planned for at present in this Budget?

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

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the whole question of nursing home beds, the whole question of the bed spectrum, I'm sure will come under intensive review in the Estimates. I can't answer that question at this juncture; we have announced the capital projects that we're going ahead with in the health field.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'm still not clear whether that means none, one, or a number, but I would ask this: whatever the plans are, whether it's to hold at the present line or to make some extension which is not known to us, in view of the fact that there is some sort of crisis in terms of the availability of beds for people in hospitals, and secondly, people in nursing homes, and now the consideration of a charge of \$7.50 per day, will the Minister look into the possibility of freeing up some more money, even shifting it from the Department of Highways, for example, to build more beds in nursing homes?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister will attempt to proceed with additional construction of additional personal care home beds as quickly as possible, but in answer to the honourable member, I don't see what that would achieve for the people involved in this case. If there were personal care home beds they would be in personal care homes paying \$6.25 a day. All we're saying is that they have that same service in an acute bed hospital, and the service they are receiving is precisely the

same, and we feel that it can be argued quite equitably that the charge should be the same.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health. The 20 percent increase which we read about, but which I gather is not yet official but we have to assume that it wouldn't be mentioned unless it was going to be acted on by the government — the 20 percent increase to people in personal care homes, which would work out to about \$250 a month for people in personal care homes — does that not exceed the amount of money which an elderly person could be expected to receive under the OAS, GIS and Manitoba Elderly Supplement Bill?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't profess to be an expert in mathematics, but I don't see how 20 per — we haven't settled on the figure yet anyway, but if it were \$7.50, which would be 20 percent, I don't see how 20 percent of \$6.25 per day, which is \$1.25 per day, and there are 30 days in the month, how that works out to an increase to the resident of \$200 or \$250 a month.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, he didn't answer my question, but I'll give him the arithmetic. It's \$187.50 per day right now for 30 days, under your proposal it is \$225.00 which is an increase of 20 percent at one fell swoop, which is a tax of 20 percent on people who can least afford it.

My next question is this, with regard to the hospitals. What about people who haven't reached that magical age of 65, but are, by virtue of ill health, required to be put in a personal care home, have received panelling, but they are still maintaining a domicile either through spouse or through children. I am wondering whether the Minister recognizes that the \$7.50 a day that will have to be paid on behalf of that person will have to be made up by the family from their other living costs and not from some source of funds unknown, somewhere far off, but in fact the family will have to sacrifice \$225.00 a month.

MR. SHERMAN: We recognize that, Mr. Speaker. That determination has not been made yet. What the individual Manitobans were covering or dealing with in this particular provision are those who have reached pensionable age and who have been panelled for personal care homes. Now, the final extent of the decision and the provision have not been determined, but I recognize, and I want to assure the honourable member the government recognizes the question he has raised.

With respect to his first question, I can assure him that in looking at any increase in the personal care home per diem we have measured it against the disposable income left with the individual, single or married, in personal care homes, and I can assure him that even if we went to \$7.50 the disposable income left among those who are on OAS, GIS, the Manitoba Supplement for the Elderly, and calculating in the Property Tax Rebate, etc., cost of living tax credit, etc., that the disposable income compares very very favourably with any that they have had ever since the personal care universally insured program came into existence.

MR. MILLER: I'll believe that when I see it. Mr. Speaker, the final supplementary question. With regard to the payment of the \$7.50 I assume that payment will be made directly by the individual patient to the hospital. Will that be treated by the hospital in the same manner as semi-private room charges or private room charges, in other words, income to the hospitals?

MR. SHERMAN: That really is one of the questions that the Leader of the Opposition asked me, Mr. Speaker. At this juncture it is being viewed as a recovery, not as income to the hospital but as a recovery item under the funding provided by the taxpayers through the department through the Health Services Commission. But that question has not been finally resolved. I think I said to the Leader of the Opposition I would take it as notice, but at this juncture we view it as a recovery item.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Supplementary to the Minister of Health, it is rather a parochial question, but it is having to do with Nursing Home care. If I may be parochial for a moment and ask the Minister of Health, given that the Conservative candidate in Rossmere last September, October, said that there was an immediate critical need for nursing home beds in the area of Concordia Hospital, northnortheast of it thereabouts, can the Minister indicate if in fact he has therefore plans under way for immediate construction of these allegedly critically needed, immediately needed beds?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Conservative candidate in Rossmere has pressed that view upon me. The New Democratic candidate in Rossmere has not pressed that view upon me but I would be very susceptible to that kind of blandishment.

MR. SCHREYER: If the Minister is to be taken at his word, and I take him at his word, that he is susceptible to this kind of blandishment, let him take note that he has just been blandished.

MR. SHERMAN: Well I presume that wasn't a question, Mr. Speaker, so I accept the blandishment. I also say that I expect the Leader of the Opposition to make that approach to me with adherence to the kind of common good sense and judgment that he professes to bring to the fiscal affairs of this

province and that he will recognize that these things can only be done as the taxpayer can afford them.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, may I then ask the Minister of Health in a non-facetious way, whether in fact he will be in a position to indicate during consideration of his estimates as to which areas urban and rural are under active file consideration for extension of additional personal care facilities?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, I think that is quite possible, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly attempt to do that.

ORDERS OF THE DAY — BUDGET DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. . . The Honourable Member for Inkster has seven minutes left.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, as often happens with Budget Addresses, we have had a sequel to it today because we now know that there will be a tax on people who are living in nursing homes, which, Mr. Speaker, for the first time will demonstrate the change in philosophy of the various governments, that under the previous administration the amount that was payable by people living in nursing homes always stayed somewhat below the amount that those people would receive as a result of being entitled to the Old Age Security Program which Canada has. But, Mr. Speaker, being consistent with the Conservative policy of user pay, we now have an addition to the budget address given by the Minister of Health which says that people living in nursing homes in accordance with the philosophy of the Conservative policy as demonstrated by the Task Force and as underlined by the Task Force that these people will now be asked to pay a part of the cost over and above that which they receive as a result of Old Age Security which was the principle, Mr. Speaker, which we utilized.

Mr. Speaker, when I indicated yesterday that I would be summing up with regard to the remarks that I made in this debate, I wanted to deal with a statement that had been made by the First Minister. The First Minister, in referring to some of the facts that we had surpluses in some of the early years said, Mr. Speaker, of one of those years — and I believe it was 1972-73, perhaps the Minister of Finance will correct me if I am wrong — but I believe that he was referring to the year 1972-73 when we had a surplus, and the First Minister said, "Even a moron could have had a surplus on that year." Did he say a moron, did he say a Simple Simon? — (Interjection) — No, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister, I am certain that the First Minister said that anybody, and he used some derogatory term, perhaps it was moron, perhaps it was Simple Simon, but that any idiot could have had a surplus in that year. Well, Mr. Speaker, any idiot could have had a surplus in that year but Darcy McKeough couldn't have a surplus in that year. Darcy McKeough, Mr. Speaker, is the provincial treasurer of the Tory businesslike government of the Province of Ontario and he had a deficit of 344 million on the year that any moron or any idiot could have had a surplus. Now, Mr. Speaker, any idiot could have had a surplus in that year but the Tory Minister of Newfoundland whoever he was didn't have a surplus in that year, he had a deficit of minus 58 million dollars. Mr. Speaker, any idiot could have had a surplus in that year and I bring this to the attention of the Member for Morris and the Member for Emerson. Any idiot could have had a surplus in 1972-73 but the treasurer and the Finance Minister of what province? The Province of Alberta didn't have a surplus in that year, they had a deficit of minus 24 million. So in the year when the New Democratic Party had a surplus and by the definition of the First Minister, any idiot could have planned for a surplus, the idiot Finance Ministers of Newfoundland — Tory; New Brunswick — Tory; Ontario — Tory; Alberta — Tory; all had deficits. Mr. Speaker, that's a remarkable proposition, that any idiot could have had a surplus and all of these Tory Ministers ran deficits.

Mr. Speaker, we had another interesting euphemism in this budget address. What we had, Mr. Speaker, was the Minister of Finance telling the vast majority of the public of the Province of Manitoba that the tax rebate was going down, that their tax credit rebate has gone down. The Minister looks at me astonished. The value of money has gone down, you have not kept pace with inflation, so for all of the citizens in this province, the tax rebate has gone down.

But the Minister wouldn't announce that the tax rebate has gone down for everybody. He colours that, Mr. Speaker, this Minister who produced a non-political budget address — he colours that by saying that there was an increase in the tax credit rebate to a particular group. Mr. Speaker, the Foundation program increased in every other year, what we know is that this feature of municipal financing went down. And rather than saying it went down, the Minister found a cute way of saying it. He said, "For a group, it has gone up." And he picked on the group of old age pensioners who live in their own homes, who have gone up from \$375 to \$475 — and I'm not yet sure, Mr. Speaker, of the consequences of that as to how many people it will affect or will it not affect those old age pensioners who are living in the biggest homes or bring in a new growth of higher income people.

I'm not sure, but I know that the former Minister of Finance has always indicated that virtually the biggest part of old age pensioners are now not paying education taxes by virtue of the rebate program. And if this increases that group, Mr. Speaker, at the expense of all of the other people in the Province of Manitoba whose tax rebates have gone down, then I say that at least that is what should be said, because my experience with old age pensioners in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, is that most of them live in modest homes and do not pay education taxes at this point. And by limiting the

Thursday, April 13, 1978

rebate for that particular group, my honourable friend has merely found a way of apologizing or attempting to apologize for the fact that the Property Tax Rebate in 1978 has gone down, and that the professed intention of this Minister of Finance — and it's on Hansard — is that it is to be eliminated, so we have step Number 1 in the program of the Minister of Finance to eliminate what he feels is a bad program by bringing it down in this year.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The member's time has expired.
The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. LEN DOMINO: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in reply to the Budget and I think it's an honour that this time I get to follow the Member for Inkster rather than he following my last remarks.

Before I say much about the Budget Speech itself and about issues of concern to my constituency, I would first like to extend some congratulations to a member of the Press Gallery, Jenni Morton, who also happens to be a constituent of mine, and who recently won an award, a Southern Fellowship for excellence in journalism. She's not here today but I hope that she'll hear my remarks, that we should congratulate her for a job well done, and I very much appreciate the fact that we're fortunate in this province to have a press corps and a media corps which, I don't always agree with their interpretation of the facts or their reporting, but I think I have to admit that on average and as a whole they do a good job and they act in an unbiased and impartial manner. I think that's very essential for an effective democracy and we are fortunate to have those sort of people here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been listening with great interest to the Budget Speech, last Monday to the Honourable Minister of Finance, and I have been watching carefully, for very obvious reasons, as a member of the government — to my government's actions in the first six months. I'm struck by the similarity between the new P.C. government's actions and the attitude of the public to the new P.C. government, and the attitude that was expressed and the attitude that we saw with the N.D.P. government when they first came in in 1969. I think there are a lot of similarities. Both governments have come in with some bold, new programs — bold new ideas. Both governments faced initially very hostile and very vocal reaction from certain segments of society, and I think that both governments — and I'll admit this readily — were both basically in tune with the public opinion and what people want.

Now I'm not about to say that about the N.D. Party throughout its eight years of power, and it is obvious that they lost that touch with the people — whatever bit of sense of what the people wanted they had in 1969 they lost. All you have to do is take a quick look at the results of the October 11th, 1977, election.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Forty percent, 40 percent.

MR. DOMINO: And you will see that they seem to have lost that rapport they once had. — (Interjection) — I'm very much aware of the fact that we too could fall victim to that sort of arrogance and that sort of remoteness that leaves you out of touch with the people, and I think as a backbencher on the government side, as a member of this Legislature who's a government member and yet not a Cabinet Minister, it's my responsibility and the responsibility of those people who sit here with me — it's our responsibility to keep the Cabinet in touch, to make them aware, to ensure that eight years down the road, or twelve years down the road, we don't find ourselves isolated from the people as the former government did last fall and we don't find ourselves out of touch with what the people really want.

Only time will tell if we can achieve this, if we can stay in touch with the people, and it's one of the basic facts of a democracy that the people decide and they'll make this judgment. Nobody in this House, that's for sure, can make that judgment.

Now the members opposite have made a big lot of noise lately about the fact that the Premier of our province is out of touch with the people. The Member for Ste. Rose who is about to leave right now has made some ridiculous statements to the effect that maybe our Premier is a fascist leader. — (Interjections) — I'm sorry, he's not leaving, he's going to sit and listen. That's good — maybe he'll learn something. There certainly is a lot of room for improvement.

The Member for Rossmere has also said some fairly incredible statements. Let me quote one, this is from his reply to the Budget, "A government that is so regressive, so right of centre that one has to go back at least three decades to find one like it." He says things like that.

The Member for Ste. Rose calls our Leader and our government a fascist government. What have we done, what have we said to elicit this kind of criticism? Let me tell you. Let's look at what we've said — we've said . . .

MR. ADAM: Ask the Member for Virden.

MR. DOMINO: We've said two basic things in our first six months in office. We said (1) that we need a leaner government, a government of less fat, a government where the public sector is more efficient. And we've also said, along with that, and let me quote now from the Leader of my party, the Premier, what he said in reply to the Speech from the Throne just last week: Quote, "The basic social services of this province will remain unimpaired, and indeed will be added to, and they are going to be based on needs, and they are going to meet all the legitimate and compassionate demands that any

civilized society would want for people who are disadvantaged and who are in need." These are the words of a so-called fascist.

We have never said during the election or since the election that we wish to destroy programs which are an advantage to the poor or of those in need. We have never said that, and if you look at our actions none of our actions can lead to that conclusion. All we are asking is that we get an honest dollar's worth for every dollar the taxpayer spends. We just want a little more efficiency. That can be achieved without hurting any of the poor people, without hurting any of the low income people. Now if you want to call us fascists that's good, because then you're calling the vast majority of the people of Manitoba fascist for they agree with what we're doing.

Recently I had the opportunity of sending a survey to all the constituents in St. Matthews constituency. About 400 took the time to fill out a rather lengthy survey, to return it to me, and when they returned that survey at their own cost, when I calculated the responses to one particular question which was, "Do you think the public service in this province is too large?" Do you know what the response was? Over 80 percent of those people said, "Yes". They agree with us. They know there's waste in government. They don't want to scrap programs — they just want a dollar's worth of services for every dollar they have to pay in taxes.

You say the Premier of our province is out of touch, that he's out of step with the people, or out of step with the times, that he goes back to Hoover. Let me assure you of this, let me suggest this to you. If he's out of touch it's not because he's two decades behind — it's because he's two or three years ahead of all of you. And all the other governments in western Europe and the United States and in Canada will be following our example the next few years, because it's essential. If you truly believe in a mixed economy, you have to be able to stop the continual growth of the public sector.

If you want to call us fascists or reactionaries, you could only get away with actually believing that we're reactionary if you're so narrow-minded and so dogmatic that you're definition of progress is exclusively government expansion. If you believe that only government expansion means progress, sure we're reactionary, but that's a very limited and dogmatic and doctrinaire position to take, and I would hope that we're not going to hear that for the next four years because, in addition to being wrong, it's also very boring.

I said we were undertaking bold new initiatives, we are. We're attempting to halt and to turn around a 20-year trend, a dangerous trend to our economy and to our political freedoms. Two things, if you look at what's been happening over the last few years. Government share of the gross product has been steadily increasing. Fifteen years ago it was 30 percent, if you take in school boards, municipal government, provincial government and federal government. It was 30 percent. This year it's going to be 44 percent. If you continue that, the inevitable is that government runs the vast majority or everything, and there is no mixed economy. If you believe in a mixed economy you can not allow the public sector to continually expand at the expense of the private because then you'll have no mixed economy.

Now another trend that we see — this one is more obvious — that's the attempted invasion of the private sector by the public sector — the actual invasion of it. Now I'd call the first trend the Eddie type of problem. It's a situation where, as I mentioned, where year after year the public share of our gross product increases continually year after year after year. I call this the Eddie type of problem — not because it's exclusively the creation of our past premier — I wouldn't want to even suggest that he was the worst offender of a government leader. He certainly wasn't. There are examples in this country, other federal and other provincial governments, which acted much more irresponsibly in this regard, and I'll concede that to you. And some of those governments aren't necessarily New Democratic Party governments. I'll concede that too. The former premier is simply the greatest exponent of this continued growth of the government in Manitoba.

Now the opposition now has been arguing that because other jurisdictions, like Ontario, for instance . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a point of privilege and that point of privilege relates to the privileges generally attended upon the rules and proceedings of this House. I thank you for providing me with Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, and I bring to your attention Rule 140. This rule says that: relating to personal reflections occurring in debate, that it is disorderly for any member in speaking to digress from the question and to attack any other member by means of opprobrious language, either applied to his person and character or to his conduct, either in general or on some particular occasion, and tending to bring him into ridicule, contempt, or hatred with his members or to create ill blood in the House. Now I know the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is not present in the House at this moment — his business calls him to other place, but I must say that I feel that the remarks made by my honourable friend for St. Matthew would tend to infringe on the general stricture set down in Rule 140 and I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to invoke Rule 140 and advise him that it is not proper to speak of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition as Eddie. The Eddie we all know refers to the Honourable Member, and I understand also there is a rule forbidding members to use specific names in debate, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DOMINO: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that the member truly had a point of privilege. I think his

intentions are only to disrupt and to make it more difficult for me to communicate my ideas. First off, I have not referred to the past premier as Eddie — I referred to a problem as the Eddie problem. That's your interpretation of what I'm talking about.

A MEMBER: You've got a guilty conscience?

MR. DOMINO: Secondly, well, I think that's sufficient. I think that this is not really a point of privilege at all, but rather a disruption, and a rude one at this time too. You'll find that in the past, as our House Leader has pointed out, we've often listened to ridiculous statements — Fascist Leader, and things like this — not because we agreed with him, but simply because we respected your right as a member of this Legislature to say what you believed. And I think you should respect my right to communicate my ideas.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: I would say only in response to that, Mr. Speaker, that I certainly do respect. . . — (Interjection)—

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

MR. DOMINO: Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad that you have ruled in my favour. As I was about to say, the Opposition has been arguing over the last little while that because other jurisdictions like Ontario — we've heard Ontario forever — because they've acted in a similar manner to Manitoba, that somehow that justifies Manitoba's irresponsibility, and Manitoba's continuing expansion of the public sector.

Let me remind you of the old, old adage, "Two wrongs do not make a right." It's false logic. It's like if two men go out hunting, one of them falls down and is bitten twice by a rattlesnake, the other goes to his aid and is bitten by a rattlesnake, but only once. Can we conclude from that that the second man is somehow much better off? Is it right for him to conclude that, "Oh, I'm okay because I was only bitten once rather than twice." The facts are that, unless there's some corrective measures taken, both men will die. It's not good enough. It's false logic that we've been hearing from the other side. They justify everything, they justify everything in terms of what other jurisdictions have done. I will readily admit to you that other provinces, the Federal Government, other provinces have made these mistakes too, and you will see, just like in Manitoba, they'll be following our lead — they'll be attempting to correct the problem.

Well, let's look at the second development, the second development — this is what I call the Sid problem. This is the outright invasion of the public sector by the private sector.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE: I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I, too, much stand on a point of privilege. I was enjoying the member's speech very much, but surely, with his abilities, he can make his point without transgressing the rules. He did an excellent job in handling the "Eddie" syndrome, but, nevertheless, when he pins it down to another one I think he is becoming more specific and is transgressing the rules.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER JORGENSEN The Member for Wellington, none too soon, has finally got his hands on the Rule Book — he needed them long ago. And the points of privilege that have been raised by both the Member for Wellington and my good friend, the Member for Winnipeg Centre, are in fact no questions of privilege at all. The infraction of the rule would be valid if my honourable friend, the Member for St. Matthews, was referring to members sitting in their place by their first names. The rule that he invoked is one that calls for an infraction if the member was being addressed in the fashion that he describes. I see no violation of the rule insofar as the remarks of my honourable friend for St. Matthews is concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: I, too, want to go on the record as supporting you for permanent Speaker and I will leave the interpretation of the rules to yourself, Sir, not the House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Is my honourable friend implying that if he raised the question in debate that I have not the right to respond to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. We can only have one speaker at a time. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: No, the point I am making, Mr. Speaker, and the House Leader said that he was glad to see that the Member for Wellington got a Rule Book. Probably after he has read it he will understand

them. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is a transgression of the rules. I leave the case in your hands, without any, once again, lectures from the House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER: I want to tell the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that the only thing that is under debate at the present time is the address by the Member for St. Matthews and the Member for Winnipeg Centre did not have a point of order.

The Honourable Member for St. Matthews and I'm adding five minutes to your time.

MR. DOMINO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a lot to say today and I was hoping that you would not deduct this from my time. These interruptions are a little disconcerting but let me continue.

I was talking about the second of the two major trends and problems we have, the one I choose to refer to is the Sid Syndrome or problem. This is the outright invasion of the private sector of our mixed economy by the public sector. Now both of the problems I have outlined lead to the same inevitable result. They lead to socialism and they lead to the socialism, the complete control of the mixed economy by the public sector.

MR. GREEN: Terrific.

MR. DOMINO: The Member for Inkster says, "Terrific," and one of the things I appreciate about him is his honesty and enthusiasm but unfortunately I don't think that a socialist society and economy is what I want for my children and my grandchildren and myself. I believe truly in the mixed economy.

Now, I'm not going to say much more about the Sid problem because I don't think it's a real definite threat. It's not all that serious at this time because it is being debunked, I would prefer to deal with the first problem. You asked why, why is it no longer a threat? And that is because over the last eight years and in the 1940s and 1950s in Saskatchewan and in many other jurisdictions around the world, the public has been aware of a total and complete failure of this policy. We've seen it in the mining, the exploration, we've seen it in manufacturing with Flyer's and Saunders. The government is not good at creating wealth, it's not good at creating employment. It's not good at producing things. — (Interjection)— The Co-op we're talking about is just that, a co-op which is somewhat different. I'm a supporter of co-ops myself but not of complete and totally organized and run government enterprises.

Now let's look closer at the most serious problem, that problem which I defined as the Eddie problem. What happens when you continually and rapidly expand the public sector? As we've seen in Manitoba and in Canada and in Western Europe and the United States, a great point conceded. Let me state that any government which now, at this point in our economic history, would continue to expand the public sector is wrong and I don't care if that's a Liberal government, a Progressive Conservative government, a Social Credit government, or an ND Party government. They would all be wrong because it's inappropriate and it's wrong now. And it's not good for our economy.

What are the results of this sort of problem? No. 1 — and I'll concede this — that we have seen an increase in valuable services. Yes, we have seen that.

No. 2, we have also seen a huge increase in the Civil Service.

No. 3, we have also seen a rise in the rate of taxation and,

No. 4, we have seen a loss of cost effectiveness in many government programs and government operations.

No. 5, we are altering the balance in our mixed economy. The balance is always being altered in the same direction toward more government, more public.

This altering of the balance in our economy threatens all of our living standards. It threatens everything about our country for it's a fact that if you look at other jurisdictions — not only Manitoba — if you look at any of the examples of a mixed economy, that the government is bad at creating wealth, it's bad at creating commodities and it's got an abysmal record when it comes to creating employment. It creates unemployment because it's inefficient.

We know that the private sector is good at doing these things. I'm not saying turn over everything to the private sector but give it the freedom and give it the opportunity to do what it does best which is create wealth.

After two decades of this uninterrupted public sector expansion all across the western world we have mixed economies.

MR. HANUSCHAK: How many decades?

MR. DOMINO: Two decades.

A MEMBER: Including Duff Roblin.

MR. DOMINO: I'm going back to Duff Roblin and saying that Duff Roblin was not as guilty of this but the government public sector was expanded under Mr. Roblin. The only major expansion of the public sector was in the health field and it was a good one, it was a good one.

The public is now telling us, though, that this trend has gone on too long and it's gone too far and it must be halted. That's why we're in touch with the people today. That's why we're the government today and that's why you are the opposition because you failed to recognize that. Even the socialist Prime Minister of Great Britain recognizes that if you look at the latest budget for Great Britain just

Thursday, April 13, 1978

released last week. People are demanding a stop to the growth of the public sector. They want a rollback of the public sector spending. We need more encouragement for private sector.

And who is saying this? There is a suggestion from the Member for Wellington that only the rich want this. Not so. I'm in touch with my constituents on a daily basis. My constituents are not necessarily very wealthy. All people from all levels of income want a reduction in the government.

MR. GREEN: Half of them are socialists.

MR. DOMINO: All sorts of varying degrees and these people of all sorts of varying degrees of political sophistication, everything from professors in the London School of Economics and Political Studies to the most humble and meek and uneducated of my constituents. They're all saying the same thing: too many civil servants, not enough cost efficiency in government programs. The people are calling for a halt. They are saying that the mix we have of goods and services from the public sector is maybe too rich, there's too much fat. We have continued to expand the funding but we haven't looked to see what we can cut back and make it more efficient.

Take education, for example. We've come a long way since the one-room schools of the 1950s. A lot of progress. And the people of Manitoba are better off for the fact that we've got a better education system. —(Interjection)— The Member for Burrows is screaming about Mr. Roblin when I'm trying to speak, speaking from his seat. Well, you've got to remember that we have the former Premier Duff Roblin basically to thank for that new education system, that good education system of ours. We on this side of the House don't disagree that there have been improvements in living standard and that we are better off for some of this extra government spending.

We don't say that we don't appreciate a better education system. Most of us would thank Duff Roblin, but what we are saying is we want to look at the cost effectiveness of programs. In recent years we have just continued to blindly pour money, more and more money into education without looking at whether it is necessary or looking at whether we're getting a whole dollar's value for every extra dollar we put in. I'm sure in the 1950s we were getting that because the need was so great, the problem was so great, but I'm not so sure we're getting that extra value now. It's one thing to laugh about it; it's another thing to seriously consider what you can do about it. When you waste a dollar somewhere, remember this, when you waste a dollar on a foolish program or a frill, it's one dollar that's not available for necessary things like income supplements for the poor or for public housing or any of the programs which are essential and which are competing with all the other programs. Remember that.

I'm willing to concede that there are things and there is waste in the private sector too. Certainly, when I watch television at night I don't need all those soap commercials and I'll admit it — it's a waste. I certainly don't need those commercials for sanitary napkins and all sorts of other weird things. —(Interjections)— My comments were to the effect that there is waste and there is inefficiency in the private sector too, but hopefully we have a market system which will weed them out. I'll concede it's an essential.

Much of the government expansion we've seen recently has been generated by the public service, not by the real demands of the citizenry and not even by the politicians in many cases. Take the now Member for Transcona. I think he had a lot more effect on the government working as a civil servant in Planning than he would have even if he was on this side in a front bench position because civil servants have a lot of power in our society and they run our government to a large extent. We haven't attempted to control them sufficiently because in a democracy it's essential that politicians control the civil servants, not the other way around which is unfortunately what has been happening. Civil servants are always inventing new ways to regulate. You know, we don't really need a lot of these new regulations. The only reason we have them is because these civil servants must find ways to justify their \$40,000 a year-plus salaries. They're a costly nuisance in many cases, and over the next four years you will see that we will find the waste slowly and we will weed it out and you will be hearing about it continually, let me assure you.

I will also concede that maybe in the future the pendulum will swing back and maybe there will come a time in my political life that the people may want and they may desire and they may need more public sector spending, but it's not now. It's not now. More public sector spending now is just simply acting as a damper on the economy, the productive part of the economy, and it is hurting us. We don't need it now.

Now, I said earlier that all income levels were calling for a reduction in government, that they're all asking for more effectiveness and that includes the low-income people. Because cutbacks in government services aren't necessarily bad for low-income people. Let me assure you, and I think that those of you who have enough understanding of economics and the social structure of our country, I think that you will be aware, that you too will concede that you can cut back on public service without hurting, and public service programs, without hurting the poor and the low-income and the fixed income.

There are a lot of people in our society, the middle and upper-income people, who continually blame the increased taxes they have to pay on the demands that the poor make on our system. I say that's hogwash. People in my constituency are poor and they're not responsible for the high taxes we have in this province. They're not. If you will take a look at what happens to tax dollars in government spending you will see you get from the government in proportion to what you pay in, and that if you are wealthier and middle-income! you get back more services from the government, and a great deal of the expansion in government programs over the last eight years have been aimed at the wealthy.

Services to the wealthy. We haven't helped the poor very much. They haven't even been getting their fair share.

A MEMBER: For example?

MR. DOMINO: Okay, someone says, "For example." Let's take a look at the big ticket items in the Budget. Take a look at the first one, education. Who uses education? The poor? The core people? I taught at a core high school, Gordon Bell, until just recently. Let me tell you the poor don't get past junior high. They're lucky if they get into technical schools, the low-income people, the ones you were really concerned about, who we should be transferring income to, they don't use that expensive education system of ours. They don't get past junior high, never mind high school, never mind going to the universities which you're so concerned about subsidizing. The universities are full of upper and middle-income children, that's who they are full of. e

Take a look at . . . Well, health care, I might concede that health care is pretty fair in its distribution and its pretty good although there are surveys and programs . . .

A MEMBER: Why don't the poor get passed Grade 9?

A MEMBER: They do; I did.

Health Care is a little better. Health care is another big ticket item. It's a little better but not all that much because there are lots of programs and reports to show that again the middle and upper-income people use the services more because they know how to use them more.

Take a look at another big item. In the last eight years we've had a big expansion in parks and recreation. Who uses them? Who goes to those parks? Not the downtown core people I represent, no — the people from Westwood, the people from Rossmere, the people from Seven Oaks, the suburban people. Take a look at the Art Gallery — the Member for Elmwood is looking at the wall right now, he's looking for one of those beautiful, thousands of dollar pictures he bought over the last four or five years. Who uses those pictures and those art galleries? Not the core people, no, not the core people.

MR. DOERN: Everybody.

MR. DOMINO: The suburbanites and the wealthy people. So you can cut back on government services and not hurt the poor.

Now you've got to do it carefully and you've got to do it wisely, and I'm on this side of the House and I'm going to stand up and fight to make sure it's always done that way by our government.

MR. HANUSCHAK: . . . of Hansard to all the members of the Treasury bench.

MR. DOMINO: If you want to raise the people at the bottom, then we've got to free enough tax dollars from these universal programs which are welfare for the rich, so that we can give income supplements to those people directly, that's the answer. You don't get to the position of being able to do that if you are continually building universal programs for the people in Westwood and the people in St. Vital.

Mr. Speaker, during my remarks this afternoon the opposition has acted in a way that I consider rude, not at all conducive to an intelligent exchange of ideas and opinions. I'm trying to express an opinion, to educate you a little, to offer you at the very least, my point of view. And what do I get? I get people all over the other side speaking from their seats, laughing, not listening — it's acceptable — it is a sign of the arrogant attitude of that particular party, the N.D. party, which put them on the opposition and will keep them there, thank God.

The Member for Inkster, who's not here right now, the member who listens to everything, who's always here, he assures me — who's not here to listen to my remarks — after I spoke in reply to the Speech from the Throne, he got up and he said something that I thought was really foolish. He said, "Oh, coming from the man who won his seat by only 150 votes; why should we listen to you?" If we're going to follow that sort of logic — that stupid logic, let me remind the Member for Inkster, of all the members of this House whose plurality were larger than his, and according to his own logic, should be listened to, and who have more to say and more of value to contribute — let me remind them; there's the Member for Charleswood, the Member for Fort Garry, the Member for River Heights, the Member for Assiniboia, the Member for Pembina, the Member for Arthur, the Member for Gladstone, the Member for Lakeside, the Member for Steinbach, the Member for Morris, the Member for Rhineland, the Member for St. Vital, the Member for Souris-Killarney, the Member for Rock Lake and many others. If you are going to apply his very own logic, then he should have nothing to contribute; he should sit back and listen to these people.

Now the other night, when the former Premier acted in what I considered a very rude manner during the Budget Speech and interrupted, and I had the opportunity to remind him of his arrogance and rudeness, the other night after that was over I was walking out in the hall, I was walking back to the Caucus Room thinking of something, and a member from the second row back there, a former Cabinet Minister, walked up to me and shoved his finger in my face and said, "You're in trouble —

you're in trouble now, because you dared to take on Eddie. We are going to be merciless with you, we're going to be merciless. The heckling will be ferocious, you'll never be able to speak again." Well, let me say to that person, let me say to that person, that I'm not intimidated that easily. I was elected by the people of St. Matthews to stand up and fight for better government, more efficient government, and for their rights. —(Interjection)—

Now, I noticed in the paper the other day that some high-falutin' Member of Parliament from down East came down to bestow the blessing on the former Premier after 20 years of illustrious service to our province, and he compared him to the Golden Boy. He said, "Oh, it's Manitoba's Golden Boy." And I thought, of course, because it's the NHL and WHA playoffs and well, I thought of course of hockey, and I thought of Bobby Hull, a great, exemplary figure, a man who plays the game fair and clean, works hard, does a good job, and I thought, that's not what you compare the former Premier to. You compare him more, he and his caucus remind me more of an NHL team which was powerful a few years ago, and they got by because they bullied and they intimidated and they thrashed all their opponents. And they had at one time, and they still do, a captain who was a pretty good player — but this man was, of course, prone to fits, and still is, of temper, and he would be often seen on television spearing his opponents. And when someone dared to say, "Oh, stop it, or I'll punch you," four or five of these Philadelphia players would run over and trounce the fellow and bash his head in. That's the same sort of attitude we get from you people; you remind me of the Philadelphia Flyers, not Bobby Hull. It's that same arrogant, bullying attitude that's going to keep you on the Opposition side forever, and thank God, that's good for the people of Manitoba. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Listening to the remarks this morning, and as a person who has been destined to be the Deputy Speaker, permanent Deputy Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, anything following the performance by the Member for St. Matthews will seem pale by comparison. I never thought of myself as one of those bullies from that famous Broad Street bully team — in fact I always despised them, I always thought of myself as one of the most gentlemanly players, or our team as one of the easier, softer teams in the league that at least played clean, but we were not obviously perceived by that on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to primarily deal in my comments with a situation that arose lately and that was on the instigation of the new Minister of Public Works about a Provincial Garage. But before that, I also wanted to make a remark to the Member for Minnedosa who unfortunately isn't present, and to some of his colleagues on the back bench, because I noticed the other day that they were, with some glee, in the government saying to those of us in the Opposition that we are wounded and we are bitter about the fact that we are on this side of the House. And they either really believe that, Mr. Speaker, or they are saying it to bait us. I don't know what it is. I don't know whether they really think that that is true or whether it's just one way of presumably getting a rise out of members of this House.

But you know, I want to tell them quite sincerely, as one who sat on this side of the House for three years, then sat on the government back bench, then sat in the Cabinet, and am now back to where I started from in 1966 — that it is not painful, it is not painful for those of us who were in the government to sit on this side of the House. It doesn't hurt. It isn't embarrassing. In fact, for many of us, Mr. Speaker, it's a relief. It's time for us to get a little rest, time for us to boost our batteries a bit, to recharge them, and it's also a lot of fun.

We don't mind the period of being in Opposition — it's only three-and-a-half years — it's good in a democratic system that people take their turns at being the government, because it is an onerous responsibility, and those members on the front benches who have a portfolio or have a couple of portfolios, or even as many as three portfolios, they will very much appreciate the day in the future when they have a chance to take a rest, because it is simply very hard work.

I want to say to the backbenchers, who are the ones that continually sing this song to those of us in the Opposition, that I can understand their frustration, because, Mr. Speaker, nobody in government in Canada can be more frustrated than a government backbencher. That is the worst position that there can possibly be, because most of the fun is either being in Cabinet or in being in Opposition. And the worst position of all, the very last man, the least in this House, are those in the government back bench. And particularly in the Tory back bench. They are looking, Mr. Speaker, at the fact that they do not have Cabinet appointments; they are looking at their Cabinet which has been stumbling and faltering and going from bad to worse, wrecking and just ruining the credits that the Conservatives stored up in Opposition and in the election period, blowing the ballgame. And they have to sit there powerless while the Ministers louse it up, and it goes from bad to worse, day by day.

Mr. Speaker, I also think of the Member for Minnedosa, who is fairly frustrated. He didn't make it into Cabinet this time, but maybe he will on the reshuffle and so on. I think he probably sees himself as a second Walter Weir, somebody who came from a part of the province, worked up to Premier, he has the model to shoot for, but he doesn't appear to be doing too well in terms of that. And then the ultimate frustration for a Royal banker is a Task Force Report. Mr. Speaker, I don't mind the Task Force Report because my bank is the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce and the Task Force modelled, they modelled the new structure in government on the basis of the Imperial Bank of Commerce, not the Royal Bank. To me that is sort of okay, at least I understand the structure, the proposed structure, but for someone from the Royal Bank, of course this is a most painful and difficult thing.

Thursday, April 13, 1978

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to deal primarily with what I regard as a sickness in the Conservative camp, that there is something wrong or as the classical Shakespeareans would say, "There is something rotten in the state of Denmark," and I see some malady, a malady in the Conservative mind, in the elected representatives who sit in this Chamber opposite. I see this, Mr. Speaker, as an overwhelming and an overpowering desire to smear the official opposition. This is the basis, this is the premise upon which the Conservatives are acting. This is their basic motivation in office. It is not to govern, it is not to present their program and defend it to the people of Manitoba, it is to look backward and to attack and to belittle and to smear the official opposition in its time or term of government. And you know, it hasn't worked — it has not worked. I don't expect it to work, it shouldn't work, but in fact it has failed to work. —(Interjection)— I feel sorry for my friend from Wolseley. He. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Point of Order.

MR. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a Point of Order to the Member for Elmwood. We are being falsely accused on this side as smearing the opposition. What we are attempting to do in government is to explain the truth of their fallacy in government to the public of Manitoba and I take personal exception that it's called smearing.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I will simply allow the member to make his observation which isn't a point of order. But I say to the Member for Wolseley who used to be the terrible tiger who sat in the extreme side of this Chamber and used to rousingly attack and slam the government. I feel sorry for him because the whole party has outflanked him. I have told him this, he used to be the extreme right-winger in the opposition. Now he is a mushy middle of the road Liberal, because the whole party has shifted so far right that he looks pale in comparison. The Member for Pembina comes in, a young tiger from the south, and brings with him the Member for St. Matthews and other people. He reads us all the old speeches of the young George Henderson, but George we must remember, did evolve and did grow, and did change, over a period of time. And we looked forward, Mr. Speaker, to the education and the alteration and the advancement of the Member for Pembina and some of his colleagues in the back bench.

Mr. Speaker, I give a few examples of the government trying to smear and blacken — would the Honourable Member accept the expression 'blacken'? — trying to blacken and besmirch the record of our administration and the attitude comes out in debate every day and it comes out particularly about once a week in some kind of crisis. This came from the Minister of Tourism who misled this House. This came from the Minister of Public Works who fabricated some crisis about a provincial garage which I'll deal with. This came from the Minister of Finance, who talked about a \$300 million cut, and then \$129 million deficit and then some unimportant \$50 million figure that he forgot about just the other day. A whole series of these things, Mr. Speaker, and they are following, they are following their leader. I mean, you know, I've said this before, I don't fault them, the name of the game is called, "cut people, fire people in your department," so they all do it. Well, can you blame them? The leader says, "I want you to fire people, the more you fire the better you are." So they run around firing people. Well, I don't fault them for that. Now the First Minister says, "Expose NDP mismanagement. This is the name of the game. Whatever is waste in mismanagement I want you to flush it out, dig it out, find it, invent it, fabricate it, imagine it, but by all means bring some forward, you must bring forward so many examples of mismanagement all the time." And he is going to demonstrate this, he says, in the course of Estimates, and he said to us, Mr. Speaker, on March 29th, "Enjoy yourselves while you can because once the Estimates begin, new unpleasant facts about the NDP administration are going to emerge every day." And he singled out my honourable friend, the Member for Rupertsland and myself, now I am sure he's added my colleague from Transcona and the list grows. It grows day by day.

MR. WILSON: As we make the discoveries.

MR. DOERN: That's right, as these things are uncovered they are going to let us have it, Mr. Speaker. Well, I simply say one thing to the opposition, I said it before, I say it again. You have a set of priorities, defend them. That is what you should be doing. Put your priorities down and defend your priorities. You want to engage in attack, you want to work on us, you want to slam us, you want to smear us, go ahead, be my guest, try it. We'll see, we'll see whether you are successful in that kind of a campaign, whether the people of Manitoba are going to listen to a government that spends all of its time attacking the previous administration in lieu of providing leadership and government. We'll see.

Mr. Speaker, you more than anyone appreciate the game of football and I wish that I could talk more learnedly about the sport. I played the game in high school. I followed football. I followed the Winnipeg Blue Bombers with some interest and watched TV, American and Canadian games, etc., and as a matter of fact I enjoy it more than watching hockey because I do not like the brutality in hockey, I do not like the endless muggings that take place on the rink and my honourable friend from St. Matthews really hurt when he described us as the notorious Philadelphia Flyers because there is nobody I despise more in hockey than the Philadelphia Flyers. I say to the Attorney-General, when the Attorney-General brought a charge against some young hockey players in this province, I say he did the right thing because I support him on that. I believe that violence in hockey, assault on the ice is assault nevertheless, and I think that he should continue on. But I say in terms of football to my honourable friends, you know it's like a football game. It's your turn with the ball, you have the ball,

take the ball, and run down the field, see how many yards you can make. It's your turn, and don't spend all your time analyzing our performance in government.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to deal with the garage, the provincial garage that this administration built and I must tell you that although I asked some questions of the Minister a week ago concerning this facility, I discovered by accident over the last couple of months what was up. I wondered why the provincial garage wasn't being used and then I discovered that the garage was in fact complete and that the present administration wasn't moving in and that they had two wild thoughts in mind. One was to sell it, and another was to renovate it, and this is what I would like to deal with today.

The question is this, Mr. Speaker. Here is a 3 million dollar facility, specifically designed for the central provincial garage. It costs at present \$3,500 a month for minimal electrical and heating bills and security and it sits idle. Now the question is, I think any intelligent citizen would say, "What is going on here, why isn't the government using this facility?" And I say that the answer is very simple, that the premier of this province in consultation with his senior ministers, and in this case the Minister of Public Works, has said in effect, "Discredit Doern, discredit Schreyer, discredit the NDP on this particular example, wherever possible, wherever possible." Here is a facility, Mr. Speaker, 100 percent complete, standing idle for political purposes, \$3 million in taxpayers' funds.

The Tories, Mr. Speaker, in the election campaign — I listened in this Chamber and I listened all through the election campaign, and I heard time and time and time again about provincial garages. The government is building garages all over the place. There is at least two. You know, I know what some means, I know what garages means, it means two or more, and it sounded like there was a number of them, that this administration was building a series of garages, a nuer of garages, and so on and so on.

They attack our planned construction in the core area of Winnipeg, an environmental laboratory which is needed, which we'll deal with during the estimates of my honourable friend; an Autopac MPB building which is on hold; the provincial garage and the provincial judges court building which we had as a lower priority, but my honourable friend apparently is now moving up in terms of possibilities when the freeze comes off. . . TSo they hold, they put a hold on the labhe lab is sitting there. . .

MR. ENNS: A hold on the seventeenth or eighteenth year of our term.

MR. DOERN: . . . the lab is sitting there, Mr. Speaker — I think there was maybe half a million, I can't remember the exact figure, half a million or more for the land, several hundred thousand in architect's fees, \$350,000 on the foundation — it sits, idle. The garage of course they had to proceed with and that of course was taken up to a 3 million dollar completion.

Mr. Speaker, what are the facts of the matter? The present provincial garage, which is down from the street from here, was built in 1947, thirty-one years ago. At that time, the provincial fleet was 300 vehicles. Today, the provincial fleet is 2,400 vehicles, eight times as many and most of them are in the Winnipeg area. Well, you know, I might remind you my friend from St. James — who is I think one of the more intelligent members in the House, and certainly on that side of the House — what he is going to tell me, what he is going to tell me, and I respect him, what he is going to tell me is that we made the fleet go up times eight, but I have to remind him that the Roblin administration was also in power and the Weir administration was also in power and they expanded and advanced the size of the fleet. And I will tell you why they did it, Mr. Speaker, because it is cheaper at a certain point to provide a car for somebody than to pay them for mileage on their own personal car. I will give you some breakdowns of that shortly. So I say that here's a facility down the street, thirty-one years old, it was built at a time when the fleet was one-eighth its present size and it is an inefficient building, it is a cramped building and it is contrary at this point in time to national building code requirements.

Now, why was this garage built? I say three reasons. Number one, we built it for present and future requirements; number two, we built it for urban renewal; and number three, we built it to stimulate employment in the construction industry with spinoffs in manufacturing. Are any of these facts considered? Are any of these facts considered? No, no, they are not considered. Well, you know we hear about Nick Ternette. My honourable friend from this side of the House makes the point, from Crescentwood, I don't know how he did it — 45 votes. . .

A MEMBER: Try 88.

MR. DOERN: . . . 88 votes — that was a squeaker. Mr. Speaker, he quotes Nick Ternette — well I don't want to spend too much time on Nick Ternette. The last time I attacked Nick Ternette my friend and I from St. Matthews, the other Member for St. Matthews, t we attacked Nick Ternette and he told on us. He wrote a letter to the New Democratic Party and he said we should be hauled up and, you know, we should be given a raking over the coals. Well, I can see, at least my friends on that side support Nick Ternette — they won't support me, but they support Nick. And, you know, Nick made the point, something about all the expropriations and so on, tried to agitate a bit to support the new Minister of Public Works and so on, but, Mr. Speaker, one mark, one mark of how effective that would be in terms of the expropriation is the number of people who settled out of court. That would be one indication of whether they accepted the offer made by the government, and Mr. Speaker, in every instance nobody went to court. There were first of all agreements made between the people in the area, and secondly, of those who had to be expropriated, nobody ultimately went to court.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with 12 points that were raised by the Minister of Public Works in this House and out of this House with the press. He made comments in this House to questions that I asked. He made his correcting statement. He gave interviews to the press. And then he went and took a look. He decided to take a look. He's been a Minister for 6 months — the \$3 million building sitting there — he never got around to it — he's a busy man, but he finally went there. You know, that reminds me of Aristotelians — you know, those of us with classical backgrounds — they used to debate. Aristotelian scholars used to debate questions like, "How many teeth are there in the mouth of a horse?" And nobody thought of going and looking into the mouth of a horse. But they had this debate raging for I don't know how many years.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question at this juncture — just one question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the Honourable Member for Elmwood accept a question?

MR. DOERN: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: My question is, "Does the member know how many teeth are in the mouth of a horse?"

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad he didn't raise the other end of that question.

A MEMBER: We know there are no teeth there!

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not dealing with agriculture now, I'm dealing with Public Works. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say this to the Minister of Public Works — that he was in rare form the other day when I asked him those questions and so on, he was in rare form. I have seen him perform in this House for 12 years. Some of my colleagues who've just been elected this time — they've never seen anything like it before. But we've seen it before, playing to the galleries, playing to the hilt. I think, unfortunately, in that particular instance, Mr. Speaker, he went too far, because what he did, in effect, was he took himself seriously. He made such a pitch about this garage that he painted himself into a corner and all of a sudden he then found himself in a precarious position where he decided that he was right. He then took himself seriously. Mr. Speaker, that's something that none of us, none of us in this House do. We do not take the Minister of Public Works seriously — none of us do. That is probably his biggest failing. He got himself into that same quandry during a debate on the Russian Art Exhibition. He started fooling around, fooling around, and all of a sudden he decided he would take a position that he started out frivolously making. Now he finds himself starting out on this business about a \$3 million garage, only this is dead serious, Mr. Speaker. We're talking about a great deal of money. We're talking about a monthly upkeep. So I say about this Minister, he doesn't take positions. He doesn't normally take positions. He stumbles into positions. He falls into positions of his own creation.

I want to look at these 12 points right now that he said. I've taken all his speeches to the press and written them all down and, I think, Mr. Speaker, that it can be demonstrated that each and every one is untrue, inaccurate, or completely fabricated.

He said, for example, No. 1, he said he doesn't know why the garage was built. That's the first thing he said. He didn't know why it was built. Well, I say to him if he doesn't know he should look up his files, he should meet with his staff, he should go down and examine the old provincial garage, not just the new provincial garage, and he should acquaint himself with the facts.

Secondly, he says he doesn't know who should occupy this building now that it is built. You know, it's kind of fun debating whether something should be built or not. That's all in good fun. But when it's sitting there completely ready — turn the key and you're in business — I think that that is another matter. He had a tour and I think he now knows what the structure was designed for.

Third, he said he's awaiting a 30 foot bronze statue. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, what could be an easier target, what could be the most vulnerable of all? Art. That's got to be the easiest thing to make fun of. I mean, never mind programs and so on, hell, just take a bit of modern art, contemporary sculpture, easy to knock, easy to make fun of, no problem whatsoever. So he talked about this 30 foot bronze statue. Well, I don't know if he knew what — I don't know if he knew whether this was a statue or wasn't a statue, but I think that he knows now that he was talking about a large wall sculpture — something that is made out of bronze, 20 odd feet long, 5 or 6 feet high, abstract design, nailed or screwed on to the wall, made by a Manitoba sculptor, in a main public area, and in line with the policy of this government and of eight or nine provincial governments and of the Federal Government of Canada to allocate 1 percent of construction moneys for art. This is equivalent to a third of 1 percent' Mr. Speaker, and it is in line with the policy of the present administration because Mr. Osler, the assistant Deputy Minister, in the first month of office, somewhere in November or December of last year, represented the Minister before a meeting of artists and confirmed the continuation of that policy, and I hope that it does continue. And if the members on that side don't like the kind of art that was commissioned by the Art Advisory Committee which I established, or bought by people in my department, or purchased on my authority, then I say to them, buy something else. Buy something else. If you don't like abstract art, buy pictures of dogs, and horses, and cows, and birds, and

mountains, and rivers. That's okay, that's okay. There's all kinds of tastes, you know. I know most of the Ministers, the only art that they have on that side of the House, in their houses, are calendars — Atomic Transfer and Security Storage calendars, that's what they have over their chesterfield. — (Interjection)— Insurance calendars, bailiff calendars and so on — all these sort of things, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, but I want to say this as well, my colleague for Inkster just made a good point. Right outside this Chamber is a mural by Brangwin, one of the great artists in what was then the British Empire. It's the first World War, maybe the second, no, the first World War memorial, a half-circle piece of art. It cost \$10,000 in 1920, Mr. Speaker. You know, 60 years ago, I think the Conservative administration, I'm not sure who was in power then. It was just after, it may have been the Roblin Administration — it may have been someone else — they had the foresight to spend \$10,000 there, and I would say in current dollars this is probably equivalent to \$65,000 today. They took one of the finest artists in the British Empire. The difference is that we take the finest artists in Manitoba. That's the difference.

Mr. Speaker, could I ask how many more minutes I have?

MR. SPEAKER: The member has ten minutes.

MR. DOERN: Ten minutes, thank you. Mr. Speaker, the fourth point that I make is this. The Minister said there were 6 gas pumps — 6 gas pumps with a statue and so on. There are four.

The fifth point. He said the gas pumps were to serve the public. Now, this was more serious, Mr. Speaker, because this was completely false. And he said that these gas pumps were to serve the public, and undoubtedly drive the three to four private operators out of business in that area. Mr. Speaker, 100 percent false — never considered, never talked about, completely contrary to the policy of the Central Provincial Garage, I assume. From day one through our administration and into the future the provincial garage services government vehicles only and sells gas to them only, and the Minister knows that. He knows that. And he also knows better than that than to have said that.

Sixth. He said the senior Public Works officials indicated to him that the present provincial garage is operating in a satisfactory manner. I say, produce those officials, name those officials. I would like to have those officials come to the Estimates and stand there and look me in the eye and tell me that that was their opinion. I would like to see one man say that because no one ever said that to me, and I don't know whether the Minister was putting us on there or not, but I say that if the senior officials said that that was true, produce those officials, let them stand up during Estimates and let them make their case because I would like them to say that to me, because if that's true somebody was being misled. They're either putting on this Minister, putting this Minister on, or they put me on. And I say, Mr. Speaker, if that is true, then this Minister should fire those senior officials because they are not trustworthy.

Mr. Speaker, a seventh point is he said that he was looking for other uses for the garage — maybe a lab, maybe an Autopac centre, maybe a Cadham lab, environmental lab and so on. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether this Minister knows anything about conversion costs but I can tell you it'll cost millions of dollars, millions of dollars to do that and would be the height of folly.

Now, on No. 8 we get the fact that the fleet may be reduced to 2,000 or 1,800. Now here the Minister was delighted. He looked up the Task Force Report. Boy, that's a laugh. I read the section on Public Works, Mr. Speaker. I used to be a teacher. I used to read essays. I can tell you, if someone turned in an essay on the Public Works section like that I would have failed them. No background, no footnotes, no logic, no familiarity with the government fleet. They said that they might cut the fleet by about a third, and therefore the new garage would be redundant. So the Minister, he got himself into a funny situation. He got himself into a corner. He got the Task Force Report and he said, "Thank God, this is in the Task Force Report. It says (Honest to God, and it does) the garage may be redundant." I don't know if he wrote that himself. I don't know who wrote that, but I know how they got there. They started with the fact of arguing that the garage was redundant. That's where they started. They said, "Let's embarrass these guys. Let's say it's a white elephant, and then let's try to make up a reason for that." I tell you this, Mr. Speaker, these men never read the Annual Report and neither did the Minister. He didn't know it was in his own Annual Report. It says in there that last year there were 49 million miles put on the government fleet — an average of 20,000. And what does it say in this report? It says, "If we make the cut-off, instead of having about 12,000 where a person may be eligible for a car, we jack it up to 15,000. Then, what'll happen is we'll cut the fleet by a third." You know what the problem is? The average car goes 20,000. It doesn't go 15,000. If you do that, if you jack it up to 15,000 nothing will happen. And if you cut the fleet by a third, which would make my honourable friend happy, cut it by a third, go ahead. Do you know what will happen? You will then have to pay for about 17 million miles. It'll cost you 6 cents a mile more to pay an individual than to operate the car — I'll give you the figures later — 6 cents a mile more on 17 million miles — a million bucks a year. That's what it will cost you if you go to private cars.

Mr. Speaker, No. 9. He's considering allowing a private firm, he's going to let a private firm lease the space while the government makes up its mind. Well, how long will it take to make up their mind? Sixty seconds? Sixty days? Five years? How long is he going to let that facility stand idle while he fools around with this proposition?

And No. 10, and the last point — no, I guess I have a couple more. He said it was inconveniently located in a congested area. You know, I read that statement twice, Mr. Speaker, because I thought he was talking about the present provincial garage. That's a congested area and that's inconveniently

located, but he was referring to the other. And then he said he has no use for it, and then he said they were going to undertake a study. Well, I'd like to know who is undertaking the study, and I would like to know how long that study is going to take.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by saying this. What started out as a little joke, a little play, a little ploy, from the Honourable Minister, who has a sense of humour, has turned into a Tory horror story. And I say this to that government, you are the government, you are free to do whatever you want with all the buildings in Manitoba. You can do whatever you want. If you want to sell the garage, you're free to do so. If you want to renovate it, you're free to do so. If you want to demolish it . . . If you want to turn it into a soup kitchen to take care of all the unemployed people that you're putting out of work in this province, go ahead. You want to take the Norquay Building and turn it into a grain elevator? You want to use the Woodsworth Building for storage? You want to rent rooms in the Legislature to people overnight? You want to take the Law Courts and turn it into public housing? Go ahead, you're the government. Mr. Speaker, I say in conclusion, the government is free to blow out their brains; they have the reins of power now, let them govern accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, may I bring you greetings from Roblin constituency, to the members of the House, and to your very able Deputy Speaker as Assistant, and wish you well.

Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult and trying to follow the Honourable Member for Elmwood in this Budget Debate, and I'm still kind of choked up about this horror story of this garage, and we just got over shedding tears for that tunnel over that washroom and getting that one — I don't know if it's functioning yet either, I hardly ever see anybody go in there — but of course, the former Minister of Public Works has left his works of art, I'm sure, all around the province and future generations will stand and amaze at those edifices that were built to the New Democratic Party. I suppose the buildings that they had in mind — all governments come and go and everybody has a different idea about buildings. The Woodsworth Building was another edifice of that great Minister, and if my memory serves me correctly, after he got it built he found that he was violating the statutes of the city because the building was too high. Some people still maintain that the building isn't sitting square with the world; of course, being a socialist, they never would stand anything square with the rest of society.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. McKENZIE: I want to finish, but sure, as soon as I finish.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, in going through the Budget, I hope that I and other members can convince the members opposite to join us in supporting this document, a very interesting Budget, one that has a lot of food and a lot of thought for the people of this province as we move into the first year of office as the government again of a great province. I like one of the opening statements of our First Minister very much, Mr. Speaker, where he spoke for a great many Canadians when he expressed deep concern about the directions our country has taken in recent years. I think it would be only fair of me at this time to draw some conclusions of what has taken place in eastern Canada, the Government of Canada, since the last Budget. I rather like the remarks of the Honourable Member for Inkster the other day, when he mentioned something about "the Liberals are on the ropes" and he was out campaigning already to try and get rid of them. And I often wonder just how closely associated the Honourable Member for Inkster is with the Prime Minister of this country, because the great man Pierre Elliott Trudeau comes from a strong New Democratic background, and I sometimes wonder just how far the members opposite would go to try and defeat that man. Sure, Mr. Speaker, he's been blamed for almost everything today and I join the sentiments of many others who blame him for our economic and our political problems in Canada today. The mismanagement of our federal affairs is in evidence every day; the dollar today is down below 87 cents, I am told, on the marketplace. And of course Mr. Speaker, we can't over-emphasize the fact that our unity crisis in this country today has likely been brought about by that man and that government by placing far too much emphasis on language and culture and neglecting the economic affairs of our great country. So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly join the sentiments of the Honourable Member for Inkster and others and hope that they can, at the earliest possible date, remove that man and that government from office. It's like the remarks I heard from our former leader, that great man Robert Stanfield, the other day when he expressed some sentiments about the Prime Minister and his government. He said something about the fact that national unity to that man is like asking an arsonist to put out a fire.

Mr. Speaker, many members opposite in their words of wisdom and in the debate, are still not convinced, still not convinced, Mr. Speaker, that we have a mandate to rule, that we have a mandate to govern, that we have a mandate to guide the people of this province for the next four years. And it comes rolling across day after day after day. May I very briefly, Mr. Speaker, quote out of the *Scratching River Post*, one of the great newspapers of our rural communities, from Morris and this editor chap by the name of Penner said, "Bully for Lyon." He says, "The howls from some quarters falling on the heels of the Provincial Government's announcement that some 373 Civil Service employees would be laid off, leads one to believe that the sources of moaning regard the Civil Service

as a sacred cow. No doubt the Civil Service has been a sacred cow in the past eight years, he goes on to say, particularly for those who have been milking the cow. It's time to give the cow a rest." And he goes on, Mr. Speaker, and he closes off his article by saying, "The Provincial Government when attempting to achieve government efficiencies, should consider no cows are sacred. They were elected to cut government spending, they have a mandate for four years; those who are howling now will have their chance to bring about change when the government must seek a mandate in the normal course of time. It is to be hoped," this great man says, "that the Provincial Government will not be detracted from their commitment to the people of Manitoba."

And Mr. Speaker, let us assure members opposite that we are going to carry out that commitment, we are going to carry out that mandate, where more than 50 percent of the people in this province told us they supported us, they support our policies, they support our views, and we are going to implement them. And I know, Mr. Speaker, the socialist crowd always have a hard time justifying that there is Conservatives and Conservative governments across this country, regardless of the number of times they are compared. But Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's ever a time in history where I as a politician in my constituency, got the message louder and clearer than this past election. And I'll tell you some of the things that people were telling me as I was knocking on doors in the hustings. I happened to pick up the Readers Digest the other day and I saw an article by a chap by the name of McGillvray who exactly said the same things that my people were telling me in Roblin constituency. He said, "Consider the average Canadian, as he gropes his way to consciousness each morning. He makes contact with government as soon as he turns the lights on. He washes in government water, his breakfast egg comes from the government egg monopoly, his cereal and toast is from the government grain monopoly, the butter, at twice the world price, comes from the government dairy monopoly. If he drives to work, the car and its operator both must have permission from the government before venturing on government streets and government roads. He stops and starts according to government instructions conveyed by peremptory red and green lights. Government determines how much money he will be paid, how long he will work, and it takes its cut out of his wages before he sees them. Born in a government hospital, educated in a government school, he will eventually retire on a government pension. Then government will pay his last medical bill."

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the concern of many many people in this province and across Canada today, where this big web and this big hand of government has got itself so deeply in the hip pockets of our taxpayers that they are finally yelling, "Ouch, ouch, ouch!" Get those heavy-spending governments, those heavy-spending Ministers, those left-wing believers who think they can save all the problems of the world, let us remove them from office, remove them from office at the earliest possible date. Mr. Speaker, that is what happened. That is what happened last fall, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure the members opposite will get used to it in a little while. It's not, as the Honourable Member for Elmwood said, that he likes the opposition over there — I'm sure, and we hope that you stay there for a long time and enjoy it, I'm sure we will.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, this mandate that we were talking about here was a mandate for change that we presented to the people of this province in the fall election. It's a mandate to hopefully turn the economy around in this province, it's a mandate for a strong and for a healthy private sector, and it's a mandate for responsive, accountable, common-sense government. And I'm telling the people of my constituency, assuring them, Mr. Speaker, assuring the people of my constituency that that's the government we're going to have, and those are the policies that we're going to carry out.

And we're not misleading the people in any way, shape, or form, as members opposite would try and have us believe. We have, Mr. Speaker, reduced the income taxes in this province, as promised. We have abolished the succession duty and the gift tax, as we promised. For the people, we have repealed the Mineral Acreage Tax as we promised. We have introduced Expenditure Estimates with the lowest growth rate in Canada this year. These are only a start. Now, those are not my words. Those are the words of the Minister of Finance in this Budget, Mr. Speaker, and I fully support them. And I am sure that the people of Roblin constituency fully support them as well.

Our challenge, he goes on to say in his comment, is to first help build and maintain the economic base which will make as many services as possibly can be for the people, and pay for them. I support that, Mr. Speaker. I have no quarrels with that. I do, Mr. Speaker, find that when that government was in office, they did very very little for Roblin constituency. I asked them how long it's going to take them, if they were still in office today — the Member for Elmwood — why didn't you put that \$3.5 million for the garage on some roads in my constituency? Why didn't you? But for some reason, you decided rather to put it in a building. Why didn't you put that \$3.5 million in a health delivery system between Dauphin and Swan River? None existed. You were in office eight years, you had all the chances in the world to put some form of health delivery system, between Dauphin and Swan River. Mr. Speaker, they failed the people of my constituency completely, completely. Why, Mr. Speaker, would any Minister of Highways — and I had the honour to live beside the former Minister of Highways and I daresay I helped the new Member for Dauphin to get rid of that Minister, and that's good riddance. Why would any Minister, in his wildest imagination, Mr. Speaker, pave his roads up to the top of the boundary of my constituency, and let the poor people from Roblin constituency drive on gravel? On gravel. Eight years in office, eight years they represented the people, they have all the policies, they spent millions and millions and millions of dollars — they spent very little of it in Roblin constituency, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Minister of Mines, the drainage programs, the drainage dollars, the drainage systems that he built in my constituency are almost non-existent, Mr. Speaker. And that's another reason why those members opposite do not have the right to govern in this province today, because they forgot the people of Roblin constituency, I assure you, on these

matters, roads, health care delivery, and drainage, and those are three of the most important things, especially in that area between Dauphin and Swan River. Those people need roads in there. — (Interjection)— I am asking you between Dauphin and Swan River, that's the area that I represent, Sir, in which health care is almost non-existent.

Mr. Speaker, let's talk about the problems that we have had with getting the road paved across the Shellmouth Dam, the many speeches I have made in this House trying to convince that government. They did pave a few miles, which I'm most grateful for, but it ended there.

Let's look at the development of the Asessippi Provincial Park, and that's a goody. That's a goody. I recall the day, Mr. Speaker, and you must remember the day, Mr. Speaker, when we opened that park. The former First Minister of this Province and the former Minister of Highways — a great entourage of people stood there all day waiting for these two honourable gentlemen to appear to cut the ribbon. As the shadows were falling toward late evening, Mr. Speaker, we finally gave up that this former Highways Minister and the former Premier of this province would appear for the official opening. The Speaker, who is in his chair today and other honourable gentlemen from the area, cut the ribbon for Asessippi Provincial Park, and I suspect that's the last time anything was done in that park. That's the last time. Many people come and go, signs are still out on the highways, Mr. Speaker, they drive in — there's not even a place to plug your trailer in. Government, management, looking after the needs of people — they don't understand, those members opposite, Mr. Speaker, they haven't got a clue how to govern.

Rather than look after some of the problems in my constituency the Honourable Minister of Public Works was building a garage downtown for electric cars, that nobody could drive, nobody wanted and nobody will have any part of. Great thrust — the great drive of this socialist crowd, Mr. Speaker. Doesn't it make your blood tingle when you see how they motivate your constituency and mine, Mr. Speaker, and look after the needs of our people?

Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would see in an election campaign some of the most uncalled for, hatred type of tactics used in a campaign as was used in my constituency during the last election. I never dreamt that any New Democrat or any of his supporters, or that any of his campaign crowd would come into Roblin constituency and tell the old age pensioners, "If you vote for McKenzie, you'll be kicked out of the nursing homes. If you vote for McKenzie and you have shingles or something done to the roof of your home under the Critical Home Repair Grant, the shingles will be ripped off your roof." Yes, those were the people who were governing this province, Mr. Speaker, those were the people who were governing this province. So they've got their great reward, Mr. Speaker, they've got everything that was coming to them — (Interjections)— they've got everything that they deserve.

I'm sure we have the ability to govern this province. We have already made the promises to the people of what we are going to do, and I'm sure we are going to do it, and we will be debating other matters as they come along in the days ahead, Mr. Speaker. So I urge the honourable members opposite — vote for the Budget, vote for Manitoba, vote for progress. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, I believe the Honourable Member for Roblin agreed to accept a couple of questions. I have two questions, Mr. Speaker, firstly, does he know approximately what percentage of his constituents will stand to directly gain or benefit from the repeal of the Provincial Succession and Gift Tax Act?

MR. MCKENZIE: I would imagine that it would be quite a number, but I haven't done a study on it. Maybe the Minister of Finance can reveal that, I'm not the Minister and don't have access, but I imagine it is quite a number.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, I wish to thank the honourable member for his interim answer, and I'll certainly be looking for a more conclusive one from the Minister of Finance at a later point in time.

The second question, when he was referring to edifices, I presume that he was also including the schools in his constituency, and the government office building built — I'm asking whether he is including for the benefit for the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, who also wants to understand the question, I want to know whether he is including, when he speaks of edifices whether he is including the schools built in his constituency and the public office building built in Portage la Prairie, the member for which is a supporter of a mixed economy and takes great pride in the fact that housed within that building are persons earning their income from the public purse? — (Interjections) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, that question is clearly out of order.
The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is my first opportunity this session, Sir, to enter debate in this Chamber, and I would like to extend good wishes to yourself, Sir, although you have had some trying moments in this House, especially in the last day or two on points of privilege and points of order, which I am sure that added to the colour of your hair very well.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of this Chamber and the Member for Roblin in his address just a few minutes ago, spoke about the Budget as being a very interesting document and it contained a lot of food for thought. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's probably the extent of his speech to which I will agree with, to that point, and everything else I will probably have to disagree with — those two comments, I do. It certainly is an interesting budget, and it certainly has a lot of food for thought.

I don't agree with the member when he indicated in his remarks that the members on this side of the House don't believe that the Conservative Party has a mandate. I don't think any member on this side has gotten up and said that the members opposite, you members in this Chamber, did not receive the mandate of the electorate of Manitoba, but don't forget, don't forget gentlemen, that the members on this side received a mandate insofar as being members on this side, and their voices will not be stifled in this Chamber. So there is no one who has said on this side that you didn't have a mandate and we will see as to how far your mandate will carry you in the next four years, Mr. Speaker.

The Honourable Member for Roblin talked about government in the article that he quoted from the Reader's Digest, I believe, that he was talking about government lights, and government water, and government driving licenses, and the government was so far in your pocket that you couldn't get away from it, Mr. Speaker, and he talked about so much government, but yet as he went on in his speech, what did he talk about? He talked about no drainage in his constituency, he talked about public funds being put into drainage; he talked about the need for having roads in his constituency, he wanted more roads — where does the money come from? — from government. He talked about health facilities or lack of them between Roblin and Swan River . . . who is going to be putting up those funds, Mr. Speaker? Who is going to be putting up those funds for those facilities in his constituency? So he talks about more government.

But what he also doesn't mention, or forgot to mention, or maybe he didn't read the report, the Task Force report, is that his own Task Force that his colleague, the Minister without Portfolio, the Member for River Heights, his Task Force said to close more rural hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is now getting up and saying he wants more hospitals while his Task Force has recommended that more rural hospitals be closed. He had better read his Task Force report and talk to the front bench, there, because he really doesn't know what they're up to.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member as well talked about great things that the government has done in terms of income tax, corporation tax, succession duties, gift tax, mineral acreage tax and all the help to his constituents. He couldn't answer the Member for Burrows when the Member for Burrows asked him how many people in his constituency or how many people in his riding were helped by the succession duties? Well, Mr. Speaker, I can tell him that I would venture a guess, that if there would be one or two out of his constituency in 1976 — you know how many people it helped — in 1976, I believe 146 or 148 people in this province paid succession duties. Mr. Speaker, how many from your constituency, what portion of the people in your constituency were affected with that kind of tax. I venture to say almost no one.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this Province, in his way of debating in this House, I don't know whether he wants to put members on this side on the defensive or whatever, but in his stature of debate he says, "I'm going to reveal to you members on this side the horror stories that your government has left, and we will be relating these horror stories all the time." Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you the kind of horror stories that we have heard from that side of the House, in not eight years, but in five and one-half months. We have had horror stories in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, we have had the incident of a horror story of the Minister of Tourism, who gets up in this House, who says he never signed any agreement in this House and then goes out into the hallway and says there is no agreement for development, and comes back into the House and says again there is no agreement, while admitting a week or so later that he authorized his Deputy Minister to sign an agreement for a development. Mr. Speaker, what kind of administration is this? What is he getting the people in?

Then we have the spectacle of the Minister of Labour in this House in the last couple of months, Number 1, attempting to interfere with the Labour Board in a decision that the Labour Board was going to rule on. She attempted to interfere with their jurisdiction. Number 2, she attempted to quash the charges under the Power Engineers Act, and then, of all things, she had her Deputy Minister go on the air and defend the policies of this government and not become an administrator, but the Deputy Minister of that department became the politician, not the Minister of Labour to defend the actions that she made. He was defending the Minister of Labour.

Number 3, we have the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, and I say it and the Leader of the Opposition said it and I will repeat it, that there was entire deception to hide the financial situation of this province. We all know that the Leader of the Opposition asked the Minister of Finance a couple of weeks ago as to whether there was going to be any type of revision in the revenues of this province in the last quarter, and what answer did he give him? He said there was no, I believe, there was no substantial difference, but when he came into this House on Budget night he said that the revenues of this province changed by \$10 million. Mr. Speaker, is that peanuts or is that the type of a horror story that they told the people last fall that this province was being mismanaged, and we were wasting and blowing money, but yet they found \$50 million. Mr. Speaker, that type of deception and that type of horror and fear that is being expressed by the members opposite — those are the kind of horror stories that are coming out, but I'm not finished yet. There's more, Mr. Speaker.

And we have, just the other day, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, who, when questioned by the Member for Transcona about whether or not a staff report was doctored or changed or altered before it was presented to this House — (Interjection) — doctored and changed substantially. The Minister of

Consumer Affairs at first denied that the report was changed, and then he got up in this Chamber and he recited chapter and verse what changes were made by himself in that report, or if he didn't make them, who did he instruct to make those changes in that report, Mr. Speaker. That is the type of interference that this government is bringing into this province.

And then, lo and behold, the Premier of this Province, first he gets up and he threatens the Member for Transcona, saying to him, "Look if you can't substantiate your charges you'd better shut up or I'm going to get you." —(Interjection)— Who said that? Your First Minister, and then when a Motion was moved by the members on this side to have this matter dealt with in the Committee of Privileges and Elections, what did he do? He ordered his whole side to vote against that motion. Mr. Speaker, he talks about being an open government. They have closed the doors within a couple of months. I won't even call him a dictator. I don't know whether there is a word for it.

Mr. Speaker, and then we have the Minister of Health talking about and mentioning that if there are staff cuts in the health care and there are cuts in the budget in health care, they really don't mean anything because they're not going to lower the service to the public. Even if we cut these budgets down and pare them down, they will not lower the service to the public. Well, Mr. Speaker, we had the spectacle of the Victoria Hospital issuing a letter to its employees saying, "Look, our budgets are so tight. Will you take a 3.2 percent cut in your wages?"

MR. BLAKE: These are hard times.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Minnedosa, the banker in this House, talks about hard times. Mr. Speaker, it's been pointed out by the Member for Inkster that you could have had a balanced, you could have had a balanced budget. You didn't have to go ahead and reduce the services that you did and increase the costs of your highways construction, you could have had a balanced budget. You had enough. You threw away approximately \$40 million in tax cuts to the rich. You increased your highways budget. You could have had a balanced budget in this province but no, that wouldn't have done your cause any good. But you see, you slipped up on one thing. You should not have given the tax cut last fall. That's where you slipped up. You should have not. You should have done the cutting, the firing, and whatever you had done last fall but not given the tax cut. You shouldn't have given the tax cut until about a year from now but you were too overzealous. It got to your head; the power got to your head. You see, because by giving those tax cuts, by giving those tax cuts, immediately upon saying that this province was in such a dire state of affairs, how can you have the people believe you when you said that the province was in such dire straits and on the next hand you turn around and give \$40 million worth of tax cuts. That is the unbelievable cut that you have made and that is the mistake that you have made last time and it will get you even deeper, that mistake will even get you deeper. You will go on and you have gone on now.

We had a very interesting thing today, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Health confirmed that there are approximately in this House, in this Chamber . . . over the news it was 600 people, but in this House, in this Chamber, he indicated it was more than that, it was over 700. I took the figure of 600 people in acute care beds that really should be in nursing homes.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have not heard any great announcement of nursing home construction in this province to get out of the problem of having people in nursing home beds, because he says that the province is in such dire financial straits that they can't afford to do those kind of things. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will show him how he can do those kind of things in the financial straits that this province is even now in the budget that he has.

Mr. Speaker, I used a figure of 600 people in acute care beds. What is the cost, per diem cost, of an acute care bed? Approximately \$100 per day in this province. So, if you take 600 people at \$100 per day for a year that's roughly \$21 million in costs. The cost of a nursing home, heavy nursing home care, is roughly — and I'll give it the upper limit, the conservative limit of \$35 per day. That is the upper limit. So you take 600 persons at \$35 a day for a year, that's about \$7.6 million. Those would be the costs of the nursing home care.

So you have nursing home costs of \$7.6 million for those people and acute care costs of \$21 million. What is the difference? Approximately \$13.5 million. Well, Mr. Speaker, if you were to build on a long term basis those 600 nursing home beds today at an estimated cost of \$25,000 per bed, that would cost you approximately \$15 million. What is the interest on that \$15 million? About \$1.5 million annually. Now, Mr. Speaker, on the difference in costs of nursing home beds and acute care beds on \$13.4 million, is \$1.34 at the same interest rate, roughly the same amount of money that you will have to borrow to pay for the difference in the acute care beds you could put into the nursing home beds. There's no magic about it. But you want to follow the policy that has been enunciated, the statements that have been enunciated by the Member for Rhineland. He is jesting from his seat. You know, Mr. Speaker, what statement he made in the Throne Speech Debate? He said that we should build condominiums for our senior citizens. He said that he knew a lot of senior citizens that had from, I believe the figure is, from \$30,000 to \$50,000 to invest. And if there were other senior citizens who could not afford those condominiums, I'm sure these senior citizens who have that kind of money would be able to invest and allow these other people to come into those condominiums. I don't know whether the honourable member really meant what he said or is he so completely out of touch with reality in terms of the incomes of senior citizens. I think he should be ashamed of himself for making those kinds of comments.

Mr. Speaker, not only would the construction of those nursing home beds be covered by that investment but, you know, we would be able to stimulate the economy and put our tradesmen who

have been in complete dire straits of employment over these last six months, in the winter months. But, you know, there is one thing. The Tories, I believe, consistently ignore . . . that they believe that the private sector is totally non-productive and whatever economic multiplier that the public sector can provide, they don't want to believe that, that there is any good, that the public sector can do no good. The Member for St. Matthews talked about it. He spoke about government is no good; it's getting into too many things. The Member for Roblin spoke about government is getting into too many things and there was just too much government. Yet, I don't know how many years the Member for St. Matthews has been a teacher. He's been wallowing in the public trough as long as he's been a teacher and even before that because he had to be educated somehow. He has used the public trough. At least the Member for Portage in his remarks during the Throne Speech Debate, at least he was being honest. He wanted more public investment in his community and he indicated in his speech that all the good things and many of the good things that were built in his constituency were of public investment and he at least acknowledged it.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Ste. Rose comments to me that the Member for Gimli spoke against the public trough. I want to put on the record because I think the members opposite and the Member for Gimli — who unfortunately is not here right now — he made some certain commitments during the election to the community of Gimli in terms of the recreation centre in that town. I would hope the members on his side remind him of those commitments that he made of assistance to the Gimli Rec Centre and that that will be forthcoming because I'm not sure that he has been in a want or desire to meet with those people from his own constituency and discuss the dire straits that that recreation centre is in because I know the recreation centre is trying to have solicit the help of the neighbouring communities of Arborg and Riverton and the like to participate in the costs of maintaining that centre and I think that is fine. But there was a commitment to that centre and I hope that the Minister of Education, the Member for Gimli, certainly remembers the commitment that he made to the people of Gimli.

Mr. Speaker, in the last few months we have had the Task Force Report tabled in this House calling for reorganization of government programs and a curtailing of others. We have had the task force made up of members who really were zero-dollar men. They were the great humanitarians of this province. They were going to give their services for nothing to the people of Manitoba. They were going to do this gesture of putting government efficiency in for nothing. —(Interjection)— The Member for Inkster is absolutely right. Well, but they are worth more but he made the comment that they are worth exactly what you paid them for. They are worth that because, Mr. Speaker, it was worth their while to have those fellows in office. We have had all kinds of demonstrations where the Premier of this province said that the members on this side were a party of confrontation and there was continuous confrontation with society.

What's happening with the doctors? What's happening under the table with the doctors' agreements? We've had demonstrations here in front of this building by the students of this province but, Mr. Speaker, there has been a demonstration in this building the likes that no one in the history of this province has ever seen. You know why no one has ever seen it? Because that demonstration is going on continuously but those people aren't standing in front of the building. They are walking into this building with their brief cases and their pin-striped suits and they are demonstrating in every Minister's office. Just like the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Housing, the Minister of Highways. Who walks into the Minister of Highways' offices if it's not the executives of the insurance companies from the east. They are demonstrating. They are demonstrating to this province that the people of Manitoba should no longer operate their own insurance business. That's what they are demonstrating and that's the kind of demonstration that is going on in this Chamber and in this building, the kind that the people of Manitoba really don't see but it is happening virtually every hour of every day. They are walking into every Minister's office and saying, "What can I do for you?" Well, they have done it. They have done it. The Budget speaks for itself. Income tax and corporation tax cuts for whom? Primarily beneficial to the high income earners. The Member for Roblin should ask how many of his constituents pay income tax or will be affected by the tax cuts or the corporation tax cuts.

MR. MCKENZIE: Very few. That's why they're . . .

MR. URUSKI: Secondly, the Succession Duties and Gift Tax Act. One hundred and forty six people were affected by it. Primarily those that are coming in daily into the Legislative Building. The Mineral Acreage tax, who did that benefit? No one, virtually no one north of the Trans-Canada Highway. Virtually no one. And who owns most of the land or the rights in the western part of this province? Is it not primarily the Hudson Bay Company? Is it not primarily the corporations. . . —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Member from Roblin in his seat says, "Farmers." Either he didn't read the legislation or doesn't want to read it, that they were exempt. Active farmers were exempt.

That is the kind of demonstration that is going on in this building — those members opposite, Mr. Speaker, are . . . Now I can stand here and be totally unabashed. About three or four years ago I was challenged by saying that the members on this side of the House were in the pockets of the insurance industry, but today there is just no doubt about it. There is no doubt about it that the members on that side of the House are completely in the pockets of the insurance industry. The then Leader of the Opposition went around this province and said that "Autopac is here to stay." You know, even if we might want to do something about it we really could not do that. He made that speech on numerous occasions.

Thursday, April 13, 1978

So they come into office and what does he start saying, "Well, we really don't believe in subsidies." We really don't believe in subsidies — what kind of subsidies, Mr. Speaker? Does he believe that the premium tax, the two cents insurance tax is a subsidy? We know that every motorist understands that a portion of his gas tax goes to Autopac. Does he believe that the insurance premium on the driver's license is a subsidy to the corporation? I'd like to know what his meaning of premium is. If it is a gift or a concession to the private sector in terms of succession duties and gift tax that is not a subsidy. That is not a subsidy, that has just got to be done. But if it is going to be removal or change in the driver's insurance premium, that's a subsidy to the insurance portfolio.

Well, Mr. Speaker, those members opposite are totally in the pockets of the insurance industry. I'd like to know. . .

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

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): The Member will either have to prove that statement, Mr. Speaker, or I would like him to retract it, because he is accusing me of being in the pockets of the insurance industry. That is an accusation that I am being paid by the insurance agency, and that will either be retracted or prove it.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member wish to change his charge?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I said that I would tell the Member, I withdrew that remark when I was on that side of the House because I could not prove it, but now I will prove that remark to the Honourable Member.

I will prove to him that you are in the pockets of the insurance industry: (1) J. Frank Johnston is part of a Conservative administration. He is one Minister of a Conservative administration that is not going to implement the insurance health care and safety insurance in this province. Why? Because he made that commitment. To whom? To the insurance industry, to members who served for nothing on that Task Force. Mr. Speaker, those members worked for nothing. They didn't work for nothing, Mr. Speaker. They didn't work for anything for that government. They worked because they elected a government to office that would do their bidding. You are in their pockets. You are now talking about and having secret meetings with the insurance industry in this country. You are in their pockets. You went out on the hustings and you said that you would do nothing, nothing to the insurance corporation in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please.

MR. JOHNSTON: I want the Honourable member to prove' prove that there are deals made with the insurance companies, or that we are in their pockets. Not in his imagination, I want proof or I want retraction.

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, No. 1, I would like to know who paid the then Leader of the Opposition \$3,000 a month for his salary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. The Honourable Member has been asked to either withdraw or to prove his statement.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have made a statement that there are meetings going on with the members of the government about removing and putting into competition and bringing the private insurance companies back in this province.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I don't care about the member's imagination or about secret meetings, I want the member to either prove that I am in the pockets of the insurance insurance company or retract that statement.

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I am making the accusation of all the members on that side, and if the member. . .

MR. JOHNSTON: I am a member on this side and I regard myself as such. Your accusation is to me, you either prove it or you retract it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is the honourable member prepared to retract the statement?

MR. URUSKI: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the Honourable Member then prepared to prove his statement?

Thursday, April 13, 1978

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member gave an indication of what the phrase meant when he used it. He said that he believes that this government is beholden to the insurance industry. I thought that that was without argument, Mr. Speaker. I thought everybody knew that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please.

MR. JOHNSTON: The Honourable Member did not use the word "beholden". . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. Is the Honourable Member prepared to withdraw the charge or prove the charge?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I will explain even further.

Let's look at the Task Force Report, Mr. Speaker, in terms of how the insurance industry is involved in this Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, who has been involved in that Task Force? Hugh A. Benham, Investment Counsellor, Canadian Premier Life Insurance Company. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harold Thompson, President and Chief Executive Officer of Monarch Life Assurance Company.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. Is the Honourable Member prepared to prove the charge? The Honourable Member.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me to elaborate on my remarks in terms of developing my position on the insurance industry I would like to continue.

MR. JOHNSTON: Is he also accusing us and the names he is reading out? Are you willing to prove that there is agreements or arrangements between those people? Mr. Speaker, where is the man's guts? Where is the man's guts?

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