



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

26 Elizabeth II

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



Vol. XXVI No. 23A

2:30 p.m. Tuesday, April 18, 1978

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, April 18, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I would like to draw the members' attention to the galleries where we have a large number of members of the National Farmers Union. On behalf of all the members, we welcome you here today.

I should also like to draw members' attention to the Speaker's gallery, where we have the former Mayor of the City of Winnipeg and a former member of the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Steve Juba. Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the Annual Report 1976-77 of the Manitoba Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, on March 15 I tabled the Reports of the Family Law Review Committee on the Family Maintenance Act and the Marital Property Act. I am tabling today the final report of the Family Review Committee which deals with an Act to amend various Acts relating to marital property.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Clean Environment Commission for the year 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.
The Honourable Member for Radisson.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. ABE KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to make a non-political statement. The Winakwa Pettites, under 10 year-old girls coached by Jim Franklin and Wilf Vallee won the Provincial Ringette 10 Year-Old Championship last Sunday. They beat the Melrose Community Club to win the first Provincial Ringette Championship ever for the Winakwa Community Club. This highlighted the year as they added the Provincials to their laurels following a win in the City Championship Final.

For those who are not familiar with Ringette, their motto is "Look out Hockey, here comes Ringette," and judging by the way the girls are going at it, the Jets may have to move over in a few years. Like any rather new sport it takes time to raise the level of skill. The hard-working people in Winakwa who were the forerunners can be proud that their efforts are now being acknowledged. While I am sure they do not measure their success in terms of championships only, it does indicate a degree of improvement in their program.

For the record I would love to introduce the girls' names: Linda Beaverage, Tracy Venables Susan Barlow, Janie Franklin, Kim Valee, Karen Valee, Darcelle Daudet, and Jane Dina Derkatch, I am proud to represent the area in which these girls participate, Mr. Speaker.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, while waiting for the Minister of Health, I would like to pose two questions to the Minister of Agriculture. Firstly, I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he can indicate today, whether there are any changes contemplated with respect to announced government intention to proceed with a checkoff on beef without a plebiscite or referendum.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, the legislation has not been cleared through cabinet caucus and at that time it will be declared the proposed plan.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, while taking note of that answer I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether it is at all possible that steps will be taken to a beef checkoff without any change in legislation and without any referendum.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite clear the way the question was put. Would the Honourable Leader of the Opposition repeat it please?

MR. SCHREYER: I am asking the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, if it is possible that the government intends to proceed with the beef checkoff without referendum and without necessarily any legislation being introduced.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as I said prior to that, the legislation will go through cabinet and caucus and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will see at that time.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the second question has to do with the question I posed some weeks ago to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the Minister indicate if in making representations to the Government of Canada, the Wheat Board in particular, protesting the policy in the course of events which has resulted in certain months of the year, of producers being unable to deliver, even to eligible quota, because of country elevators being plugged for reason of offboard sales being allowed outside of quota, can the Minister indicate if he has yet received a reply to his representations?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Leader of the Opposition is referring to the feed grains' policy that there is now a marketing program where an individual has the right to market his feed grains through the marketing. . . No, we have not had any indication from the Federal Government that they plan to change it in the near future.

MR. SCHREYER: Can the Minister indicate if the addition to the representations which he said several weeks ago he would make to federal officials, whether he intends to follow this up with additional representation so that we can get a more rational utilization of country elevators and a more equitable opportunity for producers to deliver grain when there is eligible quota still open to them?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In reference to the discussions, the inquiry of the Federal Government, we did get some action on the movement of grain out of the flooded area in the southern part of the province. In regard to the movement of grains to the east, we were assured that the movement of grain starting from the Lakehead by boat would help quite a bit of the problem and take some of the pressure off. However, we did continue to monitor that ourselves and one of the discussions that took place at the Western Premiers' Conference and it was referred to departments to take a look at the whole western feed grain situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he can indicate to the House why it is that any legislation is necessary at all with respect to introducing a beef checkoff. I do that in the context of his answer to the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, in regard to the proposed legislation, that certainly will be brought to light at the time of introduction of the bill and the member will see at that time.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, we know that the Minister does not require the legislation to do what he wants to do. I'm asking him to elaborate for us why it is necessary to have legislation if he wants to proceed with that course of action when that has been possible without any changes in the current statutes.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, that certainly will be done when the bill is introduced.

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister of Agriculture. In Estimates he indicated that 85 percent of producers were in support of the checkoff on beef. I wonder if he could advise the House just what organizations are in support of a checkoff. Could he advise the House what organizations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

Tuesday, April 18, 1978

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I would think that when we get back to Estimates I will be able to answer the member probably a little more thoroughly. I can indicate that several organizations have indicated the desire. It is also the desire of government to have a producer-run organization representing that particular segment of the agricultural industry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. In view of the fact that on March 28th I'm advised that the Minister of Finance wrote a letter to a citizen of Manitoba saying, "The \$128 million deficit is a matter of record. I cannot tell you how much I wish it were not so." Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that wishing has apparently made it "not so" will the Minister be writing to this lady, correcting the misinformation he gave her, knowing it to be wrong?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I can't of course, respond on behalf of the Minister of Finance for a partial quote from an alleged letter that he sent to somebody, but I'm sure that in the course of remarks which my honourable friend will be happy to know that I intend to make before the Budget speech is adjourned, I may be able to clarify part of that for him.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: In the absence of the Minister of Health, I'd like to ask a question of the First Minister. The Minister of Health had stated that he would not tamper with the dental program for children, and there have been quite a few rumours around. What is the status of the dental program? Is it going to remain public? Is it going private? And what is the status of the dental nurses because they are quite worried. Many of them are quite worried about this program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the detail of that question I would have to take as notice on behalf of the Minister of Health. All I can say, at the present time, to reiterate what I believe the Minister said in the House the other day, is that the matter is under review.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the acting Minister of Finance. I don't know who that is. Is he prepared to file with the Legislature the government document which he released yesterday, dealing with the apparent admission by the government that they have known of the real deficit for some three months?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, without accepting in any way whatsoever the unfortunate and inaccurate premise drawn by my honourable friend — and may I say, drawn so often by my honourable friend with respect to when knowledge was had by the Minister of Finance of a certain matter — I can say to my honourable friend that the Minister of Finance was prepared yesterday, and leave was denied him yesterday to give the information to honourable meers of the House. I will be quite happy, Mr. Speaker, to make that information available in a form that I think even the Honourable Meer for St. Johns will be able to understand, when I participate in the debate.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the honourable and gentlemanly statement already made by the acting Minister of Finance, apparently. Firstly, is he not aware that the conclusion which he attributes to me, is one which I read out of the Tribune, who had the document in their possession, which is more than I have had. So that if he wishes to make his insulting remarks, he could make them to the press rather than to members of the House. But having done that, I would ask him, Mr. Speaker, not to recognize that the Minister of Finance got up at the end of the question period in order to make a statement, and thus break the rules, and the Honourable First Minister, who should be a person who protects the rights of all the rules of the House, should be the first to have called his Minister to task for doing that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Does the Member for St. Johns have a question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the indulgence you gave me, but I recognize that you knew that it was justified to respond to the First Minister. The question I am asking is that since that statement was of a nature which could have been and was, apparently, released by the Minister of Finance then is it not possible to have it released to us, so that the true information — if one could expect that from the First Minister — could be given to us?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in that spirit of gentlemanliness which is always displayed in such an adverse way by my honourable friend from St. Johns, I will try to respond to him by being civil, which is a quality which is relatively unknown to his character. What I would say, Mr. Speaker, with response to the first part of his question is simply this, that an erroneous interpretation I understand has been drawn by certain press reports with respect to information that the Minister of Finance was attempting to give to the House yesterday in response to a question and asked for leave to continue, and that leave was not given. The record, Mr. Speaker, will show that.

No. 2, we will attempt to get that information in tabular form to my honourable friends as soon as reasonably possible, but I can assure him no later than tomorrow.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable the First Minister will not recognize that whatever was released to the press yesterday should be made available to members of this House immediately and is available now and not tomorrow.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, to repeat myself and not to get into a debate with my honourable friend, if my honourable friend chooses to deny a Minister of the Crown leave to give information he can hardly be heard to complain about it the day after, when he hasn't got it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would merely request that if Hansard bears me out and that I asked that that document be tabled yesterday when the Minister was trying to read from it. I said that if he wishes to table the document we want it tabled, and I believe that Hansard will bear me out. But if Hansard does bear me out and the First Minister is incorrect, then I assume that the document will be tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Last week I asked a question which he took as notice, which I would like to repeat, and that is has the Government of Manitoba instructed the Manitoba Telephone System to intervene in a court case on the side of challenging the right of the Public Utilities Board to provide any supervision or regulation over the rates charged by the Telephone System to cable users or any non-telephone users, and does this particular intervention represent a form of government policy supporting the position of Manitoba Telephone System?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I took note of the question, or two questions, of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge on Friday last. I undertook to provide an answer for him and I will provide that in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission. Can the Minister confirm that while public service agreements in the country are ranging between six and seven percent that the MGEA has only been offered zero percent wage increase to the clerical component and two percent to the legal component?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I believe at this time they are at the bargaining table and I don't think it's for me to talk about the figures that they are working with.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister explain the apparently vast discrepancy between the kind of offers being made to the provincial Civil Service and the 6.8 percent offered to the medical profession?

MRS. PRICE: I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that there's a comparison to be made with the doctors and the Civil Service.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister supply us with a list which grades the various professions and blue collar and white collar components so we can see how the government regards various people in their employ?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

Tuesday, April 18, 1978

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Labour. Is the Minister in a position to advise when she will be reconsidering the minimum wage in the province as a result of the . . . especially after they reported last night that there was a 1.1 percent increase for March in the cost of living?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: As I mentioned a couple of days ago, Mr. Speaker, we haven't had any meetings in that regard. We have been reviewing it but there hasn't been any decisions made.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could take as notice then a supplementary question. Could she advise us to what extent this is affecting people, the number of people who are on minimum wage and also the numbers of people whose wages are related to the minimum wage. There are some contracts that there is a spread between the minimum wage and that which are . . . effectively freezing a goodly number of people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Manitoba Housing and Renewal.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to answer a question from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that was given to me regarding St. Pauls and Arlington Street property or the property at that corner. This site has been vacant for several years. It has been cleared by the owners after the building had been condemned. MHRC expropriated on the basis that it was a vacant site which they attempted to purchase by negotiation previously. The suggested price range from the LARC — which is Legal Appraisal Review Committee — is \$59,500 to \$88,800 and makes the property too expensive for our purpose. Example: \$400 to \$600 per front foot, or \$4.00 to \$6.00 per square foot. The second mortgage holder has requested abandonment. He had been paying the payments on the first mortgage for the owner who is in financial difficulties. The Board has approved negotiated return to the owner; if he refuses to accept return on the usual basis, we could and will proceed through with the expropriation process. The staff advise that we would have to acquire more land and develop a larger project to make this a viable project, however, the other buildings adjacent are in good condition suggesting that further acquisition would be more, not less, expensive.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: I thank the Honourable Minister for his reply. May I address a question, Sir, to the Acting Minister of Health who in turn may wish to take it as notice. That is to ask whether a solemn assurance will be given to investigate allegations — they remain allegations, Sir, for the moment — that because of operating budget considerations, that a number of nursing homes in the central part of Manitoba, Portage central region, are proceeding to two meals a day being served to the residents of the nursing home during Saturdays and Sundays and that this routine has been initiated as of early April.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, we'd be happy to take that question, that allegation, for notice and see what the Minister can advise.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. I would ask the Minister of Labour if she can confirm that the members of the task force are spoiled rotten.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to the member that questions should be asking for information and should be of a nature as to not incite debate or be of a frivolous nature whatsoever. The Honourable Member for Churchill want to rephrase his question?

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I assure you that I am trying to elicit information and perhaps I will do it in a less frivolous manner. I would ask the Minister if she could tell us exactly, or explain to this House, exactly who it was she was referring to last evening when she accused all of us of being spoiled rotten.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I didn't do any speaking last night.

MR. COWAN: Excuse me, that was my error, not calling people spoiled. My error was not calling people spoiled rotten; my error was in the evening. Would the Minister explain to us then — and I get a second kick at the cat here I guess — would she explain to us then what she was doing Monday night, who she was referring to when she accused all of us of being spoiled rotten?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, to help the Minister . . . the Member rather for Churchill, I would like to tell him that he is probably referring to yesterday morning. I appeared on a panel of the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce. It was one of the other panelists that said, "The people of Manitoba are spoiled rotten and that we should be prepared to all tighten our belts." When I got up to answer one question with regard to our economy, I said that I agreed with the gentleman.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While I'm on my feet, I would thank the Honourable Minister of Labour for the recommendation she made for me and would she talk to the Leader of the Opposition so when we're in government next time he can take up on it.

I would ask her then, does she agree, does she agree that we are all spoiled rotten. She seems to be saying so today. I'm wondering if she can confirm that. Does she agree with the honourable gentleman that said that we have to tighten our belts and that we are all spoiled rotten?

MRS. PRICE: I believe, Mr. Speaker, the man that we are talking about did not say "rotten." He said that we were spoiled and I entirely agree with him that we should all be prepared to tighten our belts and economize.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Highways, whether or not he can indicate to the House just when the Selkirk bridge will be reopened so that traffic can again flow between the East and West Selkirk communities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I have received some enquiries of the same nature from people in the area and I have asked the department, the bridge engineers who are on the site looking into the matter, to advise me of that same information as soon as possible. At the moment, one would have to say that the likelihood of the bridge remaining closed is likely to continue until the water recedes somewhat.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate just at what stage the surveys are to date with respect to a new location for a bridge which would not be subject to flooding of the approaches.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: I am encouraged to hear that there is at least one member on the opposite side that has no objections to building bridges or roads occasionally. We will of course take that question as notice; the bridge is a problem area, as the member well knows. There have been to my general information, fairly extensive surveys taken. I would be pleased to make that information available to the members, perhaps during my Estimates, which I think are coming up shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister of Labour has put on record her profound views with respect to economics and philosophy that we are all spoiled, may I as one who is presumably spoiled ask another who is presumably spoiled, whether she has in mind to follow up this conclusion of hers with a submission for policy consideration as to whether some may perhaps be more spoiled than others, and that perhaps we should be then looking seriously at the degree of spoiledness in terms of the extent of luxury item purchases, semi-luxury item purchases, and whether some perhaps should have already their belts relatively tightened and others do not, etc. And more specifically, can the Honourable Lady Minister indicate whether she will follow up this conclusion of hers with willingness in the consideration of her departmental Estimates, to discuss the extent to which there are disparities in economic opportunity and life standard and life style in our society?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I feel that our government is showing every day our intent to tighten our belts. And Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, on March 27 the Leader of the Opposition asked me to get him some comparative figures of the Civil Service employment in different parts of Canada, and I have these figures.

Newfoundland from June to December 1977 — these are the best that I could get — they have gone from 7,900 down to 7,300. P.E.I. went from the year 1976 to 1977 in December from 2,400, they remain the same. Nova Scotia, for the year 1977-78 went from 8,900 to 9,200. Manitoba went from 1,204 in December 1976 to 1,203 in 1977. Quebec went from 57,000 to 60,000 from 1977 to 1978 in

Tuesday, April 18, 1978

March. And so on. Ontario stayed the same. But while I was at it, Mr. Speaker, I got some other statistics that I'd like to tell you, and that is, from 1969 to 1977. Ontario had a 20 percent increase, Quebec had a 21 percent increase, Nova Scotia had a 30 percent increase, Newfoundland had a 17 percent increase, Manitoba had a 40 percent increase, and Saskatchewan had 113 percent increase.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Labour then, since she has voluntarily and on her own initiative put some information on the record during the Question Period, may I ask her as a supplementary question if she has also the information to now put on the record as to the extent to which Manitoba's Civil Service size in relation to population is above or below the national average of Canadian provinces?

MRS. PRICE: I'll take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. To the point of order that was previously raised, I now have Hansard, Mr. Speaker. It says that my remarks to the Minister were: "He started by saying he has an answer with regard to estimated revenue and expenses. If he will give us the estimated revenue and expenses, he can then participate in debate as to what these mean, and we on this side will participate." And then, Mr. Speaker, you said: "I'm sorry the Minister does not have leave at this time. Perhaps he can table it as he suggested." So that's what I asked be done; you followed that through, Mr. Speaker. I didn't use the word "tabled" but I did ask that he give us the estimated revenues and expenses, and you, Sir, took it as a request that they be tabled. So I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister should give us the material and then he will participate in the debate, and we, just as has been suggested.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Labour. Since she seems to feel that certain people in society are spoiled rotten, does she feel that the people on the minimum wage are spoiled rotten?

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

MR. JENKINS: Supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Minister does not reply, I guess silence means consent. Does she intend at the future meeting of the Cabinet to make a strong recommendation that the minimum wage be raised in Manitoba?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I have already said today that it is under continual observation and it will be looked at in due course.

MR. JENKINS: Could the Honourable Minister then please advise the House what her recommendation will be to the Cabinet?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, that is policy determination, and until it has gone through Cabinet and caucus it is not a point to discuss.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General advise the House as to whether a decision has been arrived at yet as to the timing of the placing of Dr. Kasser on trial in Austria?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: That decision has not yet been arrived at, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAWLEY: Can the Attorney-General advise whether all the preliminary steps towards the placing of Dr. Kasser on trial have been proceeding as had been anticipated, commencing some one year ago?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I was not privy to the decisions that were made one year ago.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the Attorney-General now has all the information regarding the steps that were undertaken a year ago, can he assure the House that steps are under way still in Austria towards placing Dr. Kasser on trial?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I think I've indicated previously that it is anticipated that the special prosecutor retained by the previous government and a member of the RCMP Force anticipate travelling to Austria to review the details of the case with the Austrian prosecutors in the near future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk has already had three questions.

MR. PAWLEY: Just one supplementary. In view of the fact that a review had been conducted a year ago, at which time it was decided that the preliminary steps would be commenced, and since those steps were commenced, could the Attorney-General advise me that another review will be under way prior to placing Dr. Kasser on trial?

MR. MERCIER: No, Mr. Speaker. What has been transpiring is the translation of 11,500 pages of documents, and the Member for Selkirk is indicating it was supposed to be finished last fall. Something obviously went wrong because it was not finished last fall and it either is just being completed or is nearing completion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the subject of people being spoiled rotten has been raised, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. Has the Minister responsible for the Task Force on Government Economy been out of the province on personal, vacation, or business, or has he been out of the province recently while the House is sitting, on government business?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable the Minister in question if he sees fit — and I don't see why he should — can answer to that question when he returns to the House. We are not in the habit in this House, as the honourable member will find out after he has been here a bit longer, to inquire into the personal habits either of my honourable friend or of the Minister in question.

I'm sure, however, if he chooses to respond to a question that is more than slightly impertinent, he may.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In light of the fact that the Minister responsible for the Task Force tabled the Task Force Report and has not been in the House available to answer questions on that Task Force, who should we now direct questions about the Task Force to?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, there is ample opportunity for my honourable friend, again when he learns the procedures of the House, to debate these matters under Estimates.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, since we have not had a definite time given to debate the matter under the Minister responsible for the Task Force Estimates, in the interim — which could be the next two or three months — who should we direct questions about the Task Force to, in order to have accountability in the House, seeing as how the Minister has prevented us from asking questions of Conrad Riley, the other co-chairman of the Task Force?

MR. LYON: Well again, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend would swallow some of his bile without trying to choke on it, and if he would consult with the Honourable the House Leader on his own side of the House, he would find that he and his party have some choice as to how the Estimates are called. I would suggest that before he continue to make a fool of himself, he further apprise himself of the rules of this Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Tourism. I would still like to know from the Minister when exactly he is going to table the report which he has promised some many weeks ago now regarding the Jarmoc affair and his instructions to his Deputy Minister to sign an agreement for a condominium development in the iteshell?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, shortly.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Highways. Could the Minister tell me when he expects the change-over of speed signs to metric to be completed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the highway crews are busy attempting to change them as quickly as possible. The information that the department gives me is that this will be accomplished within the next week. I have no doubt, however, that having just said that, that somewhere in Manitoba somebody, perhaps when driving through the highways and byways during better weather, will come

up with an old miles per hour sign and inform me next session.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Public Works. Could he inform the House what the present speed limit is in the grounds of the Legislature?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I would have to ask for further clarification. Does he mean during the daytime or at night?

MR. WALDING: For clarification, Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the legal and official speed limit.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I am embarrassed to say I will have to take that question as notice.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: In the absence of the Minister of Social Development, I would like to ask the First Minister . . . Respectfully ask, I will have to be very careful of not antagonizing him. — (Interjections)— I hope I will meet your approval; I am very concerned. I am very concerned. I am shaking.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, would my honourable friend tell me —(Interjections)—

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend, the Minister of Health and Social Development, stated that the welfare roll went down from January, 1977, to January, 1978. Can we now have the information from January, 1977, to November, 1977, and November, 1977, to January, 1978?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to take that question as notice on behalf of my distinguished honourable friend from St. Boniface, and I'm sure that he is not shakey in any way whatsoever. I remind him, however, that the description that he used in the latter part of his question is one that he plagiarized from the former Member from St. George, Elman Guttormson who used it 15 years ago with much better effect than my honourable friend did today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Manitoba Housing.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On April 5th the Member for Transcona asked a question of the First Minister which he took as notice and has asked me to answer. The question was: Will the First Minister then confirm that the South St. Boniface Land Servicing Project will not be terminated by Mr. Nurgitz. I would like to inform the Member for Transcona that Mr. Nurgitz has no authority to either undertake or terminate, or anything of that nature. I'm sure the new chairman of the board will discuss the Leaf Rapids Corporation with his board and make recommendations to the Minister as he should.

ORDERS OF THE DAY — BUDGET DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to enter the Budget Debate. I have heard many of the speakers and I commend all of them for trying to add to the quality of the debate. Others, I'm afraid, I can't say that about, but I'm not going to pinpoint them.

I do believe that there hasn't been quite enough change between the content of the debate in this session as between the last session. Last fall when we met it was a few short months after the election and it was understandable that members opposite and members on this side had not really adjusted to their roles, that the government still felt that it had moved in and hadn't had a chance to really find out much of anything and I can appreciate the dilemma they were in. Members on this side, as well, felt that many of the programs that were being discussed were, of course, programs introduced by the former government.

However, in this session I had hoped that in fact we would start dealing with the record of the Conservative administration, because now they have a record.

You know, I recall in some of the comments I made in the last session, I stated at that time that what we were hearing from the government opposite . . . Particularly after they released the Interim Report on what they call "the audited financial data" — it wasn't a statement, it was financial data. I said what we were witnessing was a scenario — a scenario that was being prepared by members opposite to set out and prepare the ground for the position that they would take comes next Budget.

Tuesday, April 18, 1978

And in fact, now I can say in all fairness that I was right, that what we received last fall was a scenario. It was a script that was being prepared.

The script went something like this: We have taken office and we have found a horrible, horrible mess. We have found fat and blubber in the administration. We have found excessive spending — unnecessary spending. We can do what we promised to do, we can, in fact, change it without hurting programs, without cutting back, without shifting the cost to the individual or to a municipality or to a university or a hospital. We can do it simply by tightening up administratively better management because it is the lack of management that has created the problem; that is pretty well what we got and the proof of the pudding was this fantastic debt, this interim audited statement.

It was a snapshot in time, I indicated that at the time it was filed, and to take a snapshot in time and say this is what is going to happen six or nine months down the road, or even three months down the road is foolish. I think the Minister of Finance today recognizes how foolish it is because the snapshot in time has got him into trouble because today there is a great debate bouncing back and forth as to when did he find out that in fact that snapshot in time was invalid? When did he discover, that in fact, that snapshot in time, that indicated a deficit in current account wasn't anything like that, that in fact, the revenues from Ottawa were going to be considerably higher? At what point did he find out? That is why snapshots in time are dangerous; that is why a snapshot in time is something that I think was silly for the Conservative Government to try to write a scenario basing their whole pitch basically, their sales pitch on that particular snapshot in time interim data.

So they said they would save by cutting fat, they would save by good management, but in fact we now know that the actual figures show somewhat quite differently, that in fact there is about \$50 million that has suddenly come to light. I will say this for the Minister of Finance, he didn't try to fool the public and us here by saying that they take all the credit for it. He knew that couldn't be. As a matter of fact, today, out of the \$50 million, according to one of the newspapers, something like \$25 million of it is due to changes in the personal income tax revenue and about \$20 million due to some other revenues from Canada. Those are newspaper figures so I don't know how valid they are. But we do know from the Minister of Finance that in fact, \$50 million more is flowing from Ottawa than had been anticipated, or \$40 million, I should say. And this great great savings, great fat, was \$10 million. Well, Mr. Speaker, as has been indicated by others before I spoke in 1976 when the former Government was faced with an immediate drop in funds, a sudden unexpected drop in funds from Ottawa, we went through a restraint exercise without the ballyhoo, without all the screaming, without blaming anyone, we simply said we have got to hold back and we held back, and the result was we cut by \$20 million the funds that would have otherwise been spent.

So when the Government now says they spend \$10 million, they have saved \$10 million, I tell you that's no great shakes. What does it show? It shows there wasn't nearly as much fat as they are talking about; that in fact the restraint program that we had introduced and had maintained by a 10 percent vacancy rate in the Civil Service was effective; that in fact, there weren't that many loose bodies floating around. Now sure they release people, and they release many of them by ending programs, or by cutting back on the level of service in a program, or starting to phase out programs — something that they said they would not do, that they couldn't do. But of course the Minister of Labour feels that that is part of the fact that we are all spoiled. I found that I hadn't read the story that was referred to by the Member for Churchill, but I was really shocked when she approved of a statement which says that we are all spoiled. And I gather. . . —(Interjection)— that's right, you and I are spoiled, let me tell you my friend, the Minister responsible for Housing, you and I are spoiled don't need public housing, you don't need elderly public housing, you don't need any of that, but there are tens of thousands of people who do and you are taking out of their hide. You are taking out of their hide. That is what you want to do. Don't give me that guff. . .

MR. JOHNSTON: You and I as councillors did it.

MR. MILLER: My friend, you and I as councillors did what we could do within the confines and the limits of a municipal budget based on ratepayers' ability to pay on property tax. We did not have access to other taxes. Our government for the first time in Canada, gave access to municipalities on growth tax; we will see how much farther you go. I wouldn't be surprised if he was wrong.

MR. ENNS: It goes down doesn't it?

MR. MILLER: Yes it goes down but it is still higher than it was at any time during your years and it is still higher than it would have been if we would have simply waited till the next election, raise them another \$3.00 and buy a few votes because that was your tactic.

MR. ENNS: I am talking about today.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, as I said, the argument about the finance of Manitoba being in such terrible shape and the Minister of Finance. . . I am sorry I wasn't here — I wasn't well when he made his speech; I would certainly like to have been here but I have read it. He makes these — what he calls a non-political Budget. . . I really got a kick out of that. . . and he ; talks about the terrible mess that they found themselves in they're going to be realistic, he is going to make a summary of government's immediate and long-term objectives and present a realistic and straightforward statement of the Province's fiscal position and economic prospects. Then he proceeds to make one of the most

political speeches on the Budget I have ever heard in this House, and I have been in this House twelve years. So let them not delude anyone.

But, you know, those people are not stupid. There is a reason behind what they are doing, there is method in their madness. As I said in an earlier debate, the Conservatives are doing what comes natural — it's the theme of a song — and to them it is natural to do exactly what they are doing, but they have to hang it on somebody, so they are trying to hang it on the former government; now they are trying to hang it on people. People are spoiled, they are spoiled rotten, they have been living off — God knows what — off the fat of the land, so they are blaming everyone to do what they want to do; they are trying to justify the kind of Budget that was brought in.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, they didn't have to have any deficit if they didn't want it. They could have come with a balanced Budget, clean out, and what's more, I suspect they didn't even have to have that \$80 million deficit — you know the \$129 million, they have thrown that out the window themselves; now they talk about \$80 million. I wonder if they even needed that \$80 million. How much did they leave in those little pigeon holes that they didn't draw out? How much is left in the special municipal loan fund that could have been put in to reduce either last year's deficit or this year's deficit? How much money is left in the school lands trust fund? It could have been used to draw up the deficit last year or to draw up the deficit this year. You know, take a guess. There's \$4 million in the school lands trust fund, is it still there? Why don't you draw up your deficit? Why don't you dip into that? It is sitting there.

There's some money, I believe it's called the Liquor Commission Trust Fund. I believe there's about \$2 million in there. Why didn't you take that \$2 million and put it into this year's deficit.

Then there's money in the special Municipal Loans Fund. You know, you people cut out a lot of programs when you took over. You said, "stop, we can't afford it." So there's money there. Why didn't you bring that money forward to reduce the deficit, last year's, more than you have, or to reduce the current deficit? You talk about a current deficit of, I think the figure was — (Interjection) — oh no, no, just a minute gentlemen, thank you, you talk about the fact that the present — yes, the Minister himself said that the present deficit on Current Account would be \$13.7 million, but except for the sales tax element that came into it, it is 34.2, so there is really 13.7 or 34.2. Taking your 34.2, I say to you, and keep in mind incidentally the term "we are spoiled." That's a gem of a phrase. I love it. We are spoiled. Keep that in mind. Based on that, they've got a \$34 million deficit; they say, sorry, there was no way out of it.

Mr. Speaker, last fall, they stood up in this House and they gave away revenue to the most affluent in our society, personal income tax cuts across the board. So the person who earned \$10,000 a year, the spoiled person, the person who earned \$15,000 a year, those spoiled people, they benefitted \$13 a year and \$32 a year respectively. That's the \$10,000 and \$15,000 income earners. But those at the \$50,000 income, they benefit \$267 a year. Who is spoiled? And who is being even more spoiled? Mr. Speaker, they gave away revenue, and they did it very consciously because that's what comes natural to the Conservatives. Give cuts to those most affluent in our society, let the average citizen do it on his own. You're on your own, Jack, do as best you can. You have to send your kids to university, pay more fees.

You know, the fellow at the \$50,000 level, he doesn't care. He's going to have to pay \$100 more student fees for his son, he doesn't care, he got a \$267 tax saving. He can afford it. If the student has to go to University on a bus, tough, if you're low income. But if you're high income, it doesn't matter, because you've already got the money. The government gave you the money in order for you to be able to meet these extra costs at the university level, at the municipal level, your property taxes. Don't worry, your property taxes may be going up, but we're okay because we gave you a tax cut last fall. And we're going to give you more, probably, because we're Conservatives and we believe in that kind of a philosophy. Reward those who have much, and those who don't, scramble for it, and if you don't make it, tough luck.

It's true, if you are down to your last money, if you're broke, bankrupt, finished, and if you come to us with your hand out, yes, we'll look after you because we are compassionate people. We're compassionate people. But you've got to be on your knees. They sit back very casually . . .

I don't think it's been formalized yet. The Minister of Health indicated that the Executive Council has not yet decided. But I know Reg Edwards of the Health Services Commission. He's an honest guy. He would not get up before a convention of the health organization and tell them that they should consider \$7.50 a day per diem rate at personal care homes and at hospitals for long-stay patients who are panelled. He would not say that unless he had a pretty good idea that that's the recommendation going to Cabinet. And whose hide are you taking it out of? You're taking it out of all these spoiled people. That's these spoiled, privileged people we're hearing about. — (Interjection) — She's amused. And at her income, maybe she should be amused, because she's got it. She's had it made, and maybe she doesn't care. That's really the tragedy.

So they justify, they have brought in a Budget, before the Budget the scenario is built up, and during the Budget, the theme has been, "we've lived beyond our means, we have too much of the good life, we are all spoiled, and now the day of reckoning has come and now we have to pull back on the reins." The First Minister in a previous debate talked about, "Manitobans are prepared to make a sacrifice", and at that time I said, "yes, providing that sacrifice is equal, providing all are asked to make the sacrifice." And when I mean equal, I don't mean that the Member for Morris give up a dollar and the old age pensioner living on \$225 also give up the same dollar, because that's not an equal sacrifice. — (Interjection) — You're the same person but your incomes are far different. And that is what counts.

I said the Member for Morris because I knew I'd get a rise out of him because he doesn't believe that kind of thinking that I'm saying. He doesn't believe, really in a progressive income tax. He doesn't believe in a progressive income tax. He believes in either a proportionate tax, or better still, a regressive tax.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON(Morris): But what if I'm an old age pensioner?

MR. MILLER: With your income, with the security of the bonds and stocks you've got, the investments you've got, I know I needn't worry about you. You're well set up.

Mr. Speaker, they're justifying the user fees, they're giving less support to hospitals, to universities, to school boards, to nursing homes, they're shifting the cost. It isn't going to cost any less. It isn't that suddenly these costs are going to disappear. In the United States they don't have a Medicare program. Do people opposite know that in the United States in the decade from 1965 to 1975, costs for medical care in the United States grew at a faster rate, at a higher percentage than in Canada that had a medical care scheme? Did they know that? The difference, of course is this. Whereas in Canada it's paid for by society as a whole, based on ability to pay, there it's shifted to the individual and it's your ability to pay as an individual that determines what kind of care you get. I think our system is better. But the actual cost is not altered. The actual cost is not altered at all. It's simply shifted from the larger group, from society as a whole, through a fair tax system, to the individual to make do as best he can. And of course, when he's down to nothing and he's desperate, they, having compassion, will of course recognize that and they will give him welfare or whatever other social allowances, whatever terms you want to use.

They're asking people in the public sector, whether they work for government, or teachers working for school boards, or nurses working in hospitals, or any staff working in hospitals, they're saying, "make sacrifices, you have lived too good. You've had it too good, you're all spoiled. Make a sacrifice for the sake of Manitoba." For the sake of our economy, make sacrifices. Why don't they ask the corporate sector to make the sacrifice? Why don't they ask the people in the \$25,000, \$35,000 and \$45,000 bracket to make the sacrifice? Not only did they not ask them to make a sacrifice, they gave them money in the fall. They said, we're going to take less money from you. They didn't ask them for a sacrifice. That's the kind of, well, I won't use the word, it's staid Conservative philosophy, it's old orthodox economics of God knows what century, but now they're trying to put it in a new form. They ask everyone, I think one of the members said that we've all been too greedy. You know this all, it's an all-encompassing all; we've all been too greedy. You know, I'm speaking for the Minister for Public Works. —(Interjection)—

MR. ENNS: I've never been greedy, you know that, Saul.

MR. MILLER: Well, in that case I suppose you've turned back the personal income tax cut that you've received.

Someone said, "The economy cannot afford these annual increases — can't." And I gather one of the hospitals has already indicated to their staff that maybe they should take a cut in salary. You know, it's almost logical. If they're spoiled rotten, if they've been too greedy, then maybe the rationale is they've been overpaid all this time and now take a cut in salary. The fact that the cost of living has gone up by what? — 9, 9½ percent, I forget what it is, 8 to 10 — forget it, that doesn't matter. You've been greedy; you've had it too good. Now one of the hospitals is suggesting that they should take a cut in salary. It appears to me the Conservatives are delighted when this happens. And although I gather the Minister of Health yesterday indicated he didn't approve of this kind of tactic on the part of the hospital board, they really love it; they love it because it reinforces what they're trying to do. As I said, the scenario was show how bad things are in Manitoba, show this terrible deficit, show the fact that we have a deficit, that we're going into deficit financing for this year and that will give us the excuse to cut back — forget about improving programs — to cut back either by the elimination of a program or the shifting of the cost to a user or to simply freeze the program at a certain level of dollars which in fact is a reduction because it doesn't allow for any inflationary factor so that you can't even give as much services as you have in the past.

I've been getting calls and I haven't been able to pinpoint yet and I hope during the estimates of the Minister of Health will be able to get that — I've been getting calls from people who have been telling me that they have been on home care. You know, home care that the Minister says, in other speeches, is good because it's preventative. It keeps people from going into institutions. That in the home care field, the staffs are conveying to their clients that they may not be able to continue getting the service they've been getting. Now the Minister says that's not a policy and I believe him. I believe him. If he says that's not a policy, I'll believe him. He's an honourable man. What is happening, however, is that the fear is spreading right through the population, right through the staffs of the various agencies of the various departments of government. There is a fear which has spread — retrench, retrench, retrench, restrain, turn off the tap. They are turning off the tap and they are cutting off the oxygen. The patient is going to die, that's what's going to happen.

The question of the sacrifices, that again we're all spoiled. I gather it was Newman who made the statement that the Minister approved of and I find it interesting in this, what I consider as a concerted attack —(Interjection)—

MR. CHERNIACK: Which Newman?

MR. MILLER: No, not this one, another paper. David Newman, Walter's son. On the basis of spoiled and we've been too greedy and people have been taking too much out of the economy, in the March issue of Financial Times, they indicate that business is getting a bigger slice of the national income pie these days, that labour has stayed pat, that the farmers' income has dropped but that the coupon-clippers' share — and I like that term, the share of the coupon clippers — interest and other investment income has taken another sharp jump in 1977 and is far bigger now in relation to the other incomes, to labour, non-incorporated business and the farmer than in the past. So when we're talking about making a sacrifice and we talk in terms of we're all spoiled and we have to tighten our belts, that we can't demand more, the fact of the matter is that what this government has done has in fact proceeded to encourage a greater and greater spread between those who already have and who have the elbow room to cut back if they want to and not have to cut into bone and marrow, and those who just are barely making it, which is the vast majority — they are the ones being asked to sacrifice by this government. They are the ones that are being hurt. And as I say, they do it under the guise, under the guise of "we have no choice" and that's really where the cynicism comes in. It's cheap and it's cynical and it's false to stand up and plead and say, "We have no choice; we have no choice." You have a choice. As I indicated, even your \$34.7 million current account deficit because of the sales tax, even that, I suggest to you, did not have to be there. (a) You didn't have to give up \$23 million worth of revenue from the succession duty, the mineral acreage tax, the gift tax, the personal and corporate taxes, you didn't have to give that up. (b) You had other funds which you could have brought forward. I mentioned to you the \$4 million in the school lands trust fund, the Liquor Commission, the money from the special municipal loan fund, and we still don't know, underspent, underspent money which lapses in various departments.

You know, reference was made in social allowances and the Minister got up and said, "There were are less people on social allowance and I'm delighted to tell you this." Well, I know that as of last July or August, they had underspent by in excess of \$2 million in social allowances alone. It was down and it was down because the former government had a STEP program, a student employment program, that was meaningful; had a special job creation program that had meaning; had public works and government construction works through municipalities or through provincial government itself, or with the community centres which are meaningful, which put people to work, so that they could get enough work so that even when these things ran out, they drew on unemployment insurance. They qualified for that. But with the kind of situation we have now where the unemployment has risen sharply, they are soon going to run out of unemployment insurance and then they're going to fall plunk down on your tables, first at the municipal level and then at the provincial level because the first contact is the municipal welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I mustn't forget this. There's one — and although it doesn't fit in, I want to go back to it. During the course of his comments, the Minister of Finance did make reference to me and he talked about the fact that . . . oh yes, . . . I'm sorry, I've got to find it because this is the first chance I've had at it. Yes. "Ten days before his government left office" — and I'm now quoting from the Budget Speech — "the former Minister of Finance," — meaning me — "said the deficit was definitely not double the original estimate." Then he said, "Well he was right in a way. It was a great deal more; in fact five times more." Well, let me put the record straight. When I was approached by the press about the size of the deficit after the election and I'd been to Ottawa on October 5th or 6th, was when I discovered about the drop in federal moneys that were flowing from Ottawa, and I was asked, "How much is the deficit?" And I said, "I don't know. It's a snapshot in time. They can change and have changed over the years. The June projection isn't like the October projection, isn't like the December projection and it's very often that at the end of the fiscal year, it isn't anything anything like the previous three projections. So we never know." Well, they kept pushing, "How much?" And I said, "I don't think it will be more than double." But at that time, Mr. Speaker, — and so of course that was picked up immediately by members opposite saying, "In the printed Estimates in April, there was an indication of \$25 million and here we are with an \$80 million deficit which is therefore more than double." And mind you he said five times, four times, I guess he was still talking about the \$129 million projected deficit but it was \$80 million instead of the \$25 million in the printed Estimate.

Again, I want to caution the Minister of Finance because I think basically he's trying to be honest about this and I don't think he's being really cute about it — about cautioning him because, you know, he's got a printed Estimate now too and I am not — I will tell you now — I am not going to hold him to that printed figure and say, "In April of such-and-such a year and such-and-such a day, you got up and you tabled a document that showed revenue from Ottawa X million dollars and so many cents" and if it doesn't come to that or if it's higher than that, I'm going to say, "You misled the House." I know he can't do it; I know that he simply goes by figures that are supplied to him; he doesn't know. All he can do is put in the Estimate what he thinks.

The printed Estimate showed last year's deficit at \$25 million but by the time we left office, I knew — and that's what I said to the press when they asked me, "Would it be double?" I wasn't talking about a printed Estimate of six months earlier. I was talking about a deficit that we knew of expenditures we knew that had occurred beyond the spending Estimates and those were the salary increases, the MGEA Agreement which was, I think, signed at the end of August or September or somewhere along that, long after the Estimates were printed and put to bed. The fact that we had a very dry spring and summer requiring I think the most extensive forest fire fighting in Manitoba's history and, again, you

know, it may happen again and I hope for your sake it doesn't because, again, it's something you cannot foresee. There's no way you can do it. You can't foresee flood as occurred last fall in some areas.

So I can tell you, when I indicated double, I knew that the 25 of the printed Estimate was out, because I knew that we had an encephalitis scare last year which required over \$1 million. Boom, like that, a public health hazard. It didn't take long but it cost well over a million dollars. We also had an election and I'm sure members opposite wouldn't say, "You shouldn't have held it because your Estimates are going to be out." I'm sure they're not going to say that, but we had an election. Maybe the Member for Inkster will say it but the members opposite aren't going to say it. We had an election; cost well over \$1 million and, as is traditional, I don't know why but it's traditional and I guess I'm a traditionalist, it's traditional not to put election costs in Estimates in the spring of the year; it's never done. Don't ask me why.

These costs, these known costs, were known to me and were known to everybody because they were by Order-in-Council, they were public knowledge, these things that were occurring and so that when I said "double," I was talking about double, around \$40 million, not the 25. So when the Minister of Finance, if he wants to play games, and wants to say to me that they weren't double; they were three times, or four times, or five times, referring to his own now discredited interim audit which he himself now has agreed is not correct — that it is double — which is what I said to the press.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated before, the Conservatives for their own purposes, in order to follow through on a program which they want to follow through on, which is to shift the costs to everybody but themselves, to shift the cost away from the province which, although it may not have the taxing flexibility and the powers of the Federal Government, certainly has far more revenue raising abilities than a hospital or a university or a school board or a municipality or the private individual. They have all of this ability but they don't want to use it. They want to push as much of the cost of spending, expenditures, vital expenditures, onto somebody else and so the municipal taxes will go up and the school board costs will go up and the university students will pay more and the university budget will be cut and their staffs will be paid less and they may have to cut down on programs, the hospitals will be squeezed, the personal care homes will be squeezed, the elderly and housing will be squeezed' the personal care homes will be squeezed, they'll all be squeezed. And that's what comes natural to the Conservative party. That's what comes natural to Conservatives. They believe this. But instead of just saying, "Yes, this is what we believe," they cloak it. They say, "We're forced into it. We had this terrible problem, this horror story — look at our budget — and here we are, as best we could, we've come up with \$34 million on a current account deficit." And Mr. Speaker, as pointed out to you, they didn't have to. There are accounts that they could have brought forward, there are sums that they could have brought forward. There's tax moneys that they gave away last fall, revenues they gave away last fall they didn't have to, and they could have come in with a perfectly balanced budget even by giving up that 2 percent sales tax; how do you like that? They could even have done that. And if they didn't have the sales tax little thing, they could have had a surplus — at the expense of Manitobans, that's what you'd have had. And because you couldn't stomach that, you couldn't face that, you're hiding behind a scenario that you started to write last October, you're still trying to fool the people and yourselves, you are kidding the public, and the truth will tell in the long run, Mr. Speaker, the truth, as it always does, will tell.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, since this is my first speech, my maiden speech in this House, I would like to begin by congratulating you on your position as Speaker of the House, not because it's a customary thing to do, but because I feel that it is very well deserved. I feel it is very well deserved, Mr. Speaker, because of your unbiased manner in many difficult situations which seem to be occurring much more often as the session goes on.

I would also like to congratulate my friend and colleague, the Deputy Speaker. He seems to have moved into his new task with great ease.

Mr. Speaker, while I did personally congratulate my two colleagues, the Member for Crescentwood who so ably replied to the Throne Speech, and the Member for Portage la Prairie, a rookie like myself, who did us all proud with his fine reply, I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to publicly tell them that we think they did a wonderful job, and it's a very fine input.

Mr. Speaker, about this time I would like to dwell for a few moments on my constituency, the constituency of Assiniboia. I would like to say "thank you" to the people of Assiniboia for giving me their vote of confidence, for allowing me to sit in this House representing them. I have told them many times in the constituency that I will work very hard, not only for the people of Assiniboia, but for all the people in Manitoba. I have a rather unique constituency, Mr. Speaker. I say unique because there is a cross-section of every walk of life in my constituency. I have the blue-collar worker, I have the executive type, I have the people that clip coupons, and yes, Mr. Speaker, I have the people that work the land in agriculture. It is quite a sizable constituency, something just under 18,000 people, and it extends from just west of Grace Hospital to five miles past Headingley.

You know, Mr. Speaker, sometimes I get a very lonely feeling in this all-male club. It's strange, however, that with all the barbs and the adverse criticisms that my colleagues have been taking from the honourable gentlemen opposite about their supposedly chauvinistic ways — they don't care about women, by repealing the Family Law — I find it very strange, Mr. Speaker, that while I was looking through the annals of our wonderful Province of Manitoba, I found it very strange that in 108

years there has only been four women that have been elected to sit in this Chamber and all four women were Conservatives. Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't be here today if it wasn't for the support and the encouragement that I received both from my Leader and my colleagues. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think you'll agree that the honourable gentlemen across will have to concede that they were in error in their judgment of my colleagues. That's so much for the people's government that supposedly represents all people.

Mr. Speaker, I would be very remiss if I didn't mention the former Member for Assiniboia. He was a very respected member in this Chamber for some 15 years and I'm sure the Member for Fort Rouge must miss him greatly. —(Interjection)— I'm sure you do. I had the privilege, and I say privilege, of campaigning against him the past two elections, and Mr. Speaker, as you know one was unsuccessfully, and this last one successfully. But Mr. Speaker, if anybody can be called friendly enemies in an election campaign, I think that would best describe both of us. It seems coincidental that during his years representing the Liberal Party in this House that he was the Labour critic for the Liberal Party, and now I, his successor, am in charge of Labour.

Mr. Speaker, the last few months, five-and-a-half short months to be exact, have truly been a learning experience for me. It will be an ongoing learning experience for me as long as I'm in this portfolio or any other task that I might be called on to perform. My predecessor was a member in this House for some 16 years before he became the Minister of Labour, and he also came from a labour movement. Mr. Speaker, I do not have that same kind of background, I don't bring that kind of background to my position, but I can assure you that the interests of all groups in Manitoba will be given careful attention.

Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, we tend to forget that there are small businesses that are not part of large organized associations, and the employees that are not part of organized labour. It is estimated that there is something under 40 percent that are organized labour members, and something just over 60 percent that are in the unorganized people in the work force. This latter group, the unorganized people, are protected by various Acts, such as the Employment Standards Act and other related legislation. Similarly, the interests of the small businessman must be protected to ensure that the costs of doing business remain realistic.

But Mr. Speaker, I look forward to carrying out the responsibilities that the First Minister has seen fit to give me, and I recognize the fact that I have been and will continue to be under extra pressure. First of all, Mr. Speaker, because I am a woman in an all-male dominated institution, and in spite of equal rights, I'm not so sure that all the males are prepared to accept me in this position. I'm not naive enough to think, Mr. Speaker, that this discrimination is going to disappear overnight, but I would like to tell the honourable members opposite that one of my objectives in the next three-and-a-half or four years is to pave the way to assure that the Conservative party on this side of the House will have not just one woman, but several women after the next election.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps more important are the problems of inflation and unemployment. It's not just facing the people of Manitoba, it's facing all Canadians today. Although our rate of unemployment in Manitoba is not as high as in some other provinces, we are nonetheless concerned and we feel that our policies will help improve the economy picture.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, there is the misunderstanding about the function of the Department of Labour. Many people fail to realize that the Department of Labour is a regulatory one and as such is not an employment agency.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my gratefulness to the efficient staff that I have in my department and I'll tell you that is one place that there is no discrimination. And because of their expertise and willingness to work with me, which is something some others didn't do, for the Member for St. Johns, I have confidence that my responsibilities will be carried out not only to the best of my abilities, but to the best of anybody's abilities that they could do under these economic rough times that we are going through.

Lately, Mr. Speaker, there's been a couple of people that have resigned. I don't feel that this is anything unusual; I'm sure that every member in this House has left a position at one time or another for some reason or another, so I don't find anything unusual about that. —(Interjection)— Are there any of you that are in your original jobs?

MR. CHERNIACK: The reason counts.

MRS. PRICE: In some cases, Mr. Speaker, they have expressed their inability by action, or in writing, to refuse to accept a change in government direction. And this is natural, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that any one of us, people that are sitting in this Chamber today, if we couldn't accept the philosophies of the government of the day, we would look for other employment. And I would like to add that this is not something new that has started since October 11, that happened during the previous government's time and it will continue to happen.

Mr. Speaker, during the mini-session last November, my government rejected the proposed increase in the minimum wage which would have put Manitoba higher than anyone else, including our neighbours from the south, with the exception of Quebec. And they can also take the credit for having the highest rate of unemployment. Mr. Speaker, I think at this crucial time in Manitoba we need more to be encouraging employment, not furthering reduction in staff in the workplace, and that is precisely what happens, and it is the little fellow that suddenly finds his workplace no longer can afford the marginal worker. And I know of what I say, Mr. Speaker, because I have been in the labour intensive market for more years than a lady would care to admit.

MR. DESJARDINS: Which lady?

MRS. PRICE: This one.

MR. DESJARDINS: I know your age; I'm going to squeal if you're not careful.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, since I have taken over the Ministry of Labour I have and will continue to have an open door policy. I have made myself readily accessible to all interested groups, labour — both organized and unorganized — management, associations, or anyone that would see fit to come to my office that felt they were not being dealt with fairly.

There have been statements made recently, Mr. Speaker, about the government's lack of concern about matters of industrial safety. There are those who say we don't care about the lives of workers, and Mr. Speaker, that is absolute nonsense. The Conservative government has been concerned about matters of safety in the past, and we will continue to be concerned about matters of safety in the future. This government has been criticized —(Interjection)— You want the floor?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes.

MRS. PRICE: This government, Mr. Speaker, has been criticized because it has not appointed a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the matters of safety in the mines. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people's government of the past eight years never saw fit to have an inquiry and with the way that they don't care about how they spend money, I don't think they should be chastising us today for not having run into a Commission of Inquiry. But I would like to tell them that we have currently set up a committee that is composed of labour, management, and personnel from the Department of Labour, who are going to be examining the situation and to make recommendations for further action. We feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is the most useful approach because nobody understands the situation better than those who are directly involved.

In terms of safety, Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable criticism against the government because it is suggested that we are not providing the funding and the necessary staff to carry out the requirements of the Workplace Safety and Health Act. Mr. Speaker, the Act came into effect last September and a large portion of those organizations designated to have Safety Committees — I think there was something like 320 — and approximately 280 have set up Safety Committees in their workplaces. So I feel that we are making great progress and we are encouraged by it. At the same time, we will continually review the program to see that it is functioning effectively.

But in this time of restraint, Mr. Speaker, we must also be certain that our resources are being properly utilized. We are convinced that ultimately responsibility for safety lies not only with management but with both workers and management and that through effective use of their Safety Committees great progress can, and will, be made to reduce any accidents in the workplace. We see the department playing a supportive rather than a policing role.

Mr. Speaker, another of the functions of the department is to assist in the consultative process between labour and management. The Honourable John Munro, the Federal Minister of Labour, has during the past year attempted to institute a tri-partite method of consultation similar to what exists in many of the countries in Europe.

We feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is too dominant a role for the government to play a part in. We do not feel that either labour or business are prepared to move from the adversary system, which is the basis of collective bargaining in Canada.

However, Mr. Speaker, with the lifting of the AIB controls last Friday, it is crucially important that both parties bargain in good faith during the coming months. Otherwise government will again have to take a more active role.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to my other responsibilities, I am responsible for Manitoba's Civil Service and it is our intention to restore the principle of merit back into the Civil Service. In a time of fiscal restraint, it is a time when we are expecting the civil servants to work and perform at a high level. We feel that it is very important that their opportunity for advancement not be blocked by political patronage.

Mr. Speaker, I think that that's the extent of my remarks for today and I would like to thank you for your indulgence.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to take part in the Budget Debate, it is my pleasure to follow the only lady member that we have in this Chamber, and holding the portfolio of the Ministry of Labour in this province.

However, while she was speaking, Sir, I was wondering whether she was holding the labour portfolio or whether she was holding the portfolio of the Ministry of Industry and Commerce, because what came loud and clear through — and I don't know if she knows what her responsibilities are; her responsibilities are in the field of labour dealing with industrial relations, not with industry and commerce in this province. Notwithstanding that industry and commerce is represented by a member of the Treasury Bench.

Tuesday, April 18, 1978

The Minister of Labour today, in reply to questions from this side of the House, has confirmed that she said on a panel of a recent meeting of the Chamber of Commerce that people in our society are all spoiled rotten. Does she feel that the people on the minimum wage are spoiled rotten? They are getting too much at \$2.95 an hour and she has told them to tighten their belts. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, when you tighten your belt, if you tighten it around your leg it operates as a tourniquet; it shuts off the blood. If you tighten it around your stomach and that part of your anatomy, your stomach gets kind of hungry and shrinks. But when you put it around a person's neck and start pulling, you strangle them and this is what she is doing to the people. And many of those people who are on the minimum wage live in my constituency.

I noticed that the Minister of Labour, when she was up speaking, studiously avoided saying that she had any people in her constituency who worked for the minimum wage. She went through quite a wide spectrum but she never once mentioned the people on the minimum wage, and she has shilly-shallied, and her government has shilly-shallied, for five and a half months on this issue of the minimum wage.

You know, the Minister may laugh. She may laugh and she may leave this Chamber; I don't care what she does. I'm glad that she will be back because I'm not through with her. She has probably gone out to get instructions from Con Riley, or who else is over there at the GWL? Mr. Burns, at Great-West Life. She is probably going to get instructions of what she should come back into this House and say, and how she should operate in this House.

The Minister of Labour, as I've said, has shilly-shallied. She has stonewalled every time that we have asked her in this House about the minimum wage. She says, "Oh, that's a matter of policy; that's a matter of policy." I don't believe that she has even gone to the Cabinet with this recommendation that was made by the Minimum Wage Board and she talks about the Minimum Wage Board saying that it wants, on its own volition, to be eliminated.

Well, she quotes half-truths, Mr. Speaker, and members of this Chamber. I have a copy of the Minimum Wage Report for 1976, and one of the minutes of the Minimum Wage Board meeting held on May 17th, 1977. Recommendations from the Minimum Wage Board were for an increase in the per hour rate for workers working not under the benefit of a contract but working for these good pillars of the Tory society, who pay their workers the bare minimum that they have to pay and they are applauding the efforts of this government for holding the wage. Restraint, restraint, restraint — that's all we hear from these people over on that side of the House.

A MEMBER: And they like it.

MR. JENKINS: And they like it. The people on the minimum wage like it? Well, I can see that the Honourable Member for Emerson — (Interjection) — The Bible belt. They like restraint.

Well, my honourable friend, the Member for St. Vital, says it's called masochism. Well, perhaps that's what it is.

I will come back to the Minister of Labour when she comes back to this House. — (Interjection) — Well, I don't know whether she will or not.

I am going to deal with how this Budget affects the members of my constituency. You know, this much ballyhooed document that the . . . Non-political, non-political, I believe that was what the Minister of Finance tabled this document with. He delivered in this House the first non-political Budget Speech that was ever delivered in this House. What utter rubbish and nonsense — utter tripe.

You know, if I can quote from Shakespeare, I think that this is . . .

MR. MALINOWSKI: To Be Or Not To Be.

MR. JENKINS: No, this is a name of a play, "Much Ado About Nothing". "Much Ado About Nothing". The proposed tax cuts do nothing for the people in my constituency. How many of my senior citizens, living in my constituency, over the age of 65 have school taxes in excess of \$375.00? And you've got to have to be able to achieve anything under the niggling little bit of money that the Tory government gave out. I believe that the Tax Department, itself, issued figures that it's going to affect approximately 8,000 people in the whole province — 8,000 — and I will be very surprised if there were very many of them located in the constituency of Logan.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, all we see in this Budget, and all we have heard from the government on the other side, is restraint, restraint, restraint. And unfortunately, the restraints are being applied against those people who in our society are least able to defend themselves.

What do we see? The Minister of Health and Social Development — and he carried on at great length here yesterday evening — telling us sacredly — I believe the Member for Inkster, the Member for St. Johns, and even singled myself out, that we agreed that if we had been there that we would have had to make cuts.

Well, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that if we had been on that side of the House and we would have, through economic circumstances, been forced to make cuts, we would not have made them at the expense of people in society who are least able to defend themselves. We certainly would not have given away the money that you people have given to . . . What? 148 people, I believe, last year.

A MEMBER: Spoiled rotten.

MR. JENKINS: Spoiled rotten. Those people spoiled rotten — 148 who paid . . . What's the name of

that tax? The Succession Duty tax. 148 — those spoiled rotten people.

That's "As You Like It", my honourable friend the Member for St. Vital said.

But what do we see? The Minister of Health, who is — and you know, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health really, I think, should go and see a doctor because he is losing weight. He is losing hair and sometimes I think he is losing his sensibilities because I think the job — and I am not saying that it is not an important portfolio that he has — I think the job is too much for him. I think he is wearing away to a shadow.

But what does he propose to take to Cabinet tomorrow? I believe that Cabinet meets tomorrow. A 20 percent increase. To who? To the people over here at Great-West Life, the executives, Monarch Life, the President of the Chamber of Commerce, the Manufacturers' Association — a 20 percent increases in taxes? No, a poll tax to those people in the hospitals and personal care homes. I say to you people that if that's what you are doing now and applying to the people who are in hospitals occupying beds because your restraint program has cut to the bone — we are not building any personal care homes — so these people now, Lord, they can't help themselves. They have to be in a hospital. They have to be somewhere. What do you want them to do? Die on the street? Perhaps that's what you do want. —(Interjection)— I know they have bad ideas, and it's not very often I agree with that hack that writes in the Winnipeg Tribune — Vic Grant. But at least I do for once agree with what he said. You people want these people to die. You don't care about the old people — not one damn bit. Shame on you. Twenty percent increase to those . . . Oh boy, these people are really able to defend themselves, lying flat on their backs. They will be able to get up and really fight.

A MEMBER: Tighten their belts.

MR. JENKINS: Tighten their belts, yes. I know where they are going to put that belt. They are going to put it right around their neck and pull it, and pull it, and pull it. There will be not a breath left in them.

A MEMBER: They're spoiled rotten.

MR. JENKINS: They're spoiled rotten, these old people — terrible.

But that's what they would like, Sir, that is what they would like. Die and get out of our way. You're holding us up. We don't want you on this earth anymore. And these are the people who have made this province.

You know, my honourable friends over there get up and extol the virtues of their constituencies and the strong free enterprise people who have made this society. Well, let me tell you something. There is no one in this country that can stand on his own — no one. Because if that was the case, there wouldn't be a highway in this province. There wouldn't be a sidewalk. There wouldn't be a street. There wouldn't be a light. We all have to work together, and that is something you don't seem to realize. You're good, free and enterprising. All right, I'll tell you what. I'll give you an offer you can't refuse. Take up your pick and shovel and head north 500 or 600 miles, and see how much you'll stand on your own.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): We don't want them up there, Bill. We don't want them up there.

MR. JENKINS: No, I agree with you. The Member for Flin Flon, he wouldn't want them up there. But go up there and see what you can do on your own. Cut yourself off from this social services that the previous government set up in this province. You know, what is really happening and what is the prime objective of the First Minister of this province is to eradicate, absolutely eradicate any social change that we wrought in eight and some years in office. We're going to see a return to the Dark Ages. We're going to see the return to the Dark Ages and to the feudal lord, and there's the chief one over there, Sterling the Ruthless Lyon. That's the chief architect of the Conservative party — it's not Rufus, his name is Ruthless — Ruthless in his attack on people that can least defend themselves in our society. That is what the whole objective of that government over there is.

The Minister of Highways, the Honourable Member for Lakeside — real good free enterpriser, tremendous, strong, self-made man — he's got muscles all over the place, but I think he's got a lot between his ears — but I'll tell you what, he is a real free enterpriser. He rents government land — and you know what, he's so free and enterprising that he in turn rents that to his fellow farmers, and then he says, "I didn't realize that was wrong." And you know, he was at one time the Minister of Labour in this government when they were — or not Minister of Labour, Minister of Agriculture, pardon me. Now, if anybody should have known about agricultural regulations, it should have been the Honourable Member for Lakeside. But like other members on the other side of the House, especially members of the Treasury bench — they seem to have an amnesia of anything that happened in the past. —(Interjection)— Their Leader can't remember where he got \$3,000 a month. He can't remember signing documents. He can't remember going to Switzerland. And you see, now he's being driven back and forth here to the Legislature, maybe he can't remember where the Legislature is and he has to have somebody drive him back and forth so he knows where the place is.

And we have other Ministers who suffer from this amnesia. We have the Minister of Tourism. He can't remember — "Gosh, I can't remember telling my Deputy to sign a document." Again, this

Tuesday, April 18, 1978

amnesia. You know, one of these days, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to not be too surprised if they forget that the session is on and they'll all be somewhere else, and they're liable to be anywhere. They'll forget that this place is even operating.

But you know, I'm glad to see that the Minister of Labour is back. She's back. And she's come over to this side of the House; maybe she's trying out a seat over here for where she'll be in 1981 when she takes her place, and perhaps we could even arrange for her to sit in the same seat that the Honourable Member for Assiniboia sat. She can sit there, where I think the Honourable Member for Elmwood is now just temporarily occupying a space, and we would be very glad to see her over here. The Minister of Labour said that she has an open door policy. Yes, I agree that the Minister of Labour has an open door policy . . .

A MEMBER: It's a revolving door.

MR. JENKINS: It's a revolving door, right. It's an open door, she opens the door here, and throws you out that door over there. You know, the Minister of Labour, she said, "I can't help it if somebody resigns." Well, I don't think that the Deputy Minister of Labour resigned, I think he was fired. — (Interjection)— Right. I don't think that the permanent member . . .

A MEMBER: That's the open door policy.

MR. JENKINS: That's the open door, open the door and throw him out. You open the door and throw them out. You know, she must be a female bouncer. Must be a lady bouncer.

A MEMBER: Now she's crying.

MR. JENKINS: Oh, I don't think she's crying. I don't think she has any tears. The only tears that she would shed would be tears of rage.

A MEMBER: She's leaving the House.

MR. JENKINS: But you know, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the fact that the honourable lady was elected to this House. I thought that she would have some tempering effect upon the honourable gentlemen opposite, but I can see that she doesn't; in fact, I think that she's picking up the same amnesiac habits of the honourable gentlemen opposite. She can't remember telling three ladies that she doesn't like unions, she hates unions. She doesn't like unions. Well, that doesn't surprise me, that doesn't surprise me in the least.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Aren't you married? This is a union.

MR. JENKINS: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas said, "Yes, she is a member of a union," and I believe she is, between her and her husband. And I hope it's a happy union. I wonder who negotiates what in that household. But that is none of my business and I won't pry; I'm sure that the Honourable Minister has a happy union and her and her husband are happily married. But, to get back to the election of the Honourable Minister. I thought that the Honourable Minister, when she was elected, that she would be one of the staunchest proponents for Marital and Family Law in the province, but not so. Maybe she doesn't want to share that extra salary that she's getting with her dear husband; she says, "That's mine. What's mine is mine, and what's yours is mine." Maybe that's the relationship she has. But anyway, I thought that here would be one Minister who would be certainly a strong proponent for a strong family union and the disposal of assets if unfortunately that union should break down. Now, in that respect, Sir, she has disappointed me greatly. She has not shown that she has that kind of sympathy for the unfortunates of broken marriages and homes.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to get legislation, and it will be very interesting to see if the recommendations that were put forth by that illustrious trio of lawyers who reviewed the Family Marital Law and the Maintenance Act here in the Province of Manitoba, and to see whether the emasculating that we see that the honourable members opposite have proposed of these two bills is going to take place.

But I can tell you, Sir, and I can tell the government, that they're going to have one hell of a fight on their hands if they try to introduce that type of legislation. We will fight you tooth and nail, and in the end, you'll prevail, but the people outside are the ones who are going to judge your actions, and I can say in all sincerity that in more than eight years of office — sure, we stirred up a certain amount of antagonism among certain sections of society — no government ever operates that doesn't, you've got to step on somebody's toes once in a while. But, I can tell you, I have never seen a government in five-and-a-half months step on so many toes, having so many people mad at them, and so many people coming down here raising a ruckus because of the tactics and the carryings on of this government — (Interjection)— Oh, no, we're not organizing the people. These people are coming here of their own volition.

They're not like the people you organized in 1970, and the Honourable Member for Selkirk yesterday read into the record the memorandum, when Great-West Life, GWL across the road, gave all their employees a half a day off. Come over here and petition, and out there with placards. — (Interjection)— You weren't here but that's what happened. They got a half day's holiday, and Lord

help them if they didn't come over here — they couldn't go home — they got a half day's holiday to have a picnic on the Legislative Assembly grounds. That's the kind of lobbying that went on. And we had the gray eminence that sat up here, the gray eminence, the Toronto lawyer who was advising the Conservative opposition of that day, and the Insurance Bureau of Canada. —(Interjection)— Well, the Honourable Member for Emerson said that I've got demonstrators outside. Well, I have no demonstrators outside. I understand that today some people came from the National Farmers Union. I happen to know nobody within the National Farmers Union' but I understand it's getting to be almost a weekly or two-weekly occurrence — I believe they were here a couple of weeks ago, making representation not only to the government but to members of the opposition as well. They were making representations I believe on two or three matters, and I believe they are again here making the same representations again, trying to put some pressure on the government. Well, I wish them lots of luck, Sir, but as I said, I doubt very much that they are going to change the minds of the government opposite.

In fact, I know they aren't, because the Minister of Health said yesterday, "We don't care how much we are lobbied, we don't care how much you might say — you are not going to deter us, you are not going to slow us up, you are not going to stop us." We can't, because you're going backwards. How can we stop you, you're running backwards. We've got to stop you from running backwards. But certainly, you are not standing still. And certainly nothing that we on this side of the House are saying or anything that members of society in general say to you are in any way, shape or form formulating any policies that that group, except the members of the task force, as my honourable friend the Member for Inkster likes to refer to them, and it is a farce. It is perhaps one of the biggest farces that has been played on the people of Manitoba. In the end the document that was tabled by the Honourable Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Task Force, the Member for River Heights, as the Member for Inkster said, "It is not we on this side who are going to deter the government from implementing those recommendations. You are the people who are going to have to fight those recommendations." Because if those recommendations are carried out in their totality, they won't need a treasury bench over there. Perhaps all you will need is a business manager to run the affairs of this province.

When the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, and I see he is not here this afternoon, spoke the other day, he took quite a point of view. He said that the budget — well this document that was tabled in the House here and read out by the Minister of Finance — was not going to affect the poor people. It was going to affect the people in the middle income and upper income. Well I recommend for your reading Frances Russell's column of yesterday. I don't have to read it out to you where she deals with some of the silly things that the Member for St. Matthews made in this House.

The trickle-down theory that the members of the government seem to operate on and talk about reluctant brides, but the reduction in the sales tax is a trickle-down theory, and it works sometimes. But I can tell you I heard on the radio yesterday that already the Automotive Association Dealers of Manitoba are going to increase the cost of cars, new automobiles in Manitoba: by 1 percent?— no; 2 percent?— no; would you believe 3 percent? Exactly what you people and your federal counterparts have given to the people of Manitoba. So you get a 3 percent cut in sales tax which is supposed to put the money into the pockets of the people in the trickle-down theory; the only thing is it is a very dense forest where that trickling is coming down and when it comes down to the roots there is nothing but dry dust. That is all that comes down.—(Interjection)— That's right, the Conservatives give and the automobile dealers take it away, and that will not be the first one.

You know, I thought it was a bit blatant and I knew that certain members of the society and it's that strong free enterprise society with all the muscle where it's a dog-eat-dog society, the strong survive and the weak shall die — real Spartans. Spartans had a society such as that, they used to throw babies out on a rock for a week if he survived, he grew to manhood and if he didn't, tough luck. That seems to be the philosophy of the members opposite.

But you know, I believe it was a week ago yesterday that the Minister of Finance tabled the document and the desk thumping and pounding on the other side and the triumph when the Minister of Finance announced a 3 percent cut in the sales tax and then he proceeds in three following pages to tell us how they were dragged kicking and screaming to make this cut. —(Interjection)— Well you can have it your way. I haven't mastered that phrase that the Honourable Member for Inkster has which means, I think loosely translated, you can do it this way or you can do it this way, and it means much the same thing. I think that is a very loose translation of it. The Honourable Member for Inkster can contradict me if I am wrong, he can rise on a point of privilege and say I am misrepresenting his interpretation or my interpretation is misrepresenting what he loosely translated for us in this House. If I have it wrong, I am sure he will correct me.

But you know, kicking and screaming, or screaming and kicking, whatever you like it makes no difference. The Minister of Finance for the next three pages of his document tells us what a terrible thing it is. Here the Federal Government has made this intrusion into the field of what is provincial jurisdiction. Well, if you had had the courage of your convictions, you could have done what they did in Quebec, you could have said no. But don't give it on the one hand and then stand up and cry for three pages that you couldn't do anything. They made you an offer you couldn't refuse. And you are going to be the people in the end you know. If this thing was to go at any time, this 3 percent for six months, it would be much better to make it at the end of September for the winter months when people have to buy clothing, they have to buy fuel in excess quantity and you have to buy warm

clothing, but no, this is made during the summer months; we don't have to have as much fuel, we don't have to have as much light because we get more daylight — the cut is at the wrong time. If you want to stimulate the economy, you should have been doing it over the winter months and if it was an election ploy and I don't doubt it for one instant, the master politicians down in Ottawa caught you off base and other Ministers of Finance and Premiers across this country.

I agree it is an intrusion into the field of provincial responsibility. But you are talking about being a government of courage. All right, show us your guts, get up and say, "To hell with you, we will not make that cut." But you don't do that, you acquiesce very quietly, and you make the announcement, the Minister of Finance, who I understand has gone to Europe and I don't begrudge him that trip because I understand he is away to borrow some money that we need very badly in this Province. But to the desk thumping of the members, the government members on the other side, 3 percent cut in sales tax. Tremendous, and you know, how many people on the minimum wage are going to run out and buy a new car? How many people who are flat on their backs in the hospital that are going to get a 20 percent increase, are going to run out and buy new cars? How many other disadvantaged in our society are going to be able to take the advantage of this cut in the sales tax? Very few, very few. The people who are going to be able to take advantage of this are people who are in my wage category and honourable members opposite, and those are the people who are going to make most use of the cut in the sales tax.

And you know when you are talking about sales tax, we had — and of course it has not been increased and therefore it has been cut — we had a rebate system, a cost of living for those on the minimum wage, for those on the very basic minimum salaries for their purchases. For those people on those salary scales, perhaps 80 percent or maybe even more of the purchases they made of taxable items under the provincial sales tax was rebated to them. But you haven't increased it, you have cut it because the cost of living is rising.

You have also made cuts in support to the school division because you said, "Oh 80 percent, we are going to give you 80 percent" — and you know, this percentage figure is a bunch of bunk. It is a tax cut? Yes, it is a tax cut, or it is a cut in the support because the support is not there. You haven't picked up what the cost of living carries on, and it is running around 10 percent. We are still practically in double digit figures after 3 years of the AIB.

The support to the municipalities has been cut and I can make you a prediction, Mr. Speaker, that this year their friends on City Council kept pretty quiet but next year and the year following, they are going to be down here on your doorsteps and they are going to be howling and yelling because they are up for election two years hence and they are not going to take it lying down — your cuts in transportation, your cuts in municipal grants and your support for local government. These people will be here. You know, if we had even intimidated to the City Council of Winnipeg that we would do what you people have done, we would never have heard the end of it. They are your friends in the majority on that council, members of the Independent Civic Election Committee. They will go along with you for this year and hope that there is an upturn in the economy of this country.

As I said before, the long range indicators do not point that way. We in the western world are going to face another round of the OPEC countries raising the price of fossil fuels, which in turn will fuel again the fires of inflation.

You know, it's interesting, when we were on that side of the House we said that sure there was inflation in this province but it was inflation that was inspired elsewhere. And they said, don't talk about any place else. Talk about Manitoba. But now they're on that side of the House. Oh. They talk about everywhere but Manitoba. They say, now the fires of inflation are fueled. Those irresponsible people in Ottawa are fueling the economy. On one hand they're saying that, and they've got their other hand out taking any handout they can get from the Federal Government.

I'm not getting up here to defend the Federal Government. There may be only one thing that you and I and members of this side of the House have in common, and that is a showing out of the door of the Trudeau government, but certainly not to elect Joe Clark, but to elect a New Democratic Party government in the Dominion of Canada that will make the changes that we have made in social changes and economic policies, and when it's reviewed, I think that we spent 8 ½ years giving the best government that this province has had in over 110 years. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, at first I would certainly like to congratulate you for your elevation. It does seem the table is turned. It doesn't seem very many years ago that I used to tell you when to get up and down, but now that thing is reversed. I do congratulate you and all of the new and the re-elected members, because I've always found it costly to be here, but a pleasure to work with people on either sides of the House.

Someone mentioned Hubert Humphrey the other day, and I was one who was a believer in a lot of his thoughts. This is a line of his, "the greatest gift of life is friendship," and I have received it. I do feel here in this Chamber, while I do have my problems, I think on the long haul I have received that kind of friendship.

Certainly I do endorse the Budget, the Throne Speech and the Budget, and many of the things that have come out. It is true, it is time of restraint, but I think when one goes into his constituency and sees the senior people and the appreciation of those who are still living in their homes, then one does appreciate the relief of the Property Tax, the Education and Property Tax for low and middle incomes.

I would say the other most important thing was the freeze in our own wages. I have been one that's been here, I've been proud to be here, and I've said it other years, that I do feel in the last five, six or seven years, the impression of a politician in the public view has gone down, through Watergate and many others, and I think it does show well that we can work to put the same effort on without asking our 6.8 percent raise that many other people are. And it does put our Ministers in good stead in asking other people to hold the line, if we indeed, have done it. As you remember, when Ottawa brought in the price controls, the first thing they did was have that big increase, and the public rebelled at the whole thing, and it got that program off to a bad start.

The other thing, we've all been anxious as parents with teenagers around us, or sponsoring teenagers, encouragement that there would be employment for those. Only yesterday our Minister of Education explained that program in full, and I am one who has four young people. I don't think any of them will be needing that program, but it's nice to know for those who haven't dug and found jobs. I might say I have one daughter in the University of Manitoba and one boy in Assiniboine College in Brandon, and they will be unemployed. This program is good for them and their fellow students.

Certainly the open heart surgery and the \$12.2 million expansion in the cancer treatment and research — those who are afflicted and there's just a tremendous lot of our population has been or is afflicted with that disease — surely it must be encouraging to give them some area of hope. We know today cancer isn't fatal in many cases and this must add to that percentage.

Another pet of mine is tourism, and I'm not one who says I am the slightest bit afraid to go south in the wintertime. When I save up enough money to go on a holiday I pick the places that the weather agrees, that I like. In travelling to the south each and every winter in recent years I do try and sell Manitoba, and when I see ads like I did last week end in going down to California, the Frontier Airlines had an advertisement that I could certainly buy. "Fishing in Manitoba" on real high class paper, and I'm sure no one here in Manitoba paid for that, but Frontier Airlines did. Further on in the page — and maybe that's the best seller we have, the fishing — "There's more to fishing in Manitoba than just catching fish." A good piece of advertisement. I think that's the kind of thing if we're going to bring a tourist business here. We have a tough time because our hotel rooms are more expensive, our meals are more expensive, and sure as heaven, our gases are more expensive, so we've got to do a lot more selling in order to bring the tourist trade. We know it is the second biggest revenue gainer here.

This is touching Federal, we saw headlines the other day where western farmers are going to get \$60 million through the stabilization program. So just for the record I would like to have it known that the farmers have paid in more than \$60 million, so at this stage at least they are barely getting their own money back.

Again, I could go on on the tourist while I am there. I certainly support my colleague from Wolseley on the nighthawk flights that are coming. It's the first time we've seen any kind of encouragement, reasonably cheap rates, in this case it's through the night, and they are not stopping in Winnipeg. I think that's an absolute shame. I think we've got to put pressure on our Federal members to make them aware of it, because this is the gateway to the west and to the south if you're going to central America, central United States. Because I was just down there last winter. I had the schedule here somewhere, there it is, and if I told you it was an American airlines and I think it went up and down some 44 times in some twenty-some days, and if I told you the cost of it you wouldn't believe it — some of my colleagues. But it's a fabulous way to go and this airline was owned by the fourth man in space, Frank Borman. The company was bankrupt literally and went into this program, cut-rate fares, and now they're back in money. So I think we indeed should be encouraging our Manitoba and Canadian carriers to go into that kind of a performance because it's a one way street.

If any of you were here in 1969 when I spoke on the Throne Speech, I think I congratulated the First Minister at that time, he had gone to Ottawa, and his theme was a freer trade, to cut down the tariffs, and I do congratulate the four western premiers the other day, because that does seem to be their theme, and it says how much western Canada pays, the agriculture especially, in billions of dollars because of the tariffs, and yet we sell our product on the world market. We don't get that protection. I hope there's something more comes than what came of that effort by the then Premier in 1969.

We still have the same oil problems that we've had since I became a member, and I certainly could read back to the Hansard exactly what was said last year. The problem hasn't changed. It's incremental tax. The little guy that has two percent pays the same rate as the Chevron Standard that may have the 86 percent, and this does seem to be unfair to the small guy that put money on the line to get in there to start that production back when the oil was new.

The other problem of course has been the surface rights. There are many farmers out there that have the surface rights, and they come to the renewal, the renewal at that old rate 25 years ago. As the Minister of a year ago said, we don't want to get into governments ruling, and that's true, we don't but I think some influence — and I hope my colleague will read this — because I do think there's something that should be done in that area, because companies are big and one individual farmer that's got 14 wells, he doesn't get any interests off it, and I as a farmer would hate like the devil to work that section with that amount of turns.

Of course, my pet hobby, if there is one, is racing, it's true. I just want to read you a clipping of the Winnipeg Free Press, March 8, 1978, "Canadians Spent Freely at the Track. Canadians apparently did not take their troubles to the race track last year, where they wagered a record of \$1.232 billion, up 9.6 percent from 1976, according to statistics from the Federal Agriculture Department. However, the average bet per race on thoroughbreds dropped 2.3 percent, while the average bet on harness races increased 8.1 percent." So I guess you know what I am pushing here is harness racing. I know my Minister is aware of it. I know at this moment we are sort of frozen out of Winnipeg, but that is a big

Tuesday, April 18, 1978

industry and it does have a tremendous potential. With the Minister's encouragement — and I think the Minister was quite frank with me one day when we were discussing this — he said, "Morris, why would we build a harness track when we indeed didn't build the other track." And it's a good defense for the Minister, but whatever you put in to harness racing you get back two or three fold. The more you put in, the more — it's the one revenue gainer and I just hope — yes, it is the nuer one tourist attraction here in the summer time, because you only have to go out to the track and see how many Minnesota, North Dakota cars are out there. Or even go to the club and talk to them, because I've been there enough to know. While I don't think I could ever be classed as a betting buff, the odds are just not good enough for me there, but I enjoy being there and being part of the racing scene.

The other thing is I would like to congratulate my Attorney-General for making a stand on capital punishment. We realize that's a Federal problem, but I think I am proud to see my Minister stand up and say he's for it. Never was there a time when the mood of the people — of course I'm near Oak Lake what excited that, that petition — but I have been for it for a long time and I'm not afraid to say it. I do think I don't have the right to take a life, but I think the people in power, if that is the mood of that person, I believe they have that right.

Certainly we have seen quite a bit of discussion on our university fee tuition raise. Well, as I said, I have two children there and they're not children that have in any way gained from bursaries or student loans, but in any case they weren't down here in front of the building and I was kind of proud of that. There are some sane thinking university kids that aren't just out for the glory of it.

I know we have problems in the field of agriculture at the moment. Certainly we listened to the farmers' union people this morning. They don't see it quite the way we do and our Minister does, but again I am speaking, not seeing the particular bill that they were protesting.

The other thing that I would hope the Minister in the years ahead would have a way of funding because there are many farms today that have trenched sloughs to run into ditches, that compound municipal peoples problem when indeed a tile drain — and I'm talking about not in the Interlake where there is a . . . out in my part of the province where some are tile draining without any subsidy. I have the Ontario Act here where there is encouragement for farmers to do this. Certainly in my case, it might cost me many thousands of dollars to do what I think has to be done. If the Minister, or his department, had just a little bit of easement there, I think it would encourage more of this and this indeed would help the flood-off. It's easy to make a ditch and it moves and everything moves together but an underground tile — and there's people that do a good job of this — that would hold back that water in your back 40 until the frost comes out and by that time the runoff has gone. I just hope the Minister would make note of that and some time in the future, maybe not at this time of restraint, but some years ahead that I think this would be encouraging for agriculture and it would put more acres into production, more money into the treasury, more tax dollars.

Of course, the most recent one is the dental technicians. I have several in my constituency that are finished their course this year. I have several others close to my constituency or in it, that are on the first year and there is great wonderment where they are going to end up. I've been encouraging them that things will work out but I know, as they tell me, the arrangements were they were funded and they promised to work for the government of Manitoba for X amount of years. Well, if there isn't work in Manitoba, I would hope that it could be fitted in to a — (Interjection) — But if there isn't work here for them, put them to work at the same kind of a contract that we have . . . and there are people in other Asian countries that need this worse than Manitobans do.

Of course my biggest beef is rail abandonment. I looked over the maps of Canada and I don't believe anyone else ever has or ever will have such an effect over branch lines. I have four branch lines with dead-ends within the constituency. In other words, they turn around there, so they're certainly up for abandonment. I would like to see our group just take a little stronger hand in this because it's going to cost us, the people of Manitoba, millions of dollars to upgrade, to make the roads that we're going to have to buy bigger trucks to go over, to make up for that and you only have to appreciate if you lived out there and see a train come up with 27 or 30 tank cars and relate that to your own truckload to realize absolutely how many truckloads are going over that road that they are pulling over pretty slowly, but it is still, to me, the most economical way of moving any kind of stuff such as grain. I know Ottawa says no more subsidy and I'm not sure the railroads ever did use the subsidy for what it was intended. But, you know, they can figure and they can show ways and means.

So, in closing, I would just hope that my Minister of Highways — he isn't there — but that with his increase that I get a raise of 30 or 35 percent increase to my road programs and I suppose we won't know that for several weeks. I do know, to put it on the record, Highway 250 and 259 are certainly ones that are most important. — (Interjection) — Well, never mind.

Well, that's maybe my remarks. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask permission of the House and call this 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Member realize there is still 20 minutes left in the time of the House but I'm just the servant of the House.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We have one member, the Member for Portage, I believe, that has a very short statement he'd like to make, maybe ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. LLOYD G. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to enter into this Budget Debate to voice my opinion on some of the problems facing this government in the next four years. This House has been repeatedly aware of the sluggishness of the provincial economy and indeed of the Canadian economy.

There is need for initiative, need for responsibility on the part of every Manitoban to engage in their own interests of business, to provide jobs and to build a strong economic base.

Since forming the government last October, we have kept our election promises. We have reduced the taxes in Manitoba. Income taxes have been reduced. Succession duties and gift taxes have been abolished. Corporate capital taxes reduced and the mineral acreage tax, the tax which has been labelled as a nuisance tax, has been removed. In the area of tax relief, I welcome the proposed increase in property tax credit for senior citizen home owners.

There are, Mr. Speaker, many young people out of work across our country. We realize this and we are concerned. Under the limited expenditures made available, the 2,000 student jobs in the public sector this summer will be welcomed. It is my hope, and everyone's, that in the near future permanent employment will exist more often for both young and old. However, I believe the initiative must come from the individuals themselves. I want to emphasize how fortunate we are to have individuals who are willing and able to use their initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to outline a few businesses that were not government sponsored by the tax dollars or didn't have to be put up by the taxpayer at all. The private sector is still ready to take part in the building of this province and our country. I would like to cite just from our Daily Graphic of March 23rd, "Burch official opening of their process plant on April 1st." This was no April 1st joke at all. This was money that was put out by our private sector in the constituency of Portage la Prairie. I want to read to you, "The new seed processing facility of the Burch Seeds Limited of Bagot is expected to be in operation in mid-March. When completed, it will be the most modern seed processing facility in the province offering the most complete service program available with the added advantage of high capacity. The new facility is owned by a joint family company, M. W. Burch and two sons, Dennis and Keith. It represents an extension of the present Burch Farms Limited who have been in the seed business producing, processing and marketing seed grain for over 30 years.

The seed industry in Canada has undergone many changes in the last few years and like other industries, has felt the effects of inflation. There are many cleaning plants across the country doing excellent work on a small scale, mainly pedigreed seed and some commercial custom cleaning. This represents a small part of the total seed requirements. The results are the use of grain elevators cleaning or none at all.

The recent seed grain drill survey done by the Manitoba Department of Agriculture shows that the bulk of the annual seed being used is of very bad quality, both genetical as well as in purity. The solution to this situation would seem to be larger capacity facilities capable of cleaning to the government seed standards and offering prices and services that will provide an attractive alternate to country elevator cleaning. Burch Seeds hope to provide that alternative and anticipate a very active role in the seed industry of Canada. The firm will employ five persons.

This, Mr. Speaker, is one of many private enterprisers that are going to come to Manitoba in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, these people are continuing on the basis of free enterprise, the system which was responsible for building this province and it is people like these who will enable our economy to get back on track. The Portage constituency, like all Manitoba, was settled by ambitious men, men like the McKenzie family who was the first homesteader in Manitoba to receive a title under the Dominion-Canada Land Titles Act. There are the Sanderson families, the Trimbles, the Yuills, the Sissons, all are five generation farmsteads.

Mr. Speaker, I can name many privately owned and operated companies who have been serving the Portage area for many years, financed by private moneys, not government tax dollars. I would like to mention one, the Portage Mutual Insurance Company. I wish to read just a short note: "From a humble beginning," it reads, "It was just 17 eventful years after Confederation, a brief three years after the coming of the railroad that a group of prominent Portage plains' settlers conceived the idea of a mutual fund for protection against the disaster of fire." Just remember, that is back in the early years of this country. "A charter was granted, the company formed and seven of their numbers were named the directors.

"In 1884," Mr. Speaker, "a group of original settlers of the Portage la Prairie district met to discuss the matter of insurance which in those early days was a hard thing to obtain, especially on farm property. These pioneers had in mind the formation of a mutual company such as they had known in Eastern Canada. They decided to form such a company and in October of 1884, they obtained from the Legislature of Manitoba a Charter authorizing the establishment of the Portage la Prairie Mutual Fire Insurance Company.

"The first directors of this, the first co-operative insurance company in western Canada were Kenneth McKenzie, George Tidsbury, Hugh Grant, L. T. MacLean, C. J. Green" — I don't believe that to be any relative of our member of the opposition — but however, there was a Mr. T. Wallace and a Max Wilton.

"The expense in forming the company was borne by these men who gave their personal notes guaranteeing the expenses of conducting the affairs of the company."

Tuesday, April 18, 1978

Mr. Speaker, I could read on and it's quite lengthy, to also show the pictures of these pioneer family men that were responsible for building of the mutual company in Portage la Prairie, however, I do want to bring to your attention and to the members of this House also, a few other names that are prominent in the Portage area: the Christianson's, the John Deere dealers now in the third generation; we have Blights, yes we have the Blight family, International Harvester dealers in the area, a family of long history to Portage and district. Car dealerships that are just . . . these are just a few of the examples I can use, Mr. Speaker. This is an indication of what an individual can achieve.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition, if he so wishes could protect in piastic this additional information for further reference.

Mr. Speaker, the Portage constituency has never in the last hundred years been represented in this Legislature by a socialist and I don't expect it will in the next one hundred years. Heaven knows' heaven knows, Mr. Speaker, heaven knows they tried their level best during the last election to buy that seat but the electors saw fit to reject them.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity of speaking at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. CO AN: Mr. Speaker, seeing the time, I would ask the House to call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the agreement of the House to call it 5:30? (Agreed) The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m.