



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

28 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXVII No. 6B 8:00 P.M. Thursday, February 22, 1979

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, February 22, 1979

Time: 8:00 p.m. THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: When we rose at 5:30 the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose was speaking, he had ten minutes left.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I just indicate on a point of order that he indicated just at 5:30 that he would not be returning this evening so that the floor is open.

MR. SPEAKER: The floor is then open on the proposed motion. The Honourable Member for Dauphin.

MR. JIM GALBRAITH: First of all, before I get into my remarks I would like to congratulate you on your reappointment to your high office. I realize that office is not always that easy to carry out but I think you are doing a magnificent job in that capacity.

I see that the Interim Leader of the Opposition is not here but in his absence I would like to congratulate —(Interjection)— At any rate I would like to congratulate him on his appointment and I would like to wish him —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Dauphin, please carry on.

MR. GALBRAITH: I would like to wish the Leader of the Opposition, if that is the way the members opposite would like to have, the greatest of luck until the time of the next General Election, just until then. I would not want to wish such circumstances on the constituents of the riding of Selkirk in the future and hopefully in the future we will have another member on this side of the House.

I would also like to make a few comments, Mr. Speaker, about the recent appointment of Edward Schreyer to the position of Governor-General of Canada. I think that is a milestone for Manitoba. I know the constituents of Dauphin wish him and his wife all the best in the coming years.

I would also like to at this time to congratulate the Mover of the Throne Speech, the member for Springfield and also the Seconder, the Member for Radisson, for a job well done. The Member for Springfield in his own quiet way, I thought, did a real good job of outlining the progresses Government has made in its first year in office. The Member for Radisson in his usual spirited way was very entertaining in his manner.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the motion put forward but by the Interim Leader of the Opposition for a number of reasons. But I do support the Mover and Seconder of the Throne Speech. I feel the most important part of this Throne Speech is the position our government takes with regard to financial responsibility and I am sure that the constituency of Dauphin will back me fully on this, with maybe the exception of one constituent who happens to be the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. —(Interjection)— But he is also a constituent of Dauphin!

Anyway, I am pleased that the government remains committed to the principles of financial responsibility within government and fiscal accountability to the people of Manitoba. Dauphin constituents fully recognize that governments cannot allow expenditures to increase at a rate faster than which the rate of taxation or the general wealth of the public of this province and therefore I remain fully committed to this government.

Employment in this province seems to be a topic that Members of the House on the other side seem to take great exception to, but they fail to recognize that there are 22,000 more people working in this province now than there were some 16-odd months ago. To me, that is a great improvement. Even though we have had an increase in our work force, I think that we have done a tremendous job. We also are maintaining our position in Canada as the province with the third lowest rate of unemployment in the country and give us another few months and if the present trends continue, we will be the second lowest.

I feel that our government has done wonders to stimulate the economic growth through the private sector. Initiatives developed in 1978 are to be continued and are to be pursued vigorously during the coming year. I think that our front bench Ministers should be congratulated for their efforts

along this line.

When it comes to The Property Tax and The Cost of Living Tax Rebate Programs in conjunction with new Federal Government rebate programs that are coming into place, I think that there is a lot of room for a White Paper and a review of these property tax and cost of living credits. I don't see why the taxpayers of Canada should be paying for duplication in these fields.

I think our First Minister should be congratulated for the promoting of the Federal/Provincial Conference on Grain Handling and Transportation. That is one field that has been neglected by all governments in Canada and it took our leader and our government to bring this problem to the forefront and I will say this much, that Canada as a whole is going to benefit from this, not only the three Prairie Provinces, but the whole country will benefit in the end when the final results from this come in.

Constituents of Dauphin, I am sure, are quite happy with the new Crown land policies that will be coming before the House. There are many farmers in different parts of the Dauphin constituency and in the province as a whole that would like to be able to purchase some of the land that they are now leasing from the Provincial Government. It is my feeling, and their feeling, that if they can get the deeds to this land, then the improvements that they make on it are theirs and they will benefit from those improvements in years to come.

I think the people that are interested in recreation in this province will also look forward to this new program with regards to Crown lands when it comes to beach fronts and cottages at our numerous lakes in Manitoba. I see no reason why the people of Manitoba should be blocked out at these facilities we have right at our own province, and I think this government has taken a step in the right direction when they are taking a serious look at this serious situation in our province with regard to a lack of recreation facilities in our province.

When it comes around to the Mining Royalty Act, I am only too happy to think that our government is willing to take steps to make our province competitive with the other provinces in this country, especially Alberta and Saskatchewan. How can we expect to get new mines opened up in this province when our royalties are not in line with the other provinces? Naturally they are going to move to Saskatchewan or Alberta or some other jurisdiction, or some other country for that matter.

I back fully the Minister of Highways in his efforts to continue to improve, to expand our highway system in this province. Maybe we can complete the upgrading and paving of some of the roads in this province that were started during the last administration, but for some reason or other they seem to have stopped abruptly when they come to a Conservative constituency. I hope that this government will be more longer-sighted when they start in to fixing up a road like the provincial road that's running north to Gilbert Plains, when this government intends to fix it up, that they will fix that complete road up and not just half of it.

In regards to liquor control outlets in Manitoba, I look forward to extending of retail outlets to our private sector. I have travelled quite extensively in the world and I find that Canada and Manitoba have one of the most restrictive control of outlets in any parts of the world that I have travelled. I have travelled extensively in quite a few parts of the world and I don't see why we have to make a special trip down to the Liquor Commission to purchase our beverage requirements when we should be able to pick them up in any retail outlet anywhere in our towns or province, or for that matter in our country, although we do not have any control over that part of it. But I fully support the opening up of The Liquor Act in expanding these facilities to our private sector.

The Planning Act is a bill that I look forward to seeing opened up and putting more of the powers back to our municipalities and let them handle it at the local level. I think it is far easier for them to keep track of what is happening in individual municipalities and towns and surely with just a little guidance from the province, they can make the proper decisions.

There is a program in Education that I am greatly pleased with and that is the Ukrainian immersion classes in kindergarten and grade one. Last evening, I sat and listened to the Member for Burrows and he didn't seem to be that happy with that program. He seemed to try to work it around that people of the Ukrainian descent were all socialist in their thinking. Well, I've got news for the Member for Burrows. There is no way that I would have got elected to this House if all the people of Ukrainian extraction were socialists, and I think I can say the same thing for the Member for Roblin. I don't see why the member would want to classify people of one ethnic group in one camp such as that. I think those people are the same as any other nationality and have mixed feelings among them all.

I am also quite happy with the remarks from the Throne Speech about legislation being brought forward to protect citizens purchasing services from our travel industries. I think this is a step in the right direction. Canadians are among the greatest travellers in the world and I think a little bit of protection from a few of the adverse things that sometimes happen in the travel industry, at no fault of the industry concerned, but I think a few protections for the consumer in those areas

are quite welcome.

Going on our record, I am proud of this government for its record so far. I am sure that the constituents of Dauphin feel likewise. We have a government that has reduced taxes in this province by some \$83 million. It has also reduced personal income taxes in this province and that has done nothing other than to stimulate the whole economy of this province and the country when you reduce personal income taxes.

It has also made a determined effort to reduce the amount of our deficit in this province and in our first year of operation, they have succeeded to a tune of some 40 percent from the rate that was established by the last administration. I'm quite happy that our province has had the lowest spending increase, only 3 percent last year, among all the provincial governments in Canada. I think that is a tremendous step.

Our government has also reduced taxes to small businesses and this has helped to stimulate job creation in this province. We hear all this cry about no low-cost housing being provided in Manitoba but during the last year there have been another 1,755 units supplied. During the last election campaign, I heard nothing but the Critical Home Repair Program would be thrown out but in the last year there was another \$2 million spent on that program. We hear all kinds of complaints from the City of Winnipeg from the Opposition but I think the City of Winnipeg is very happy with the block-funding system that they are getting and going to be allowed to run their own business.

Our province is very successful in the Private Sector Youth Employment Program that it brought forward last year. That program created some 4,900 jobs among our young people in this province and they weren't make-work projects either. More summer jobs for our young people.

I think our government should be commended for its policy of discontinuing the state farm policy in this province. I know of several cases in the Dauphin area where the Government of Manitoba was competing directly with our young farmers in the province, not giving the young people a chance at all to own their own farms in this province, competing directly against them for the purchase of those same farms.

The government has created a new farm credit program where young farmers can borrow up to \$200,000 to expand their farming operation and their livestock and machinery needs so that they can carry on farming in this province.

This government brought forward the Cattle Producers' Association Act which is going to try to help these farmers promote the beef industry in this province.

There are a few other statistics that are interesting in this province. We hear of all the housing shortages in this province but in the last year there was a 36 percent rise in housing starts in this province. Manufacturing up 13.5 percent; retail sales up 11.5 percent; farm implement sales up 34 percent. Those are all pretty good indicators of what direction this province is taking. I think the people of this province are getting better value for their hard-earned tax dollars and more efficiency and less waste.

I would just like to deal for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, with the Manitoba Beef Producers' Income Assurance Plan. This was a program brought in in 1975 by the former administration and I will make some comments on it. For one thing, I would like to say that that could have been a very good program except for a few blatant mistakes that were made.

As we know, there are some 1,500-odd producers in Manitoba, something just under 6,500 signed up into that beef income assurance program, or about 43 percent of the beef producers in Manitoba. Now, there was a problem with that program and it happened that producers were allowed to opt out of that program for very minor reasons, and that's what went wrong with that program. But anyway, there were 775 producers that opted out for health reasons, retirement, a few other reasons. There were some 1,470 that were allowed to opt into the federal program, with no payback, same as the ones that were terminated for the other reasons, for a total opt-out of some 2,245. The total cost of that opt-out was some \$10 million to the taxpayers of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet have a . . .

MR. BILLIE URUSKI (Lac du Bonnet): Yes. I wonder if the member would submit to a question?

MR. GALBRAITH: After the speech.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Dauphin.

MR. GALBRAITH: For those who joined the program, there was some 23 percent opted into the federal program, and of those who were in the program, there was some 12 percent who were

allowed to opt out, for a total of 35 percent. That left 65 percent of those who were in the program sort of caught in the dilemma. Now, the former administration as far as I am concerned has created five different classifications of beef producers in this province.

A MEMBER: All they wanted was one.

MR. GALBRAITH: Well anyway, they ended up with five. Producers who didn't join any plan represent some 60 percent of the producers in this province, or 57 percent to be exact. And then there were the beef producers who joined the Manitoba Beef Producers and stayed in, and that group is now down to some 65 percent of those who first joined the program. Then there were the producers who joined the program and opted out for medical reasons, retirement, and a number of other reasons that are listed in there. And there were producers who joined the plan and opted for the federal plan, and then there were producers who only joined the federal program.

Now, the former administration has created certain problems, and these could have been prevented. That would have been a very good program but there should have been no opting out, or if there was opting out, they should have paid back moneys that they had collected from the province. The way it was handled has created hard feelings among the cattle producers of Manitoba, besides the fact that the provincial government has lost some \$10 million that it cannot regain. That is \$10 million of hard-earned tax dollars from the people of Manitoba.

I have also heard a number of comments in this House, Mr. Speaker, about our personal care homes in Manitoba. When that program was first started in 1974 or 1975, the daily per diem was some \$4.50 a day. Approximately a year later, the government of the day who now sits opposite, took upon themselves to raise that per diem some 75 cents. When you stop and figure that out, that's a 16 2/3 percent raise in one year, and yet we hear all the static about when it went up 75 cents a day. But anyway, to go further into that, they raised it a further 50 cents in 1976, which amounts to 9.5 percent; they raised it 8.7 percent in 1977, or another 50 cents which amounted to 8.7 percent; and then when this government took over in 1978, the rate went to 75 cents which amounted to 12 percent. This year it is going to go up another 75 cents which will amount to 10.7 percent, but when you take the three years that the former administration was responsible for and take the average, the average comes to some 11.6 percent of an average increase. The two year increase of the present government is some 11.3. I don't see what the opposition are making all their holler about. They say that persons in the personal care homes are going to be left short of funds. Well, from my understanding, a single pensioner in a personal care home has an income of some \$304.49 per month and if you take \$7.75 times 30 for an average month, that comes to some \$232.50, leaving a pensioner something in the neighbourhood of \$72.00 to spend on his personal needs, after his meals are all paid for, after his shelter is all supplied. I think that these pensioners in these nursing care homes are being very well cared for.

The cries and the distress from the opposition, including the Leader and all, makes me wonder if members opposite are not now in favour of the abolishment of the estate taxes and gift taxes. It seems to me that maybe they are looking for some great inheritance from some of the people that are staying in some of these nursing care homes, at the expense of the taxpayers of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal a little bit with the Municipal Assessment Branch, and some of the problems that have been created in this branch of government by the previous administration. This is a pretty serious one. Anyway, before I get into my remarks, I would like to commend our government for taking the step of appointing a committee of Cabinet to study this legislation that was brought in by the previous administration. This legislation has created a real hornets' nest of problems and that comes right from the Ombudsman. He states here, "I said I would, but little did I realize that what a hornets' nest I was getting into." And that is true. It seems to me that this legislation was only put forward to help the big fellow of this province by a party that seems to like to think that it only thinks of the little person, but it is one area that they worked only for the big fellow. The problems that they have created. What about the semi-retired couple that are still living on a half-section of land, semi-retired, still carrying on a farming operation? Now they are collecting the old age pension and maybe they've saved a few dollars throughout their lifetime. All of a sudden they are in a position where their house is taxable, whereas the fellow down the road who may be making 10 times what they are, his home is not taxable. And they call that legislation for the little fellow? No way. That's only benefiting the big fellow.

What about the small young farmer who is trying to expand his operation or improve his position in this world of ours, or province of ours? He goes out and takes on a second job, trying to make his farming operation more viable. As soon as he goes out and tries to improve his standard of living, he has another tax thrown at him and yet his big neighbour down the road is still off scott-free. Is this what members opposite like to call legislation for the little fellow? No, it's only doing harm

to him.

What about the farmer who has expanded his operation and owes a large capital debt? His income is not that high and he goes out and gets a job, tries to pay off some of his debts and all of a sudden he ends up with another tax thrown at him. This is legislation brought in by the previous administration. It's sure not trying to help the little fellow or the fellow that's trying to start up in his operation but it is only hindering him.

And then coming from the director of the Municipal Assessment Branch, he says, "From an administrative point of view, the exemption sections pertaining to the farm buildings has become an assessor's nightmare" — and I agree with him — "and in an attempt to deal with the problems, the assessor simply deals with those properties which are glaringly obvious, or else will respond to those cases which are brought to his attention." In other words, somebody has to squeal on somebody else before this piece of legislation is ever acted upon, creating more hard feelings among our rural people. The result is that some buildings or some homes in the rural area are on the assessment roll and others are never, even though they glaringly should be.

I also don't see why the people in the Provincial Assessment Branch should have to be prying into people's personal lives to see what their personal income tax file reads so that they know whether their home is taxable. To me, that is not a very envious position to have our civil servants in this province put in and they were put in that position by the previous administration, not by this government.

I would like to just go back to the situation that took place in Dauphin just a few months ago. I know personally the people that were involved in that dispute with the Assessment Branch. It is not so much the fact that they mind paying taxes on their home but when their neighbour down the road is not paying that tax on their home, then they say, "Why should we?", when they're only trying to get ahead.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to commend our government ministers here for taking a look at this Municipal Assessment Branch and hopefully we can come up with some policies in the future that are going to be acceptable to all the people of this province.

The other day I had the Official Leader of the Opposition take a swing at this government and he even brought me into it with regard to the Dauphin Hospital in Dauphin and I was quite surprised. I didn't think that the Opposition Leader would have to stoop to taking newspaper clips and flashing them around the room. But anyway, I don't think that he was too much aware of what went on up there and if he wants to believe clippings that are in the newspaper and take their word as fact, well, I would say that this a sad day for Manitoba when the Opposition Leader has to revert to newspaper clippings to try to make his points. —(Interjection)— Yes, I will admit that we do have a problem in Dauphin. He brings out the fact that we have problems with some food cart in Dauphin and he likes to imply that that was a waste, but I would also like to bring it to the attention of the members opposite that I am sure that when this construction does take place in Dauphin, that there will be a necessity for a food cart of some kind to haul the meals from one area of that complex to another when the new construction does take place. Also at this time, I would like to ask the Member for Fort Rouge why his federal counterparts could take up to a whole month in getting this so-called food cart across the Manitoba borders. It did not get held up in American Customs; it got held up for a full month by the Canadian Customs and I wonder just what his federal counterparts are doing about that.

I feel that there are a number of reasons why we didn't get our hospital immediately in Dauphin and I would just like to bring to the attention of members opposite . . .

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

MEMBERS: Leave. Leave.

MR. GALBRAITH: It's all right, I think I can wind up my remarks in the following five minutes. Anyway, it just shows clearly the former government had no priorities for the Province of Manitoba. They spent some \$4.25 million in Dauphin alone just prior to the last provincial election on a government office building in Dauphin. Where were their priorities? They didn't have any. There were also office buildings built in Thompson and in Portage. There were \$3 million spent on some kind of garage in Winnipeg that I understand is still empty, although some athletes were running around in it. There were \$32 million spent on the Seven Oaks Hospital in Winnipeg that really wasn't needed. Just think of all the nursing care homes and hospitals we could have spread over Manitoba with that kind of money.

There are also a few other points that I would like to bring to the attention of members. During the last election campaign, we not only had a new office building built in Dauphin. Some of these projects that went on, I back fully, but it just shows priorities. If they were worried about health

care services, why didn't they go ahead with the hospital first? They built a senior citizens highrise in Dauphin but we do not have any housing shortage in Dauphin but they went ahead with that program first. I am not condemning the senior citizens' highrise, but just where are the priorities? —(Interjection)— The money has all been spent.

They built a new Autopac building in Dauphin and I'll say one thing that they did do, they built a nursing care home in Dauphin, which I am quite happy with.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in supporting this government and the Throne Speech that they have brought forward. I look forward to the coming debates in the House when we really get into the nitty-gritty of the meat that is in this Throne Speech. I thank the members on this side of the House for giving me the opportunity to take part in the Throne Speech.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnett with a question?

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The member indicated that he was prepared to answer a question or two at the end of his speech. So I would like to ask him how he arrives at a loss of \$10 million on the Beef Income Assurance Program because of some people having withdrawn from the program, or opted out? How does he arrive at \$10 million, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Dauphin.

MR. GALBRAITH: Those figures are fairly plain if I can just find them here, Mr. Speaker. The money that should have been coming back to the program from the people that opted into the federal program and the ones who opted out of the program, how are the rest of the people of Manitoba supposed to be expected to fund people who join, sign up into a program, and then are allowed to opt out into another program without paying back the funds that they had signed up for?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, a further point of clarification. The member did not respond to the question of how he arrived at the figure of \$10 million. I would like to ask him how he arrives at \$10 million. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnett asking a question or is he entering into the debate?

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Member for Dauphin how he arrived at \$10 million. The second question is, is he not aware that those people who were allowed to opt out also had to forego one year of subsidy? —(Interjection)— Oh yes, oh yes. —(Interjection)— No, no, provincial subsidy.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member was prepared to answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I indicated to the Member for Dauphin some while ago that he had five minutes. His time has now expired. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE: It isn't a matter of my rights, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of my responsibility and when I get into my remarks in a few minutes, if the rabble over there will just keep quiet, especially the one in the first bench over there, you will see why, because we have a matter of utmost public importance which is occurring at the present time.

Headingley Jail was constructed and has a capacity of 250. The population at the moment is 474. They 12 13 usually issue from six to ten temporary absences a week. In the last hour and one-half they issued forty. And it is still going on. This was drawn to my attention a few moments ago by Peter Warren, for which I thank Peter.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't know first of all how to start my remarks, whether I should start with the main thrust of the silent anarchists across the way. But you can start here with this carpet on this floor, how you people maintain the public trust.

The Minister of Health who earlier today mentioned some of the waste that the former administration was trying to put into place as far as the correctional system was concerned, should be empathized with because it is very difficult to attract public dollars to such systems. Nevertheless in 1969, this Government was faced with the necessity of practically rebuilding the system, studied it, researched it, analyzed it, and started to implement a plan to correct this situation. —(Interjection)— I call you anarchists because this is what you are. In The Pas — I don't know

what this current Minister feels like, but when the Fire Commissioner tells me that I have to shut down the boiler, I have to come up with an immediate response to it, because I wouldn't be responsible for somebody burning to death as they did down in one of your eastern Conservative jails because the poor kid had too much to drink one night.

A MEMBER: When did you become Minister?

MR. BOYCE: When we had the plans ready to go and they had somebody that the First Minister at that time wanted to assign to rebuild that system, I was asked to do in 1976, 1975 rather. But you don't pull these plans out of the woodwork.

So the arrangements were made with the community of The Pas. The temporary facilities would be established and if I was involved with the Town of The Pas, I would sue this Government because our British Parliamentary System, which the people on this side respect, but the people on that side have given over the power to the man in the front seat who chirps, chirps, chirps but never on his feet, who gets \$76,000 a year. —(Interjection)— Hold it, hold it, \$76,000 a year — he gets \$36,000 from the public purse and \$36,000 from his friends. —(Interjection)— Oh, , he couldn't remember it and my friends in business, and I have friends in business . . . —(Interjection)—

POINT OF ORDER

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I simply raise a question of privilege in the House. If the Honourable Member wishes to pursue that particular line of debate, it will lead to other quarters of course, such as making charges that the current Leader of the Opposition picks up \$50,000 under the table from organized labour, has picked it up all the time. So what can we gain with that kind of nonsense debate?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I point out to all members of the Chamber that it is accepted parliamentary custom to refrain from going into the personal integrity of any member of this Chamber and I would suggest that any member that wishes to pursue that line is himself open to severe criticism in the Chamber. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: I wish to thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, 36 and 36 equals 72. You are absolutely right. But I'm not attributing motives or anything else to the person to whom I refer. This was recalled himself. He forgot about it for a while and then he remembered himself. But I have reason to believe that my friends on the other side of the House believe in the other political philosophy, the Conservative philosophy, who happen to be in business, who tell me that they are still being solicited for funds in this regard. I have reason to believe them.

But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the deterioration of the total system of services in this particular province is of great concern. The ramifications of it, one of them, was the withdrawal of the priorities that the Federal Government had given to the establishment of a maximum security institution in Selkirk, because this was part of a much broader design than these marvelous businessmen over there are incapable of comprehending. Because at the end of this total system, Mr. Speaker, is a \$25,000 a year maintenance cost for 25 years for people who are assigned to that kind of institution because of capital murders. Twenty-five years is a mandatory sentence and its annual cost is \$25,000 a year. So in this current year, using 1979 current dollars, it is \$625,000 per year. So the time to try and start chipping away at that is a way back in the juvenile system. The total system which was developed under the former administration is being totally emasculated by this Government. And you can start at that end of it or you can start at the other end of it.

The current attention is being focused on the Ombudsman's Report because of this situation which exists in The Pas. I empathize or sympathize with the present Minister because this is a situation that I had to tolerate also, but it was a temporary measure at that time. If the plans had been implemented as they had been laid out by the same people he is getting advice from now, except perhaps he brings in some people that are going to put tissue paper walls up which some future government will have to rebuild because they won't last. —(Interjection)— I didn't quite hear the member, I think he was saying \$5 million. Is that right? \$5 million.

MR. DRIEDGER: Tell me how much.

MR. BOYCE: You're saying \$5 million. Is that what the Brandon Institution is coming in at, is \$5 million?

MR. DRIEDGER: We're talking about The Pas.

MR. BOYCE: This is what you are trying to tell me. I don't know if that's what the costs will be in 1979 or not. I know what the costs were. . .

MR. DRIEDGER: Well, if it is less, tell me how much it was.

MR. BOYCE: Well, it was five to six million in Brandon and The Pas. . . Well, I am going to digress for a moment. The former Member for Swan River was in here just a few moments ago and before there was a change in administration he was the critic on corrections. And I got more advice and co-operation from that man because we tried as best we could to keep Corrections out of it because these people have no political clout at all and he knew what we were up against; that we had to rebuild the system. But nevertheless, you people, are bringing into the whole scene in Manitoba, class warfare. The Minister of Health said earlier today something about class distinction is not ordained by God, and I just wanted to add to that, it's not ordained by the Conservative Party either. But you people are causing the rifts, you people are causing class warfare, and you should attend to what you are doing, because the milieu is now, that you can't hire people to go do your fighting for you any more. You can't do that any more, because people won't do it for you, and it doesn't make any difference where it exists, whether it's in Northern Ireland, Lebanon, or Iran, that if you make too much difference between the top and the bottom, you're going to have trouble and you're not going to be able to hire people to keep the people down.

Mr. Speaker, this is just strange, you know. It's still in the Senate in this country and it annoys me. They have it engraved in Latin, that the nobles must protect the state against the fickleness of the people, and this is a whole attitudinal thing. So when the Minister of Health talks about class distinction, they are bringing more and more and more of it back into Manitoba; farmer against city folks, city folks against farmers. —(Interjection)— No, you do it; you do it. When we try to come up with a program to solve unemployment in the City of Winnipeg, and you're freeing the birds. . . Go around the City of Winnipeg and tell everybody in Winnipeg that we pay 18 cents for every dollar of freight to pull your wheat around; go around and tell them that. —(Interjection)— The taxpayers. How much income tax do you pay as a farmer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to all members, especially members that have already made their contribution in this debate, that they allow the courtesy of the floor to those that are in the process of making theirs. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I probably provoked them; I shouldn't do that, so I'll try and help the decorum of the House by getting back to my point.

The complexity of what was involved in trying to change the direction in this whole correctional system and the co-operation we used to get from the Conservative Party, to try and see that this was brought about, starting with young people in conflict with the law. The Attorney-General I see has established another committee to look at the same thing which has been analyzed for the last 15 or 20 years. There is more documentation and research in his office and in the Minister of Health's office than you can shake a stick at. All he's got to do is read it, because when I left that office all I did was put my hat and coat on and leave. It's all there, and it's passing strange that that which we are doing in Manitoba, both in the adult area and in the juvenile area, attracted not only Canadian attention, but world-wide interest, I had the honor when I was over there on the other side of the House to be Canada's representative at the United Nations on the conference on crime. And our contribution was to talk to the people on what we were doing in Manitoba. But the Conservatives for some reason or other have wanted to destroy all that.

In Brandon, they have a university. What is the reason that they have a university at Brandon? The Conservatives, when they were in government before . . . well, I really consider Mr. Campbell a Conservative in many regards. He established this university, and some of us thought that an excellent thing to do would be to try to make Brandon into an area and an educational facility which would be really avant-garde in all of North America relative to dealing with people with problems; emotional problems, correctional problems, legal problems, that we were moving towards that in co-operation with the federal government. Do you remember . . . I don't know if the Minister has scrapped the agreement or not, but nevertheless there was a contract worked out with the federal government, for staff development, which we hoped over a period of five years would really grow into something which would focus attention and give a raison d'etre for the University of Brandon. But they scrapped it, and as a result the federal government . . . why, why? Because they think they are saving money, and you're not saving money. You're not saving money by allowing

that carpet over there to have the dirt ground into it, because you haven't got enough people to run around with a vacuum cleaner. That carpet right there is wearing out ten times as fast as it should, and this is your whole attitude as far as maintenance is concerned.

In the 1950's for example, they went to The Pas, and somebody said we need a new jail. They never fixed a tap from the 1950's. Preventative maintenance was out; we're going to build a new jail so we won't do anything. The thing rotted. Some of you have been around here long enough Legislature o remember a march in the wasn't carried out by a bunch of rabid reds, it was carried out by the people in the City of Winnipeg who were fed up to the teeth with the juvenile detention centre at Vaughan Street, because it had deteriorated to the point where it was just no better than a hog pen. That's your attitude toward maintenance. You are pound foolish and penny wise. If one social worker could keep one person a year out of jail, they've earned their keep, just one. —(Interjection)— You don't see that. It's a big joke. But let's get rid of crime.

Oh, the Member for Wolseley is back. You sent me two reports from the Legislature; I only need one. I happen to have —(Interjection)— well, I don't know, he's not that bad. We'll see in the next election. We had a lot of fun the ways that we tangled before so maybe the next time around we'll be able to repeat it. But a few short years ago, I remember him sitting over here on this side of the House, with indignation, standing up . . . terrible things were going on. He was going to clear out all the halfway houses in Wolseley.

But, Mr. Speaker, to focus on Peter Warren's . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: Reports and enquiries into university finances.

MR. BOYCE: 250 people, that's capacity you're hitting, 478, and they're turning them loose at the rate of, well let me let's see. If you figure this out at 40 in two hours, that's 20 an hour they're turning out, and by the way, I don't think the Minister is aware of this, they're stamping on these TA's, which I question the legality of, in these circumstances, "No Room — No Room". So I wonder where the Member for Wolseley is in this particular case; he's strangely silent.

But this saving money, they're not saving the taxpayers of Manitoba money. This implementation of Conservative policy. In this blurb that I get from the Member for Wolseley, he too — I guess it's a standard form that they send out all over — they said we saved \$83 million, or something they saved, \$83 million they saved. They've reduced taxes. Oh, \$83.00 for every Manitoban and the Member for Wolseley corrects me. They did not. The Member for St. George pointed out earlier how the arithmetic on that is fallacious. I get people saying, "The Conservatives are saying that they spent less money than you did." And I say "No, that isn't what they're saying." —(Interjection)— They're not doing anything is right. They're shifting, they're shifting.

The billion dollar flea in Manitoba, or the billion-dollar-coming-back, the billion dollar investment Minister, whoever that is, —(Interjection)— Yes, but I'd better not say that — threw all these figures around. How great it was to live in Manitoba. But what they have done, Mr. Speaker, is shifted taxes. The Minister of Highways knows that. Autopac rates will go up because they took the two cents a gallon off there and put it over into General Revenues. That was just a switch of taxes. But the one that hurts the most is the 400 percent increase in Red River Community College fees. That's a tax; it's a premium tax. —(Interjection)— The Member for Lakeside says, "Oh no, no, no."

I remember in 1969, that was a good year; you showed great intelligence, you called an election. Why don't you call one this year? I think the results would be the same because they're doing the same thing again. They're squeezing the City of Winnipeg, and other areas, to the tune that costs are being shifted back down to the individual right in their pocket. You know, this thing about Autopac, it's just a usual Conservative ploy. They shake their fist in your fist while they steal it out of your pocket. Bus fares, senior citizens' bus fares going up 50 percent in the City of Winnipeg — 50 percent. In tonight's Free Press there's a little article —(Interjection)— a little dignity. Well, my friend from Minnedosa, he keeps me elected. I keep my tape recorder going and we have fun with it.

But here in the Free Press tonight, bus drivers —(Interjection)— Well, I hope they get more than you do; they contribute more to society than you do. But, Mr. Speaker, William Avenue, which happens to be a main thoroughfare, for six weeks had two ruts, one each way, and if you didn't get in the right one when you started, you were shafted. But this bus driver is pointing out just exactly how difficult it is to travel on the streets. Now I know salting streets when the temperature is 15 degrees below Fahrenheit doesn't do much good, but nevertheless, they used to scarify, they used to plane those streets so that the main thoroughfares, you had your two lanes. By the way, the City of Winnipeg is Conservatively administered too. —(Interjection)— Well, you call yourself ICEC or somebody. Who do you think they fool? Who do you think they fool? ICEC, ICEC, ICEC, or something.

But nevertheless, where do they shift this cost? Now they've shifted the cost of education 400 percent to the individual, from \$7.00 to \$28.00 a month. I hate using percentage figures in those terms because that's not what the instruments were designed to do; 100 percent is all there is, but that's the way you do it. And here, they shift this over to Autopac, they shift it over to Autopac, because there were more rear-enders in January than they've ever seen in their life.

A MEMBER: Why?

MR. BOYCE: Saving money, \$83.00 the Member for Wolseley tells me in his propaganda; \$83.00. They sure didn't save me \$83.00. —(Interjections)—

MR. WILSON: Why didn't you reply to my questionnaire?

MR. BOYCE: Well, I kept one as a souvenir and the other one I put to appropriate use; I was short of bathroom tissue. —(Interjection)— No, I'm sorry, it wasn't even any good for that.

With reference to the Ombudsman's report, I would only make one comment insofar as the context is concerned and that is to express some disagreement with the suggestion that he could run a foster home in The Pas with only two people, otherwise I would agree with everything that he said. I would point out to people that there's a term used in . . . you know, they refer to a person who is an Inspector-General. I don't know really what the Minister intends to do with this particular department. I don't really think he's got time to pay any attention to it because about two-thirds of the administrative responsibility of the government comes over in his area. But with the Inspector-General, we had hoped to evolve an office that would be somewhat outside the direct administrative control in the sense that the person would be able to comment publicly on the correctional system because it is difficult for people who work directly in the system to report even to the Minister on what happens on a day-to-day basis because they have to keep their jobs. But, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister if he would table this report of the Inspector-General referred to by the Ombudsman.

In saying that we needed a foster care facility in The Pas, there were plans — and I really don't know where these sit either — as part of this northern correctional system relative to juveniles to utilize Cranberry Portage, the Minister is now using a term, "We're going to monitor it."

Well, I think the semantics of the word have changed somewhat. "Monitor" used to mean that you looked at a situation and you did something about it if you found something amiss. But that isn't what you mean. You haven't got the money. You haven't got the money and you haven't got the support of that group over there because the Member for Gladstone re-emphasized the policy of the Conservative governments over the years, which was articulated best by Thelma Forbes when she said we'll just forget about it because nobody lives up there. Because when he talked about Churchill, you know, forget about it, don't do anything up at Churchill. The same thing that Gordon Beard left you people, to heck with the north. You won't get any money out of those klutz.

If I may go back just a little bit, we almost got into a kind of a personal conversation, the Minister of Health and myself. He was talking about effective opposition and I wanted to start off with his pusillanimous speech he wanted to give, and remind him about the jackboots are coming, and I also would like to remind him of what he and his colleague, the Minister of Health, were saying over here about the black day in the history of Manitoba, the Gordie Howe of the financial world was leaving Manitoba — the black day. While Kasser was picking our pockets for \$30 million, they are standing up here saying what a great guy he is. But here again, they have just elected Conservatives all over the world. They shake their fist in your face and they steal it out of your pocket. —(Interjection)— \$600 million. No, no, no, it was \$3 billion. —(Interjection)— It was \$3 billion, because you started it. If you want to lay the blame where it should be, if there is anything the matter, if you people want to change it, or you would have changed it, then you should never have introduced the bill in the House in the first place. You should have gone ahead and done it.

But the Member for Inkster was absolutely right. If you are going to have an inquiry, why don't you go back to 1965, 1964, and see that the thing had any reason to be implemented at all. The report is already written. This commission thing that is going on, this great inquiry, where this impartial commissioner asks the witness, do you think — is this Cass-Beggs toy? — remarks like this. The report is already written. And one of the counsels for the commission says that he is out to make a case against Hydro. The report is written on \$600 million wasted. What hogwash. —(Interjection)— The Member for Minnedosa — I can't quite hear him, I've got cotton batting in my ear — I'll be glad to . . .

MR. BLAKE: I never said a word.

MR. BOYCE: Oh, well, Mr. Speaker, they are quite good at chirping from their seats.

There is one other item I wanted to cover on the Throne Speech. I really hadn't intended to talk about Corrections per se until the Minister of Health earlier today completely ignored it. Albeit that the whole system is in a scandalous state as said by the Ombudsman and of course I hope the Minister will take my question as notice and be prepared to let us know tomorrow morning just exactly what the state is, how many people they did release on temporary absences and what the prison population is at Headingley.

But, Mr. Speaker, the City of Winnipeg that I happen to really love, that may sound corny in this day and age, but I am a Winnipegonian I guess. And when the former government had the intestinal fortitude to bring together the cities into one administrative unit, I had great hopes that after a couple of elections that people of stature would evolve that could set aside their partisanshipness, who could really look at the problems of the city, try and understand them from a human being point of view, from a dollar point of view, and try and relate them so that we would have in the future a type of city that we had inherited when I was a youngster. By and large, Conservatives were at the turn of the century responsible for the laying out of the City of Winnipeg. I doubt very much if the names who were bantered around, the Ashdowns, the Eatons, and all the other people who had the intestinal fortitude to lay out a city which has features which are envied all over the world. City Park, for example, City Park was laid out like that. Portage Avenue. But even these people had the foresight to say that if the people of the City of Winnipeg are being shafted by private enterprise, then perhaps we should have some public enterprise.

We had a monopoly in the private sector . . . —(Interjections)— oh yeah, they did, there's the great Minister of Agriculture who knows all about the City of Winnipeg. —(Interjections)— How much did the farmers pay for the road system? Rural electrification? Transportation costs?

MR. DOWNEY: How about education? They pay for it all.

MR. HANUSCHAK: What was that again? They pay for it all. The farmers pay for it all. Let that go on the record.

MR. CHERNIACK: The government is pulling back from education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The farmers are paying for it all says the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HYDE: Bud, what's the matter, have you got problems?

MR. BOYCE: No, I haven't got problems, I enjoy it. And the chirping that goes on makes just as much sense as anything an individual has to say. I was just going to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he knows what the Winnipeg Electric Company was charging for electricity when they forced the City of Winnipeg to establish a public utility.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has two minutes left.

Mr. Speaker, I've said what I wanted to say, and when I have another opportunity to bring some of these matters of public concern to the attention of the House, I will do so. But you know, what about the hydro rates? I really love that one, so that's why I just let them go and chirp, and chirp, and chirp. If you look back, I think that the Winnipeg Electric was charging somewhere around 15 cents a kilowatt hour. Something like that, away back at the turn of the century. The great free private enterprise. I don't think we're up there yet. Are we up there in Winnipeg? I'll have to check that over night, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Health has given me assurance that he'll check into this and I intend to leave the Chamber right now and do some checking myself. I don't think the Minister has issued directives to the correctional staff. I don't think he can really because I think it says in the statute that a member of the Legislature can visit any correctional institution at any time. I know you don't have to go through the Attorney-General like you do to get information from the Land Titles Office, but I intend to check this information out and see if the situation has deteriorated any more in the past half hour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the customary manner for those that are able to partake in the Throne Speech debate, I offer my congratulations to you on once again occupying that Chair. I know in some of the unruly times in the House that I maybe contribute my share to your problems and I hope that admonition when it's due will be meted out in the usual manner.

I might suggest to you if it's more convenient for you not to do it in the House, if you wanted to invite me to your Chambers after hours, I might come equipped that we might discuss things in an amiable manner and solve our problems without any great difficulties. I'm sure that the former Speaker of the House would agree with any arrangements like that.

I would also offer my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the debate and also to my colleague, the Member for Dauphin, who has just spoken. Unfortunately he's left the Chamber — oh, I see he's still here — but for the benefit of the members, he is celebrating his birthday tomorrow morning, the 39th, which shall never return again and he may be 39 for many years to come. So I congratulate him on that milestone as well as his remarks.

I also congratulate the Interim Leader of the Official Opposition. You know, it's a funny thing, Mr. Speaker. We, on this side of the House, are the ones who are always noted for in-fighting and out-fighting and street fighting and I'm sure that if we could get a look behind the scenes on the in-fighting that's going on across the way, Mr. Speaker, that we wouldn't feel that we're alone in some of the problems that we've had over the years in our leadership contests. I thought at one time, Mr. Speaker, that with the appointment of the former Premier to the exalted position of Governor-General of Canada, which I congratulate him for and we're all very proud to have a Manitoban in that particular post. He was known for many many years in his political activity in this province as "Steady Eddie." And with the election of the new Interim Leader, we thought we might probably have "Heavy Howard" following him, but it would appear we have "Powder puff Pawley."

I refer to an editorial that appeared in one of the well-known Winnipeg newspapers — it will probably be more in the news from now on — the Winnipeg Free Press. The editorial writer wrote, "The challenge is great and is the NDP up to it?" I won't take the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, to dwell too long on it but think there are very many points in there that are excellent points and I congratulate the writer. I sometimes question some of her judgment because I was aware of the poll that was conducted during the last federal election on how many members would be elected on this side of the House and I'm well aware of what her vote was. She didn't have a very good finger on the pulse of the Manitoba voters, so she is not always right, but in this case I think she has hit on the nub of the problem across the way, very very well.\$

Mr. Speaker, I want to say I had originally intended to only speak for a few moments and I feel a little guilty if I do carry on a little longer than I intended because the Member for St. Vital has been trying to get up and speak and has had his good lady here to hear him for the last two days and apparently he gets pre-empted all the time over there. I think we probably could have done without the last tirade or dribble that we had from that side and we could have let him make his contribution where the good lady could have been here to hear it. I don't know whether she'll be able to come tomorrow or not.

But, Mr. Speaker, I can't let the remarks of the member that has just finished speaking go without some passing mention. He got up in a great huff and puff and I thought he had some great new disaster that had struck upon us in the Headingley Jail problem. Well, Mr. Speaker, I won't dwell on it too much but I had the privilege of touring Headingley Jail last year with a good number of members of this House and we all know that there are some changes needed out there but I'll tell you, we had an excellent farm operation out there at one time that provided excellent therapy and provided a great deal of the groceries and other products that normally come from a farm for that institution. It has completely disappeared over the last few years. Apparently the social planners felt that you weren't able to ask a prisoner, someone who is incarcerated, to do some menial task like milking cows or mucking out the byre, as they say, that our farm people do every day of the week and they seem to thrive on it and get by very very well. But apparently that's not the thing to do anymore, so that has completely disappeared. We had a great debate in this House a few years back on what had happened to the dairy herd, one of the finest herds of Holstein cattle, dairy cattle, in Manitoba. Prize cattle, practically given away.

There is nothing for those inmates to do any more. We toured that institution, Mr. Speaker. There were people lying in bed at 11 o'clock in the morning with TVs going and radios going and pin-ups on the wall. Then they have the nerve to talk about the pizzas and the shrimp being taking out of the mental institution. Well, the next thing we know, they're going to be taking the steaks out of Headingley and Stony Mountain and they're going to be crying about that.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that those institutions have to be there and they have to be upgraded and we have to keep people in reasonable circumstances, but we don't have to keep them in luxury. It sounded as if he was the Minister from the minute this government became office in 1969, on June 25th. I remember that date very very well because that's when I first became active in politics. It was a sad day for Manitoba and it will take us a long long time to recover from June 25, 1969.

But, Mr. Speaker, if I recall, since after I got into politics, and I think he didn't get elected until 1971, it seems to me that the Member for Winnipeg Centre was on the verge of crossing the floor because he was at odds with his counterparts over there and finally the Leader of the Day gave him a small Cabinet post and put him in charge of Corrections. You would think to hear him tonight that he was in charge of Corrections from Day One and these conditions were appalling. I don't think he was made a Minister until 1973 or 1974, and these conditions existed long before that. He knew they were there. We know they are there and we're trying to correct them as fast as we can but you can't do all of these things overnight, so I won't spend too much time on his remarks, Mr. Speaker, because I don't think they really deserve it.

But I do want to make some passing comment on the Leader of the Opposition's reply to the Throne Speech, and as I said earlier, I'll try not to take my full time to allow the Member for St. Vital to make his contribution. But the Acting Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, went on and on, just flailing old straw. I referred to an editorial a while ago and I think that it hit it right on the head, where: "The performance over the first few days of the current session is not encouraging. Questions, with few notable exceptions, have been neither hard hitting nor based on any original research but are repeats of old stories." Now that's what they're accusing the Throne Speech of being, a repeat of old newscasts. And, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition flailed away and came up with absolutely nothing new.

The freeze on hospitals, we'll hear more about it; we've heard an awful lot about it to date. We know that it was necessary. There was just such a commitment of funds to that program that there is no possible way the taxpayers of this province could have possibly carried the load. The Minister has got a tremendous job. He's sorting it out the best he can and I, for one, am not always happy with the decisions that are made. There were some announcements today that I personally thought maybe could have been made a little differently, but they have their reasons for making them and they did all their research and they arrived at priorities. They arrived at priorities and I think they're there. —(Interjection)— I certainly have a little personal feeling for the care home in Flin Flon, if you want to know which one, and I know I'll get some support on that. But I accept the judgment and the research that has been done and that hospital, or that care home, or facility will be put in place just as quickly as it's possible to gather the funds and allocate the funds in the various areas to build these facilities, as will others that are very high on the priority list. I think they're all high on the priority list but there's only so many a year you can do, or so many each session that you can do. The Treasury Bench is struggling with this problem and they're solving it the best they can. I'm sure the people of Manitoba agree with that and if they don't get their home this year, they'll get it in a few years and I'm sure that they will go along with that.

Mr. Speaker, the Interim Leader of the Official Opposition flailed away and came storming out about the minimum wage, that we haven't increased the minimum wage. Well, the Minister of Labour has talked about that many many times in this House. The decision could have been made to increase it a long time ago. They had recommendations; now we haven't got a recommendation, and some decision has to be made. But I wanted to go back to his original remarks that increasing the minimum wage is going to put a whole amount of new funds into the hands of the consumer that's going to boost the economy. Mr. Speaker, you don't have to be much of an economist to realize that that's a lot of nonsense. We all know it and they know it on that side. You increase the minimum wage 15 or 20 cents, the guy making \$12.00 an hour becomes \$13.00 an hour. That's where the problem lies. And until you get a formula to sort that out, there's really not much point in increasing that minimum wage by 10 or 15 cents because it really doesn't help those little people. —(Interjection)— There may be some good arguments to be made for that too, but I'm not prepared to get into that at this time.

The Leader of the Opposition flailed away on how we have given away the assets of this province and he went on to cite that we've sold the boat and we've sold this, and we've sold that, and we've sold Saunders Aircraft for a mere, mere pittance for each aircraft. Mr. Speaker, those aircraft aren't certified and I doubt if half of them will fly. They just wanted to get rid of that horror story and get it off the taxpayers' back and forget about it. That decision was made before the House Leader on the other side had talked about the tendering system they were trying to sell him. They hadn't got any offers, there was an offer came in, it was the best offer and that's the offer that was taken.

If the truth were known, Mr. Speaker, on how they got into Saunders Aircraft, the economist from Brandon East is probably the engineer of that particular program. If you could ever get the truth out of him or out of the House Leader on that side of the House, you would find that there is a horror story there that we may never know until some of them write their memoirs a few years down the road.

So what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is, the Leader of the Opposition came out flailing on his first official function as a Leader of the Opposition and it was really a dismal performance. There

was no punch; he didn't hit hard like everyone expected him to hit. So I think we've got the problem well in hand that he has inherited a nice guy image and it's going to be something that he'll have very, very much difficulty in shedding.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other speakers on that side, the Member for Elmwood, in the first Question Period, flailed away at one of the Ministers on this side about the sun show that is coming up and we've got one of the biggest shows going on in Brandon now, the Jeux Canada Winter Games, and he has not even attended them. If he's concerned in taking part in all the functions that are going on in Manitoba, I think he should get on to something that is going on and is visible and has given us national coverage throughout this country for the past two weeks. He's worried about the eclipse of the sun. That's where their priorities are, Mr. Speaker, something that they pick up in the paper, and it's catchy, and they jump on it and well, it's like the bed sheets, that somebody will jump on and flail away at.

The Member for St. George, I can't help but mention, Mr. Speaker, in the embarrassment that I am sure that they were in on that side of the House last night. It shows what an opposition they are; they're ill prepared, disorganized, they couldn't even field speakers. But I know now why he didn't get up to speak last night, because his speech hadn't arrived. It was written by someone in the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation and they hadn't quite got all their notes together. It came this morning and he was able to read it off this afternoon, so there's got to be another leak. I can understand the Member for St. George not being able to get up last night, Mr. Speaker, because the speech wasn't quite ready.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster got on about a \$118 million federal cost-shared program and I won't go into the details of it, but he was defending — or not defending — berating our government on getting into these plans and it brings to mind a discussion or a debate that arose some time ago when the Member for Burrows was the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. —(Interjection)— Well, any ministry that he had was a sad day for Manitoba, but the particular debate arose that we had spend \$5 million on Gull Harbour Lodge, and the Minister jumped to his feet and said that \$2 million of that was federal money and if we hadn't gone ahead and built that lodge, we wouldn't have got that \$2 million Federal Government money. Now that's NDP arithmetic. You spend \$5 million to get \$2 million, and you're going to be a winner? You can't be a winner that way, but that's the philosophy that has plagued members opposite for so many years. That's NDP arithmetic. —(Interjection)— We can't find a buyer for it; no one will buy it. It's a white elephant and we're stuck with it and you're responsible, you're responsible for here's nobody that will buy Gull Harbour. —(Interjection)— If we get a buyer, it may be a good idea.

Mr. Speaker, that's the arithmetic from that side of the House. You spend five to win two from the Federal Government. Where does it all come from? From the taxpayer. They still think there's a free lunch somewhere over that side of the House. Mr. Speaker, there's no free lunch. We know that on this side of the House and sooner or later they're going to learn it on that side of the House. It happens to be, Mr. Speaker, they just don't understand people, on that side of the House. We went around this country, they're trying to get a class fight going between the poor people and the elite, they've harped on the poor people and the elderly last election. Well, that didn't wash, Mr. Speaker. The elderly people and the poor aren't going to be fooled. They harped on that last election and they didn't win on that. So they just don't understand. We went across this province on a land appraisal committee a few years ago and they were told, and told, and told, by hundreds and hundreds of people that appeared on that commission that they didn't want the government to own land, but they wouldn't believe it. They got the message a year ago October; they got the message — the people don't want the government to own land. They want to own land themselves; they want to own their own land. And this is the message that you're never going to get over there because you just won't listen to what's going on; you're out of touch, you're out of touch. You're out of touch with the people.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster has apparently latched onto a great disaster that's occurring in the country with mortgage foreclosures. Well, it's no news to me, when you have conditions such as we have with inflation running rampant such as we have, and you can't blame that on us. There's no question in my mind that people are going to be in trouble that have been buying \$50,000 homes, young couples with \$500 and \$600 a month mortgage payments to make, there is no question in my mind that there is going to be mortgage foreclosures. It's happened before and it will happen again, and hopefully we can turn this country around before there is too many more of them, but it's nothing new. I can't understand the Member for Inkster, with the brilliant mind that he has and the experience that he has, jumping on something like that as if it's something new, as if it has just happened. I just fail to understand that. —(Interjection)— Private ownership is still something I believe in rather than the state owning land and if we can make that productive, I'm all for it. If we can turn that land into productive farmland, I'm all for it. I happen to believe in ownership. Some of the members over there that can't find a job, or aren't maybe able to get anything together,

might think that way, but there are people on this side of the House that happen to believe that that guy who wants to work and pull himself up by his boot straps is entitled to own something, and the more he can own, God bless him. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Burrows made his contribution the other night, and I am sure we're all agreed that in the 40 minutes that he took, he didn't say a damn thing, but I kind of wish he'd keep quiet tonight.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington has a point of order.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I do have a point of order. I rise in your defense. I noted, Mr. Speaker, that you rose and tried to attract the attention of the speaker. I presumed you wished to bring the House to order but the speaker, being the honourable member who is presently debating the Throne Speech address, didn't recognize you and didn't allow you the opportunity to bring the House to order, so I thought that I would assist you by way of intervening. —(Interjection)—

MR. BLAKE: Well, Mr. Speaker, if he had a point of order or not, it maybe got us back on track, because I think we were getting a little bit away from the debate and I guess we're all guilty of that.

I admire the Member for Inkster and I always enjoy listening to his speeches and his speech this year just seemed to lack something. He just wasn't on track like he usually is; he's usually pretty hard-hitting and pretty well on, and we respect him on this side of the House and I think maybe he's trying to brush up his image a little bit because he might be taking a shot at the leadership when it comes up in the fall. I notice the Member for Lac du Bonnet is fairly quiet. He's getting himself cleansed from all his problems with Agriculture, and he'll probably come running out of the chute. I noticed in some of the newscasts, while I'm on leadership, some of the newscasts that came out mentioned the Member for Churchill might be a contender, and God forbid, God forbid, Mr. Speaker, save us from that. But I wish him well. If he wants to take a run at it, I wish him well, Mr. Speaker.

I was surprised that the Member for Inkster went to such lengths on going into private versus public enterprise and criticizing this government for giving away millions and millions of dollars to our wealthy business friends. I won't go into the details, Mr. Speaker, because they are well known, but that just doesn't wash. He's known from time to time, or from years immemorial, that there's been seed money and prime-the-pump money used and their neighbors to the west of us in Saskatchewan have used it very, very effectively. Sedco is a pretty good operation out there, it's well received, and that's money going in to prime the pump of the private enterprise system. The only thing out there is that they want 50 percent of it before you get any of it. We happen to believe that maybe if you let the fellow fly on his own that he might be twice as good and he won't be stealing it all out from under you because you're going to get half of his profits anyway. But that system, Mr. Speaker, has survived for a few hundred years and we happen to think, on this side of the House, we happen to think it's a good system. We'll continue to prime the pump and attract the business to this province if they can create the jobs and get our economy rolling again. Whether people succeed or not — it bothers us if they don't — but if they succeed, we say good luck. But the members opposite, my friends on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker, just can't seem to stand a person being successful. They hate to see a guy get ahead.

Mr. Speaker, the restraint program that we hear so much about, is with us and I am afraid if we are going to follow a policy of sound financial management for the taxpayers of this province and to manage the economy of Manitoba, that certain matters of restraint have been with us and will be with us for a while, and I can support them. But when restraint programs are misplaced, it disturbs me, Mr. Speaker, and I think of our government of the day in Ottawa that will cut out millions of dollars out of a road strengthening program which is so important to us in the rural areas and they will cut \$6 million or \$9 million out of our road strengthening program, but they will still throw \$250 million, or whatever it is, into bilingualism without any thought of dollars and cents whatsoever.\$

The matter I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, of that money that had been taken from the road program is important to us in the rural areas and I, for a moment, might relate to my own area that has been hit very, very hard by rail line abandonment. Rail line abandonment, as we all know, has been handled very, very badly by I don't know what levels of the government. The federal, I suppose, is going to get most of the blame. The railways are partly to blame, but I don't think the grain companies are completely innocent either. We have had rail lines go out of our area without any elevator facilities being built to handle the extra grain. We have to have roads to carry the grain to market. It's important to have those roads upgraded to carry the bigger trucks because we have heard many, many speeches on that particular problem and I won't waste the time of the House

in going into that now. It's a very, very serious problem in my area, Mr. Speaker, and I wouldn't want my constituents to think that I'm not aware of it. We have to upgrade the rural areas and it's going to take dollars, and up to date we have no idea how much cost-sharing we are going to get out of the federal government, how much the railroads are going to contribute and co-operate, and it's going to be very, very difficult.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. George went on and laboured away at great length on the speech he had written for him, on what we hadn't done on Autopac and what we might be doing to it. Mr. Speaker, I think the study that was mentioned in the Throne Speech on the Public Insurance Corporation is one that will be only to benefit the motorist of Manitoba, to try and find ways to improve the system, because regardless how good anything is, it can probably be improved. Hopefully, when the studies are completed, the system will be better for it and the Manitoba motorist will benefit from some of the changes that are forthcoming.

We've heard a great speech today on the hospitals, the lack of concern on this side, and I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, it's just a matter of funds and a matter of priorities, r because when you inherit a bankrupt policy — and the province was virtually bankrupt by this government after eight years of administration — and they can flail away at how heartless we are, and we haven't done this, and we haven't done that, but they forget to mention little things.

The Interim Leader of the Official Opposition flailed away on why we haven't built a hospital here, or a hospital there, but he forgot to mention Snow Lake. That hospital was falling down six or seven years ago and nothing was done by members on that side of the House. Well, that hospital is going to be built now. We realized something had to be done and we're going to do it. So you can't flail away too long, Mr. Speaker, without some of these things coming home to roost and I'm sure that the Leader of the Opposition is going to find in the chore that he has ahead of him — and it's a difficult one — they're going to find that some of these problems are going to come back to haunt them because the province isn't going to hell in a handbasket because the Conservatives were elected. We've inherited a massive deficit and some problems — we've talked about horror stories — and some of them will be admitted on that side of the House, there's no question about it. You can't do it in 18 months. Cry all you like. We can't clean it up in 18 months; it's going to take us probably the next 10 or 15 years to get everything squared away that you've left us with.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and finish out my time but I did promise the Member for St. Vital that I would allow him an opportunity to get the floor and with those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your attention on your Chair and on that side of the House for allowing me to contribute to the Throne Speech debate at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the member would submit to one question. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa mentioned the extension to the Flin Flon Hospital for extensive care. Would he kindly try to impress the Minister of Health of the importance of that particular extension.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Member for Flin Flon for his question. I have done just that. I have impressed that on the Minister of Health and on his other colleagues that that community, that great community in the north that I spent so many enjoyable years happens to be quite near and dear to me and I have many many friends up there that are encouraging me at every opportunity to lay the whip on to my colleagues in Cabinet to get that care home built. I've done the best I can but it wasn't quite good enough. So with the Member for Flin Flon, with his efforts on that side and my efforts on this side, I am sure that in due course, the residents of Flin Flon will get their care home.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I would move seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't going to speak on the Throne Speech debate this year because of a problem I've had in being able to be my usual boisterous self and

wore out myself in Public Accounts shouting for certain investigations to take place regarding the former government's waste and mismanagement. However, I would, Mr. Speaker, be remiss in the short time that I have if I didn't say that the constituents in my area have demanded and suggested in their replies to my questionnaire, the encouragement to continue to support the Leader and our government in the role that we are playing and the thrust that we have towards improving the quality of life in this province. There have been a number of suggestions which I'll deal with later and some of my own thoughts which possibly may be slightly considered as mildly critical. But you do have a good government when you have a strong opposition and I'm afraid to date that the members opposite have not given us that adieu.

I would want to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, before going on, on being re-elected to your position, and certainly to my colleague from Springfield who moved the main motion' and my compatriot from the Radisson constituency for seconding the Throne Speech.

I wanted to, before I got into the serious matters, deal with some of the things that we talked about, and certainly in Public Accounts we could not find certain areas in which we could deal with many of the horror stories that fill my desk. I thought tonight, during the short period of my time, that I would not start with the Member for Elmwood, that I would like to deal with . . . Well, the first thing we should deal with is the \$29.8 million the former government spent in approximately the two and one-half years that they had. According to Public Accounts, in 1977-78, it was \$14.5 million and 1976 - 1977 it's \$15.3 million. And I can assure under our restraint program that the civil servants and certainly Gentle Ben, the Member from Burrows, will not be travelling around all over the world at the taxpayer's expense. The member can deny it but I had the fortune to spend about \$3,000 of my hard earned money to arrive in Tobago and be informed that the Presidential Suite at the hotel, Crown Radisson, had been occupied by only two famous Canadians, both Prime Ministers. One was the Prime Minister of Canada, Pierre Trudeau and the other gentleman apparently who occupied that suite was the Prime Minister of Manitoba, Mr. Hanuschak.

Well the Member from Burrows took my advice and encouraged the voters to force him to resign from his portfolio and you know, he's talking about birds now, but he must have done an awful lot of talking in his many 26 trips alone in 1976 - 1977 and that doesn't mention Ghana and it doesn't mention what he did for forty-five days at the Olympics. I understand it was explained away that he rented that suite of rooms for other members of the government but it still appears in his expense account which certainly was far in excess of the way normal Ministers travel. But, let's not get too hard on the Member from Burrows, you know you walk around here and you have to look at a fellow who has been very critical of our Government. I thought maybe I would look at the former Northern Affairs Minister, the now Member from The Pas, and I regret that he is not here because his department was charged with a \$480,000 experiment.

Well we've got to ask ourselves if this project dealing with human waste in the North was really a success story. And was this project necessary in the first place? You know I have some very well thought out and well dictated series of questions to be raised in Public Accounts which I couldn't raise but when you look at the very fact that this government could have gotten that information from the private sector or they could have gotten this research carried on by the Federal Government, I get a big kick out of this fellow from The Pas standing up and talking about some of the questionable things that we are attempting to do to bring good management and good government to the province.

Let us just very quickly in the few minutes that I have left, and I'll have time possibly to deal with it tomorrow, but these people put these particular toilets, this molding toilet project, in the North. And they put them down on a solid base of perma-frost. So you know what happens to the toilets, they heaved, and they heaved up into the houses. What happened to the exhaust system? The exhaust system froze so the result is the stench in the houses forced the people to go back to their old fashioned ways of living. Well the members laugh but they didn't explain these things to the residents in the North. And there was no public acceptance of this particular NDP Program. It was an absolute failure. But nobody talked about it because it only involved a half million dollars. It wasn't \$40 million like Saunders and it wasn't those grandiose type of losses that were so carried by the media. But when you get into the details, Mr. Speaker, you can see that there was no public acceptance to this type of government waste. The Municipality of Arborg right now has to go ahead and build the lagoon because these goons on the other side, some of them that they hired...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 10:00, I will entertain a motion for adjournment of the House. The Honourable Government House Leader.

R. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Wolseley, that the House do now adjourn.

Thursday, February 22, 1979

MOTION presented and carried, and the House adjourned until 10:00 tomorrow morning (Friday).