



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. 7B

2:30 P.M. Friday, February 23, 1979

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, February 23, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed with the afternoon's business, I would like to direct the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have 10 students of Grade 11 and 12 standing of the Anicinabe School, under the direction of Miss Janet Savage. This school is in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

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

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I, on this occasion in the latter days of the Throne Speech Debate, join other colleagues of this Chamber in congratulating you on your return to the Chair. I understand that you had some medical problems prior to the opening of the Assembly, but we are delighted to see you back and in fine form and fettle and we hope that you will continue in that frame of health for the remainder of the session and for many years to come.

I would like also at the same time, to offer my congratulations to the Mover and the Seconder of the Speech from the Throne, having had that privilege on two separate occasions when I was a member of the New Democratic Party government. It's a privilege that is extended to members, to introduce the Throne Speech Debate and I commend them on their presentation in this House.

I would also at this time like to offer my congratulations to our new leader, the Honourable Member for Selkirk, Howard Pawley. Having known Howard as the Member for Selkirk for many many years and having been a member of the old CCF, when Howard was also a member of the CCF, I have known him for quite some number of years and I have found him to be a very honourable gentleman. He will, I am sure, acquit himself well as the Leader of the Official Opposition. Speaking for myself, and I'm sure I'm speaking for the remainder of my colleagues on this side, we intend to give him our wholehearted support and we know that he will do the job. As members of the government benches have said, the Member for Selkirk, or the Leader of the Opposition, is there in a pro tempore capacity, and regardless of who becomes the new leader of the New Democratic Party, comes the election at the convention this coming fall, I feel quite confident that the Member for Selkirk will acquit himself quite well and will be one of the main contenders.

But regardless of that, whoever becomes the leader of the New Democratic Party here in Manitoba, he will command and receive the support — the wholehearted support I might add — of all the members of this Assembly on this side of the House.

I commend him for the amendment that he moved to the reply in the Speech from the Throne. I think he picked out the pertinent points that were needed to be put forward and put before the people of Manitoba. Number One,

In he stated that the present government has proved to be an inefficient manager of Manitoba's economy, driving business and people out of our province, and reducing Manitoba's real economic growth to the lowest rate of any province in Canada. And that is true. That is true, Mr. Speaker. This Conservative government has mishandled the economy of our province. This government has mishandled the economy of our province to the point that where Manitoba now trails almost all the whole country in wages, in job opportunities. Where once our province was a leader in social justice and equal opportunity for all, we now endure the sorry spectacle of this Conservative Government grinding down who? The aged, the infirm, the poor, and the disadvantaged. All of these without any political or monetary clout to defend themselves. These are the ones. They attack those. Restraint, they call it. Restraint. I can tell you what we call it on this side. We call it repression. Repression. That's what it is. That is not restraint.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, it is nothing new for these people of that particular political persuasion. For as long as human history, it has been practised. The Pharaohs of Egypt were the past masters at it. The past masters of restraint and repression, until Moses showed them that

it was a two-way street. That is the type of government that we are getting from this Progressive Conservative government. That is the type of government. There have been many more down through the ages of history. There was King John I, Charles II, who carried restraint so far that the people rose against them and they subdued the first and beheaded the second. Our contemporary restrainers, the Progressive Conservatives, the dictators of whatever political ideology mainly come to a sticky end and are usually disposed.

You know, we just have to look in today's history which is being written today. It's today's current events, but it's tomorrow's history. Circa the Shah of Iran — repression, restraint, to the point that the people could stand it no more. And you know what happened to him.

The sooner that this government over here, on that side of the House learns the obvious lesson, that people will not suffer unfair treatment for too long, the better off they're going to be. And I expect, Mr. Speaker, that next year, or perhaps the year following, we're going to see the goodies being trotted out. The goodies are going to come out, but as I believe the Honourable Member for St. Vital pointed out this morning — I believe it's the Honourable Member for St. Vital — you've already used up one third of your time. The sands of time are starting to drip, drip, drip, and your time is running out. I believe the Honourable Member for St. Vital said that the approximate life of Legislatures here in the province of Manitoba has been 48 months. You've already used up 16 months of it. A quarter of this Legislature —(Interjection)—

And yes, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Highways, yes, there will be many to come, when you will be sitting over here, year after year, decade after decade. You will be growing long, grey beards and sitting over here. I can see the Honourable Member for Lakeside coming in with his cane, tripping on his beard, and still as repressive and restraint-minded as he is today.

But, to get back to what we were starting out to talk about. —(Interjection)— Yes, and incidentally, I'm glad that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface brought that up. Now, if we had ever seen any bull-headedness, it has to be in the present Minister of Highways. There is a provincial garage, ready to use. Ready to use. He took the media and the television down to see the new garage. See the waste and the horror story. Why didn't he take them to the old garage? Why doesn't he take the Members of this Legislature and the media and let's go down and see what kind of conditions these people are working under. Let's have a look at that garage. —(Interjection)— Right. We'll do it tomorrow. Perhaps we can adjourn the House now and go and have a look. I don't trust the Honourable Minister of Highways. I know how they work in industry. When somebody comes to visit, they get the old clean-up program, you know, get the brooms out, and I say if the Honourable Minister of Highways is going to do that, we do it now. Not when he gets time to have the boys clean the place up and make it look spic and span. That's how you inspect a place. Don't let anybody know you're coming. I know how the Member for Lakeside, the Honourable Minister of Highways, I mean, he would cover his tracks pretty well. Certainly he would have the cars out of there, there would be no overcrowding, the people would probably have on clean overalls, and you know, if the Honourable Minister thinks he's going to fool us with that kind of stuff, I'll call the date when we go, and if the Minister will let me do that, then we'll arrange it. And we'll do it on ten minutes notice.

But to get back, as I said, let us have a look at what this restraint program has led to so far. Number one, Minister of Government Services. He tells us one figure of how many civil servants have been rationalized — we call it axed — in this so-called rationalization program. The figures range up to 1,800. A paper came out somewhere; a memo, inter-office memo, I believe that's what it was and it states that the Minister's figures are no better than the figures that we have on this side. I think that the Honourable Member for Inkster said that his guess was as good as any Treasury Bench Minister over there, and I think that's true.

I think if we got a computer printout of the payroll of the Province of Manitoba, we would find that there are probably about the same amount of civil servants still on the public payrolls today as there were in 1977. So somebody disappeared; somebody must have been hired. Now who did we hire? It must have been their friends. Because if we can look at one aspect where they replaced people on Boards and Commissions and I think that the lady correspondent from the Winnipeg Tribune, Frances Russell, pointed that out, and documented it fairly well. —(Interjection)— Oh yes, the Member for Morris. The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs. —(Interjection)— Patronage, pork barrelling, and he admitted it. He admitted it was pork barrelling. So if there's pork barrelling in the commissions and committees, perhaps there's pork barrelling of the people that they've hired. I know there has been in some of these executive assistants and deputy ministers that have been hired out of the private industry. —(Interjection)—

If my friend wants to talk about relatives. He wants to read a speech when the Honourable Member for Morris accused me of having a relative work here. I never had no relative working here. He didn't have the courtesy, and even the press didn't have the courtesy. He went outside

this House and stated that a gentleman out here was my father-in-law.

A MEMBER: It's a question of having a relative that does work.

MR. JENKINS: Not the guts or the intestinal fortitude did he have, or that Richard Purser of the Winnipeg Tribune. That's the kind of tactics that that Minister adopted when he was over in this side of the House. Rationalization, that's what they call it. Rationalization. You know, a witch hunt is a witch hunt.

A MEMBER: The voters are going to rationalize him next time.

MR. JENKINS: Yes, I think the voters will be rationalizing and perhaps will be monitoring, which seems to be a favourite term and studying. You know, this is the greatest bunch of students that I've ever seen in my life over here. Studying this, studying that, studying something else.

MR. BOYCE: Slow learners.

MR. JENKINS: They must have belonged, as the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre said, in the slow learners' class. They need to go to the higher horizons. Oh yes, there's the Minister of Education. Yes, and another student of Shakespeare. Another student of Shakespeare. I thought the only one that was in this House besides myself was the Member for Fort Garry.

You know, the Minister was talking about Julius Caesar. He perhaps saw it on Prairie Public Television last Sunday, which was a very good production, and I recommend him to view that television station some time. They have some very educational programs on there. And he talked about Caesar talking to Mark Anthony and about Cassius with his lean, hungry look. I don't know whether he was trying to emulate Brutus at the burying of Caesar today, but if he was trying to emulate Mark Anthony, he did one hell of a poor job. I wouldn't hire him for a part in the play whatsoever. —(Interjection)— He, as the Member for Winnipeg Centre said, admits he has neither wit nor word, but Mark Anthony did. And he, through Shakespeare and through the lips of Mark Anthony, wrote the finest political speech that has ever been written in the English language, or any other language.

Now, to get back to the Throne Speech itself. You know, at this late date, Mr. Speaker, there has been so much hashing and rehashing of what is good and what is bad in this Speech that it becomes difficult in order not to become repetitive, and I ask you to bear with me, Sir, because we have had the pros and cons of this Speech dissected, bisected, trisected, you name it, in various degrees on both sides of the House. I can tell you, as far as I am concerned, it was eight pages of tedium. Eight pages of tedium. And the person I really felt sorry for was the Lieutenant-Governor. He kept having to pick up a glass and drink, it was so dry and tedious. I was almost waiting for him to throw in one of his ad libs. He would have at least livened the Speech up. There was nothing in there to inspire the people of Manitoba, to inspire this House. But let's have a look how the Corporation, their friends across the street, one group down Broadway, the rest of the insurance industry — let's see how they have fared under this restraint program. They've been given tax breaks to the detriment of the province's coffers. Some restraint that is.

This Conservative Government has already said that Autopac is going to be studied and maybe handed over like a sacrificial lamb to the private insurance agencies. This is perhaps the payoff. The payoff for the support that they receive from the Insurance Bureau of Canada, who are waiting like jackals to tear to pieces the best public auto insurance system in the country.

You know, Mr. Speaker, payment of political debts comes high. And when the money goes out of the public purse and into the private foreign pockets. You know if these were Manitoba firms in the main it would be something, but Lloyd's of London, the gnomes of Switzerland, the bankers of New York, these are the people that control the auto insurance industry. Restraint is not for the likes of these monied interests.

And meanwhile, let's get back down to the people's level, to the people's level. There are cutbacks of grants for Health and Welfare, Education, municipalities, school boards, and the freezing of necessary construction of all types. And you know, last night — last evening wasn't it? — the Minister of Health announced this tremendous surge in building program of health facilities, all of which were on the books. He can't even think up any new ones. He's working on our plan, plans that if we had been the government, would have been carried out.

A MEMBER: Would have been built.

MR. JENKINS: Would have been built. And when you talk about shifting taxation, talk to the

at Red River Community College, Assiniboine Community College, Frontier Community College. \$83.00 tax saving? Their fees have gone up approximately 400 percent and like the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, I don't like using statistics, percentages. You know, there's the old adage that figures don't lie, but liars can sure as hell figure.

MR. ENNS: Now, now, Bill.

MR. JENKINS: And when we start playing with percentages, when we start playing with percentages and trying to use statistics to manipulate, and any good statistician can take any set of statistics and twist them around to serve his purpose and his ends.

But to those people who go to the university, to those who go to the community colleges, an increase from \$70.00 per annum to \$270.00. And the Honourable Minister of Education says, "Well, that's still pretty low in comparison to the rest of Canada." But the City of Winnipeg is about 85th on the average pay scale, weekly wage, in the Dominion of Canada. The City of Brandon is what? — 95, 96, somewhere in that vicinity.

If we were basing our university fees and our community college fees on the average wage, we would have to reduce them, not jack them up. That \$83.00 you supposedly save these people and which the Honourable Member for St. Vital really squelched, but good, this morning, \$83.00. When you get a \$200 increase in fees in the time that you have been in government to students of the community colleges, and you tell them that you're saving them \$83.00 per year, which has been proved false, and you call that a tax saving? That's a tax increase of \$200 per annum for those students at community colleges. The same is true at the universities. The same is true when you cut back the support for public transportation in the City of Winnipeg. Old age pensioners, and I believe the Honourable Member for Minnedosa boasted, "It's good for them, good for them. Let them pay more." That's what he said, "Let them pay more, they'll feel better about it. They'll feel better because they have to pay more." That's what the Honourable Member for Minnedosa said. —(Interjection)— "Give them self-respect," he said.

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

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a point of order I did not say that the old age pensioners should pay more for their bus fares. I said they were paying 10 cents a bus ride now, and I felt that they were quite willing to contribute something to maintain their dignity to feel that they were paying their own way. I did not say they should pay more.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: I will read Hansard. That is not the way I understood the honourable member but I will take the honourable member's word for it until I have checked Hansard, and I am prepared to check Hansard.

But I am not again too much willing to trust the Member for Minnedosa because I can remember when he stood in this House and read an unsigned letter into this Chamber, and not until he had read that speech did he acknowledg that it was unsigned and it has nevei been signed to this day.

So, you must remember, Mr. Speaker, that if I'm a bit skeptical of what the Member for Minnedosa says, then I have just reason to do so.

You know, with all these increases in taxation, user fees, school boards have had to raise their portion of the taxes; the municipalities, and if anybody thinks that what's happening out on the streets of Winnipeg today, that the tremendous support that is coming from the Provincial government — I think the Member for Winnipeg Centre said there's two ruts. Well, I had to go and see the doctor this afternoon at 1:00 o'clock. I drove down Broadway, down by the Convention Centre, went in and saw the doctor and came out and was going down Graham and so-help-me-God once you got into a set of ruts there, I was on the wrong side of the street and I had one devil of a time getting over to the other, because there is no support for the cities and the municipalities from this government. With all your garbage about a bloc-funding, that's rubbish. The cutback in services . . .

POINT OF ORDER

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Highways on a point of order.

MR. ENNS: I don't like to interrupt the honourable member but we intend to let them put these

things on the Order Paper at their pleasure. The fact of the matter is, that the per line maintenance grant that the City of Winnipeg receives, is exactly the same as the year before, given by the New Democratic Party, and the capital construction grant was increased from \$10 million to \$15 million, \$5 million more than the last NDP party gave. So let's not have this kind of garbage.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ENNS: \$5 million more than the City of Winnipeg received from the Conservative government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. Order please. Let's have one speaker at a time. The Honourable Member for Logan has the floor.

MR. JENKINS: . . . whether the Member for Lakeside was in order or not, and I don't want my time deducted on some superfluous garbage that he wants to inject into this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JENKINS: He has had the floor once and if he's trying to get the floor again, he'll have to wait till next year. He's had his show and I don't want my time deducted by his garbage being introduced in my speech. I want you to rule, Mr. Speaker, one way or the other. You are the arbiter of this House and the protector of all our privileges and I'm asking you to protect my privilege now.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Member for Logan is now prepared to sit down and listen, then I will tell the honourable member that the time will not be deducted from his speaking time. He has eleven more minutes. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I also asked you to rule whether the Member for Lakeside was in order or had a point of order, or not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Any member has the right on a point of order, to clarify a statement if he thinks that the statement is being misinterpreted. The Honourable Member for Logan. Order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Highways has already risen on a point of order. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)—

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

MR. PETER FOX: Yes, sir. I do believe that if a member has been granted the floor by you, the other members should at least have the courtesy to listen. Now, we've had a number of interjections. They haven't been points of orders and I don't see how the Member for Logan can proceed and I would ask you, Sir, to ask some of those members who keep interjecting, to kindly refrain from doing so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan has a very legitimate point of order and I would ask all members to extend the courtesy to the member who has the floor, of allowing him to make his remarks as long as they are factually correct to the members and each member will have his time to make his own contribution when he is recognized by the Chair. The Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Minister of Highways on a point of order.

MR. ENNS: I appeal to you. I think it's important and obviously the members opposite wish to have that matter clarified, what constitutes a point of order and a deliberate falsehood being attributed to another member and to, in this case, the entire government, to be read into the record when the honourable member said that the City of Winnipeg was receiving "nothing", I believe was his words, or at least a cutback, when in fact there has been a substantial — from a \$10 million to a \$15 million increase.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have already ruled that a point of order is one in which clarification of a statement is made. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After all that turmoil I would like first and foremost to reconfirm that I have eleven minutes. Do I have eleven minutes, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The member's time is up at 3:11.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you. I get one minute's grace. You know, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Highways has achieved one thing, he has thrown me a bit of a left curve and I swung at the ball and I missed it. Nevertheless, to get back to the support and you know my friends across the hall here, across this Chamber, are so happy to talk in today's dollars as opposed to yesterday's dollars and the dollar the week before. True, maybe your support to the cities have increased, but the dollar value is much less than what it was when we were government.

We have a city government here that is preaching restraint, cutback of services. You know, even my friend Bill Norrie, he and I, when we were members of the School Board, never saw eye to eye. But even he is saying, "We can't cut to the bone any more down there, because of the lack of support that we are getting from you people." These things are going to come back and they are going to haunt us, and I'll tell you, that if you think the City Council is going to sit quietly by next year because next year is their election year, and they're going to be down here pounding on your desks and asking for support. They're your friends that control that Council. You may call them by any name you like but they are Conservatives in the main.

What have we had from this government, from its restraint, refreshing program? We have professional people, the architects, other groups, engineers, qualified tradesmen, leaving the province in groves more than ever before, this year. —(Interjection)— Well, I don't think that the people in the architectural societies of Manitoba, the professional groups, that you could say that those were 90 percent members of the New Democratic Party, because they were not. These are the people that are leaving the province, and doesn't the First Minister . . . I'm going to call him the Interim First Minister, because that seems to be the attack that the people on that side are adopting towards our present leader. He's an interim leader for two years, two and a half years, down the road, when the people of Manitoba will say, "Out, out on your ear." Does the Interim First Minister forget that these people that are leaving Manitoba, being driven from their native province, are Manitobans, native Manitobans. They are being lost to us forever? They won't come back. I doubt if they will even come back if the government changes.

This restraint program, by this so-called Progressive Conservative Party; their actions and their deeds proclaim them, and this is what I am going to call them in future: the Regressive Conservative Party. You people are going back beyond even R.B. Bennett. And you know, Mr. Speaker, they're not even content with the havoc that they have already created in this province. They are prepared to tinker, and tamper with the property tax and the cost of living credit. We shouldn't be surprised because the Minister of Finance is a fine gentleman. I have known that gentleman for many years. I knew him when he was a member of the Advisory Committee on the City of Winnipeg School Board. I thought him to be a fair minded person at that time, however, I must say that some of the actions that I have seen him carry out since have sort of tarnished his image as far as I am concerned. But to tinker with the Manitoba property tax credit, cost of living tax credit, the one system, and which I may say, the Manitoba system, which I am proud to say, was initiated by our New Democratic Party government, and which has been hailed by all across the length and breadth of this country, as the most equitable and most progressive in the whole of Canada. Much more so than the one in Alberta, which is a pale carbon copy of what is here in Manitoba, even the one in Ontario, pale by suggestion.

And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I tell the members on that side of the House, we give you notice right now, that we will steadfastly oppose any changes that will water down the plans, the tax plans that we have, or are not in the interest of the public and the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, time is running out, and before I do close I would like to, at this time, deal with a few matters which have not been mentioned in the Throne Speech.

We have been hounding this government to do something about the minimum wage in this province for the last sixteen months. The Minister has had a formula, the former Minister and the present Minister, and since they have come into office they have steadfastly refused to do anything. They have not adopted the formula. Well, then just to stand here and criticize for the sake of criticizing is not good, so then I will say that I will give you a formula, and it's too bad that the Minister of Labour is not here. Maybe he heard about the lead poisoning coming up and he decided not to be here today, I don't know. But having given some thought to the minimum wage here in

it's my opinion that the minimum wage should be based on the rise of the cost of living. Well, there is nothing wrong with that, especially in view of the high cost of food, and particularly in the high costs of red meats, which, I understand, and we were told that beef prices will increase somewhere from 18 to 20 percent by year's end, and the people in the minimum wage, many of whom are my constituents, they have to eat too. There's talk that hamburger will be \$4 a pound. It will be a luxury for those in the prisons.

So I say to the Minister, the Minister of Labour, if you can't come up with a formula, at least base the rise of the minimum wage on the cost of living. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I take this opportunity to congratulate you on assuming your role for the current session. I wish you well in your duties.

I would also like to take this opportunity, although the member isn't here, the Member for Springfield, who moved the motion from the Throne Speech, and also I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the MLA for Radisson, who moved the motion.

Also I would like to extend my very best wishes to the Member for Selkirk, on assuming the highest office in the NDP Party; I wish him well in the upcoming session. I know that he has a tough job to do and I wish him all the success that he will need to do his job well in this House.

Also, I would like to extend my best wishes to Mr. Edward Schreyer, former Premier and former Leader of the Opposition, who has been appointed our Governor-General, and of course I extend my very best wishes to Mrs. Schreyer and his family for their duration in Ottawa.

Generally I am very pleased with the Throne Speech but in particular I know there are two very important areas important to my constituency, namely agriculture and tourism. As was indicated by the Minister of Agriculture here a couple of days ago, an agreement with the federal government called the General Development Agreement which will encourage Manitoba's farm community to continue expansion, diversification and specialization, I think is really welcome. You know, up until the early Seventies, in the Swan Valley constituency, the Manitoba Department of Agriculture conducted a variety of tests for the farm people in the area. In the early Seventies, as I mentioned, this program was discontinued for reasons, I guess, to introduce other programs and policies which the administration of the day felt more important.

We are some 300 miles, and it has been mentioned here on many occasions, without a doubt we are the most isolated agricultural community of any significant size in the Province of Manitoba. The farmers there feel that it is very important that they have some research into the varieties that are to be grown in that part of the province. They don't feel that it is fair that they should receive the recommendations on research based on solely information gathered from data collected in other parts of the province, primarily in the southern sections of the Province of Manitoba.

So with this new agreement, I understand that we can expect to receive some funding which will see the return of more crop variety demonstrations and also in recent years there have been some excellent varieties of corn produced at the experimental station in Morden by the federal government, with the time of maturity much less than what it used to be. We hope, and we know that we can expect to get some co-operation in having the Department of Education conduct corn trials on farm scale sizes, not just plots. I understand that we can expect to get some corn trials there on the field scale, as I mentioned, co-operating with farmers to grow 50-acre blocks.

There are many other areas of course that this agreement will cover and I know that we can expect considerably more research in agricultural crop development, livestock development, in the years ahead. And of course, variety demonstration plots are a good extension tool and I am sure that these will be used well in the years ahead in the Swan Valley area.

Now, the Member for Fort Rouge, when he was speaking, condemned the government for laying off some 80-some civil servants in the Farm Diversification and Rural Water Services section. Perhaps he didn't say "civil servants," it may have been "employees." I think it has been adequately explained by previous speakers from this side of the House that the ARDA Agreement that was signed with the province to introduce the Farm Diversification had run its course and I believe it expires the end of March this year. The employees who were hired at the time were well aware that the program would come to an end at the end of March and although the program had a reasonable record of success, in my opinion, it had three very serious disadvantages. First of all, the program was too costly. We are not a province that can afford, even using some 50-cent federal dollars, to have people advise farmers on a one-to-one basis. Also, the program created, in my opinion, serious animosities amongst farmers. Your neighbour was able to qualify for the program and the fellow across the road was denied any assistance under the Farm Diversification Program. I think too, another disadvantage was too many civil servants became very evident, and a concern to many

taxpayers. There is no doubt in my mind that had the government not changed in 1977, many of these employees would still be working for the Department of Agriculture on some scheme or another. I think care has to be taken in developing extension program that the cure or the prevention isn't worse than the disease itself.

The provision of water to farms and rural communities for increased livestock and crop production, as well as household and industrial use, will continue to be a priority matter with this government. The sale of plumbing supplies and pumps by the province was discontinued because the service is adequately being handled by plumbers in the Province of Manitoba. They have been doing an adequate job for many years and I am sure they can continue to do this in the future. Furthermore, we expect them to continue paying taxes to all levels of government.

I am delighted that the Minister of Tourism has been successful in negotiating a Federal/Provincial Tourism Development Agreement. Tourism for many years has been a very important industry to the Swan Valley area, probably second to agriculture. In my opinion, we haven't even begun to scratch the surface on this very important industry in our very scenic part of Manitoba.

As a matter of interest, since October 11, 1977, to my knowledge, only two MLAs from the opposite side of the House have been to the Swan Valley area on official business. The Member for Kildonan and the Member for Transcona have been into the area, as far as I know. I am very pleased to report that on this side of the House, we have had a number of Cabinet Ministers and MLAs. I would like to just review how many of them have visited the area, some at their own expense and some on government expense.

The Minister of Agriculture has visited us on official business on a couple of occasions. We had a visit from the Minister of Health who attended some meetings in the area and stayed overnight. The Premier and his family were able to participate in the Northwest Roundup and Rodeo last July. The Highways Minister had an opportunity to look at some of the road concerns last fall. The Minister of Education had the opportunity to visit the regional school in Swan River as well as other parts of the constituency and he has promised me that he would be coming back within the next year to visit more of the schools and facilities in the area.45 146

The Minister of Mines and Resources had an extensive tour of the area last fall as well as the Minister of Northern Affairs. In addition we've had the then Minister of Parks and Tourism who is now Minister of Amateur Sports and Physical Fitness. The MLAs that have attended and visited functions in the area are the MLA for Minnedosa, the MLA for St. James, the MLA for Crescentwood, the MLA for Radisson, the MLA for Emerson, the MLA for Roblin, the MLA for Dauphin, and, Sir, we've also had the pleasure of your visit to our area, I believe it was last April when we had a function for the retiring member for Swan River, Mr. Bilton. —(Interjection)— Well, as I said to my knowledge there were only two MLAs from the opposite side of the House that I was aware of in an official capacity.

A MEMBER: How come you didn't call off the city members?

MR. GOURLAY: I'm sorry . . . —(Interjection)— three . I think that it is important that the members from this House get around to the various parts of the province to see what we really have. I don't think that we should leave it to election time to go out and visit the various communities to see what we have.

I wish to commend our Premier in suggesting and hosting the Federal Provincial Conference in the grain handling and transportation which took place in Winnipeg in early 1979. This is the first time in the history of Western Canada that we have had representatives from government, the industry. The producers come together to discuss some very serious concerns that we have in the agricultural industry, one that has cost, not only the taxpayers, but the producers of this province and other Western provinces great sums of money, particularly in recent years.

And although perhaps the results were not forthcoming immediately, it's certainly been a step in the right direction. I had a chance to speak to some of the participants of the Conference. They were all enthusiastic, including some of the members from the NDP Party in Ottawa.

Another concern that I share with many Manitobans is the rail line abandonment in advance of any attempt to provide for improved transportation and handling facilities at alternative locations before they start ripping the tracks. It is encouraging to note however that the Highways Program is providing special emphasis on this. There's a little story that I heard just recently that tends to leave a couple of messages, and it was with respect to a truck driver who was driving a fairly big semi trailer. He was approaching Winnipeg from the West and he wasn't sure whether his truck would clear the underpass out of the west end, that he took a chance and sure enough he got stuck. It really jammed in there and couldn't go forward, he couldn't go backwards and after he sat there for some time he thought he would try it again and no, it wouldn't move either way. So he got out of the truck and he took a look at it from the back, he took a look from the front

and while this was going on, a cruiser car had been waiting on the other side of the underpass and the policeman got out, came over to the truck driver and said, "Are you stuck?" he truck driver was dismayed with this kind of a question and he said, "No, I'm just moving this underpass and I've lost my way." I think there is two messages here, that if the Member for Fort Rouge tries to move some underpasses, he may find that he will lose his way. And I think that it is very important that the members opposite ask the right questions. So far this session, I think we've had a lot of nit wit type of questioning.

A MEMBER: Hear hear. Half-wit. Half-wit.

MR. GOURLAY: Last year we heard nothing but concerns about sheets, and this year it is meals. I was going to ask the Member for Ste. Rose — he talked to us yesterday, and he was concerned about the tarps they were using in the hospital. I'm just wondering if he went to an animal hospital or a general hospital. Because some of the vet clinics do use tarps. So I am really concerned about using tarps in hospitals other than veterinary clinics.

Now the bird survey that was announced here some time ago triggered the bird brain in the Member for Burrows and he's been in a sweat eery since, concerned about this survey which I am sure is a million dollar business in the City of Winnipeg. So why not spend a few bucks to find out what makes these birds tick.

MR. GOURLAY: The proposed new policy governing the sale of specific Crown Lands which are utilized to make up viable farming operation units will be well received by those people directly concerned and by farm people generally. It is also noted that several hundred cottage lots have been developed for release during the current year, which is good news.

MR. GOURLAY: I am very pleased to note that the Minister of Health has announced several capital projects to proceed this year in the health field. The total cost of these thirteen projects, I think, is something like \$13 million. He tells us that the Seven Oaks Hospital which is probably questionable whether it was needed in the first place going to cost \$34 million. If that \$34 million could have been utilized, you can see that we would have been able to cover other important facilities that are needed at the present time.

I'm surprised that the Leader of the Opposition would have the nerve or gall to suggest the present government had virtually given away Crown assets. And he used the example of Saunders Aircraft, etc. You know the millions of dollars squandered by the previous administration on airplanes and hotels and Chinese food and what have you would have gone a long way too in fulfilling some of the health requirements, hospitals, personal care homes that are required and are not able to proceed at this time.

What about the rural stay option we have heard quite a bit about? I kind of like that terminology, I think it was a good program, or it had good intentions. Millions of dollars was spent by the previous administration on the farm diversification program, the extended crop insurance, beef income, rural water services, labour grants for farm buildings. And you can go on. I think there was a hog subsidy for one of two years.

But the farm decline in Manitoba really hasn't changed all that much since 1951. From 1951 to 1956, a period of some 15 years, there was a decline in the farm numbers by 24.1 percent. And yet from 1969 to 1976, that was seven years, there was a decline of 11 percent in the number of farms. About half the number of years and about half the percentage. In 1966, there was a survey that was conducted that would show by 1980 there would be approximately 30,000 farms left in the Province of Manitoba, and at the present time we have about 31,000 and it's expected that we'll likely drop close to 1,000 before 1980 is over.

A MEMBER: What about the TED report?

MR. GOURLAY: Well, actually, some of those figures are the ones that I'm quoting from, the TED report. —(Interjections)—

So, you know, the stay-option program, I'd have nothing against it; I think it's fine to try and keep people in the rural areas and maintain the rural populations. But in spite of the millions of dollars that have been spent, it hasn't really slowed up the exodus from the farms all that much.

The Beef Income Assistance Program gave a tremendous boost to the rural economy, I won't argue with that fact. It has certainly helped a lot of beef producers in a time when they were really up against it. They had three or four years where they really couldn't make ends meet; they were producing beef cattle at a loss. The main problem, as I experienced it, was that the program was

already in play long before the rules were finalized. The previous Minister of Agriculture would make statements at one meeting and his deputy would go out to another meeting and correct them and, of course, people were being signed up into the program . . . —(Interjection)— or vice-versa, right.

Another serious mistake I think that was made, too many people were involved. They were farm machinery dealers, they were school teachers, they were crop insurance agents, who had good incomes from other sources but they identified themselves as beef producers and I feel that bona fide beef producers should have been the only ones that qualified for this program.

Well, just to go on briefly to some of the remarks by the Leader of the Opposition, the basic principles embodied in the Throne Speech which the Leader of the Opposition conveniently avoided. I think there were about four points that I could detect.

1. Financially responsible development of public policy; 2. Development of government policy in a way which emphasized the government's accountability to the people of Manitoba; 3. Encouragement of an enduring foundation for positive, permanent economic growth; and 4. The provision of services and income transfer for those with the greatest demonstrable need for assistance.

It is this government's intention to encourage a balanced and realistic development of both social and economic resources in Manitoba. Many of the Opposition Leader's fiscal jargon can simply be explained by difficulty in making massive changes in the numbers of employed people in the province where on an interprovincial basis has a low level of unemployment. Also, with the traditional structure of this province, one would not expect huge changes in manufacturing shipments in a relatively stable but small manufacturing sector.

Again, changes in general economic trends is beyond the control of any one government, as far as I'm concerned. There's a general increase in Canadian bankruptcy rates across the country and with the high rate of inflation, the high interest rates, one would expect that the number of bankruptcies is going to increase under these conditions.

Besides the factors just mentioned, I feel a major impediment to the rapid and erratic change in Manitoba's economy is the legacy of poor utilization of human, social and economic resources which was left by the previous administration. Some of the examples of that: investment in industries that could not possibly provide a basis for permanent, enduring economic growth, also discouraging the most productive development in the province's important ag sector, and committing the province to expensive adventures in social programs rather than designing programs around those that had the greatest need.

The effects of the legacy left by the previous administration, in my opinion, cannot be reversed overnight. I think it is a tribute to the present government that certain specific leading indicators of Manitoba's future are already showing signs of improvement. We heard the Member for Logan expounding on the terrible economic situation across the Province of Manitoba. I just happened to see this paper before I came in after lunch. — "Killarney's growth quite spectacular." — It's an article in the Tribune, and it says, "If there is supposed to be something like a recession in rural Manitoba, somehow the people of Killarney haven't been told about it." I could read similar stories from various parts of the province, including the Swan Valley area. We've had some tremendous economic development in the town of Swan River and it hasn't been from public money. Housing starts, a new Ford garage, a new resort hotel, a new printing office, a new drug store. I think the signs look very good.

There has been a tremendous improvement in the ag sector. I think the farm machinery sales have gone up something like 34 percent in the last year.

Certainly, in my opinion, any attempt to improve the long-run use of Manitoba's economic and social resources will create some short-term dislocations. I don't think we can argue with that fact. It is my belief that the overall balance of increased private income, increased provincial transfers and dramatically increased federal transfers will compensate for most short-run dislocations experienced by Manitobans.

The Leader of the Opposition, in his speech, attempted to paint the government as heartless and I think the Minister of Education did a commendable job this morning in just shooting down that kind of a statement made by the Leader of the Opposition. I think that this government has demonstrated a sense of responsibility and accountability to all Manitobans. No loosey-goofy approach to management or laissez-faire monitoring of its activities as was the case in the last administration. For instance, we have had the chance to look at the welfare situation and I believe the formal structure of rates for future age welfare recipients is being monitored well. This would really have no effect on current aged welfare recipients. Also, what about the health cards? Last year, I believe it was about this time, the Minister of Health recalled some 2,700 health cards that were out in the province and there was a huge cry of horror from the members opposite that we were cutting off all these 2,700 people —(Interjection)— 1,700 was it? I think it was 2,700. In order

to institute a greater equity and efficiency in welfare, it was decided to review health card eligibility on a more frequent basis. The previous government obviously ignored this administrative responsibility. No one was barred from receiving such a card and should their income have fluctuated downward, they could get their cards back.

Also, in the children's welfare services, it was not unusual for annual increases of up to 20 percent in various children's programs. This is also being monitored and, as announced in the Throne Speech debate, increased expenditures will be apparent in certain child-oriented social services, but not necessarily all.

The nursing home per diem rates: I just forget which speaker now was expounding on the fact that the 75 cent per diem increase was going to be a serious hardship to many, if not all, of the senior citizens, people in personal care homes. In 1973 when this program was instituted by the members opposite, the charge was \$4.50, but it wasn't long until it went up to \$5.25, an increase of 75 cents. So, you know, 75 cents over \$4.50 is a heck of a lot bigger increase than 75 cents over \$7.00. Even so, needy nursing home residents can still have their per diems paid by the province; there is no problem there. Increased Old Age Security and the GIS payments will help maintain nursing home residents from any financial hardships.

Since we took office some 16 or 17 months ago, we have been referred to by many members opposite as a caretaker government. Possibly that terminology has been appropriate, until now at least, because only a caretaker could describe the mess we acquired and it has been a mopping-up situation in many respects ever since and many constituents tell us we are not finished the job yet. However, most will agree that we have gone a long way in fulfilling our election promises.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity of participating in this Throne Speech debate.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in the traditional way, I would like to congratulate both Mr. Speaker, who is out of the Chamber at the moment and you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for resuming your roles and in the traditional way, I recognize that the office and the person is entitled to the respect on the basis of impartiality which is expected to be seen from the Speaker. But I think it is fair to say that every Speaker, and I have spoken before quite a few, must strive to earn that respect and then must strive to retain that respect.

Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed listening to both the Members for Springfield and Radisson; they are amongst the members of government whom I have learned to respect as gentlemen — and I noticed you are one of the two I just referred to as gentlemen — and worthy of consideration.

I want also, Mr. Speaker, to take advantage of this opportunity to express my regrets that the Member for Crescentwood has decided not to continue to act as Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House. I found him a good chairman, a fair chairman, and regardless of his successor's ability, which has not yet been tested, I would say that the Member for Crescentwood was a good and fair chairman and as I say, I am sorry that he has decided not to continue.

Just for a moment, to recognize, as others have done, the fact that the former leader of our party, who led our party to government and led government for eight years, has been called to a role which is most unusual for a person with his background. I think it is a great credit to Canadians and to him particularly, and to our party as well, that he was selected to fill a role which I believe he will handle well.

I want also to express the loyalty that will be given, and has already been given, to the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Selkirk, who is the Leader of our party. I should point out to those members who still want to be cute or smart about it, that constitutionally, according to our party's constitution, he was elected as the Acting Leader, but the caucus in the end names the Leader of the Opposition, as those who know the rules ought to recognize, and he is the Leader of the Opposition. It is a disservice to those who are cute about it, not to address him in the way that he is entitled. The result was that we have already heard from this side of the House, remarks about the Interim Premier, the Interim Leader of the Conservative Party, and that was invited by some of the comments on the other side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, you will have noticed in the short time that you have been in this House that there is a rough and tumble that takes place amongst members of the House. It is usually non-productive; it is usually not amusing; it is usually unpleasant, and yet many of us fall into the trap of becoming involved. I know I do and I often try to start a session by saying I will avoid it, but I don't succeed too well. Unfortunately this kind of rough and tumble often results from the sensitivity that people have about their own inadequacies or the inadequacies in their program or in their administration, and it develops.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to try to speak today on the difference in philosophic approach between our party and the Conservative Party and try to, in my own mind, develop how we differ, because

we start out well-meaning. We have all offered our services to the public in various elective capacities and now we are all here as Members of the Legislature. I think it is correct, the traditional way of assuming that everyone is here in good faith is a correct assumption, but then we do get carried away, really by differences in ideology.

I want for a moment to touch on the fact that last December, on December 21, I clipped from the Winnipeg Free Press an article which is headed "United Church Brief Hits Government Restraint Policies." The lengthy article enumerated the various program changes adopted by the present government which the United Church felt was harmful to the poor and harmful therefore to the people in Manitoba. It pointed out that the United Church has not presented a brief to government for a long time but they felt it necessary so to do on this occasion.

I clipped it out, as one is prone to do when one sees remarks about government, but then just a few days later, I guess it was, on December 29, I clipped out a much lengthier article wherein there was, I guess, a report or an in-depth interview with the Leader of the Conservative Party, the Premier of the province, and the juxtaposition of the United Church just having presented a brief and his comments with regard to the United Church brought back my memory to 1967 when I made some comments that related, in an indirect way, to certain religious beliefs.

Well, first, quoting from this article which appeared on December 29, 1978 in the Winnipeg Tribune, there was reference to that very brief presented by the United Church. The question was asked: "You received a delegation from the United Church yesterday which maintained your government is hurting the poor and these concerns are not totally unknown to Christians." The Premier was reported to have said, "Ah, but there are Christians who believe in social action first, and there are Christians who believe in individual redemption first, and I am one of the latter."

The article then goes on further on this and ends with the following questions and answers. "Do you think the secular humanist government was trying to usurp the place of religion?" The answer is, "Yes, to some extent. To be a committed Marxist, for example, I don't think a committed Marxist can be a Christian. Marxism has to be the anti-Christ." Well, that only shows his ignorance, it does not show much more than that.

But then the question went on, the question then was, "Why?" The answer: "Because it believes the message of salvation is not going to be understood or acted on by the individual, therefore, Big Brother, the state, must move in and do all the things the individuals aren't doing. But that's a very simplistic way of putting it." I depart from the text to agree that it's a simplistic way of putting it.

Next question: "Are you saying Christianity should be just concerned with individual redemption?" The answer is: "Not just — all I'm saying is social action should not displace the message of individual redemption and that is what's happened. The secular humanist governments, having all the answers, is past and that's why you are seeing this manifestation of people wanting to get back to the spiritual roots, but the day of government action is not passed. Government is always going to have a role." Question: "But not really in terms of righting social wrongs?" Answer: "It will always have that role through the taxation system, through distribution of wealth to the extent that the state could ever do that properly, but there's a limit to that too. People are finding that's not the answer in terms of individual salvation. You know, we are among the richest people on the face of the earth, but are we that much happier? I don't know how to measure happiness. Are people settled with themselves, are they at peace with themselves? I don't know."

Well, Mr. Speaker, that interchange did remind me that as a person who does not have any deep religious affiliation, I did back in 1967, have occasion to speak on behalf of this party in response to the Budget Address of the Conservative government. I started by saying that I wanted to use a text which was "Love thy neighbour." I elaborated on that by pointing out that it is a well established principle and appears in many religions.

Back in the 8th century, the prophet Isaiah said, "And show mercy and compassion every man to his brother." I also quoted Confucius who said, "Do not to others what you do not want done to yourself." There was a teacher of the Hebrews in the century before Christ, named Hillel, who stated: "Do not do unto others what you would not have them do unto you." Christ and his disciple, Paul, used the expression which is quoted in the Revised Standard version of the Bible as, "Whatever you wish that men would do to you, you do so to them, for this is the law of the prophets."

I think that the fundamentalist approach shown by the Premier should be a reflection of what was said by these religious leaders. To me, it was acceptable, as I remember then it was not acceptable to members of the Conservative Party, to quote the statement made by a gentleman, a French politician and historian, Louis Jean Joseph Charles Blanc, who said in French, but I will translate it — maybe for you, Mr. Speaker, I'll say it in French — which for others, Mr. Speaker — other than you — I should translate to read: "To each according to his needs; from each according to his ability."

Now remember, after I said that, one of the newspapers came along and said, "Oh no, no, this Frenchman didn't say it, Marx said it." Well, it so happens I did go to the trouble to trace who said it but I have every belief that Marx also believed in that and may have well quoted this Monsieur Blanc in the same respect. But it is something I do not shrink from at all. "To each according to his needs; from each according to his ability." What I indicated then, and what I indicate now, firstly, it was a quotation from G.D.H. Cole, who was a recognized authority on economics and socialism, and I read what he said then: "Socialism in effect does not consist in the establishment of public ownership of industry, though of course it involved this. It is quite possible for a wide range of industries and services to be publicly owned in a community which remains fundamentally capitalist in its structure and outlook. The essence of socialism is to be found not in a particular way of organizing the conduct of industry, but in a particular relationship among men. Socialization is a means and not an end, a means towards the realization of the ideal of human equality which lies at the basis of socialist movement."

Mr. Speaker, back in 1967, the Budget Address by Gurney Evans stated, and I quote: "The real concern of government is the well-being of people. This involves implementation of progressive social and economic measures, including education, health, welfare and related services. It involves programs aimed at encouraging communities in which rising generations can plan their careers and live their lives in security and confidence and with opportunity to find the kind of work near at hand they would like to do." Socialist dogma, Mr. Speaker, spoken by Gurney Evans.

I would very much like to think that this Finance Minister, in presenting his Budget Speech, would quote his predecessor, Gurney Evans. But I don't think so, Mr. Speaker, because when we were in Opposition, before 1969, I used to plead with the Conservative government to enunciate their policies, to give us a philosophy on the basis of which they worked within the tax structure, they worked within their programs, and they never did. But this current government has been doing that, and it has shown a rejection of the former Roblin approach and the progressive part of the Progressive Conservative Party. I join the Member for Logan who says it is better put now Regressive Conservative Party. Party.

Well, we tried in our way to create that greater equality of opportunity that I've spoken about. We tried, in our way, to think in terms of doing unto others as we would like to have done for us and to us. We thought in that sense when we did things. I understand the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal will be speaking this afternoon and I will tell him that I do believe that we did a great deal to create housing for those who were unable to create it for themselves. I do believe that the present government, under his guidance, has cut back substantially on that program to the detriment of the homes of many.

I believe that in bringing in the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, we were carrying out the concept of making a utility into a public utility, a utility which affected drivers and owners and persons and property who were injured as a result of accidents that occurred and that because of the great savings in administration costs and litigation costs where there was one insurer rather than competing ones, we were able to carry out a viable public utility and see to it that all the investment moneys which they had available would be used to support Manitoba public institutions.

Well, the Conservatives opposed it; they fought it; they voted against it, but when it came election time, they said, "Oh no, we're not going to disturb that; we're going to keep the Public Insurance Corporation." I think that when the present Premier stood up and made that statement, all the members behind him fell over in disbelief that they were now going to support the Public Insurance Corporation. But now, Mr. Speaker, it is being threatened. It is being threatened.

Firstly, there is a substantial change in emphasis by the government's withdrawing from them some \$7 million in revenue produced out of taxation and not giving it back to the people but keeping it in order to increase taxation, as indeed they did last year.

Secondly, by announcing the review, and the Premier was quick to say, "Oh, no, no, that doesn't mean we're going to open it up wide but we're going to look at it again," and who could object to another look? Well, it is being threatened.

We removed the premiums from Medicare and I'm glad the Minister of Economic Development, I believe is his present title, is here, because he is the one who used to talk about his being an old man and he would still hear my saying that the greatest shift in taxation took place when we transferred from the premiums to the income tax, progressive income tax system. It is something that the Conservative parties opposed vigorously; it is something which the Premier announced before the last election that they would not change, they would not bring back the premium system. I believe it is being threatened; I am waiting to see just how they are going to do it. I would think a user fee will be the first imposition of taxation that they will put back on the shoulders of those who are ill.

The Property Tax Credit Plan, the Cost of Living Tax Credit Plan, were all fought vigorously

by Conservatives, and I believe that the Premier announced before the election that they would not drop the Property Tax Credit Plan. It was brought in by our government in order to create a greater equity in the burden of taxation, i.e. more progressive taxation. But I feel that the first step to go against that was last year when they brought in the reduction in income taxation based not on the progressive system but on the flat rated reduction which meant, as I recall it, something like a \$15.00 reduction a year, I think, for somebody earning \$15,000 — \$15.00 or \$20.00 — and something like \$500.00 for those earning in excess of \$35,000 or \$40,000.00. —(Interjection)— \$50,000 I'm told.

Mr. Speaker, the present Minister of Finance, in 1976, and I quote from Page 3258, he was then the Leader of the Opposition, and he said that the Property Tax Credit Plan which had been brought in by the Conservative government some time in 1965-66, he said, when asked what they would do with our Property Tax Credit Plan, he said, and I quote, "I'll tell you, we had the political courage to eliminate it once already. What makes you think we wouldn't have the political courage to do it again?" He said, "It's a very cheap vote buying technique, and this government," and he means then the NDP government, "knows it better than anybody else. It buys votes like you wouldn't believe."

But in the same speech, and on Page 3260, he said, "Well, they're preoccupied whether we'll wash it out or not. Let me tell you right now, it would be our prime objective to get rid of this sort of an inefficient program. Now if you say will we wash it out, I say, how many years do you give us, because right now, you're up to \$77 million. How fast can you absorb \$77 million into a grant structure?" I'm still quoting, Mr. Speaker. "If the Foundation Program can be repaired in one year to the point where we can again establish an equitable school finance program, I assume we would do it in one year. But I tell you one thing, it will come back to a provincial government recognizing its responsibilities to adequately finance its school boards, etc." What did we learn, Mr. Speaker? The government has now announced that they are actually reducing the percentage of contribution of the provincial government to the system of education. But the property tax credit plan is threatened. It is frozen now, but the future of it is threatened, if one can accept the words of the present Minister of Finance, that they will change it just as soon as they can. They have been at it 15 months. I expect it won't be long and it will certainly be well before the next election when it will be substantially changed by the present government. And, it will be a regressive step in the taxation philosophy of this government.

Mr. Speaker, it is even laughable that they have gone to the trouble of now appointing private auditors to do certain audits of Crown corporations. I don't think I have the news release which was published by the Minister of Finance, where he talked about the reason for bringing in this change. But as I recall it, he said that that would create greater independence, autonomy for the Crown corporations, but I believe he said, greater independence than now exists.

And who was it but the Provincial Auditor who took first objection to that statement, because anybody who knows the way in which the Provincial Auditor carries on his work, knows full well he could only be fired by a two-thirds majority in this House, Mr. Speaker. The government can't fire him, but the government has taken work away from him, I think in 13 different Crown corporations, is handing it out to private firms who are clearly going to be able to be discharged, dismissed, by Order-in-Council. And he says that's a greater deal of independence, and that's nonsense, Mr. Speaker. The fact is, they are going to cost more. There isn't the slightest doubt about it, Mr. Speaker. We now know what it is that the Provincial Auditor has been charging for the audit, and we have yet to find out what the government will be paying these new auditors. I will predict that they will lower their fees because of the prestigious nature of the appointment and that they will come in at a low fee, but I cannot conceive that it would be anything nearly as low as that of the Provincial Auditor. We have yet to see that and of course, we will.

They are now going ahead with their own philosophic bent to give money to multi-national mining companies. They are going ahead now according to their philosophic bent to sell off Crown lands, the one resource there is in this province which cannot grow under any circumstance. They have already indicated their philosophic bent by being in user fees in so many ways; legal aid, universities, personal care homes, community colleges. They have transferred costs to other governments, increased the cost of education, reduced their percentage contribution both to education and in health care, reduced through their block system now, that \$30 million grant to the City of Winnipeg, and in that way reduced their support to municipalities, forcing the municipalities to increase their costs to the real property taxpayer. The buses, Mr. Speaker, we already have the increase in buses such as we said was bound to come. And all this, with the reduction in services, all of which is Conservative philosophy, and I recognize it as such. I wish that they would admit that that is their philosophy. I wish they would say that our philosophy is, that this is all part of what we believe ought to be done instead of looking for excuses.

Mind you, it's not their philosophy, I should think, to justify the way in which they proceeded

to fire civil servants, calling them into an office, telling them, "you've got two hours from now and you're out, out on the street." Doing it in such a blatantly open fashion as to make it disgusting to so many who were onlooking. I don't think it is part of their philosophy to be using deceptive statements such as we have heard before, all these horror stories they talked about, and there are some mistakes that were made by the previous government which needed to be rectified.

One of the members the other day talked about the fact that there is a change in the unemployment and employment picture in spite of the fact that the former government brought in hordes — I don't think he used the word hordes — but great numbers of civil servants from Saskatchewan, and that distorted the figures of the growth of Manitoba; that kind of nonsense. The kind of nonsense that I referred to years back that I found in Rock Lake in the 1973 campaign. The member is present, so that he will certainly remember my quoting some little old lady who came up to me and said, "It can't be true that Mr. Schreyer is going to take away our church." And you know when I said that in some real dismay, I got laughter — the Member for Rock Lake laughed, and others laughed, and said, "Well, you know, that's what happens on the campaign trail." It's not part of their philosophy to sit there and say, "Dirty Socialists, go to Moscow, go to Peking, go to Chile." — of all places — that's further ignorance, that's not part of their philosophy.

It's not part of their philosophy to talk about state farms when our program was not acceptable to them because they know it's not true. It's not part of their philosophy, nor, Mr. Speaker, should it be part of their philosophy to carry on this deception of \$83 million. And I quote now from the news service release of October 27, 1978, reporting on the Premier's speech in New York: "Premier Lyon said he had advocated less government long before Proposition 13 became an issue in California." That is part of their philosophy and that Proposition 13 has come home to roost in California as it will in many other places, where people have said to government, you are limited in the amount of taxation you can carry out in property taxes, Proposition 13 in California. They started immediately collecting the same kind of money in other ways, just as this government is bound to do.

But I refer back to the Premier's speech in New York: "Civil service was reduced by about 1,800 almost entirely by attrition." We know the attrition hurt a number of people very hard in a bloody way, and done in a bloody way, and that's what they called attrition. But many of these and probably most of these jobs were jobs that weren't filled so that for him to go to New York and brag about reducing the service by some 1,800 when we know very well many were not filled jobs, is nonsense. But I come really to the tax revenue cuts which totalled \$83,000 million and apparently somebody's been talking about \$83.00 for every man, woman and child and that is the kind of distortion, that kind of deception which is not part of the philosophy of the Conservative Party but seems to be part of their ingrained need to deceive.

I have here the news release of April 14, 1978 issued by the Minister of Finance, where he enumerated the \$83 million. And let's run through it quickly. Mr. Speaker, may I know how much time I have left?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has seven minutes left.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Personal and corporate income tax \$17 million. I would like that amount to stick in the minds of Honourable Members who are listening to me. Succession duty and gift tax \$5 million, that totals \$22 million. Then there are a number, mineral acres tax, corporation capital tax, selective fuel taxes, steam heat, and selective sales tax which total approximately \$4 million. Sales tax reductions 61.5 million and the Minister of Finance pointed out provincial share was 20.5 million, federal share was 41 million, total \$87.8 million. Get that, Mr. Speaker, that included 61.5 million of sales tax reduction. So we have \$87.8 million but they increased tobacco tax, although they said they were not going to increase taxes, they did increase tobacco tax \$4.8 million. That helped distort the personal bookkeeping of the Member for St. Vital as he reported this morning. So they have a net reduction of \$83 million. In the next paragraph they report a further tax increase of \$7 million although they don't quite describe it that way. But they took \$7 million which belonged to the premium payers of the Autopac system, they took it away from them and they put it into provincial coffers, thus increasing the gasoline tax by two cents per gallon, \$7 million. So that \$83 million, which is their figure, should be reduced by \$7 million that being the increase just like the tobacco tax was, which gives \$76 million, not \$83 million.

But, Mr. Speaker, the sales tax reduction was wiped out by last October. \$61 million was only a six month holiday that was given by the Federal Government and how this Minister of Finance complained bitterly about the way in which it was done. But it is back on again. We're back to paying 5 percent sales tax. Let's put back that \$61 million, a little holiday that was given for six months, and by adding back \$61 million we are down to a \$15 million reduction. And,

And Mr. Speaker, I asked you to remember personal and corporate taxes \$17 million, succession duty and gift tax \$5 million, \$22 million of reduction and I have shown how \$15 million is the net reduction, not that \$83 million fictitious figure' which Members of the Backbench have been using but I don't accuse them of deception. I don't think they realized just what it is that they were using as a figure, which was a phony figure, Mr. Speaker. We're down to \$15 million. Whom did it relieve, Mr. Speaker. The people who were expected and were paying estate tax. People who were dying, leaving estates to others who did nothing to earn it and who therefore were being relieved of that burden of taxation.

Personal corporate income tax, and I've already referred to the fact that the change in personal tax helped the rich and did not help the middle income people, 15,000 to 20,000 were helped in a very minor way as was indicated by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, who gave us his personal figures. The \$83 million is a hoax. —(Interjection)— with the arithmetic. The arithmetic is correct. I am showing more figures that should be used in the arithmetic to show that \$83 million is a deception.

A MEMBER: You agreed with the succession.

MR. CHERNIACK: I am prepared to discuss succession duty on the Honourable Minister's time, not on my time. But I am not dodging the issue. If you give me an extension of time, Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to discuss it now.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other matter and I am glad that the Minister of Finance is here, because I want his response to it. They made a big deal about the great deficit that they have inherited. They threw into the figures moneys that were set aside for capital purposes, moneys that were voted for capital purposes to increase and inflate their figure of deficit. They later discovered that there were certain reductions in the deficit due to unexpected, to them, income from the federal government. They didn't announce that for a little while, if you recall. I forget how long it was that they knew there would be a reduction in the deficit because of revenue coming from Canada but they didn't tell us for quite awhile. But finally the figures came and the deficit figure was reduced.

We found, it took a little searching, Mr. Speaker, we found some \$30 million-plus that were taken out of the coffers of the province shown as an expenditure and put into a trust account as being future, to be disbursed in the future. It's some \$30 million that they were notified by the federal government would be repayable to the federal government due to over estimation and overpayment by the federal government. Not to be paid in that fiscal year, but they chose for their own purposes to take that \$30 million, show it as a deficit, whereas it was not a cash expenditure and throw it into a trust account' so it will show as if it were an expenditure, as if it were part of the deficit, whereas it was a bookkeeping transfer of funds. I Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance says of the same practice that he is wrong, and I tell him he is wrong, and when we asked him about it in the Public Accounts, he had to turn to the Deputy for support and the Deputy said, "Yes, there was something done," and I took the trouble to find out. He did not have the figures, he did not have the example, he has yet to produce the example. The one I recall was a lesser sum of money and it dealt with a forwarding of revenue, it did not deal with an increase of the deficit. It had to do with a forwarding of revenue to be taken into account in the following year, a different process altogether, and, Mr. Speaker, never used at a time of a change in government where one government, the new one, was doing its best to create an image of a great deficit of the government that follows.

But, Mr. Speaker, I will talk to the Honourable Minister about something else which I wanted to explain because I do not pretend to know the answer but I want him to know. I have been looking at the Public Accounts — we've not yet come to that in the Committee — I've been looking ahead and I came to Trust Account items and I found quite a large amount which is shown as being a trust account set aside for the Health Services Commission.

In their statement, which I just got today because I went to see the Provincial Auditor about it, I found that the Health Services Commission ended the year March 31, 1978 with \$23,420,490 in funds on deposit with the government of the Province of Manitoba. In the previous year apparently they had \$5 million in funds on deposit, a growth of some \$18 million. Mr. Speaker, it shows up on Page 216 of Public Accounts where the Health Services Commission had put into trust \$161 million, had drawn out \$143 million, and I couldn't quite understand it. Then I went back and there's some reference to it but it is pretty clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that at the end of that fiscal year, this government took \$12.5 million, added it to some \$10 million, reduced the revenue shown in this revenue account as being received in income tax, and put it in as an expenditure and used it also to create a larger deficit than the previous year.

Now I am sure there will be explanations, but the fact is there seems to me to be another \$20

million which was taken in bookkeeping by the government from last year's money and shown as an expenditure and put into this year's money.

I'm sorry that my time is up, Mr. Speaker, there may be other matters I wanted to deal with but this is one I leave for the Honourable Minister of Finance to clarify because it looks to me like there is another \$20 million of deception involved in their estimate of deficit for last year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to congratulate you for your new position. I've congratulated you on three separate occasions now so I am not going to take all that much time to go into the formalities of the work that you do because I would be repeating myself. I agree with what I said last year and again I know you will do the job you are supposed to do.

I will also thank the mover and the seconder, Mr. Speaker, for the excellent job that they did. I won't go into too many formalities on that because I would like to get very clearly to a point that I would like to make quickly, that I've heard the same old record for the last three years from the Honourable Member for St. Johns. I've heard the reading of the Honourable Minister of Finance's statement for three years in a row. I've heard this talk about the way the manipulation of the budget went on for two years in a row, and I guess the member is getting old and worn down because he hasn't come up with anything very much new. I could tell you this, that the Minister of Finance will show the Member from St. Johns that his figures are correct. We'll stand behind the figures the same as we stand behind the fact that we give a financial report every three or four months in this province which is something that he certainly wasn't prepared to do when he was the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, let's talk about insurance for a minute because I was going to do this later on in my speech but the Honourable Member for St. Johns wanted to bring up insurance. He mentions the amount of money that was taken from the automobile insurance by this government. Let me tell you how the shell game is played by the socialists. They have to find a way to pay for their idiotic, stupid programs that they come up with. And one of the major ways that it has always been done is to try and find a way to hide it in a department somewhere where somebody doesn't notice it all that much.

Well, Mr. Speaker, on July 3, 1975, a memo went forth from the Minister, the Honourable Bill Uruski, to the previous Premier of the province: "Pursuant to our discussion in Law Amendments Committee. This memo is to re-emphasize that all government departments, Crown corporations and agencies shall contact MPIC directly concerning general insurance policies which expire July, 1975 or later. Contact can be made through Mr. J. O. Dutton, General Manager, or Mr. J. P. Pereira, Director of Underwriting. All Cabinet Ministers, heads of government agencies, Crown corporations." Now that's marvellous.

And then to Mr. Fallis from Mr. Fedoruk: "This is a government directive; that is nothing from the private sector."

Here we go again. Here's another directive he had received from somebody, a proposition of using a broker and he explains that you could use a broker to give you some advice on some maybe complicated insurance. But the last paragraph says, "It shall be understood however, that in all circumstances the insurance will be placed with the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, for their 1979 coverage put it out to public tender and our saving is \$286,000 — \$286,000 less we will pay in the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation for our insurance when we put it out to private tender. An amazing thing happened also. While we were getting votes while we had to buy from MPIC, the rates were coming in 25 cents per 100 from MPIC. All of a sudden now there is some competition. We're getting it at 16, as low as 12. Funny, funny they can do it that way now. Funny from MPIC. Isn't it amazing? So we have the shills in a shell game of how you hide things in the government. Well, I can tell you the money could have been used very easily. We could have built some more houses with it, we could have come up with some social problems that are creating the problems that make us build houses, very easily.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Johns just finished giving us all a nice little lecture when he started out about how unfortunate it is we have to talk when other people are talking. He usually jumps up when somebody interrupts him or he usually sits down and he says, "Would you like the floor?" So, fine. The money would have been used. I can tell you another thing. A directive from the government to the MHRC, and it went to all other departments I understand, that we must use electric power. We must use electric heating. I will tell you at the present time, Mr. Speaker, that we have to live under a situation with MHRC and in our relationship with CMHC, we have

to build within a certain type or amount of money. They would inspect or approve our plans. They could say, "This building is too much, you are paying too much for that particular building. You are not getting enough units for the money you are spending." They could do that. So we always had to be careful, and they always had to be careful, as to how the quotes came in and be very careful to see that they stayed within the amounts that could be spent.

Most of the specifications that ever went out from MHRC on buildings showed that the best possible or the most efficient way to heat those buildings would have been with gas heat. Architects, engineers came forward and told them that. They've sat in my office and I've said to them, "Why electric heat?" "We were told electric heat." We have had the gas companies come in and say, "We've made representation where we proved that we could heat those buildings cheaper, and we were told we can't do it. The government instruction is electric heat." According to the statistics in the department at the present time, if we could convert the ones that we could convert — some we can't — if we could convert them we'd save \$250,000 annually. Of course it is, those houses, those single family units we have people living in them, and we've got electric heat in those buildings. A lady in Brandon just said to the Chairman the other day, she said, "I make \$14,000 a year, or this family does. We have three children. I pay 25 percent of our income on rent, approximately \$320.00. My hydro bill is \$150 a month." You know those poor people that you were trying to help, because the government policy was electric heat.

The Honourable Minister of Highways when he was with Public Works can tell you the same thing applied in all the other buildings — millions. We could save \$500,000 annually if we could convert them all. Or if it had never been done, we wouldn't be spending it. So we talk about how this government handled money. Now, Mr. Speaker, when we mention those two things, the insurance and the heating is just one.

You know, one of the reasons why some of our insurance is so high is because of some of the construction we have because of proposal call situations. For years we found that the patio doors would never close on the buildings that we built. We found it out in 1973 and a report said, "Don't put any more patio doors in that are sliding. Put a patio door in. You know, you can open up a door and go into the patio but not sliding doors." They kept doing it; they keep doing it. Up went the heating costs, up went the insurance premiums, damages were done, doors were falling off. We've got ice in basements. I've got a picture in my office where we have the beams underneath rotting because of the construction and inspection went on.

Mr. Speaker, it's there because they wouldn't listen to anybody. One of the reasons they wouldn't listen was the policy was to build, build at any cost. —(Interjection)— Yeah, whether you need it or not, just build. Then we'll fill them; then we'll fill them. One we had in the Honourable Minister of Education's constituency that just happened to be built on the last piece of property in the area of Stonewall that was really a swamp at the end of the golf course but it had to be finished, in 1977 for some reason or other — in 1973 pardon me — in a hurry. —(Interjection)— Yeah, had to be finished in 1973 in a hurry. And we've just replaced all the beams underneath the building.

Mr. Speaker, you talk about management of money. Well I can assure you of this, Mr. Speaker, that it won't continue to happen. The honourable members can talk as they like about the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, and they're all wet when they say that we haven't done anything. I said in my Estimates in 1977, last year, that when I took office for responsibility for the Housing Corporation, there were \$6 million of construction had been submitted to CMHC by MHRC. Oh sure, there was a \$54 million program but only \$6 million had been submitted. We only had \$34 million allotted from CMHC that year, the government did, but they were going to spend 52 or 56. We worked our butts off to get \$22 million of it done and we got it out, we got it out in two months' time, and for them to say we cut off the program, we stopped building public housing? I tell you, if we built them, then they'll be built better than they were before.

Mr. Speaker, 1978 comes along and what happened then? Mr. Speaker, I can tell you what happened then. The federal government allotted the Province of Manitoba \$14 million and we've spent \$15 million — 14 plus our 10. We have built about \$13 million of it in the core area of Winnipeg. There have been more units built in the core area of Winnipeg since the Conservative Party took power than there was in the whole time the NDP was in power. And, Mr. Speaker, the Minister can shake — and I have great respect for the previous Minister responsible for Housing. I can give him those figures any time he wants. Those will be in place by the end of the construction period this year. I assure you of that.

Now let me tell you about some of the land that was expropriated or bought. They expropriated the old Burrows Court, Mr. Speaker. Mind you, it was condemned and it was expropriated and the expropriation figure is \$85,000.00. We're still in negotiation, mind you. We may have to pay more. It looks like, when the negotiations are over, we might have to. We had estimates for fixing it up that probably ranged from \$250,000 to \$300,000.00. We found that after we did that, we would

end up with a building with suites in it that we could have bought brand new buildings for for lesser money, so we thought we'd put it on the market, Mr. Speaker, to see if we could move it. We got offered \$15,000 for it, Mr. Speaker. We didn't take the offer. The man phoned up and he was going to sue us' he said. We were able to explain that legally we didn't have to accept his offer. We got offered \$15'000 for the building.

Now let me tell you about the building, Mr. Speaker. There isn't a room in it that's more than 240 square feet. They expropriate a building to put senior citizens in, in cells. —(Interjection)— That's right, we have been building approximately 480 to 520 square feet for senior citizens for a long time, so has every province across this country, and you expropriate a building for \$85,000 — that's the price laid down, we may pay more. We can't get \$15,000 on the market for it. If we fix it up, it'll cost us \$315,000 or better, and we'll have 240 square foot rooms for senior citizens. Now that's efficiency, that's efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you where we built most of them. We had some land, we didn't go into much expropriated land this year. When the Minister wants to say the land was all bought, most of it was expropriated. We stayed away as much as possible. In fact we don't know what we're going to pay for some of that property so we stayed away as much as possible from properties that we don't know what we're going to pay for yet. We went and we had an agreement with the city that was made with the previous government. We were able to pick up 25 lots for \$1,200 a lot, and that's where we're moving. We're moving in a direction of the core area, spreading them out as much as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that the insurance situation, the construction inspection, the continuation of carrying on habits that were going on for years that were faulty, the expropriation of property and we don't know what we're going to pay for a lot of it as yet. The committee that was set up of lawyers and estimators and everything else to help us decide how much it's going to cost us in that property, or when we get into court' it has cost us in the neighbourhood of approximately \$85'000 already to keep them advising us on what we're going to do. We have negotiated a fair amount of it back and if we could negotiate it all back, we will. But I can assure, there are people who don't want to have the land back. Who would want to negotiate back when you're going to get \$85,000 or better and it's worth \$15,000 on the market?

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to mention that the Housing Corporation is in the situation at the present time of having the federal government tell us there is no more Section 43 money. The federal government will no longer be loaning funds under Section 43. We would have to borrow moneys on our own and they would probably get into some guarantees. They haven't really settled their future housing program down. The Minister in Ottawa has announced that he favours the idea of supplement to senior citizens and even supplement to those people in need in letting them live where they like. He's looking at the safer program that is used in British Columbia. We have been studying those types of programs and I should say to you that in the White Paper that was talked about in the Throne Speech, those type of things are being looked at, but it also looks as if the federal government is going the same way.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, most of the people in the province don't realize that our subsidy on public housing or for MHRC subsidies on units that we own, public housing and senior citizens' housing, will be \$34 million — \$34 million split between the federal government and ourselves. So when we open the door April 1st in the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, we have a \$17 million bill staring us in the face.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, we still will not back off our commitment to supply assistance to those in need. But, Mr. Speaker, when it costs you \$337 average, per month, to operate one of your units in public housing, and approximately \$280 per month to operate your senior citizens' units' average, and in public housing our average return is around \$180 a month, and in the other senior citizens' it's getting up to around because of the changes in the incomes of senior citizens. We still stay with the ratio of 16 to 25 percent that was laid down years ago. In Ontario and Alberta and other provinces, it's 30 percent. They've gone to it across the board. We haven't. We haven't. We have still said that we will be a government that will look at the needs of people, but I assure you that there are apartments and houses for rent in this city at the present time for a lot less money than it costs us to operate the units that we have.

And, Mr. Speaker, the cost of operation is just going like that. The maintenance costs, because of the age of the buildings and some of the construction that we have is just getting to the point where we are looking, we are looking at hundreds of thousands, or even close to \$2 million we could estimate, and we're going to get it off. We're going to find out. Because we're getting a report of what has to be done to these units to make sure that they can remain open and it looks like it's going to be in the millions to be able to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you this, that we have to do it. We are the landlords. You can't have units where there is ice on the floor of the second floor of a house where kids are trying to sleep

and study, and it's there. We could show you. We'll take you out and show you. We'll drive you around to the people who live in them without even any problem. Mr. Speaker, if you want to really talk about the housing corporation, let's talk about it, but I'll tell you now, Mr. Speaker, that this government will operate it properly. We will take care of those people that are in need and we will have construction that will last in anything that we build.

Mr. Speaker, you know, we come along, and the members on the other side get quite excited about the fact that we said there was a \$214 million deficit. Well, it was \$214 million. We have shown the figures are correct several times. We've shown that they've been audited. Mr. Speaker, you know, the people of Manitoba were wandering around, saying to themselves, "Isn't it marvelous we can have all of these things." "You know, it really seems kind of silly," one fellow said to me from Northern Manitoba, "to have all these people running around doing nothing, but I guess if we've got the money, we can do it. We wouldn't really expect the government to do these things if they didn't have the money. We can keep building buildings that we don't need; we can keep getting into businesses that don't make any money; we can keep doing all of these things, but I guess it must be all right if we've got the money." All of a sudden, they found out that the socialist philosophy is to keep doing it whether you have the money or you don't. They all of a sudden found out the province was in a drastic financial situation and they looked up and said, "You know, these guys kidded me. These guys broke me. I wouldn't even do that to my own family, I wouldn't do that in my own home, but these guys broke me."

So they said, You know, all of this fairy tale stuff that we were hearing, the things that they said that they could do, all of a sudden they found out, sure you can do them, but they didn't have any money to do it. And the horror story of it is they were prepared to keep on doing it. They weren't even prepared to quit doing it.

The Member for Elmwood, or whatever it is, that fellow who was once the Minister of Public Works who doesn't know a bolt from a screwdriver, but I tell you this, he was going to keep building buildings. He was going to keep putting up public buildings, renting space to people when there was half of the downtown section of Winnipeg empty.

A MEMBER: He had to have a place to hang his art.

MR. JOHNSTON: You know, he wanted to put up more office buildings. —(Interjection)— You're right, my honourable friend from Wolseley is right, he bought the pictures, he needed some place to put them. That's just about what it is. They were going to keep doing it.

They didn't really want to get out of the airplane business. You know, if they had wanted to really advance the aerospace industry of this province, if they had just taken the time to sit down and find out what could have been done by advancing the aerospace industry we presently have, instead of going into a business and cutting a second-hand airplane in two and putting it back together. The only fellow that came out of that in good shape was Saunders.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the aerospace industry in the Province of Manitoba is third in Canada. Do you know, I bet you the honourable members on the other side who fly in airplanes now and then on a 1011, that big round chute you see in the back of that airplane that really makes it keep on going and keeps it up in the air, is made in the Bristol plant in Winnipeg. Did you know that Standard Aero Engine supplies an engine to a guy in London, England faster than the manufacturer in London, England does? Do you know how far afield that company works? Did you know that Boeing of Canada comes in, and mind you it's only two days they can supply it. They have a warehouse in Heath Row. It's on the plane here, off in Heath Row, and delivered. Did you know that Boeing's plant here has expanded regularly every year and have the property to expand further? And what did they do? They went and spent \$40-\$45 million, or whatever it's going to end up on a second-hand old airplane that they cut in two, tried to put back together. When they did, nobody wanted it, or would pay for it, and they were going to keep doing it. They were going to keep doing it. Here we were sitting there with a ready-made aerospace industry looking us square in the face. Mr. Speaker, it just isn't conceivable to think that they can carry on in that way.

Mr. Speaker, we've had a fair amount of talk about birds. I really take exception to the statements that have been made by the Honourable Member for Burrows. I take exception to it because he can't say what he's saying without changing his politics and we sure don't want him in our party. Mr. Speaker, he's the man that believes in human rights, and helping everybody in this province. He's the man that believes that everybody in this province should have the same right as anybody else. He's the man that believes more than anybody else that you shouldn't help the big guys, help the little guys. So let me tell you what happened, let me tell you what happened.

There was a lady who was a graduate zoologist, Mr. Speaker, came into our department and explained to us — and the member laughs, and he laughed just a while ago — that the bird business and the birdseed business and the ladders for bird cages and birdcages and bells that birds pick

at, is worth \$600,000 a year in this province. She said there's that many pets that are birds in this province. And she said, "I, personally, would like to set up a place with a veterinarian to help people that have sick birds. I do it now and I'm getting a lot of requests."

So it took us a couple of hours to sit down and chat with her and she said, "I want to invest some money in the Province of Manitoba." She said, "Can you help me? Would I be making a good investment?" We said, "Well, we're not quite sure but we'll find out. What do you have to know, what do you have to know?"

Well, she gave us a list of questions of things that she would have to know before she would invest her money in Manitoba. Now this one happens to be birds, but two months previous to that, we did one on a man who makes maps, small maps. He does it in a small shop. He's now hired . . . and after we sent it out to the industry and asked them: would you like to have somebody that could map different things for you in different areas in detail? He's in business now, hired three people. But you know, you didn't happen to read the questionnaire we sent out to them.

But this lady happened to be interested in helping birds and she gave us the list of things that she wanted to know before she would invest her money. So, Mr. Speaker, we said, "Okay, we'll help you." She gave us the questions, we had the Queen's Printer do it for us, 540 copies were printed on the department letterhead. We used the department letterhead because, through experience, people will answer a question from government sometimes before they'll answer a question to an individual. The letterhead cost us, at \$9.00 a thousand, \$4.86. The printing costs were \$4.25 for the 540.

A MEMBER: That's an expense account then.

MR. JOHNSTON: There were returns. By February 5th we had had 30 returns at a cost of printing and envelopes on the returns at \$22.18 per thousand, of \$11.98. The postage that came back on the 30 envelopes cost us 17.5 cents each and cost us \$5.25. The lady delivered them to the pet shops herself because she knew where she wanted to have them go. Right? And when they came back, she said, "Well, I don't want you to analyze them, I want to analyze them."

A MEMBER: Free of charge.

MR. JOHNSTON: Free of charge. She analyzed them. And we don't offer to do those things, you know, because we know in government when we have to hire people to analyze things, we have to pay them. Yes, we have to pay them. So for a total of \$26.34, we gave this service to a person in Manitoba. As I said to the Honourable Member for Inkster, if it's goldfish, we'll do it. If you've got an idea, we'll do it. If any small person in this province has an idea, we'll do it.

MR. ENNS: You've got to draw the line somewhere. . . Okay will. We won't do it for him. ' I

Mr. Speaker, I had a letter sent to me by the member, and it's public because he sent it to the press and everything too. The most stupid, silly, childish, idiotic letter I've ever read in my life. If he's got nothing more to do than that, he doesn't deserve to be here, and his constituents should have it sent to them so that they would know what he spends his time doing. Mr. Speaker, the letter is available. It was in the front page of the paper, most of it, the Free Press. —(Interjection)— No, I read it as ridicule, I read it as ridicule when I read it in the Free Press.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Economic Development is there to help the people of Manitoba and we'll continue to. We'll help small business, we'll help big business, and we'll help the people and we'll do surveys for people. That's what government is for. But you know, strangely enough, they come to us now, Mr. Speaker. They come to us now. Do you know they used to run from the department practically before. . . But do you know why they wouldn't come before? Somebody had a good idea. You know, the government was going to maybe be in that business shortly. And if they did come in with an idea and want some assistance from government, they very seldom got it unless they gave some equity up.

A MEMBER: 50 percent.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, they come to us now and they will continue to come to us.

We now have a situation in the Province of Manitoba that we have never had before and that's the sub-DREE Agreement in the Province of Manitoba. I assure you that the Enterprise Manitoba Agreement will do all kinds of things to help small business in this province. WEE HAVE THE Rural Small Business Program which has grants up to \$30,000.00. We will pay 50 percent, up to \$30,000, to a person who wants to get into manufacturing in this province. We will pay up to \$18,000 for

expansion. Mr. Speaker, it's a partnership with the federal government. There's still the big DREE loans, but all the surveys that were done by the Feds and all the surveys done by Manitoba said we needed something to be able to work with the small businessman. So we have done it, we have set up businessmen boards to advise us.

We've set up an infrastructure program that says to the towns and municipalities, if you can have initiative to go out and find a business that will locate there, you can come to the provincial government, and we have a program of \$10 million over 5 years that will help them pay for the infrastructure for that business, to go there. We'll take the tax load off the real property taxpayer in that town. They will not have to back off. Mr. Speaker, after reading his letter, I'd never listen to him again anyway. Mr. Speaker, we will take the real tax load off people. Towns will be able to say with confidence, we do have somebody to go to for infrastructure.

We have the technology assistance programs that will be starting up. We have the small business surveys that will go into towns and do surveys for them and give them the opportunity to find out what the best business will be for their town — \$1.7 million. The small business centres will be set up. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you, we are working with the small business in this province.

Because I know I only have about three minutes left, and I could go on, and I will go on much more when we get to the other debates. I'll be glad when my Estimates come forward. I'll be glad when the Budget debate comes up because I've got more here to say, but I want to tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, this province is standing at the present time in history, the best time it's ever had for going forward. We're looking at a market to the west of us that we've never had before. We are identifying in the Department of Economic Development, the products that we should be working at to move in Manitoba. We are identifying markets and where we should be selling them. We are aggressively looking for new business but we are working with what we have here now first. I tell you this, that we won't back off talking to anybody. But, Mr. Speaker, that government over there, and that group of men, are the most doom and gloom bunch of radicals I've ever seen in my life. They'd almost be happy if this province didn't grow. And that is the success of socialism: keep it down, keep control, take the attitude that nobody else knows any better than them, take the attitude that if we loan them money, we'll finally get to own them ourselves, and don't ever get the people thinking that they have it good. Don't ever get them thinking that way. Don't ever let them think they've got an initiative. Don't ever let them think that we can have the best province in Western Canada — and we can — but not according to you fellows, not according to you fellows.

Mr. Speaker, right now we were called the Gateway to the Golden West in Manitoba at one time. We did it by warehousing here in Winnipeg and parts of Manitoba. At the present time we won't do it warehousing again because you warehouse where the market is. We'll do it with small manufacturing and we'll do it selling products to Western Canada and the parts of the States that we can, and growing gradually. We've apart, unbeknownst to me, I didn't know his department was looking at it. They found out the same thing, that he's nuts. The Minister of Finance found out the report is crazy. All independent people found out that what the . . . Don't rely on it, gentlemen. Don't go to the people with the Member for Brandon East's report because none of you will be left, because it's just rot. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources proved it and he's right, it's a bunch of rot. He dropped it and ran. So don't use it, gentlemen, or you'll be in trouble.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, given the lateness of the hour, I would be prepared to take the adjournment, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, unless another member wishes to speak in which case I would have no objection.

MR. SPEAKER: You've heard the motion of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns, I should like to announce that it is the intention that the Rules Committee will meet on Tuesday at 10:00 in Room 254.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Economic Development, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday (February 26, 1979).