

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
Tuesday, 4 March, 1980.

Time: 8:00 p.m.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the Speaker's gallery, where we have the Red River Unit of the National Association of Parliamentarians.

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

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, in my comments before 5:30, I said that the official opposition had not put into the record their policy on energy. I withdraw that statement, Mr. Speaker, and apologize, because several members of the Chamber advised me that the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet did put their policy into the record the other day. So I took the liberty during the supper hour to take a look at it and see what the honourable member did say. It's very very interesting, Mr. Speaker, to find what that learned member did put in the record.

He said here, and I quote, Mr. Speaker, from Page 128 of Hansard, Wednesday, the 27th of February: "And so, Mr. Speaker, I don't mind pointing out that if it was I who had to make the decision, that I wouldn't need any more than one oil company in Canada, and that oil company should be owned by the Canadian people. I have no hesitation, Mr. Speaker, to suggest to you that there should be only one oil company in Canada."

Now, I apologize to the members opposite for not having picked that up earlier in the debates. And right away, Mr. Speaker, on that subject matter, many interesting questions are raised as to the one oil company in this country.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: I know that the Member for Roblin is always hospitable in letting me ask him a question. Would the honourable member agree that the Member for Lac du Bonnet's position is almost identical to the position of John D. Rockefeller in 1890?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I must profess to my learned friend that my limitations of the policies of the late Mr. Rockefeller are very very limited. However, I will take the opportunity in the next few days to review the statements of that great politician. I am sure I will gain something.

But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I come to the problem of the comments of the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet of nationalizing this oil industry, and first of all, where is he going to get the money? Is he just going to walk and send the troops in and take it over? Or do the NDP intend to pay for this asset?

I just asked real quick for the member's - right away in this country we're facing a \$3 billion subsidy for everybody that resides east of the Ottawa River, due to the pricing system that we have in this country today. So, that's the first. We need \$3 billion there to subsidize those people who live east of the Ottawa River for the rest of this year. --(Interjection)-- Almost three, as I gathered the other day, Mr. Speaker.

The second possibility that came across my mind, right away they'd raise the taxes to nationalize those oil companies; that is a strong possibility. And I wonder what bigger and more taxes that the people of this province especially can bear, than they're bearing at the present time.

So, they can borrow the money. They could likely go out and borrow the capital to set up this one oil company so you go to the one gas station, you'd have one kind of oil and you'd have one oil can, one kind of grease, but nevertheless they could borrow it likely. Now how much money, Mr. Speaker, would it require to set up this one oil company in Canada today? I

suspect, Mr. Speaker, it would likely be in the neighbourhood of \$100 billion, or maybe higher. Now what would happen, Mr. Speaker, if we borrowed that \$100 billion or more on the marketplace today? Would that force the dollar down, or would it force it up, Mr. Speaker? I suspect the dollar would fall decidedly and very very quickly, and there are all kinds of indicators to show us that would happen.

The other thing, when we have been into the borrowing market for that kind of capital, Mr. Speaker, what would happen to the inflation rate that we all would have been plagued with - double-digit inflation? Would inflation move up to 12 percent, 15 percent, if we went on the money market to borrow that kind of capital to set up one oil company in Canada?

Mr. Speaker, there are some fair indicators for members of this House and other learned people to take a look at. Two weeks ago, the government of Canada, they couldn't raise up \$1.5 billion on the term money market at 11 1/2 percent. They couldn't raise \$1.5 billion. That's the money market, where it is today. At 11 1/2, not the prime rate, 11 1/2, they had to go and take \$500 million out of the Bank of Canada, Mr. Speaker.

So, I suggest to the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet and members opposite, that system is going to have to be analyzed very very carefully, because I don't think it works. I don't think it will work. I think it is just a bunch of NDP jargon. They have been dreaming in the back rooms and they are making themselves believe, of course, Mr. Speaker, that that system will work in Canada. I suggest it won't, and I suggest we'll have lots of opportunity to debate it further on this Throne Speech Debate and other matters.

Mr. Speaker, to get back to the Throne Speech which we are debating in the House tonight, I notice in the comments there is something about gasohol in here. My great friend from Minnedosa has got that as a possibility for the people. The members opposite voted against that, of course, the other night, including the Member for Inkster, who I thought at least on that one point would go with us. Unfortunately, he didn't see fit, and voted against it. As a matter of fact, if you read the document it says, Mr. Speaker, "Similarly, Manitoba's manufacturing industries stand to gain major benefits, not only from our own hydro developments, but from many other capital projects that will be undertaken in the rest of Canada, and particularly in Western Canada over the next number of years." That is in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker. Members opposite voted against it, and said, "Nay, we vote against that."

Mr. Speaker, it goes on. There is a clause here for small business. "My Ministers also inform me that the government will be making significant improvements in the support of services available to small business." Again, Mr. Speaker, last night members opposite all voted against that development and support services for small business.

Mr. Speaker, it went on here and says that, "My government is pleased as well at the encouraging recovery that has already taken place in our mining industry." It goes on and on, and says, "Financial returns in combination with approved world markets for many metals have caused mining exploration activity in Manitoba to reach its highest level in nine years." Members opposite, of course, don't believe that, don't support it. They voted against it, Mr. Speaker.

So it goes on - oil exploration, mineral exploration. Let's look at agriculture, Mr. Speaker, one of our prime number one industries in this province. And, of course, Mr. Speaker, the government has no problems in looking to the problems of agriculture, because luckily our caucus has some of the most able and dedicated and good farmers that there are in the province, sitting right on our benches here. But, Mr. Speaker, agriculture gets very special significance in this document. Grain handling - Manitoba will continue to press for improvements in the grain handling system. That's been awaiting for farmers of this province for years, Mr. Speaker. Thank the Lord if the Clark government finally did grasp that problem, and maybe didn't get it wrestled to the ground, but at least they got started. And they have better grain deliveries in Roblin constituency last year than they have had for years and years and years, yet the Clark government was only in business for a very few months.

Mr. Speaker, it goes on to say. "My government will be asking you to vote for funds to support enhanced programs to expand markets and market activities for the livestock and other agricultural products of Manitoba." Members opposite voted against that. Put it in the record, Mr. Speaker. Put it into the record that the Member for Ste. Rose doesn't support that concept at all. He has no idea, but at least he is opposed to it because the government is proposing it. The Agro Water Program will continue to provide water for livestock and crop production. The Member for Ste. Rose voted against that, Mr. Speaker. Strange! And I suspect, under that Agro Water Program, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

will be the first guy at the trough looking for money. He'll be the first one. And here, Mr. Speaker, two-faced as he could possibly be, he stands up and votes against that issue.

Mr. Speaker, tourism, let's move into tourism. "The enhanced programs of support to small business will be providing additional management and other help to small tourist operators in the coming year. In addition, through the expansion of highway transportation to communities throughout the province, my government believes it can permit more communities to benefit from that important industry." All members opposite voted against it, Mr. Speaker. They don't support tourism in this province. They don't want no tourism out in their areas, they don't want it in ours either. They don't want it for anybody in Manitoba. They just up and said no.

And it moves on, Mr. Speaker. Wildlife Management. "You will be asked to consider revisions to The Wildlife Act, both to facilitate better management of our wildlife resources and encourage land owners to maintain wildlife habitat." Long overdue, Mr. Speaker, that legislation. Fortunately, the members opposite, including the Member for St. Boniface, voted against it, Mr. Speaker.

Changes to The Clean Environment Act, the Workplace Health and Safety Act, and I heard enough speeches last year, especially from the Member for Churchill, about the Workplace Health and Safety of our province - and what do they do?. He stands up today and makes a forty minute eulogy to the record, and he stands up and votes against it, Mr. Speaker. Now how two-faced can he be? He can't have it both ways. He can stand over there and criticize all day, and yet when we offer dollars here in the Throne Speech, he says no, I'm not going to take it. Let the Member for Churchill go back and tell the labour people or the people that work in factories and that, that the NDP are opposed to moneys being expended to improve the conditions in the workplace and the health and safety of our factories.

Mine safety, Mr. Speaker. There is money in the Throne Speech for mine safety. They voted against it, Mr. Speaker. They voted against it, and so on. The SAFER Program, and we all understand it, they voted against it. Health, education, a new fee schedule with the Manitoba Medical Association - of course the Honourable Member for St. Boniface couldn't support that one. But, nevertheless, he voted against it. Personal care homes for the people in our province, newborn infants programs for newborn infants, special dental service, self-care dialysis for the health of people in this province - members opposite all voted against it, Mr. Speaker.

Outpatient, physiotherapy, dollars, Mr. Speaker, for children with learning disabilities - how many times did I hear members last year stand up and criticize us, stand up and the criticism received when the hearings were held on the new Education Act, about we are not doing enough for children with learning disabilities? The money is in there, Mr. Speaker, and the program will be documented in this House and members opposite said no, we do not support it, Mr. Speaker, we do not support it. And it goes on and on, Mr. Speaker.

There are dollars in here for increasing the expansion of the French language in our province. I am surprised that the Member for Inkster and the Member for St. Boniface, and especially the Member for Ste. Rose, voted against that, Mr. Speaker. And so on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, does that not indicate to the members of this House and to the people of this province that this government is functioning properly, that they are putting programs before the people in this Throne Speech that they have been asking for. Mr. Speaker, no, members opposite say no, we are not offering the people anything. They are starving to death in this province. There are no sheets on the beds in the hospitals, they are not getting fed properly. Show it to me in that document, Mr. Speaker, where any of those allegations can be founded.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is typical of the Socialists, the doom and gloom of the Socialist people. They go around this province with their scare tactics and tell us what a terrible place it is to live. It is surprising that some people do believe them. But, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe them, and the people in Roblin don't believe them. So I look with keen interest to the next election, so we can fight this and other matters in that campaign.

The Council for the Aged is mentioned in the Throne Speech. They voted against that, Mr. Speaker. There is a matter - I am an old age pensioner now - since the last session, I got my first old age pension cheque. And, Mr. Speaker, I welcome this government putting that into this Throne Speech, it is long overdue in this province. I don't know what the New Democrats and Socialists were doing the eight years they were in office. They never forgot about the aged. Sure, they will yak and talk about it, but they didn't show any concrete evidence that they were serious about the problem of the aged in this province. Mr. Speaker, it is right in there.

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

The Advisory Council for the Status of Women - and I heard the new member today, from Fort Garry, I apologize, from Fort Rouge, standing on her feet today and worrying about that program. All she had to do was read it in the Throne Speech and vote for it and it would have been solved that way. But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, she voted against it, she stood up and opposed that program that is right in the legislation. Now I don't know whether --(Interjections)-- I don't like to be too critical of the honourable member because she is new in the House, and she doesn't maybe understand what this document means and things like that, and I do apologize to her maybe, but I am sure now she will take a look at it after I have drawn it to her attention and maybe she will ask to have her vote changed so she could support us on this program.

Mr. Speaker, the next paragraph, crime prevention in this province. Is there any member over there that does not support dollars for crime prevention in this province? They voted against it, every one of them, Mr. Speaker.

Let's look over it - Community residences for the retarded people in our province. Are you for that or against it? You stood up, every one of you, and voted against it. That is a good program, and one that is long overdue in our province.

Expanded facilities for the mentally ill, Mr. Speaker, that is in the Throne Speech. Members opposite and the great Leader of the Official Opposition with his new hairstyle, even he voted against that one.

Mr. Speaker, programs for the north, programs for the native citizens, programs for parks, programs for sports and recreation, and so the list goes on and on and on. Mr. Speaker, can you possibly believe that members that have been sitting in this House, especially as long as the Member for St. Boniface, would have the courage and the audacity to stand up and vote against that Throne Speech? But, for some unknown reason, something must be bothering him in the twilight of his political career, like mine. He's got his courage screwed up, and he voted against it.

Mr. Speaker, there is a program here for housing problems for the older neighbourhoods in the city that they have been waiting for. Mr. Speaker, it is a tragedy. And of course, Mr. Speaker, right away they come back and they say, where are we going to get the dollars for these programs. Where is the money coming from, Mr. Speaker?

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

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'll just quote an article out of the Winnipeg Free Press on February 29th. Look, can you read that? "Brighter days for Manitoba". Brighter days for Manitoba. Is that because we've got a bunch of Socialists sitting over there, or is that because we've got the Tories sitting over here? It's because we've got Tories here, that's why there's brighter days in Manitoba. The provincial government's third-quarter - read this, Mr. Speaker - the provincial government's third-quarter financial statement may be a portent of brighter days for that province. And it goes on and shows what our projected deficit was, and instead of \$122.6 as forecast, we're going to have an increase expect . . . where is it? . . . with a deficit of \$73.3 million instead of the \$122.6.

Mr. Speaker, let's go through this document here and . . .

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is reading from an article, would he read who the article is quoting when that statement is being made? Who is the . . .

MR. McKENZIE: It's from the Winnipeg Free Press, and there is nobody quoted at all. No quotations. I'll table it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Roblin may proceed.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, look at this one. What day was this - the 29th, too. Manitoba plant base lauded. And you're worrying about . . . It says here, "Mr. John Bowman, himself --(Interjections)-- It's February 29, 1980, from the Winnipeg Free Press and I'll table it. --(Interjection)-- It's an article from a Mr. Bowman. He said, "Manitoba has the west strongest secondary manufacturing base." In the next paragraph of this document, Mr.

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

Bowman says, "manufacturers realize this", Mr. Speaker, "they can expand or establish plants here at less cost than in Saskatchewan or less cost than in Alberta." And who is talking about the doom and gloom of this province, that we are not able to pay for our programs. He went on here, Mr. Speaker, to say . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I realize that it's after supper. The hours do crowd on in the evening, but we would like to have just one member speaking at a time please. The Honourable Member for Roblin has the floor.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, this article says in manufacturing alone there were 4,000 more jobs in the province last year through new and expanded operations. What does it say? Shipments are up 29 percent. Mr. Speaker, there is no problem for us to find the dollars with a booming economy such as that to implement those programs that are in the Throne Speech.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to spend the next hour, with leave, if I could, to try and prove to members opposite, that they actually made a bunch of fools of themselves last night by voting twice against programs which this government has for the people of the province. And they stood up - not a one of them, Mr. Speaker, supported us.

Let's go through this statistic rigmarole that we've heard here for days of population, migration and employment. Or bankruptcies. I've got reams of stuff if you want to have statistics put into the record. But as I said earlier in my comments, Mr. Speaker, statistics are not that important in these debates in this House, because you can make them read anything you like. Mr. Speaker, it's much better to put the programs on the table, put the cost dollars with them, find out if the people want those programs, and then implement them, rather than stand up and argue here all day whether it's three percent or two percent, or there's no percentage at all.

So Mr. Speaker, I will finish my remarks at a later time in the Budget Debate. I apologize to the people of this province for the members opposite not supporting that Throne Speech. They are the ones that are going to regret it, Mr. Speaker, not the people of this province.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, it's always a pleasure following the Member for Roblin. There's a lot of levity in the air after his speech. It's much better, it's much improved, over the bitterness and hate that was after the First Minister spoke last night.

I'd like to quote the rest of this article. The part that was read was the part that's underlined in yellow. The other part says, "the provincial" - that's the part that was left out by my honourable friend - "the provincial government's third-quarter financial statement may be a portent of brighter days, according to revised estimates." I rest my case.

Mr. Speaker, I've watched this debate with interest, and I must say that I feel - I didn't think this would be possible, but I feel sorry for the PC this year after the speeches that I've heard. There is no doubt that this is a party in complete panic; it's a group of desperate people who are now, after only their third year - the first year was blame the former government, then blame the feds - that was taken away from them, and now they're on the defence. For, if they attack, it is to personal name-calling, personal ridicule and so on, like we saw last night.

Mr. Speaker, it would appear that there is a complete reversal of their position. I say "appear", because I am sure that you will find when the next election comes that many of these programs that my honourable friend read will be found on the drawing board, or will be being studied by commissions and task forces and so on. Since 1977, we've heard nothing but restraint. It was cost first, and then need. How many times did we hear that? We heard it from the Minister of Health so many times. And this was done, they wanted to have this restraint, they were withholding money from Ottawa, especially in the health field. But then on February - well, let's see if there is not a complete reversal? On February 2nd, the Premier of this province said, and I quote from the - I think that is the Free Press, I am not sure - it is Jim Burgoyne, Sun staff writer, "Premier Sterling Lyon said Saturday that if he had any criticism of the proposed Federal Progressive Conservative Budget, it would be that it is not tough enough". That was on the 2nd, the Federal Budget wasn't tough enough. On the 21st of February, we were given this panic-inspired document, and all of a sudden there is no more restraint, and all the needs will be answered.

Now this is what? There were 19 days. Well, what happened during these 19 days that would make this government change so fast? Is it that inflation has been licked? Well, Mr.

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

Speaker, is it that we no longer have these high interest rates? The Minister of Finance told us today, not today a few days ago, that we can expect more of the same. Is it that the fight against unemployment is finished? Is it that the deficit has been wiped out? In fact the deficit since 1977 has increased over \$800 for each man, woman and child. It went from \$3,130 to \$3,968, Mr. Speaker. This is the government that said that they were going to reduce the deficit; and the deficit has increased since they took office, and especially after getting much more money from Ottawa than we ever received.

Over 21,000 people left Manitoba, and we are not going to play with words on that. They say that more people left Manitoba, but more were coming in. But the fact is that there are less people now residing in Manitoba than we had before. And you remember the joke when we were on the other side, and they were telling us that the people would leave because of our party, because of our government. Well, you know what they used to say, let the last person turn out the lights. I wonder if the Premier will turn out the lights.

If they say, well, it is not that we are not getting any more people, there are not more people leaving, but there are more coming in. Well, they have been a failure in so many things and they are even a failure as the great breeder as they were telling us. They were telling us that they were going to be the great breeders and now there are less people in Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Speaker, why? Why this complete turn-around? Why, Mr. Speaker, from the 2nd to the 21st? You saw that things aren't any better, things are worse. Well, Mr. Speaker, between the 2nd and the 21st, there was a date of the 18th of February. That explains the panic, Mr. Speaker, and that explains why this is such a mishmash, this speech, they only had three days to change it and to write another speech. They claim that they are concerned, that they are confident, but it is quite obvious that they are full of panic.

First, there was the May election, and what was supposed to be a PC sweep from 11 to 14 instead went down to seven. That was the first thing that caused a bit of concern. Then the First Minister was saying that "I am 100 percent convinced that we are doing it right, I don't regret what we are doing for one second." There was no change at all.

The Minister of Housing also today told us during the Throne Speech, was chastizing us for that, and said the opposite - he was quite incensed during the last election when the NDP showed that they were quite happy with the results and he said, "If you read the newspaper, the newspaper said the Conservatives are in power. Do you understand that?" he asked, taunting the opposition. Well, I guess he can't say that now. But that was in May. --(Interjection)-- That's right, you can't. Then the Provincial Election also was a decline in the vote, that was the second step.

You know, you had in River Heights, where you had a very good candidate, a very popular man who still, I think, lost about 16 percent of the vote, had a reduction of 16 percent of the vote. And the NDP lost 1.75, the Liberals gained about 18. In Rossmere, the PCs were about the same. In fact, it was practically the same all over - and this was a seat that only Schreyer could keep apparently. And that, again, was a very popular well-known councillor that ran for the PCs and he didn't improve anything. In Fort Rouge, again the Conservatives had three well-known good candidates. Mr. McDonald, who ran previously against Mr. Axworthy, lost 6.48 percent of the vote, and there the NDP gained over 6 percent.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that was the second step. The First Minister then said, "Well, there is still a Liberal, a Conservative, and an NDP, it doesn't matter." But he knew better than that, and he was quite concerned.

Then finally, on February 18th, there was Clark's crushing defeat and Manitoba lost two seats and nearly six percent decrease in popular vote. Well, they were still unconcerned. It didn't mean that much. And they tried to make the public believe that they weren't concerned, but their credibility will suffer if they keep on trying to keep this attitude or this pretence.

The PC doctrinaire policies fail miserably, but they still won't admit it, and they'll do anything to survive, so this is why we see this apparent change. Now, as was said this afternoon, Clark went down to defeat because of his harsh and unfair policies over the working people in this country, and his lack of leadership, but in defeat he was still very much respected, Mr. Speaker. He was respected because he had the courage of his conviction. He went down swinging and fighting for something that he believed in, something that we do not find here in Manitoba with the Conservative Party. They talked about restraint and all of a sudden they are ready to give everything away. I dare say that we will see probably very close to what - to \$2 billion in the Estimates in an hour or so when we get this information.

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

Now the Premier is the same arrogant self. He dismisses all opposition as stupid. If they don't agree with him, he is stupid, and that worries me. That worries me very much because, first of all, as I say, it is his personal and name-calling, he talks about the appearance of the members. It was a speech last night that very seldom have I seen any speeches in the House in my 22 years here, especially I have never seen it coming from the Premier of the province, where there was so much hate and venom. You could feel it in the air, you can feel it all over. It was just McCarthyism at its best, the accusation and everything that we had. Read Hansard and you will see what happened. He was just a wild doctrinaire paranoid egomaniac that was fighting for his political life and fighting, also, to try to stay in power, insisting that whoever would dare try to wrestle this God-given mantle of Premier from his royal shoulders should be punished.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that he is the least popular of all Premiers, and that he was invited, or at least suggested to him, encouraged, to stay away during the last federal election. And now, after insulting everybody, he has the gall to appeal to Liberal-minded Manitobans to support him to beat the Socialists, which is the lowest form of human beings - he, the most doctrinaire of all Manitobans.

I'm worried, Mr. Speaker. I'm worried to see how many stupid, ignorant people there are in Manitoba. After listening to the First Minister last night, I am worried very much. In 1974, there were 52 percent of those people in Manitoba that were stupid, ignorant, that didn't know any better. And then an increase, in 1979, to 56 percent, and finally, there are 62 percent of these stupid people in Manitoba who will not support the PC, either federally. It's enough to make people worry.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to see - I think it would make a good choice for the people of Manitoba if we still talk about the restraint a bit. There's nothing wrong with restraint, and there is no doubt in my mind that we should have some restraint during a period of devaluation of the dollar, of inflation, and so on, we should have some restraint. But a fair restraint, a restraint applied fairly, not restraint for only the less fortunate.

It reminds me of the words of John Paul II when he visited the United States, and I think that we should think about this, and that makes a lot of sense. He said, you must never be content to leave them just the crumbs from the feast. You must take of your substance and not just of your abundance in order to help. When you said tighten the belt, it was always tighten the belt of the guy at the bottom of the ladder, or the middle. It wasn't the top, it wasn't the people that were saying tighten the belt. They were all right, they kept on drinking their Crown Royal, driving their big cars. There was no problem there at all.

Here in Manitoba, we're talking about Socialists, they're worried that we are Socialists, and it's said with so much, as I said, venom and hate, and despises us so much. In Manitoba here we have a bunch of plutocrats on this side that are governing, this is it, it's government - I might explain to the stupid members on this side of the House that it is the government by wealth and also a controlling class of wealthy people. And this is what we get, Mr. Speaker.

The PC have never understood this need - they never did for the last years - the need of the sick, the aged, the underprivileged, of the handicapped. Cost first, then need. It's too bad, but we must tighten the belt. Tighten the belt all the time. But the poor people, who leave in excess of a quarter-of-a-million dollars, their need must come first. We had a special session to take care of their needs. That was more important, the large corporations, their needs came first.

The employment, the people on minimum or marginal income, the welfare recipient, the old age pensioner - cost first, then need. Tighten up that belt, Mr. Speaker. The high income group, the Premier, the Cabinet Ministers, the MLAs, we'll take care of their needs. The MLAs and the Cabinet Ministers, we abuse so much when we're in power, we had too many Cabinets, there is the same number of Cabinet members. I think there are more Executive Assistants, and I don't think they do anything for their money. They don't know what's going on their department, they have to ask questions in the House. That's one thing. And then they're on the same board and everything.

And there was a show-off play, a ridiculous play. We were pegged, the salaries of the MLAs were indexed and the first year, that is frozen. What a show-off play. If that's ever played for the . . . what a ridiculous thing, and you all know it, and you all agree with me. And it's going to take you a long time to get back. That was ridiculous. It was a fair salary. --(Interjection)--

Yes. And now they're talking about more pay for the MLAs. The rural members got \$40. Even the Cabinet Ministers, who have a full-time job, last year received \$40 more. Mind you, the year before was frozen. And all of a sudden, \$40, they're creating Deputy Chairmen, and

all kinds of things. Everybody's got a job. Everybody's got a job on this side. When they were sitting on this side, what did they say to us about that? And it's worse, and now they want an increase, not only for the Cabinet Ministers, but even for the MLAs. And the pension has been increased, and so on. And these are the people that remember, cost first, need after.

Well, the people that are in this bracket, I guess need a little more. Oh yes, and then we're going to cut down to a four day week, cut down a Question Period, the rest of the Question Period, have all these members ask questions to try to take away from the opposition because they don't want to hear what we have to say.

The need, then cost, that has been the doctrine, that has been the policy of this Conservative government, except when it comes to a selected few. Don't rock the boat, they tell us. Don't disturb the pecking order. Be good, abiding citizens. That's what we hear. You know, when you're in the driver's seat, it's very easy to say those kind of things.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we should give credit where credit is due. If the Conservatives failed so miserably in so many things, I must say that they have no equal in their lack of leadership, in their flying of kites, in their indecision and also in taking undue credit. Since 1977, this government has ruled by task force, by commission, by studies, by flying kites. Invariably the public is made to expect the worst. Then the measures are toned down a bit, bring some form of relief to those expecting the worst, but they're catching on to that also.

The Minister in the Department of Health has been misleading the public more than anybody else. You know, they're talking about two-faced, there are two faces to that Minister. He is polite, he's well-dressed, he's neat, he's smiling all the time, he's the best PR man on this - in fact, he's the best PR man in the House. He can wring out the last drop of publicity out of anything. I understand that they're talking about, I think about 17 or 18 official openings for Seven Oaks, every floor and every ward will be opened separately - more ribbons to cut. And this is the place they didn't want at all.

But on the other side, he also is full of these personal attacks. Mind you, he's a little different. He will come to you after and smile and kind of excuse himself until the next time, then he will hit you again below the belt if he can. He certainly can't make a decision, he hasn't made a decision since he took over this portfolio, and now he's taking credit for everything. --(Interjection)--

No, he went in a complete circle. You want slander, okay let's see. He went in a complete circle. Remember, Sir, in 1977, (1) this department had been mismanaged, we had thrown money away, there were all kinds of horror stories. During the Estimates we asked them to show us that, but no, there were no horror stories, no, certainly no horror stories in that department. It had not been mismanaged - in fact it was very mismanaged - he didn't mean that department, it was other departments. That was No. (2). No. (3), the cost, then the need. He froze the construction, first of all, fired anyone suspected of having supported the NDP, he reduced the health services, and he can say what he wants, and the first Minister can say what he wants, and the Member for Roblin can get up and tell us about the wonderful things they do, read the paper. Read what Dean Naimark has to say. Read what Victoria Hospital has to say. Read what St. Boniface Hospital has to say. Read what Concordia - and those are people that are so afraid that they'll be cut a little more, but there's a limit, and they are saying, what's going on? They are saying the danger that we see now.

Now all of a sudden we've had - and everything centers on the eighteenth of February. Now all of a sudden the purse strings will be loosened. They are going to be big spenders. The Member for Lakeside said awhile ago, "just imagine a few years ago I was throwing money away as the former Minister of Health" - and he sat in his seat a few days ago and he said that I was a piker compared to the now Minister of Health, who is doing all these wonderful things and they applauded. They thought that was wonderful.

Now, Sir, as I said, he went the complete circle. Now he's approving the policies that we had, our own policies and he's not even trying to change them that much. And this is what you think is so wonderful. So the policies, the decisions that were made and announced here as policy, things that were not dreams, things that were going to be done immediately and things that we started immediately and this was done just a few years ago.

I've got some of the list here. Take the Seven Oaks Hospital. How many times would they run this thing down and now you hear what the people from Concordia are saying that they need more beds and you'll be very pleased to see that hospital, the Seven Oaks Hospital. It makes a lot of sense. I don't know exactly what you've changed out there. I know that there were going to be some personal care homes, some rehab beds that you haven't got now. These people are taking the place of others in acute beds. You've got something that can't be managed at the Health Sciences Centre. It is too big. That could have been reduced a bit.



Tuesday, March 4, 1980

The whole thing was going to be fixed. You're going to spend money at the Municipal Hospitals also. Those are things that we had started.

Day care. You ruined the day care and now you're starting - I don't blame the present Minister - it is obvious that he doesn't understand that program of day care, Mr. Speaker. It's obvious when he said that maintenance grant would make it difficult, if he increased that, would make it difficult for the people attending these places. It doesn't make sense at all. Well all right, that is going to be ruined. Then they are saying they are putting in the Throne Speech and we hear a big announcement, big press conference, day care for the elderly. That was a new concept. That was something that we had been doing for years. We had it at the Tache Hospital in St. Boniface and we had it in Winnipeg and it was working quite well.

Then they talk about the lotteries. When they were on this side of the House they did everything to defeat that lottery, to knock that program down with their friends, the middleman, who is still there and making more money than ever. And now they are going to take that money for the sports programs, the programs that we had and they're giving a partnership to the Sports Federation, the greatest saviour and they are reducing by the same amount the programs that they were doing and sponsoring and financing out of their own Estimates. That's not there any more, so what have you done? And then the sports and cultural facilities, they are going to help with the maintenance. We built those places or the lottery funds built those places.

Whether they are out to destroy the children's dental program, a program that was going very well, that's going very well in Saskatchewan. They made all kinds of commitments to the dental nurses. What are they doing? And some of the members sitting on that side know what I am talking about. They don't dare stand up but they know that in their constituency the people are mad because of this change. Because they had to deliver to the dental profession that didn't need that at all.

Home care, well home care is just a shell of what it was. The best home care program in Canada, what is it now? You haven't got the staff. It takes weeks and months to send somebody to find out what is needed and then you are sorry you haven't got the staff. And as I said the day care, pharmacare - you're putting it in there, you're reducing certain taxes and then the people that need it the most, the people from personal care homes, they're the ones that you increase their taxes or increase the per diem also. And the day care, the people in the middle-class, read the editorial that was in the paper not too long ago.

Pharmacare, well who's going to - very few now will get anything out of pharmacare with this change.

Now we've talked about propriety nursing homes and they tried like they always do. They tried, the Minister and the Conservative Party tried to say we're against private enterprise. We're not against private enterprise. We don't blame private enterprise. We're not saying that they can't do a good job. We are saying that there is no place for profit making, for salary, it is not the same thing as profit making, at the expense of somebody. Of course nobody is going to work for nothing when they can't afford it. They have to live. That is assinine and ridiculous to make a statement like my friend from Dauphin made this afternoon.

We are talking about profit. Why? Because what is private enterprise? Private enterprise and the system would collapse completely if it didn't work like that. What is it? Profit, making money and then also you've got to look at what you have to pay to borrow that money. That's another thing. And of course that commitment was made that we were going to go ahead in Selkirk. The need was there. My honourable friend the Minister knew it but he gave it to private enterprise. You know, it's going to look good on the books. They won't owe any money. The deficit will go lower. You know what they're going to pay? They're going to pay by the heavy per diem rate for the rest of their life in that place. But then even at that, even if they knew that they would get what? Construction costs, all the costs, the capital costs, the cost of borrowing money, the profit and then lastly the money if there was anything left to run that place. Of course they couldn't build with the rates of interest being so high, so they waited. So the need was there but we had to wait for private enterprise. And I don't blame private enterprise. You or my friend to my left here or myself, if we had ventures in a profit business of course we would want to make our profit. This is aimed at the government and read the books that were written about the abuse that you have in the States about those personal care homes. There is no room for that.

You know, we say okay, even those that don't believe in socialism say well at least those that can help themselves, the underprivileged, the older people and so on, let's take care of them. You know what they do in some of those places because they have a shortage of staff, they keep them so drugged that they don't move. It's quiet. You can go there, they're all

sleeping. They are drugged. They are drugged because they haven't got the staff to take care of them and they can then start feeding them only two meals a day. That's easy. That's what good . . . You laugh but you wouldn't want your relatives to be in any of those places. You wouldn't want that. And why not, somebody asked him? That was supposed to be a big joke. Why not have private hospitals? They have it in the States. It's exactly the same thing. It's for profit.

You know, I was in Hawaii with my daughter and my grandson just a few weeks ago. My grandson developed an earache. My daughter who is a nurse, knew exactly what it was. She needed some kind of medicine, some drops. She didn't have any prescription. She had to go to the hospital. She told them what it was. The doctor said, yes, you are right, \$55 please. Then she had to go and get the drug. Do you want this in Canada? Well this is what you are going to have. This is why we are saying that there is no place - this is not an attack on the free enterprise, on the private sector, but certainly . . . what we did, we accepted these non-profit organizations such as the Oddfellows and such as these other groups, we weren't trying to own these buildings at all. We didn't, we were having those non-profit organizations - and you and my friend were talking about volunteers. What a better way than that than to have these people run these things?

You know, talking about my friend the Minister of Health, - and I'm envious, I'll admit it. I've never seen anybody in this House get the press coverage, the good press that he's had over the years. You can look in the paper any time, his picture is there three or four times a week, if not more. The same rehashed, you see the same thing, and it is always well-written. One person dare say something, you saw the way he reacted. He is getting to be just as much an egomaniac as his boss. And that is when they start insulting people, when things don't go well.

Let's look at . . . there was a big day the other day, and everybody clapped. The Minister gave us his capital program. You want to look at this, you want us to look at it together? Okay. First of all, there was Phase 1 of the Health, at the General Hospital, I guess. There was the Phase 1 there and we have had Phase 1 announced. I don't know if it is exactly the same amount of money, and they did the same thing as Roblin did a few years ago. They announced that the Health Science Centre was going to become the hospital in North America, more research there, everybody would come from there. It would be another Mayo. Of course, the government changed. How could government say we are going to do Phase 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. You can plan, but you should announce the first phase and when you are ready, maybe the second phase and so on. That never happened. So they announced Phase 1 and we did the same thing, and that was being done, except they had to call somebody else to look at it when we had spent enough time trying to sort this thing out. It was very difficult, and it is difficult because it is a real concrete jungle out there. There was no planning when this was done, or very poor planning, and we are paying for it now.

Now the five-year plan, the five-year program, that I announced, besides the Health Centre. There was Dauphin - that was in our plan. That was announced by me in 1976. Hamiota, MacGregor, Rivers, Rosburn, Ste. Annes, Selkirk, Winnipeg Municipal Hospital, Misericordia, the Odd Fellows, St. Vital, psychiatric beds for children - all of those. You know, what wasn't in there that were mentioned? There were three of them, Lundar for one. Well, Lundar - and my friend will deal with this - that we had Ashern and Eriksdale, now they have got Lundar in the constituency of Lakeside, which doesn't make any sense at all. The Minister of Health in Ontario closed those small hospitals. We haven't even got acute beds, and we are going to have a personal care home when it is only a few miles from this. If this is not political, I have never seen it.

I can say that that five-year plan, that wasn't one of these places even suggested by any members on our side. This was the Commission and the experts of the Commission, their recommendation, and I would like to know why. I wouldn't dare ask the Chairman of the Commission, he would be fired, not the Chairman, but the General Manager, but I would like to know why and I would - well, I know that they didn't change their mind. I know that was a direction from the Minister.

So that leaves - you know what was left and I don't know, there was Elkhorn and Reston. I can tell you that we had a lot more. Let's go back to the last year's program. In the five-year program, there were the Interlake, Carman, St. Claude, Pilot Mound, Crystal City, St. Joseph's Home. They were all there, they were all there, and the big announcement. Gosh! You know, we sure missed a bet. If I would have known that we would have got these kind of press conferences for these things, I would have had to have a couple of assistants just to be at the conference like my honourable friend is.

What about those that they were too far gone and they weren't affected by the freeze when the Minister took over? Well, he is taking credit for that, such as Arborg, Birtle, Boissevain, Deloraine, Emerson, Flin Flon, Lac du Bonnet, Melita, Portage la Prairie, Teulon, Meadowood, Holy Family, Tache Nursing Home, and yes, Seven Oaks. That was too far down the pipe, and that was all in the plan, Mr. Speaker.

That five-year plan would be practically completed by now, it would be practically finished. But then it was bad management, where with bad management they had this five-year plan, and the need was there. Well, they waited, they froze everything. That disturbed the economy, it didn't meet the needs of the people, and now they are announcing it and God, there is the Saviour! What did he say? They are going to do it with vigour. What was it? Without delay, vigour, what were his words? I had them here somewhere, with vigour, compassion - compassion, and speed. Oh yeah, "We are moving with vigour, compassion and as fast as possible." Why now, after three years? Vigour, compassion and speed, what was the matter with speed, compassion and vigour in those days? What was the matter in meeting the needs? I could go on, Mr. Speaker, and mention these others projected in our five-year program that so far have been left out, and there are some.

You know that the government waited, they waited for inflation to add to the costs, and that is approximately 10 percent a year, added on and on and on. You know, that you had, I am not, I don't want to exaggerate things, there are certain things that we had started that have continued. The Minister started a few things last year and he is talking about some now. But if that been started, if there hadn't been February 18th, this wouldn't be started. You know, what you would pay, you would pay now \$197 million instead of \$135, and then you would have to add more and more every year of the incompleting portion. And this five-year program would be finished this year, maybe a few things next year, that was the whole thing would be finished. I am including only Phase 1 at the Health Science Centre.

Besides that, how much did we lose of this \$19 million under The Federal Health Resources Fund Act? There was a limit on that, and I suspect that maybe we lost \$3 million or \$4 million. Well, what's a million, you know?

Also we had good reason to believe that we were going to receive extra allocation on the project under the program, Projects of National Significance, and I dare say that you lost that also. You know that is good management, and that is exactly what you did.

There is nothing new in that government. If there is something new, it was something was being developed like this special care for infants, and so on. This was done, this was being worked with the MMA, and it difficult because they had problems between the, they had internal political problems also.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

My honourable friend mentioned Deer Lodge also, as if this was all set. There is the change and apparently there is nothing settled out there, they are still negotiating. They are still worrying about the Legion, and this is one concern that we had. But when we talked about the Legion, I mean when we talk about Deer Lodge, tell us, don't just say this is going to cost so much money. Tell us what the deal is and how much money, because we were negotiating pretty good. We were getting - I don't remember exactly what the amount was - but we were getting a fair share of funds from the Federal Government to take over Deer Lodge.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that, I'm not going to exaggerate and say that everything, nothing is new, but there is very little. There are no policies, new ideas, I think that was the only thing that was said partly. Right in the Throne Speech it said that you are keeping on the work of other governments, like succeeding governments do to a point. But you froze everything, it cost you millions of dollars more, the needs of people weren't met, people left the province, the construction worker had no work at all, and all of a sudden, you are still saying that you have restraint - No, you are not saying it too loudly. I haven't heard the word "restraint" mentioned from that side of the House not once this session, not once. You know, and we know, and you know we know, and we know you know that the 18th of February caused all that, because inflation is the same, the high cost, the high rate of interest is the same, everything and you owe debt. And I am very anxious to see the Estimates. And I think I'm not too wrong if I say that you're going to be pretty close to the \$2 billion, in there.

And this is an idea - the Minister said okay, the way it is written, the press release, he is talking about, the government said, we are going to reduce the deficit. Period. Now, they

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

are talking about the yearly deficit that they created themselves. They say that they inherited that deficit from us, but they are pleased when they reduced the deficit that they created themselves. That has nothing to do with us. And they received more money, Mr. Speaker, way more money, much more money, than we ever received from the federal government under this block funding, that they are not spending on health.

Mr. Speaker, we can go on and on, but when I say that this government has panicked, and if they argued ideas and policies and said you're wrong, and fight for that, but it's not that, it's a personal vendetta. It's McCarthyism at its best.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be nice. It's a pleasure to have an opportunity to take part again in the Throne Speech debate. As customary, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate you again on being appointed to the responsible position that you occupy in that Chair and to keep order in this House and keep things moving as smoothly and as impartially as you do and have done over the past several years.

I also congratulate the Mover and the Seconder of the Speech from the Throne. The new Member for River Heights accredited himself very well in his moving of the Address from the Throne, and the Member for Emerson suitably seconded it.

I would also, Mr. Speaker, welcome the new members to the House, the Member for Fort Rouge and the Member for Rossmere, in addition to the new member on this side of the House for River Heights. I know that they will soon learn the ways of this Chamber, and I'm sure before the session is finished, will have some doubts maybe as to why they fought so hard to gain office. But I'm sure they will do well in this House and do a job for their constituents that they are capable of doing, because the confidence has been shown in them by the voters and I know they will respect that confidence and do their constituents proud.

To the Member for Elmwood, I have been elected three times in hard-fought battles against innumerable odds on each occasion, and I have been victorious because the people in my area are free-thinking, Conservative-minded people that know right from wrong, and elected me with a large majority on each occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I would also be remiss if I did not congratulate the new members in Cabinet from among our ranks. I know they will do an excellent job in the responsibilities that have been given to them, and we look forward to many years of good government under their Ministership in the various portfolios that they have been selected to carry. I know that they join a strong team under the leadership of our Premier, Sterling Lyon, and will do well to keep the ship of state in a strong position and show the forward thrust that's been so evident in the past two years in the province.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to belabour the Throne Speech. I don't want to thrash old straw, it's been gone over and over many times in the past two or three days, but I cannot help, Mr. Speaker, but mention the positive steps that have been taken in the various items outlined in the Speech from the Throne. There is no question that the responsibility has been brought back into government and the finances have been brought under control to a very large degree. We are still facing a small deficit, but that is miniscule in the eyes of what was faced by the Premier of this province and the Cabinet when we took over the reigns of government in 1977. --(Interjection)-- Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's been mentioned by the Member for Rock Lake, in 1969 the Budget showed a surplus of some \$40 million.

There was \$40 some million left in the pot for them when they took over and then, in a short eight years, Mr. Speaker, it didn't take them long to whittle that away and leave us with a deficit throughout the years of some \$191 million, or is it \$221 million? That question has been debated before, and I won't get into that, so I'll give you the benefit of the doubt on that side of the House. Mr. Speaker, I'll say it's \$191 million that we inherited.

It's a terrible burden to be faced with, Mr. Speaker, when you take over the reigns of government and have been led to understand that the deficit was such and such a figure and then you call in your people, as the Premier mentioned in his address the other night, and find out that you're just in a terrible financial bind. The cupboard is literally bare, and you have to pull yourself together and say, how are we going to get this province back into some strength financially? That is the problem that the Premier of this province was faced with when he took over government in October 1977. --(Interjection)-- When I'm finished my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I'd be glad to accommodate the Member for Inkster, because I know he enjoys debate.

Mr. Speaker, that was the problem faced by the Premier of this province in 1977. There was no question about it, that some form of fiscal responsibility had to be returned to government, if you call it restraint, you call it financial management, call it what you will. It happened to be called restraint at that particular time. But there was no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that that was necessary. The province was floundering in a sea of debt. The country is floundering in that sea of debt today. And I don't know all the answers, and I'm sure the honourable members on that side don't know them all. They might know some of them, but I'm not too sure they know as many as we know on this side.

But something has to be done to right this country of ours, and particularly this Province of Manitoba, because we have been on a wild spending spree. The previous speaker talked about hospitals. My God, it's no wonder they didn't build them, Mr. Speaker. They ran out of money. I don't think they could have borrowed any more money. They borrowed money for Hydro, they borrowed for this, they had the capital debt figure so high, they had the province so far in debt, we just didn't know which way to turn and they didn't know which way to turn.

And that was the problem, Mr. Speaker, faced by the Premier when he took over the reigns of government in 1977, and it was an extremely difficult task to try and get the message to the people of this province that we had to tighten our belts and stop this wild spending spree.

An effort was made by the federal Progressive Conservative Party. The people in this country apparently, just aren't ready to accept that. I know during the election I said to friends of mine, you know I'm getting the message that people are saying on the street, my God, the government wants to start paying their bills. If they start paying their bills they're going to ask me to pay mine and I can't afford it. I've been living on credit for so long I want to keep living on credit. Well, Mr. Speaker, the great economist from Brandon East will understand that. At least I think he will, that you cannot keep spending forever. You cannot keep spending forever. You have to put governments in the same light as your household and you can not spend your way to prosperity.

And I don't disagree with deficit financing to a degree. I don't disagree with borrowing money because I've been involved in that particular operation for some years. And there are many, many responsible people that it's been the lifeline to the better life. They've had to borrow on certain occasions and they've been able to turn that into good fortune and they've been able to pay back their borrowings and gone on to greater profits, - that I know is a very bad word over there. But if you've got profits, you're able to pay your bills and you're able to put a little bit away and some day if you are fortunate enough to live long enough to retire, you can look after yourself with some help from government, if it's needed. There are some of us that hope we can get along without being helped by the government, but there's no question about it, that there are those that cannot do that and they have to be looked after and I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there is no government more receptive to helping those who can not help themselves than those on this side of the House in the Conservative Party.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many things in the Throne Speech, as I say my colleagues before me on both sides of the House have gone over them. I think the Member for Roblin did an excellent job on highlighting what we feel was an excellent Speech from the Throne. The members over there have done a great deal to tear it apart, not too successfully, I might say, but they have made their effort, no doubt and being in opposition that's their prerogative to do that.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, one of the things naturally that is near and dear to my heart is the plant in my particular constituency they were trying to get operating again and I was glad to see in the Speech from the Throne that there'll be an effort made to promote the practical use of gasohol and other renewable energy resources as well as other conservation measures to preserve the energy or the petrol problem that we have in this country today. This is an extremely lucrative business apparently across the border to the south of us. There are plants being built in Grafton, North Dakota, which aren't very far from here. They're able to get rid of every bit of their product. We have a plant in my particular constituency that is capable of producing a gasohol product. We've been encouraging the people involved with it or the government to take some further steps to encourage this either as a viable plant in production or as a method of researching the product to see if it would be particularly useful in our agricultural industry or in whatever other vehicles it may be practical to use it in.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the Speech from the Throne was a very worthwhile document and I support it wholeheartedly. There are great measures in there for small business, research, health care, education. I can go on and on. The document was well put together, well delivered, and I am sure will be supported unquestionably by those on this side of the House

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

and I think if the members on that side reflect on what the Member for Roblin just told them a short while ago, that they will have some second thoughts on the final vote tonight and we may see several standing up on that side of the House and supporting the Speech from the Throne, particularly, Mr. Speaker, the one independent member over there that is free thinking.

And I must say, Mr. Speaker, on looking across there I'm always reminded when I look at the new Member for Fort Rouge, I can't help but think of the old song, the Lonely Little Petunia in the Onion Patch, because, Mr. Speaker, I just would give her a word of warning not to be taken in by all of the information and suggestions she's receiving from that side of the House because it may tend to sway her judgment to some degree, Mr. Speaker, and I know that she came in here with her mind made up to be a good strong supporter of her party with one foot firmly planted on either side of the fence.

The members across the way, Mr. Speaker, mentioned that there wasn't very much in the Throne Speech on agriculture. Well I don't think there's any question about where this party stands on the support of our number one industry in this province. The Minister of Agriculture has made some great strides forward I think in bringing agriculture to the fore. There is no question that the Beef Stabilization Plan, for one, that was brought in by the members opposite when they were in government has been a disastrous plan for the livestock industry in this province. It has divided the farmers, especially the livestock people. It was a disastrous plan. The Member for St. George, the agricultural critic, had the audacity to stand up the other day and say to the Minister of Agriculture, what has the decline in the beef population got to do with the feed grain problem?

Well, Mr. Speaker, there's articles coming out of the USSR today. They're having a declining population in agriculture over there, a declining livestock population. They've got a feed grain problem. So it's very, very basic and I'm surprised that the Member for St. George would make such a statement that declining livestock population had nothing to do with the feed grain problem.

Mr. Speaker, it was mentioned by that same member about the high interest rates, that the Minister of Agriculture had driven farmers to mortgage their souls to buy farmland and we know that's not true. They have the option of buying it or not buying it. If they've bought it we know they have a problem. Interest rates are extraordinarily high. But I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, what would they do about interest rates. I don't like high interest rates either. I think they are terrible. But what are you going to do about high interest rates? —(Interjection)— I've told him that but what are you going to do about high interest rates, Mr. Speaker? What would they do about it? You've either got a 60 cent dollar and a ten percent interest rate or you've got a 16 percent interest rate and a stable dollar at 84 cents, if that's a stable dollar. It's one way or the other, Mr. Speaker. You can't have it both ways. You have to have it one way or the other. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, when I'm finished my remarks there'll be all kinds of questions I'm sure.

Mr. Speaker, I want to know what they're going to do about high interest rates. They can yell and scream all they like about it. I don't like high interest rates either, I'm paying them too and I think it's terrible. But when you walk into a bank today and say, I've got a few thousand dollars I don't need for a while and they offer you 13, 13 1/2 percent, you don't have to be a genius to know that they're going to lend that money out again and they're going to cover their overhead and they're going to charge you 16, 16 1/2, 17 or what ever they can get. It's very very simple and I think it's just a terrible thing.

I don't think our country can survive on the interest rates the way they are. But I don't know how they are going to solve it and I am sure the members over there don't know either. So they can stand up and scream all they want about the high interest rates and what a terrible thing it is, but I don't think they have any answers any more than we do over here. I just get a little tired of it, Mr. Speaker, when all of these people are screaming about high interest rates and I don't think they have any more answers than they have on this side of the House, or the new Minister of Finance is going to have in Ottawa.

Just wait and see. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the great economist from Brandon East says, "Wait and see". You want a 70¢ dollar and low interest rates or what? It is going to be one way or the other, believe me. You are not going to have it both ways. But, Mr. Speaker, that is the problem with my honourable friends on that side of the House. They want to have their cake and eat it too, and you can't have it both ways. They think there is a free lunch over there, Mr. Speaker. There is no free lunch in this country. The Federal Government tried to tell them that. There comes a time when you have got to shape up, you have got to take an accounting of yourselves and you find out you are in debt umpteen billion dollars, you

have to pull up your socks and say, we are going to quit spending money, we are going to start paying our bills. But the people aren't ready to accept that in this country just yet. But they will be, Mr. Speaker, before too long, you mark my words.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that is affecting agriculture in this country, and we all know, is rail line abandonment. Today I had an opportunity to visit in my constituency and the adjoining constituency of my colleague from Virden on a Rail Line Abandonment hearing - the Forest-Lenore Line - which is slated for abandonment December this year, but they got some reprieve because of a slow down in work construction on a new elevator. It is not ready for delivery of large quantities of grain yet, so they have some reprieve and they were able to get another hearing.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, the hardships that rail line abandonment is presenting to those of us representing rural areas. I was amazed at the reaction of the National Farmers Union at the Speech from the Throne, when it came over the news that they felt that, when we mentioned in the Throne Speech that we were going to provide for a road system in order for farmers to get their product to market, what a terrible tragedy it was that we were shifting the blame for transporting the farmers' products to market from the railways onto the backs of the taxpayer because we were going to build roads. Well, if we listened to the Member for Transcona, Mr. Speaker, we might be able to build a bit cheaper, but they wouldn't have any shoulders on them. And I don't know what might happen if we should happen to slide off the shoulder in an icy condition, because we would be in the ditch with the loads of produce attempting to get to market.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker. I was amazed at the attitude of that particular group when we said in the Throne Speech that we were going to provide money for roads, because in my area I have been faced with rail line abandonment. The rail line has gone, it has been closed, the tracks have been torn up, the ties have been sold, I think to the United States. There is no railway there. I have to have roads in that area to truck that grain another 15 miles either way to the delivery points to allow those farmers an elevator to deliver their product to. There has to be a road system that would deliver that grain. And when they stand up and say that we are shifting the responsibility onto the backs of the taxpayers, Mr. Speaker, that is the most ridiculous claim that I have ever heard of. Because there is no question about it, that the farmers have to have proper transportation arteries to get the grain delivered.

I want to say a word, Mr. Speaker, because the Member for St. George, in his remarks earlier, touched on the Autopac Burns Report. And I am sorry that he is not here, because I am not going to belabour the Burns Report or the problems or the non-problems facing Autopac, but I do want to mention one of his remarks. He said, "We had an opportunity to separate the Chairman of the Board from the General Manager's position." That came out on the report. He said, "What did we have to spend the money for, because they had already done that?"

Well, we know that, Mr. Speaker. The present Leader of the party and the Member for St. George were both Chairmen of the Board of Autopac. We know what happened when they were in that position, Mr. Speaker. This is the political interference that was referred to in the Burns Report. There is no question about political interference when they were ensconced in the same building as the Autopac offices. There is weeping and wringing of hands because we have done this, or we haven't done that. Mr. Speaker, we increased some increase in benefits, announced some increase in benefits a while back, and the response from that side of the House was unbelievable.

Mr. Speaker, those benefit increases were recommended to the Cabinet when those gentlemen opposite sat in Cabinet and decided on that recommendation from Autopac, and they decided against increasing the benefits. When the Member for St. George is back in the House, I want him to stand up and deny that that is not a fact. Those benefits could have been in three years ago; they turned them down. Now they criticize us and say we are grabbing onto the Burns Report. There was, I think, 89 recommendations in that report. Certainly 60 of them can be instituted without any great problem as far the corporation is concerned.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get into a lengthy debate on that, but I know the Member for St. George is capable and honest enough that, when he is confronted with that, will admit that those recommendations were brought before them in 1977, prior to this party taking over the reins of government, and they were turned down.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to end my remarks without saying a word or two about the last speaker, the Member for St. Boniface. You know, Mr. Speaker, it disturbs me when people

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

that have been in this House as long as he has stands up and talks about hate and venom and bitterness, referring to the speech of the Premier of this province. He has been in this House long enough, Mr. Speaker, to know better than that. He can criticize the Premier all he wants, but there is no bigger hypocrite in this House than the Member for St. Boniface and he knows it. He has gone back and forth in this House . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he is using unparliamentary language, and if he would . . .

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the unparliamentary remark that I used in reference to the Member for St. Boniface. But, Mr. Speaker, he has paraded around this House saying that I am really not a Socialist, I am an Ed Schreyer Socialist, I am really not a Socialist. Well, that gentleman has left this Chamber now, Mr. Speaker, and I still see him sitting on that side of the House. So I just don't want him walking around here talking about venom and hate when he is referring to the Premier of this province, because he knows better than that, he has been in this Chamber long enough. He has been in this Chamber long enough to know better than that, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)-- And he has ample opportunity, he doesn't have to cross very far, Mr. Speaker, he doesn't have to cross very far to sit next to his friend on his left, because he is sitting as an Independent, there is still room there. We can move another chair in or put a little divider up next to the Member for St. Johns, because I doubt if he will be crossing over.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I am very nearly finished the remarks in my notes, and I will just be thrashing old straw, but I can do it for another two minutes, unless you want to call it 9:30.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to reiterate that the Throne Speech has been well-delivered, it has been well-debated, and this is the final throes of it now; we are going to have one more vote. There is still time for those that have seen the light to repent on that side of the House. They can vote with us. And if I am stuck for the next couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker, I have some notes on the Tritschler Report, and I am sure the members on that side of the House don't want me to get into that, because I am sure we would be running overtime, and we wouldn't want to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I support the Speech from the Throne, and I will be voting for it in the next few minutes. There was forward thrust in there, there were benefits to a large segment of the population of Manitoba, particularly for the agricultural industry, the elderly. There were even benefits in there for the mining industry, and I know the Member for Flin Flon is going to be extremely happy with that. The care home in Flin Flon, Mr. Speaker, and I am happy to report it is very nearly completed. In spite of what the Member for St. Boniface says, the care home in Hamiota, the care home in Rivers, are much needed in that particular area.

The Member for St. Boniface said it is ridiculous building care homes in areas where there are no hospitals. I want him to go into Sandy Lake and tell the people in Sandy Lake that they can't have a care home because they have got no hospital. Mr. Speaker, we know that care homes are needed in larger numbers throughout this province; there is a declining enrolment that the members on that side jump up and scream about. If there is a declining enrolment in the schools, there is an increasing enrolment in care homes, and we need more care homes. Maybe we can convert some of the school rooms into care homes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. According to our Rules, Rules 35(4), on the eighth of the eight days at 30 minutes before the ordinary daily adjournment, the question shall be put.

The Motion we have is the Motion of the Honourable Member for River Heights, that an Humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor as follows:

We, her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in Session assembled, humbly thank your Honour for the gracious speech which your Honour has been pleased to address us at the opening of the present Session.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.



Tuesday, March 4, 1980

MR. SPEAKER: The Lieutenant-Governor transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Estimates of sums required for the service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1981, and recommends these Estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health, that the said message, together with the Estimates accompanying the same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, while copies of the Estimates are being distributed to all members, I would ask the permission of the House to make a brief statement on the government's expenditure proposals for the fiscal year beginning April 1, 1980.

The Estimates have been compiled from the Treasury Board review of departmental submissions under the chairmanship of the Minister of Natural Resources. Members will see that the main Estimates for 1980/81 reflect the re-organized departmental structure, which is now in effect. For comparability, the 1979/80 Estimates have been recast on the same basis.

The 1979/80 departmental figures also include amounts from enabling votes, such as the authorization from General Salary increases. As has been the practice in the last two years, the detailed information on each department includes a reconciliation statement, showing the adjustments which were made in the 1979/80 figures.

In total, the main Estimates for the 1980/81 fiscal year amount to \$1,990,915,800.00. This represents an increase of approximately \$178.8 million, or 9.86 percent over the combined main and supplementary Estimates approved by the Legislature at our last session.

Together, the three major social program departments, Health, Education and Community Services and Corrections, will account for combined expenditures of almost \$1.2 billion, or nearly 60 percent of the province's total expenditures in the coming year.

In absolute terms, the largest single increase in the Estimates for 1980/81 is in the Department of Health, with provision for additional expenditures of \$65.2 million, or 12.6 percent.

The increase for the Department of Education is second largest, at \$29.5 million, or 8.0 percent. The expenditures of the Department of Community Services and Corrections will rise by \$14.2 million, or 7.6 percent.

The Department of Economic Development and Tourism shows the largest departmental percentage increase at 37.9 percent, or \$13.9 million. This reflects an \$8.7 million increase in the Estimates of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, including provision for the new SAFER program.

Most of the many increase is required for programming under the tourism and industrial development sub-agreements with the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, the federal department. Additional amounts for the tourism and industry agreements, along with other federal-provincial agreements which are in place, or pending, including the water development agreement with DREE, and the energy agreement with the federal department of Energy, Mines and Resources, are included once again under an enabling vote to be administered by the Department of Finance in accordance with the cash requirements of the departments delivering the programs.

The overall Estimates of the Department of Finance show a 4.3 percent increase in 1980/81. This relatively low percentage growth rate reflects a substantial reduction in the cost of the hydro rate stabilization, a reduction of about \$17.2 million, or 55 percent from the \$31.3 million estimate of last year. The actual cost in 1979/80 will, of course, be higher, at about \$37.1 million for the rate stabilization program, as was indicated in the third quarter financial statement. This reduction in the cost of the Hydro rate freeze offsets, to an extent, two major increases in the Department of Finance Estimates, an increase of \$16.3 million, or 11.6 percent for property and cost-of-living tax credit payments, and an increase of \$11.8 million, or 17.3 percent in public debt charges. As members are aware, both the public debt and Hydro rate stabilization items are statutory.

In aggregate, our Estimates for 1980/81 represent the largest annual increase in Estimates yet proposed by this government. Because of our success in securing the province's budgetary

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

and economic base over the last two years, we are now in a sound position to begin implementing significantly larger scale improvements than have been possible up to now in the programs and services provided by our government to the people of Manitoba.

The Estimates reflect our success in ensuring that adequate resources are available to finance a balanced set of priorities, with emphasis, of course, on the top priority programming of the Departments of Health and Education, as well as on our new and ongoing economic development initiatives, ranging from crop development in the Department of Agriculture, to northern programming through Northern Affairs, to the tourist promotion and industrial programs of the Department of Economic Development and Tourism. These programs will play an important part in creating productive new employment opportunities for the people of Manitoba in the years ahead.

In addition, I wish to express my appreciation, and that of my colleagues, to all of the departmental staff involved in preparing the Estimates.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for that opportunity to briefly address the Assembly. I would like to make a further motion.

MR. SPEAKER: We have to dispose of the motion on the floor before we can entertain a second one. The motion on the floor at the present time is the motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that the message, together with the Estimates accompanying same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister Without Portfolio, that this House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee to Consider of the Supply to be Granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services, that this House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee to Consider the Ways and Means for Raising of the Supply to be Granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a disposition to call it 10:00 o'clock.

I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Minister of Government Services, that this House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Wednesday)