

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, May 25, 1979

Time: 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have 45 students from the Warren Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Wiebe. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Government Services. On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this morning.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the 8th Annual Report of the Manitoba Law Reform Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . . Oral Questions . . . Orders of the Day.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance . . .

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: I believe you called for questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. EVANS: I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Education could report to the House, could give an answer to myself and to the House to a question that I submitted 2 ½ months ago respecting the conditions at the Assiniboine Community College in Brandon? The overcrowded conditions in that college in the city of Brandon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, we're well aware of the overcrowded conditions that we have in, not only Assiniboine Community College but in Red River as well. The popularity of many of the courses, of course, cause that condition to pertain, and we're looking at ways and means of solving that particular problem.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Minister knows, the previous government had plans for a major expansion of that facility, and I wonder, therefore, if the Minister could advise the House whether it is the intention of the government to proceed now with the expansion plans laid out by the previous administration for that very fine institution in the city of Brandon?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I have to agree with the honourable member, it is a very fine institution, and doing valuable work, and we have that particular project under study at this time.

MR. EVANS: Yes, well a supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. The minister has indicated it's under advisement, under study — could he give the House any indication when a decision will be

on the matter of the expansion of that facility?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, as soon as possible.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture, and ask him, since the Estimates process of his department is over for some period of time, the minister undertook to provide Members of the Committee the appraisals, the value of the appraisals that were undertaken on the parcels of land that were auctioned off by his department; could the minister indicate when he will be in a position to provide those appraisals to the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker' if the member had not been so busy campaigning for the federal election, he would have known that I accepted an Order for Return on that a week ago.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does it take an Order for Return to bring that information to the House when the minister personally undertook to provide that information to Members of the Committee?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that he ask that question to the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. In the review of his departmental Estimates, the minister undertook to find out how much cumulative revenue the provincial government had lost since the Federal Government introduced indexation of income taxes in 1974. Can the minister now confirm that that amount is something in the order of \$.5 billion?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, the member may be able to remind me, but I did table the numbers on the individual years as I recall after the Estimates were completed. He may remind me as to whether that wasn't the case or not, it seems to me that those numbers were, in fact, tabled. Whether or not the cumulative amount was added up, I don't recall, but it wouldn't be that difficult for him to take the numbers that were tabled and do that.

MR. PARASIUK: Perhaps the minister will recall that when he brought in the figure of \$173 million revenue loss for 1979, I asked him to determine whether that was for the calendar year or the fiscal year, and I further asked him to bring those figures in line with some of the numbers that he had given us on a fiscal year basis in the Departmental Estimates Review. I wasn't sure whether he was adding up these numbers on a fiscal year basis or on a calendar year basis, and the minister undertook in Question Period to look into that and come back with coherent figures.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps so we don't have to search the records — what the member, I gather, is asking for are the accumulations over the years based on, presumably, the fiscal year of the amount of reduction of income tax caused by the indexing formula instituted by the Federal Government some years ago, and he wants to get the total of the amount caused by that indexing up to the present current year.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I recall, there was a rough estimate given at the time of the Estimates. I'll do a check on it and see if we have something more precise.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona with a final supplementary.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I thank the minister for that undertaking, and I'd like to ask

him if he would consider asking the new federal Conservative government to review the whole question of indexation of income taxes, since it was the Conservative government of Manitoba in their Task Force that identified indexation of income taxes, causing a severe constraint on the revenues of the province and leading to the province's deficit position. Since we have a new government in place, is the Manitoba government prepared to present the position to the federal government presented in 1974, namely that the federal indexation of income taxes should be reviewed so that provinces aren't put in a very difficult revenue situation?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, we will wait to get the current federal government into position in office before those sorts of questions are explored. This government has not made representation to the former federal government on that matter. It will be a matter of that policy being considered in due course by both the federal and provincial governments, and it will be addressed at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Economic Development. The Minister stated the other day that the rich and not only the poor buy secondhand clothes. Would he ask his colleague, the Minister of Finance, to cease discriminating against their friends, the capitalist welfare recipients? That is the Board members of Southam Moore Corporation and the like, who are buying secondhand tuxedos at Eaton's for their son's graduation parties for \$39.99 and are being charged sales tax.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): The honourable member continues to show his inability to be a member of this House when he asks like that.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, then I would want to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Finance. Would the Minister live up to the image of efficiency, which he purports to portray, and inform the shopkeepers of Manitoba to pass on the tax relief which he announced on May 15th to all Manitobans, to enable them to receive maximum benefits of his so-called tax cuts and thus not discriminate against the rich, who choose to buy secondhand clothes at Eaton's rather than in the secondhand store.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, with a problem as serious as that I will attempt to have it solved before lunchtime.

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

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture, and ask him if he has come to a decision; he took under advisement whether or not to table a copy of lessees who are leasing land under the Agricultural Crown Lands, which was common practice, by the way, under the previous open administration. We provided copies, I believe, to all members of the Legislative Assembly and I wonder if the Minister is prepared to table at least one copy for the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am considering it.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This question is to the Minister of Health and it relates to the announcement that he made on February 22nd, dealing with the construction announcement of personal care beds throughout the province and specifically to those in the Interlake, the west side of the Interlake. Could the Minister indicate whether he has now made a decision as to which community will be favored with the construction of the 20 personal care beds that he announced last February.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, no final decision has been made. There are three communities that are interested, as the honourable member knows, notably Eriksdale, Ashern, and Lundar. All three have made representations to the Health Services Commission and the Health Services Commission is refining a recommendation, has in fact, Sir, made a recommendation to my office. We have not made a final decision yet but I expect to make one almost momentarily.

MR. UURUSKI: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate whether he is prepared to accept the decision, the unanimous decision, of the Board of the Interlake District Health Board that made a unanimous decision, all the members who are representatives of all the various municipalities involved in the board, to have the home built in the mix of having the clinics built at Lundar and Gypsumville, and the personal care home in the mix built at Eriksdale.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, all things being equal, I would agree with the implication in the honourable member's question, that a recommendation of that kind, and a consensus of that kind, if indeed it is there, would and should carry a great deal of weight in the final determination. However, I would remind the Honourable Member for St. George that the consensus was not, in my understanding at least, as clear as he suggests it was. There have been, in fact, some fairly sharply opposed views taken by some members of that Health District.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George with a final supplementary.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister indicate, then, in his reply to myself, what factors made him change his mind or hold back on the decision when he wrote the District Health Board on January 8th of 1979? I quote from that letter, signed by L. R. Sherman: "I might say that we are looking at the Eriksdale Personal Care Home project as the desired priority for the moment in the Eriksdale-Ashern mix, and trust that this meets with your approval."

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Sir, I stand by the position that I took on that date, but I found, after having written and distributed that letter, that it didn't meet with everybody's approval. There was, in fact, a very vocal reaction from some sections of that District Health system and this is really what's involved and at the centre of the delay in the decision up to this point. But I once again reassure my honourable friend that that decision will be made virtually momentarily.

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question to the Minister of Highways: I wonder if he could now provide me with some information in regard to the question that I posed to him on Tuesday in regard to lifting the weight restrictions, or at least increasing the weight restrictions, particularly in those areas where agriculture must get under way very shortly?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I am advised by my departmental officials that we are not in a position to remove the weight restrictions in general for this weekend. We are, in some instances, allowing, you know, special permitted loads to travel, and I would invite the honourable member to see me if there's a specific case in mind. I'd hoped, as I indicated to the honourable member, that perhaps by this weekend some general lifting of the restrictions could be put in effect, but I'm advised that the weather conditions are still not such that that can be done without some serious damage to our roadway systems.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the House Leader. Mr. Speaker, no one respects decorum in the House as much or more than I, but last night I was treated to a display of very uncouth behaviour —(Interjection)— by the Member for Lakeside, in the most ignorant, arrogant manner, which caused this House to be adjourned one-half hour before 10:00 o'clock, and my question is this Mr. House Leader: Will this be allowed to continue or will he be severely chastised?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Member's question is out of order. The Honourable Member for St. Vital. The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): The Honourable Member for Logan asked a question yesterday, and I undertook to have a response for him today. The inquiry was as to how the two cent per litre increase in the price of milk was distributed between the producers, the processors and the retailers. Well, as I indicated yesterday, we eliminated the cow. It was obvious that she got nothing. But the one cent of the two cent increase went to the producers, and the remaining two cents, which was made up of the one cent carry-over of the metrification cost that had been allocated in a previous board decision. In actual fact, there was a three cent increase. As I said one cent went to the producers, and the other two cents went to the processand retailers. .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, A question to the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs. Could the minister indicate by how many millions of dollars the \$116 million savings, which the Minister of Finance promised the people of Manitoba on May 15th, will be reduced by the two cent per litre increase in the price of milk?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, that profound and complicated question, I cannot answer it at this moment.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes. A question to the Honourable Minister of Finance. Has his department calculated the effect of the two cent per litre increase in the price of milk on the consumer and the taxpayer in the Province of Manitoba, in terms of total amount?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that the honourable member should be made aware of the history of price increases in milk. Going back to 1951 and up until 1969, that's a period of 18 years, there was a 12 cent increase per quart in the price of milk. From that period on, from 1959 to 1977, in the period of five (sic) years —(Interjection)— there was an increase of 24 cents per quart, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that it reflects an increase in the velocity of inflation, which inflation that has increased costs to the producers and to the processors that have to be compensated for in some way. Everyone regrets an increase in the cost of living, but I advise my honourable friends that that is brought about by inflation, which this government is attempting to bring under control. Well, my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition laughs, but every effort that is made in this part of the House to bring inflation under control is met with that same sort of derision and jeering. One would think that it is almost a death wish on the part of my honourable friends opposite, to have inflation increase at an even greater rate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows with a final supplementary.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, after the speech that the honourable Minister had just delivered, I would ask the honourable Minister, for the benefit of the taxpayers of Manitoba who want to keep their arithmetic as accurate as possible, will the 2 cent per litre increase result in a reduction of the savings by \$10 million, or \$20 million, or \$30 million, or what?

MR. SPEAKERThe Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot comprehend what my honourable friend is driving at. If I were to make a guess, I would say that perhaps he doesn't know either.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs what the 2 cent per litre increase in the price of milk, what would that amount to in total increase in the cost of milk to the consumers of Manitoba?

MR. JORGENSEN: That has been already indicated by the Milk Board's report — 2 cents a litre, and I should advise my honourable friend —(Interjection)— my honourable friend, I presume, could figure that out if he knew how many litres were sold on an annual or a daily basis. I have no knowledge

of how many litres of milk are sold on a daily or an annual basis and my honourable friend can get that information, I suppose, as easily as I can get it.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Government House Leader. In view of the fact that the Speedup Resolution has appeared on the Order Paper, could the honourable Minister resolve to speed up the production of Order for Return No. 55, that's been outstanding for a year now?

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to address a question to the Minister of Finance. What private auditors have not yet come to an agreement with the Crown on the charges they will make for the audits they do on Crown corporations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, there's a minority of them that have not, most of them have been settled. I think the ones whose dates are later in the year have not been finalized, and I'm not sure that all of those for early in the year are all done. I'll have to check on that. I, quite frankly at this point, do not know exactly how many are not finalized.

MR. CHERNIACK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister be prepared now to tell the House what arrangements have been made with those with whom settlements have been arrived at?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I presume the member is asking what dollar amounts have been arrived at on each of the individual audits? Mr. Speaker, I have indicated before that we would, when this matter is all finalized and they're all done, we'll pass an Order-in-Council that will lay them all out.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister has indicated that it may be quite some time before the last one is settled because of the delay that would take place in the need for the audit, is he not prepared to inform the House now what settlements have been made, what payments have been agreed upon, so that we are aware of the cost to the treasury or to the Crown Corporations of the introduction of private auditors in replacement of the civil servants in the provincial auditor's staff that were formerly doing the work?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this will all come out in due course. There are a large number of considerations that are handled daily by Treasury Board on matters that are far more significant in terms of the finances of the province than this question, Mr. Speaker, and I've indicated the procedure whereby this would be laid out for the information of the Member for St. Johns and the information of the public in general, although it isn't, as he's already acknowledged a necessity to do it by way of Order-in-Council; we've indicated that we would do it by Order-in-Council, so he will have a full statement on the matter, Mr. Speaker, which incidentally has never, to my knowledge, occurred before when the former government hired almost all of the same numbers of auditing firms here, there and everywhere, whether it was on MDC assignments or others.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I would like to know whether the Minister of Mines has found anything in the cost-benefit studies related to a Boyne River diversion around Carman which would indicate that the engineering advice that he was given was falsified in any way, pressured, or in any way wrong in the years that those studies were done with regard to flood controls around Carman?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines, Resources and the Environment.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I have not examined the information in terms of looking for anything that might have been falsified, and I'm not entirely sure what the

honourable member is referring to. He may be speaking about frequency expectations where the floods that have occurred over the past ten years have had an expectancy of one in twenty years, each one of those floods could be expected to occur once in twenty years. The fact that three of them have occurred in ten years, means, I believe, that the odds are 8,000 to 1 against that occurring by chance, and so it casts some doubt upon the data base that has been used to make those predictions.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister agree that the flood that was experienced in Carman this year, as well as the flood that was experienced in other parts of southern Manitoba, is a very low frequency flood, that is a flood that would occur only once in at least twenty or thirty years?

MR. RANSOM: That's the prediction, Mr. Speaker, that it would occur once in twenty years. That was the prediction for the flood that occurred in 1974, and that was the prediction for the flood that occurred in 1970, I believe. Now, when you combine those three floods and you find that that sequence of events of one in twenty floods occurring in ten years, the odds against that happening are 8,000 to 1.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Mines assure the people of Manitoba and the members of this House that flood programs, flood protection programs will be based on the same criteria for all of the citizens of the province of Manitoba and that there will be no special consideration given to Carman because of the gut feeling of the farmers that they have a problem in that particular area?

MR. RANSOM: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the honourable member that assurance. The policy that the previous government had pursued was one of examining a flooding situation, and if it showed a positive cost-benefit ratio, then protection was provided at a cost to the senior government and not to the municipal government. If the cost-benefit ratio was less than one, then no flood protection was provided and I believe the time has come, Mr. Speaker, when we must examine those situations now and say that we have to look at more than a cost-benefit ratio, we have to look at the impact that not having flood protection may have upon the future development opportunities of various towns, and Carman is only one of a number of them that have problems. So I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that we will be looking at these situations in a rather different light than the previous Minister was prepared to look at them.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister will read the question in Hansard, and I will repeat it to him again, and I want to ask him whether his answer is still the same. I said nothing about the previous administration. I asked the Minister whether he can assure the people of Manitoba that the criteria upon which flood protection works are given will be the same for all of the people of the province of Manitoba, and that no special consideration would be given to one particular constituency that happens to vote Conservative?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, that, I'm sure is a hypothetical question that the honourable member is asking. There has never been any indication on my part that any special consideration would be given to Carman or to any other constituency for the reasons that the honourable member points out. Clearly a hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Highways. Considering the damage done to highways, municipal roads and bridges by the spring flooding this year, is this damage part of the cost-shared with the federal government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Minister responsible for Water Resources, I believe just the other day issued a press release that covers that item. The municipal authorities will be putting their costs together and making Water Resources aware of them. They will be compensated out of the costs bearing formula that we have with the federal government, and so the answer to the honourable member's question is yes, they are sharable with the provincial and the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour, and I ask it more as encouragement than for any other reason, can the Minister indicate if any decision has been made during the past week in regard to supplementary funding for the Savage Island Fish Processing Plant, and I ask it with a sense of urgency, as it is getting late into the season and this decision will determine how long the fishermen can fish in that area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): There has been no firm decision made on that, Mr. Speaker. I believe that I — if I didn't, I intended to make it clear to the Member for Churchill that I would be letting him know immediately as soon as something had been worked out in that particular regard.

MR. COWAN: Yes, a supplementary to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, on a different subject. Last week the Minister informed the House that an investigation was being carried out to determine if either the spirit or the letter of the eligibility requirements of the private sector Youth Employment Program were violated by grants to J.D. Construction Company and associated companies. Can the Minister now indicate if any decision or determination has been made as a result of that investigation?

MR. MacMASTER: The original assessment of the situation was and is at this moment that violations did not take place, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Again last week the Minister undertook to determine if Reserve communities in Manitoba that operate under a special contract with Hydro would be included in the five-year freeze on Hydro rates, and I would ask the Minister if he has come to any decision as to that matter yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry I didn't bring the written explanation from the Utility with me, but I did receive an answer from them today on that and the only ones that are not covered are those where there is an escalator clause pertaining the price of diesel fuel. That, I gather, is a minority situation where there is a special contract that ties in with the price of diesel fuel on diesel units.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister, then, if he will undertake to bring back to the House the specific number of communities that are affected and the number of individual power users in those communities that are affected, and also if he will undertake to investigate the situation so as to arise at a compromise that would include those people in those communities who are in the greatest need of this freeze, that would enable them to participate in the program also.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think that that information can be made available, either now or when the Utility appears before the Public Utilities Committee. It is my understanding, although the numbers were not given of the total communities involved, my understanding is that most of them are on a contract that ties it into the system rate, in which case they would be protected from increases. But there are cases where there is a clause or there is a diesel fuel cost escalator in it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. ABE KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism. On this publication that almost eliminated the farm area of which I participate, in the southeast corner of the province, I would wonder whether the Honourable Minister could direct her staff that when preparing another publication that the Town of Menisino be listed and that it be listed as the blueberry capital of the world.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, in view of the question from the Honourable Member for Radisson, and earlier questions, and indication by the Minister that she would be compelled to re-treat or redo the brochure, I wonder if she could provide the House with an estimate as to the cost of that re-treatment of the mistakes in the original brochure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have repeated on several occasions here in the House that this was not meant to be a thorough book on Tourism. —(Interjection)— That's right; you're leering, to the Member for St. Johns. It's just meant to be an inticement to people to arouse their curiosity to come and it was at no time ever meant to be a thorough guide for tourists.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, now that the Honourable Minister of Tourism asked me to rise to the bait, I would ask her — and I waited for Hansard to be printed to confirm — ask her if she is prepared not only to countenance but to approve the sending of Manitoba people to Breezy Point Resort, Minnesota, in order to talk to Manitoba people about the value of having conventions of Manitoba people in Manitoba; is she actually prepared to spend money to send people to a resort in Minnesota to talk to Manitobans who meet here at least every month, and probably the executive meets more often than once a month, in Winnipeg, to plan their future conventions?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable members that there is probably a questionable value to repetitious questions being asked in the Chamber. The honourable member asked the question the other day, received an answer, and if he wants repetition I wonder whether it is serving the best interests of the House to use up time in that matter. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I would certainly not quarrel with it if I hadn't checked Hansard carefully as to what was said last time. The last time I asked what had been done in order to investigate the plans of the Manitoba Bar to hold the current convention in Breezy Point, Minnesota. The Minister said, and I quote, "There will be some representatives out there to sell Manitoba to them for one of their future conventions." And then she said, "The members for the Tourist and Convention Bureau will be at the conference to talk to the Manitoba Bar Association people about having one of their future conventions."

Mr. Speaker, the point I am making on this point of order is that only until I saw it in print was I able to ask the Minister if she was prepared to spend — actually planning to spend — taxpayers' money to send Manitobans to Breezy Point, Minnesota, to convince Manitobans to have conventions in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, it's a new matter. It's expenditure of taxpayers' money that prompts this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, the Bar Associations in Manitoba and across the line have a reciprocal arrangement whereby they all like to stay in resorts and they go back and forth from different parts of this —(Interjections)— Do you want to hear it, or don't you? All right. Our people go and speak to the Bar Associations over the line to ask them to come down to have their conventions at our place. They take turns in going back and forth to different places in Manitoba and Saskatchewan and Ontario, and our people go over there to encourage them to come to Manitoba.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister why it is necessary to go to Breezy Point, Minnesota, to talk to members of the Manitoba Bar Association, to convince them to hold their conventions in Manitoba or anywhere else; why spend the money to go to Breezy Point to talk to them?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, our people are not going to speak to the people of Manitoba per se; they're going to speak to the other people, too, that are going to be in that vicinity. We do that with all conventions or conferences of any size, that we feel that . . . It's the same as sending a sales person from any type of business, and we do, too, in the pursuit of future business.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East, and there is one minute left.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Economic Development, who is responsible for the transportation secretariat, and ask the Minister, that in view of the pending new government in Ottawa, will the Minister be prepared to make firm representation to the new Minister of Transportation to ensure that the Crow's Nest Pass Rate Agreement is maintained so that Manitoba farm income will be protected?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to say what I'm about to go down and talk to the new Minister about at the present time.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable Minister prepared to tell this House, to advise the people of Manitoba, on what the position of the government is — this government is — with regard to the Crow Rate? Are you in favour of maintaining the Crow Rate or are you prepared to abandon it and thus cause greater increases to the farmers of Manitoba?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I explained this to the honourable member in my estimates. It has been explained to him many times and our position in Manitoba hasn't changed in the last week. We are not prepared to see the Crow Rate go unless there is something as good in its place, or better, and we are requesting that the situation be studied to try and accomplish that for western Canada farmers, and we have said that continually; we will continue to say that continually.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance . . . The Honourable Member for Inkster.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a matter of privilege affecting all of the members of the House, and, Mr. Speaker, in doing so, I want to do it in as conciliatory a method and without in any way challenging the conduct of members or the Speaker, but to raise a point which I think is substantial.

There were two instances in the last week which could have an effect on the time allowed for the Budget Debate. The first was the First Minister saying that the House is ready for a Motion for Adjournment at any time and that, Mr. Speaker, I indicate to you, could theoretically — and I'm not suggesting it will happen, but in theory it could happen — mean that the majority in the House could limit the Budget Debate to virtually nothing by moving a Motion of Adjournment every time we got into the House, which I know has not happened and don't suspect will happen, but I'm merely indicating that that was said.

If that were the only thing perhaps it could be left alone, but last night there was demonstrated that there can be another means of interfering with the time of the Budget Debate by any individual member because when you, Mr. Speaker, adjourned the House, which is perfectly within your province and I'm not objecting to it and I'm not commenting on it, the fact is that whatever time was lost was lost to the Budget Debate unless it is carried on for an additional period of time.

I would therefore indicate, Mr. Speaker, that this side, and I would hope all honourable members, would be concerned with proceedings of that nature, which could interfere with the time allotted for the Budget Debate, through either the actions of one or two individual members — and I don't wish to single people out — or a majority deciding to move adjournment, which the First Minister indicated he was prepared to do even though we said we would be willing to sit on Tuesday night.

Now, I don't think that that was a serious problem. I'm not raising it as a serious problem in the instance; I'm raising the implications of the problem as being serious and certainly I think that during a limited debate, a proceeding taken by the majority or one member is something which affects the privileges of the members of the House and I am raising it, Sir, for your consideration rather than demanding any ruling on it but as to what you would either recommend to Rules Committee, or the conduct — your own conduct — as Speaker when that kind of question arises.

MR. SPEAKER: The Point of Privilege of the House raised by the Honourable Member for Inkster, I think is a very valid point that should probably be raised at the next meeting of the Rules

ORDERS OF THE DAY — BUDGET DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. On the Adjourned Debate of the proposal of the Minister of Finance, the Honourable Member for St. George has 32 minutes.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate having the opportunity to continue with my remarks today. I feel a bit taken aback by the remarks of the Minister of Highways that one member could disrupt the proceedings of the House with an outburst of the nature that was shown here last evening.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I point out to the honourable membrr, it is highly improper for any member to comment on the conduct of another member during debate in the Chamber. The Honourable Mmmber for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, certainly last evening's remarks must have hit a very tender spot on the government benches with respect to their one big thrust in the Budget, and that is with respect to the freezing of the Hydro rates in this province. As I indicated last night. . .

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

MR. CHERNIACK: On a point of order, I do apologize for interrupting both my colleague and the proceedings but, Mr. Speaker, I think I heard you make what appeared to be a ruling and I would ask very much, Mr. Speaker, that we consider that it was a comment which is yet subject to review. I admit to you I did not hear what the Member for St. George said that prompted your response, but the simple statement, I believe, that a member may not comment on the conduct of another member of the House is one that I'm not aware of and I would not like to let it go unchallenged, but certainly at this point I'm not challenging it, Mr. Speaker. I would like to reflect on whether or not I would agree with that statement and would just ask that it not be a ruling at this stage.

MR. SPEAKER: I have to say that it is usually the case, when the Speaker makes a ruling, he should refer to a citation. I refer the Honourable Member to Citation 315 of Beauchesne.
The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To continue to recap what I mentioned last night with respect to the main thrust of the Conservative Budget in terms of freezing the Hydro rates, I indicated that Manitoba certainly did not and will not lose its comparative position in terms of Hydro rates, as has been mentioned by the Member for Swan River, and also even the Minister of Finance in his Address where he indicates that somehow Manitoba, and I would like to quote from his Address on Page 54 and 55 where the Minister of Finance indicated that: "The fixing of the domestic Hydro rates for a five-year period will most surely return Manitoba to having the lowest electric power rates in North America; a position we once enjoyed, but lost over the past few years.

Mr. Speaker, that statement, Mr. Speaker, has no accuracy whatsoever. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, if one looks at the respective position of the Province of Manitoba with respect to the rest of Canada, in terms of Hydro electric energy rates, we have enjoyed and continue to enjoy either the second, and primarily th second or third lowest Hydro rates in this country and we have not deviated from that position over the last decade. So the statement of the Minister of Finance is not only highly suspect, but it is deviating from the actual facts of the matter, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget Address and the Budget proposals of the Tory Party, insofar as the Hydro freeze, point out clearly that the Commission that they set up, the Tritschler Commission, was nothing but a political tool and a waste of over a \$1 million in this Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, because it is shown by the Minister of Finance, the Minister responsible for Hydro, in his comments in the Budget Address and in answers to questions from members onthis side, to indicate that no matter what the Tritschler Commission comes up with, we know that Hydro rates are stabilizing in this province; we know that the financial position of Hydro is good, Mr. Speaker, and that no matter what is being said it is now a waste of time and effort because the Conservative Party themselves are now admitting that the decisions made to have Hydro development in northern Manitoba to be proceeded with were valid decisions made by the previous administration; were valid decisions going back to 1966 taken by his colleagues, of whom he was a member of

to proceed with the Nelson River Projects in terms of Hydro development were valid decisions, were the right decisions.

And now, in terms of the Hydro freeze, Mr. Speaker, where the minister himself admits that it may not cost the Treasury one red cent over the next five years, it points out, more clearly than ever, that those decisions were accurate decisions and they were the right decisions.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways, in his tirade against members on this side, indicated and made some comments that the entire Lake Winnipeg Regulation Project was a waste of money and that Lake Winnipeg regulation is not working and will not work. Mr. Speaker, either the Minister of Highways has been asleep for the last number of years, or he does not wish to take the advice of his own Engineers in terms of the Lake Winnipeg Regulation.

Anyone who lives around Lake Winnipeg knows that the regulation scheme in place on Lake Winnipeg will effect the levels to a limit of 2 feet, Mr. Speaker. It will regulate the lake to a maximum of 2 feet, so that whatever the levels may be on the lake today, under natural conditions they would have been 2 feet higher. So ask anyone who lives along the lake, whether it be in Gimli, whether it be in Hnaua, whether it be in Husavick, whether it be in Riverton what the elevations of Lake Winnipeg would be under natural conditions had the Regulations not been put into place. Far from the tirade and the insults that were thrown by the Minister of Highways in terms of what the Regulation can or cannot do, he either doesn't want to accept the facts of the matter or he wishes to continue blindly in his tirade against the effects of Lake Winnipeg Regulation.

Mr. Speaker, the two items that I would have to, before I go further into my remark on the Budget, I would have to indicate that there are two small, very small, items in the Budget that one can take no quarrel with, whatsoever, and those are the items with respect to the sales tax on meals — increasing the exemption on meals from \$2.99 or \$3.00 to the \$4.00 limit; and tee passing on of the sales tax benefits to municipal and community fire fighting groups with respect to the purchase of fire fighting equipment. I don't believe that anyone can quarrel with that, but the fact of the matter is that that same type of assistance could have been provided in terms of increased per capita grants to the municipalities, and they would have been able to purchase that fire fighting equipment with increased grants to the municipalities on a specific program. . But in terms of the way the province is handling it, I certainly cannot quarrel with those two moves.

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this Budget Debate one can only comment about the Budget in terms of its effectiveness as a nothing or less than nothing Budget; a Budget that is brought in by a government that is bankrupt of any ideas, of any thrusts in terms of assisting the people of this province.

We have nothing in the Budget dealing with Housing in terms of the housing thrust; we have the Minister of Economic Development over the last number of weeks and months indicating that the housing supply in Manitoba is growing in leaps and bounds, and there are vacancy rates, huge vacancy rates in the Province of Manitoba. No one quarrels, Mr. Speaker, that there are vacancy rates' but in what kind of housing, Mr. Speaker? Not in the type of housing that is required by our elderly and low income people, Mr. Speaker. That is where the crisis exists, and will exist, until the Government of the Province of Manitoba recognizes its responsibility to its citizens in providing needed shelter and housing to our low income people and our elderly, Mr. Speaker. But they have no intentions in moving in that direction; they indicate that the housing situation is one of having increased vacancy rates, and their program, especially in rural Manitoba, their thrust is negligible to put the best light on it — they have cut projects, they have frozen Housing Projects, and they have made certain statements that they will go ahead with them, but two years have gone by and nothing has happened, and it appears that nothing will happen.

The thrust of the Housing Program to deal with, in terms of assisting community groups, will only assist the communities who have very active and very well financed community organizations; it will not be able to assist communities that have a need for housing, but they do not have a very well oiled and well financed community group, and that's where the fallacy of the Conservative Program is; it will only assist the communities who already are in a good position in terms of organizing their needs for their communities and their people.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this Province, in comments over the last week or two on his analysis of the election campaign, spoke that the members on this side of the House, members of the New Democratic Party, raised the issue of health care and he indicated that that issue of health care was a phony issue, Mr. Speaker. That was the statement of the Premier. The issue dealing with the cutbacks and the restraint program, by his government, was a phony issue. Well, it may be phony to the Tories, Mr. Speaker, but it's not phony to everyone else. It's not phony to the people who they have attacked. It is real and it has been felt by all the people across this province in terms of the — not only in terms of the staff and the services that have been affected in both urban and rural hospitals, in terms of the needy all through this province. The issue, while the Premier may talk about it in an offhanded way as being a phony issue, I think his Ministers and some of

his own members can go out into the countryside and speak to the people and certainly find out firsthand that the issue is far from being phony. It is about as real an issue as can be seen and has been felt by all the people of this province.

The Tory government, in its election platform in 1977, promised, if one can relate it, four things primarily, four things in their program for re-election. They promised restraint. They promised reduced spending. They promised increased efficiency and improved programming. Mr. Speaker, well we have seen the restraint promise, we have seen it in spades. We've seen the lack of opportunities for our young and our native people in terms of job opportunities. We have now a syndrome in this province or an attitude, a welfare syndrome that has been created by the Conservative government. They have cut programs in terms of employment for our northern communities, where all you have to do is go to either the remote or the semi-remote communities and talk to the people there and ask the people. They want jobs, Mr. Speaker. They're not proud to do any kind of work that they will not take any job, they want any kind of work. They do not want welfare, Mr. Speaker. While the Tories sit back and say in their Budget speech, the Minister of Finance and members say, that government programs are not programs, it should be the private sector that is creating those jobs. Well, Mr. Speaker, those people want work. They don't care who is providing the work. They do not want welfare, and that's the kind of syndrome that we are moving in, Mr. Speaker. We are going back to the colonial system of welfare in all those communities.

We have had cuts in education programs, the BUNTEP program. You know, I attended an opening in Fairford just last week with the Minister of Education, where for two years they severely cut back the program of education for native and non-native people in remote communities. Now all of a sudden during the federal campaign, the Minister of Education gets up and says that there are going to be new negotiations with the federal government, that we are going to attempt to expand the BUNTEP program. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's the case, why did they not expand the program in this House, instead they are cutting back and have cut that program back two years running.

We have had reduced spending. You know, the provincial government promised reduced spending. So what have we seen in terms of reduced spending? All we have to do in the last two years is look at — and that's judging the Tories by their own standards, judging the Conservative government by their own standards. You know, Sterling Lyon said that we are going to cut spending, we are going to reduce spending. Well all we have to do is look at the Budget. You know there's been an increase of roughly \$175 to \$180 million by their own accounting methods, in two years, Mr. Speaker. They have reduced spending but they certainly — reduced spending? \$180 million more in two years, is that reducing spending, Mr. Speaker, by their own standards? Mr. Speaker, all they have to do — they have increased spending by \$180 million, and they have cut services. And let them sit here and let them keep doing it because I think, as was mentioned by the Member for Ste. Rose, our greatest champion, our greatest campaigner in this federal election was Sterling Lyon, and he has been our hero in the last few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, the Tories promised increased efficiency in terms of their term of office for governing. Well let's look at what the increased efficiency has been. They said that Manitoba was in a terrible financial position when they came into office. We were in such debt that we were going down the tube, as the Minister of Finance would say, or the Minister of Economic Development. Well in the first year, Mr. Speaker, even by their own records, and I'm using their own standards, they said that they gave away \$83 million in 1978 to the taxpayers. Is that efficiency, Mr. Speaker? Would any businessman who gives away his income before he pays his bills, would he be called an efficient manager? But that's what the Tories have done. They have been prepared to give away \$83 million and not pay their bills. Now that's efficiency, Mr. Speaker. As I have indicated they have reduced employment opportunities and the next result is more welfare. Pay people for doing nothing. Is that efficient, Mr. Speaker? That's real efficiency.

They reintroduced, after freezing the critical home repair program — now here's a real dilly. They stopped the advertising and they cut the staff so that, you know applications, people will not know whether the program is on or off, and so people are sitting back and saying, they don't know. You know there was one announcement that the program is being reintroduced. Now there are some applications flowing through but they have reduced the staff so the staff can't process the applications in a speedy way. People are getting fed up and saying, well look, I can't wait six months or a year for assistance under the Critical Home Repair Program. To heck, there is really no program in effect, and soon they will forget about the program and there will be no applications and the Tories can stand up and say, well you know, there is certainly no need for that program. You know, there are no applications. TF250

That's efficiency, Mr. Speaker. That's the type of efficiency that they are conducting in this province. The efficiency of strangling the general insurance program in the Manitoba Public Insurance

Corporation rather than dealing with it, you know, philosophically if they don't want that program whatsoever. They could have sold that division off; made some money for the shareholders who are all the people of this province — no. They have strangled it. They will continue to strangle it till the business falls by the wayside, till the private sector takes over the business by default, and then that will be efficiency, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the efficiency of selling the Lord Selkirk, you know, even they admit that they gave away the Lord Selkirk for less than salvage value, even the people who had purchased it — that is efficiency to give away an asset of all the people of this province for less than salvage value is an efficient move?

And another one, Mr. Speaker, Morden Fine Foods, Morden Fine Foods, Mr. Speaker, \$1 million of stock, of inventory in that corporation, they sold it for \$1 million, and what did you do with the buildings? They gave the buildings away for nothing to the entrepreneur who bought the inventory for \$1 million. That's efficiency, Mr. Speaker. The land giveaway, the Minister of Agriculture, you know he will go on for months, not producing the information that we have asked him, that he said was available, that he promised to give to the members of the Agricultural Committee, that they will provide the information on the land sales. They have sold land below value, even though they have had appraisals, because that's their new standards of selling the land. As long as they recoup the money that was put into it, and not what the asset is worth, that's the new standard of efficiency by the P.C. government.

Mr. Speaker, more efficiency in terms of grants to their own party, which the Minister of Education said was okay, but then he backtracked several days later, where they gave Labour Grants in excess of \$2,000 to the Progressive Conservative Party, which they recouped, which I believe they should have at least charged interest on if it was an illegal move on behalf of the government. But they said it was okay in the first instance — that's efficiency.

Now we have today an instance of the Minister of Tourism, who is going to send people to the United States to talk to Manitoba people, and bring them back to Manitoba, and have their conventions in Manitoba — that's efficiency. Mr. Speaker, we have the Minister of Finance, dealing with the auditors, hiring private auditors, buying a pig in a poke, if one could say it in that way, allowing the auditors to do the work, but not being able to tell the public of Manitoba what their going to be faced with, in terms of costs of doing the auditing of the Crown corporations. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this government . . . How much time have I got?

MR. SPEAKER: Six minutes.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is the type of efficiency that we have seen, and I have just listed a few examples, Mr. Speaker.

The other area was improved programming, Mr. Speaker. The Tories, they raided us for two years, in terms of our Nursing Home Program, in terms of our Health Care Programs, that we weren't doing enough. Now what do we have? We have Sterling Lyon get up in 1977 and say, "We will build upon those good NDP programs. We will keep them in place, and this is what we will do for the people of Manitoba." Well, Mr. Speaker, what have we seen? We have seen cutbacks. We have seen nursing home construction virtually frozen. We now have a situation in the Interlake, where we have the Minister of Health playing complete politics of forcing one community against the other, to play around with respect to nursing home construction. Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of efficiency and improved programming we have. If we don't want to do something, we will say, "Here people, fight about it, and then maybe when you can come to some consensus we will do something for you, otherwise, leave us alone because we've got other, more important things to do." And that's what is happening, for example, in the Interlake. And that's also what has happened in the community, a total freeze in the Community of Selkirk. Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether it was Nate Nurgitz or someone from the Conservative benches, who indicated that the results in the Selkirk-Interlake riding, especially in the Community of Selkirk, was disastrous in terms of the New Democratic Party. Well, Mr. Speaker, for the first time, I believe since 1970, did the Town of Selkirk vote increase — you know, it used to be we had won it fairly well, but for the first time we have won polls, two-to-one and three-to-one in that town. To say that the vote results were disastrous in the Town of Selkirk, you know, is to really defy just the greatest, Mr. Speaker, you can't even put words on it. But I want them to continue to believe that that was a move certainly against the New Democratic Party in the Town of Selkirk, and it was certainly evidenced by their policies of restraint and total freezes and cutback, with respect to the freeze on the personal care home and hospital in that community.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a virtual elimination of northern programs. The user-pay principle has moved itself into the education programs, university tuition fees. We have the Red River Community College fees, we have legal aid, we have pharmacare, we have the assistance to the

transit in the City of Winnipeg. These are examples of improved programming. A shift of financing from the province to the local taxpayer, regardless of his means to pay, that's the improved programming that has been brought in by the Provincial Government. Those are the improvements that the Conservative government has brought into this province. Those are the four promises that they have made to the people of this province, and they certainly, Mr. Speaker, are keeping them in spades. I want them to continue to keep on with that increased inefficiency, the type of reduced spending that they have brought into this province, the type of improved programming and the type of restraint that they have continued with.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that an indication was brought home to them very clearly a few days ago. You know, we've had the situation in the Interlake, and I have to make one comment, and it really was brought home clear how the Tories fought the election. They fought it Joe Clark style, you know, to be on both sides — they wanted to be on both sides of the fence — to attack an issue, and if it has no rebuttal, then attack it some more and that's good politics. But if there's a fight back, then you retract, back off and go on the other side of the fence and say that you're in support of it, so that you can be on both sides of the issue.

We had the spectacle of the federal candidate in the Interlake indicate to the people there that he was a member of a union for 29 years, and he supported the labour movement, and he was a friend of labour, and he certainly was ' in support of workers' rights and he was a friend of labour. Then in the next breath, Mr. Speaker, he talked about and he attacked the working man and said that he was asking for too much money, and that he was being greedy and he was killing the economy of this country and this Province of Manitoba.

That has been the type of Tory campaign that was fought in the Interlake, and that is why, Mr. Speaker, by them trying to be on both sides of the fence they are getting the message clear from the public of Manitoba, that they have not the capability to govern. Mr. Speaker, their policies are not only not clear, they are totally opposed to the well-being of the people of Manitoba. Their efficiency and mismanagement of the economy of this province has certainly been well demonstrated in the last 18 months.

Mr. Speaker, only the next year will tell whether or not they are prepared to at least look at, and at least maybe have a change of heart in terms of remedying their ways for the next two years, and bring some sense of stability to the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in congratulating the Minister of Finance on the very positive Budget that he has brought into this House. On speaking to numerous people in our province, I find that they were very happy with it and they're very pleased with the stand that this government has taken to be concerned about all of the people in Manitoba, not just a few.

I'd like to also take advantage of this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to tell you of some of the accomplishments, and also some of the contemplated projects that will be taking place in the coming year in my department. Starting with the accomplishments, I think I'd like to read into the record some of the support that this government has given to a variety of the arts people.

Starting with the catch-up grants that were given last year to four of the major groups, the Winnipeg Ballet; the Winnipeg Symphony; the Manitoba Theatre Centre; and the Contemporary Dancers. We felt this move was necessary, Mr. Speaker, in order to ease their burden of operating continuously on a deficit.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, we have increased the library funding in the remote areas from \$2.00 per capita to \$2.50 per capita. Speaking of the libraries, I would like you to know that we have just commissioned one of the — the Director, in fact, of the Public Library Services to do a complete in-depth study of the problems of the libraries in Manitoba. We know that particularly in the rural areas, they do have a great deal of trouble, and we feel that they should have access to the library facilities as much as the people do in the larger centres.

We also gave \$50,000 worth of talking books to the Institute of the Blind for their listening to. There is another segment of the blind that have been overlooked, they're the people that are not termed legally blind and we feel that we have to do some work with them and we are looking into that at the present time.

My department has committed \$500,000 to Heritage Winnipeg on a five-year plan, \$100,000 per year, and this is towards the restoration and preservation of the Old Market Square, and we feel that in the years to come we will have an outstanding tourism attraction.

We also, during the fiscal year of 1978-79, gave a continuing operating grant to the Winnipeg Art Gallery of \$209,000, plus \$77,000 for a special capital grant. Here again, Mr. Speaker, we have a liaison group of government working with the board of the Art Gallery on a five-year projected

program, and they feel at the end of the five years that they will be in very good shape and will be almost in the autonomous stage.

We also increased the Museum of Man and Nature's Exhibit Development Grant from \$100,000 to \$200,000, and that's based on \$2.00 being given for every dollar that they raise, and this year they raised the maximum.

We started another new program this year, Mr. Speaker. In the past there has been offices set up in the different regions to have the people in the community let us know what the people in the community wanted in the form of cultural entertainment, etc. We did away with that, and we got people that live in the communities, volunteers, that we will give a small honorarium to, who we feel will have a feel for the community and of their needs and wants.

Also, there was a major tour hosting program set up with the Manitoba Arts Council and the Canada Council to aid both Manitoba and Canadian performing artists, serving in these various communities.

With regard to the cultural programs, I imagine that the people have read about the press release I just put out where we have, on the recommendation of the Task Force, set up a cultural policy review committee of five, and this is to study the government cultural policies. We feel, in the past years that they have not been run too stringently, nor has there been enough accountability required as we felt should be, and we are going to be strengthening these lines considerably. We feel that with the developed guidelines and the policies that we are going to develop, will be of a great benefit to the people who will be applying to the government for funds.

We also sincerely feel, Mr. Speaker, that the government should tell these people who are working under grants that they should know what they're going to have, not only for the first year, but for the ensuing four years so that they will be able to budget themselves accordingly and not just be going to the government for deficit funding as they have been doing for the last number of years.

Also, I'd like to say that there was a large conference of all the mayors in the United States took place last September, and they felt that for every dollar that was generated in the arts, there was \$4.00 more that was generated directly or indirectly in the community, so I feel that cultural affairs, while the people have had a lot of negative thoughts about cultural programs and the deficits that they have been reading about in the paper, I think it's a very important segment of our society.

Mr. Speaker, another area that I would like to touch on is the Tourism Department. We have augmented the advertising program by some 60 percent this year, in order to try and rejuvenate the tourism industry, as it's been going downhill for the last three or four years, especially from across the line. We felt that definitely the time was right to pour more money into it so that we would get a better return from it.

We've gone up, from 1975 the advertising was \$400,000, in 1976, it was \$355,000, in 1977 it was \$380,000.00. When we came into government in 1978, we raised it to \$529,000, and this year we have some \$817,000.00.

We are greatly encouraged, also, Mr. Speaker, that Air Canada is going to start their route between Winnipeg and Chicago, as we all know the devastating results that we had last summer during July and August when Northwest were on strike, Air Canada had the option to pick up that route and refused to do so. Transair offered to do it but Air Canada wouldn't let them. So now I'm hoping, and I know, that with this new government in Ottawa we won't be having the tunnel vision that we've been having to put up with for the past eleven years.

Via Rail has doubled their excursions to Churchill because of the extreme popularity and success they are having, the fishing packages and the racing packages have been augmented. Racing packages are being offered to Minnesota all through the summer months.

Speaking of horse racing, Mr. Speaker, that industry is the largest tourism attraction in Manitoba, not only the tourist attraction but the monetary gain that it has for the government. Last year we had some \$3 million that was given to government through the horse racing, so even though the purses have been upped a trifle over last year, we still are not paying out our money, we're just giving the people back some of their own money to encourage even better returns. I know the Member for St. Johns is very critical of the industry, but then he seems to be most critical of anything that's done on this side of the House anyway.

Yesterday I committed my department to a complete productivity study for the horse-racing industry, and it's with the approval of the harness racers as well as thoroughbred. There's been a little contention then there with the rural and the city, and I feel that the outcome of this will be a much greater liaison between the two and for the good of not only the horse-racing industry but for all the people of Manitoba.

I just completed a tour of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, all the regions, taking our program for the coming season to them. And in this case, it's the first time in the history of Manitoba that I know

of that the private sector has been brought in and working in conjunction with the government. We went to them and offered them a co-operative deal with the government in the form of advertising in a coupon that was extremely well received. We launched our kick-off here in Winnipeg and there were some 150 or 175 people that are closely related to the tourist industry and they were very pleased that they were being allowed to have a voice in what is going to be taking place this coming year, and they are working very hard with us. We feel that it should be, the tourist industry, or the private industry should have their own operation of their industries, and that government should work with them, not run them. And as long as I will be in this department, Mr. Speaker, that is the direction that my department will go. It will go to help the people in the industry and allow them their freedom so that they can breathe and grow on their own without the intrusion of the government. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I very seldom take part in Budget Debates, I think this is the first time. Not because I didn't want to, but our side of the House seemed very anxious to take part in these things, you have to take your turn, and according to seniority, I rank away at the rear end. —(Interjection)— That is true, Mr. Speaker.

But Mr. Speaker, reading and listening to the Budget Address, I was very disappointed, the first hour of it, we should have been playing gin rummy. It would have been more educational. The next 10 minutes he spent telling us what a great leader he had, and I don't blame him because the leader is a very modest man. And he has very much to be modest about, Mr. Speaker.

But I'd like to say a few things on this Budget as a working man, not as a very articulate graduate of some university, and how it affects them, Mr. Speaker, and I'll try and do that. One of the items, of course, was the meals. The \$4.00 meal is free of the tax, the 14 year old clothing, the five percent sales tax removed. That sounds good. But Mr. Speaker, they didn't have to do this. The people this affects is the minimum wage people. They are the people who will need this. But they didn't do that. They're going to spend the taxpayers' money on these concessions, where a simple raise, or a decent raise in the minimum wage would have eliminated all this, at no cost to the taxpayer. But what happened? I assume, and I'm sure that the Chamber of Commerce people get to you, stressing the minimum wage would do this, and the Minister of Tourism stressed that last Session. And you listen to the Chamber of Commerce. And who is the Chamber of Commerce, supposedly? A group of people who are dedicated to the welfare of all people in their municipality, town, city and so on. Nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. Speaker.

The Chamber of Commerce people are people who are dedicated to their own selfish interests, their own profits. They're just big corporations reduced to a minor role. —(Interjection)— I'm going by the Flin Flon Chamber of Commerce. The Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce, I'll tell you all about him sometime. And you talk about socialism, you have your views, and we have ours. I'm a socialist and very proud to be a socialist. I have been a socialist since I was old enough to know the difference between the different parties. And when you talk about socialism, then you link it with communism, and we're going to ruin the world, which is, you know, what you think.

Now, I think it's the church, I don't know whether it's the Mennonite or the Hutterite, all the wages go to the church, and they work in perfect harmony. Money is not their objective, they're very happy people. Isn't that a form of communism? Communal? I would think so.

And the natives, when you go back in history, it was all communal, it was share and share alike. The Eskimo was a perfect example of communal spirit, or communism as you call it today, where they looked after the weak first and the old. When they made a kill, it doesn't matter how tough things were, they were first. And who spoiled that system? We did. —(Interjection)— That's right, when they get old, which is a form of living that they believed in, and it worked for them. They were a happy, healthy race of people until we started telling them about the great free enterprise system, and look at them now, just look at them now.

Even coal miners, Mr. Speaker, are communal. Many many mines have 30 people working in the same area on a communal basis. It doesn't matter how hard you work and how hard you don't work, it is shared equally because some days you are more capable than others, of course, and it works very well.

I should say a few words too, Mr. Speaker, about the minerals. I understand you are going to take over the exploration, or if you aren't, you will, and the taxes eliminated from mining companies. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm a firm believer that those minerals do not belong to the big corporations; they belong to everyone, everyone in Manitoba, in Canada, have an equal share of those minerals, much the same as taking the crop away from a farmer — that's his crop and he loses or gains on this crop and he gambles on this crop — as we do with our minerals.

In the Flin Flon area, my God, Mr. Speaker, don't let them go into exploration. Think about it. The man who found that first ore body in Flin Flon in 1928, and he is a name that will never be forgotten. His name was Creighton. They called a town after him, a village after him, and they have a big plaque dedicated to him, and they just found out in the last two years that he didn't find the ore body. It was a man by the name of Collins, an Indian. Creighton bought the samples from him for a 24-pound bag of flour and that's the HBM and S's history.

And may you go into exploration, Mr. Speaker, and I have some experience because I worked for a year on exploration, but right in their back door, they could have fallen over it, Trout Lake, the water reservoir, is one of the richest bodies in Manitoba, probably in Canada. It has every type of nickel, zinc, gold, everything high grade. They have drilled to depths from 400 to 1,000 feet, and that mine right now will pay. If there's no more ore, it will pay. And when you go down into a mine of that type, they will never never assess any more than what they have drilled, but that ore body could widen out, lengthen, or it could narrow down and disappear. This is the gamble you take with mines, much as I said you do with farming.

But you will give that away, yes, because the government owned 47-½ percent —(Interjection)— You will, yes.

A MEMBER: Never.

MR. BARROW: Certainly you will. They say, Mr. Speaker, that exploration, when it is taken over, it will boom, the mines will boom and it will create more employment. Well, Mr. Speaker, I've said in the House before and I'll say it again, that H.B.M. and S., Inco, Sherritt-Gordon, can't hire men. They've gone from the east coast to the west coast. Now, they are training Natives, which they should have done in 1930, to work their mines. And why does this happen? Because the companies, Mr. Speaker, are very very poor employers. So it's a farce when you say, to take the expression back from the government, it will create employment.

Mr. Speaker, I think I should say a few words about the lead poisoning in my area, which my colleague from Thompson has expounded on in great length and we're calling for a Royal Commission into this and I think this last episode where 75-80 men were laid off is a strong hint it should be done. What does the Minister say, the Minister of Labour? He says, "I do not think it is necessary." You know, Mr. Speaker, the first three or four words are the truest words he has ever spoken in this House: "I do not think..." That's what he said. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Thompson, a former union president who uses union facilities, what he has done in the union to climb up in the corporation, well known in Thompson as a company flunkie, the pipeline direct from Inco to the House. Mr. Speaker, we have no Minister of Labour here. He said he's full of unionism. That's not what he's full of, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you what he's full of — it's a four-letter word, it ends in "it" and it's often found in the bottom of bird cages and politicians are full of it. And that's what he's full of, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— True grit. Yes, he's full of grit, Mr. Speaker, grit and determination to do everything he can for the corporation and screw the miners.

Mr. Speaker, have a new leader in Ottawa, Joseph Clark, Joe Clark who is going to copy our honourable Premier with restraint. That's what he said. And his giveaways, Mr. Speaker, amount to \$8 billion; that's what he has promised the people of Canada — \$8 billion, and a restraint program. Where does he fit on the separation when he's asked: What are your views on separation? "I'm against it; Quebec will not separate." What will you do to prevent them? —(Interjection)— "I'll make a deal." His dealing days are over.

Mr. Speaker, to give an example — and they give lots of examples of Joe — but there are probably, what? 500,000 troops, soldiers who have bayonets, and every one of them knows the idea of a bayonet is to stick it into someone, but not Joe Clark, he sticks himself upon the bayonet. And that's the man who's leading our country, Mr. Speaker, he has it all backwards. Mr. Speaker, I think the Conservative Party has picked up the Barnum and Bailey saying, as Barnum and Bailey used to say, "There's a sucker born every minute."

Mr. Speaker, it isn't true. I thought the people of the north were apathetic; I thought they didn't care who they voted for, or if they voted. My God, Mr. Speaker, did you ever see such a turnover in the north country in this last election? It just proves, Mr. Speaker, the people in the north have much more intelligence and foresight than many of the people in this province.

Mr. Speaker, talking about roads, and the Minister is gone of course, he talks about roads that were built, should have been built, election ploys. Well, Mr. Speaker, in 1969 or 1970, in a caucus meeting, we went up to Churchill, Thompson. We stopped off at Wabowden and the Mayor of Wabowden at that time, Don McIvor, took us on a bus tour to show us the town and he said I have something very interesting I would like you all to note. Here, he said, is a road that is 200 yards long; it doesn't start anywhere, it doesn't end anywhere and it was stopped after the election.

That was the 1969 election. A road that was supposed to fool those poor people into voting Conservative, and this is the ploy they used, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Minister — I think \$43 million spent on 391, from Thompson to No. 10. But what puzzles me, Mr. Speaker, is that road built for people to go to Thompson or is it built for the people leaving Thompson. 700 people left, and they're leaving every day. They're going in convoys now.

Mr. Speaker, they make a lot of noise about strikes, the right to strike, how many days have been lost. Mr. Speaker, I believe in strikes, withdraw your labour for better conditions. The only unfair part about strikes, Mr. Speaker, is the power that different unions have compared to others. For instance, the Grain Inspectors. If Grain Inspectors go on strike in Vancouver and tie up the ships, the railroad and the farm, I'd say it is not feasible; I don't agree with that type. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, for power, if you are going to have security, high wages, good conditions, it pays you to be a garbage man, and when you call your strike, it's June or July and it doesn't last very long, Mr. Speaker. And then we come to policemen and firemen. I believe they should have the right to strike. I believe these people are intelligent enough and have enough foresight to know the consequences of a strike on their part and they will act accordingly. The same goes with Hydro, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we can argue about strikes and labour forever and it won't get us anywhere because we never agree.

I'd like to say a few words about your leadership. It's fascinating to a new member, and it must be when you look back in history, and of course your first leader was Walter Weir who you really gave the exit to — poor old Walter. I understand now he is working for undertaking parlours. He gave away all our ore bodies and now he is making money filling them up with Canadian bodies.

And poor Sidney, how he got shellacked! And the present leader, Mr. Speaker, the handwriting's on the wall. I mean, there must be some friction now in your caucus.

MR. DRIEDGER: None, - absolutely none.

MR. BARROW: One thing about Conservatives, Mr. Speaker, they always tell the truth. Mr. Speaker, one thing about your present leader, he has an awful memory. He forgot he was getting \$3,000 a month; he forgot for half an hour. He didn't remember. I'd like to know who pays that. I'd like to know if he's still getting it. He deserves it — nothing wrong with it — if he's getting \$3,000 a month, that's good, that's like the minimum wage. He deserves it to lead such a motley group.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I think the ideal leader, and I'm going to write a memo to your caucus, would be the Member for Wolseley, honest. He put it on the line, Mr. Speaker, he said this in Hansard: "Don't tax the companies a little bit; don't tax them 15 to 17; don't tax them 35 percent on windfall profits. Help them, give them grants, build them up, then whack them." That's what he said. And he was right. And I don't believe all the things they say about him either, Mr. Speaker. It's said that he puts poor old ladies out in the snow because they can't pay the rent; he chucks them out — never. He might give them a little shove but he never chucks them out.

And then we've got to come back into the local scene, Mr. Speaker, the local scene on election day. Poor old Cec, an auctioneer, a very frustrated auctioneer, he spent five years in Ottawa and he said exactly five words. Another one, Mr. Speaker. You know, if your hand signals weren't working on your car and you put your left hand out for a left-hand turn, he was shaking it. It was terrible, and he was very popular. But, Mr. Speaker, that just goes so far. Poor old Cec — ah, he's not a bad guy. He's not a bad guy for a Conservative that is. He was in trouble, so what he did, he sent for Mr. Diefenbaker. Now, there's a man that you can respect, respect the Conservative. But, two days before, with the flu, he fell in the bathtub, or out — it doesn't matter — and they sent for him. Dief is well known, he never leaves his riding, never, but he came up to Flin Flon to save poor old Cec. It did work; he drew an enormous crowd' I think it was 250 — 400 — you're reading the wrong paper. And then they were still a little leery so they brought in Ms McTeer, the brain behind the brain, who would make a much better Prime Minister than Joe, much more personality, much more intelligence, and by God, much more better looking.

MR. WALDING: And she doesn't lose her luggage.

MR. BARROW: No, she hangs onto her luggage. And what I did find humorous, Mr. Speaker, and this is humorous, the Snow Lake Hospital, which you have brought up many times this side of the House. . Don't get me wrong; I'm grateful you're going to build it. I'm happy, but that Snow Lake Hospital was never, never an issue until the last two years of our reign and we were going to build it. And you, of course, on your restraint program, cut it off, and the man who got a lot of credit

for it was the Minister of Health and Social Services, and he deserved it. But then the Minister of Labour gets up and he tells the people, if it hadn't been for me, you wouldn't have had this hospital and I'm very happy you got it. That's the Member for Thompson.

But my God, Mr. Speaker, when Cecil Smith takes credit for this hospital, how many people who fought . . . Let me tell you who should get, really, the credit. And it was good. No, not me. We had a meeting in Snow Lake, a public meeting over the needs of a hospital. The community hall was full. I forget the date, but it was packed. An invitation went out to the federal people, the Minister concerned or one of his flunkies, to come and attend this meeting. —(Interjection)— Underlings. The Minister of Labour was invited, or one of his . . . Mr. Speaker, I was the only one there. I was the only politician, I was the only one. And I spoke and I said — I believe it was my fault . . . But the tenders were out and the hospital was going to be built, and I absorb some of the blame. But who got that hospital? It was a young lady with three children, 25 years old, who got up, a shy lady but she was angry. But she got a mike and she said this, "Look, the people of Snow Lake want a hospital and what I'm going to do is organize a group of ladies and we will picket every mine in this area and no one will work." What happened? The corporation phoned down, "My God, we're in trouble; build a hospital."

So, between this lady and HBM and S, that's how the hospital was built.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few points that I would like to bring out here of some of the things that have happened that my people in Flin Flon are a little amazed with, a little bewildered with, and I hope maybe I will get some explanations.

We are informed that 40,000 a year, plus, civil servants are having their club memberships bought by this government with taxpayers' money. Is that true? I guess it is, you don't deny it.

Then they see appointments of defeated Tory candidates and professional hangers-on getting their snouts into the public trough. Is that right? —(Interjection)— Oh, \$75 an hour?

We know the President of the Tory Party was hired at \$75 an hour of taxpayers' money. My God, what ammunition for the next election. I will be 65, but I think I will run again.

We know that 13 accountant firms were given government jobs and that the so-called Honourable Minister of Finance admitted that this work would have cost more than when done by the Provincial Auditor. Was that restraint? What that your restraint program?

We know Jarmac got permission to despoil a public park within days after this government was elected and we wonder whose fingers are in that deal. No wonder you were demoted, my friend. —(Interjection)— What? Two years from now you won't be here, and I can guarantee you that.

We know Senator Duff Roblin's Metropolitan Security Agency was given a special concession on government contracts. Shame.

We know the bird-brained Minister of Economic Development — that's not nice, Mr. Speaker, I will wipe out that "bird-brained" because right now he is not feeling well, Mr. Speaker. You see, he is moulting. But he is so desperate to pay his friends to make jobs, he has given as many as four grants to the same people. Shame on that, too.

We know this government has given away publicly-owned companies at a fraction of their value. That's why I am scared over the Flin Flon . . . , Mr. Speaker.

We know that the brother of the Minister of Mines is gone. He was given a piece of taxpayer-owned land at far below the market value, and he put it in, the only bid. My God, Mr. Speaker, how can they live with themselves?

But finally their greed and stupidity caught up with them. They gave \$2,300 of taxpayers' money to the Tory Party Office. And outraged Opposition, that's us — I love to see my friend laugh — forced them to get it back. How low can you stoop, Mr. Speaker? —(Interjection)— Without interest, yes. How low can you stoop?

Now, Mr. Speaker, we know what the Tories, with their hands in the pot got out of this government but what did the people of Manitoba get? That's the interesting part. Food prices went up. They went up 22 percent last year, with some food items increasing 45 percent. The food and beverage industry enjoyed its greatest profit in 15 years and a recent report in the Winnipeg Tribune states that profits, not costs, were forcing prices up. But the President of the Grocers Manufacturers Association, through his mouthpiece, this dirty word and bad word, Harry Morden, demanded more. Therefore, when we asked for the appointment of a food price commission the Honourable Minister responsible for the pork barrel refuses. His master's voice had spoken.

During the past decade profits increased twice as fast as wages. Well, they did something about that, a big thing, an enormous thing; they increased the minimum wage by 10 cents an hour, an increase of 3 percent. The Minister of Labour, who is full of unionism and grit has proven he supports the minimum wage, and the more minimum the better.

A recent report states home prices in Winnipeg increased 10 percent last year. It also states that mortgage defaults on homes increased 430 percent last year. It also states that the interest

terms of a particular mortgage company increased a phenomenal 132 percent in the first three months of this year.

Why is this outrage allowed to continue? Well, recently Mr. Albert Cohen, the First Minister's employer, made a speech saying he and his friends needed more profits and his employer in the Premier's Office apparently is happy to oblige. By the way, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it was the same Mr. Cohen who helped pay that \$3,000 to the First Minister. Do you suppose . . . ? When he was the Leader of the Opposition. Do you remember that \$3,000 a month? Do you not remember? I think he had something to do with that.

This pork barrel government, Mr. Speaker, has appointed all kinds of inquiry commissions. The present Conservative Party was paid \$75 an hour of taxpayers' money to inquire into lotteries, as though this was a matter of great urgency. Who cares?

The First Minister has announced he is appointing a commission to convince farmers they should be happy to abolish the Crow's Nest Pass rates and to pay a 250 increase in freight rates. Is that true? I guess so.

They have announced two more inquiry commissions. I guess some more good free-enterprising Tory needs a government job at the minimum wage of \$75 an hour. They are going to inquire into the Tax Credit Program, the program that has given high rebates to low income people into higher income people. And it is opposed to Tory philosophy, so they have to change that.

They're also inquiring into Autopac. Now, there's something — Autopac. You know, Mr. Speaker, the main opponents of Autopac in 1969 was the Member for Roblin and the late Earl McKellar. And do you know why? Because he sold insurance. They had their hand in the public's pocket, too. They had a vested interest and shouldn't have been allowed to speak. We let them speak because we knew it was to no avail.

It's so good that despite the fact the government stole \$7 million from Autopac we still enjoy the lowest insurance rates in North America. The Tories and their friends in the insurance industry can't stand it, so they set up a commission at public expenses to destroy it.

And of course they appointed a Commission to inquire into Hydro. These prudent businessmen, who believe in restraint, appoint a Commission that was supposed to cost \$150,000, Mr. Speaker; it is already over \$2 million. And they claim it is necessary to investigate Hydro. Manitoba enjoys the third lowest Hydro rates in North America but the pork barrelers on that side say it must be investigated because Hydro rates doubled in the past five years.

And, Mr. Speaker, they are going to freeze rates for five years. It's the same as the hospital in Snow Lake. They are all quite happy to take credit for it. Well, let's put credit where it's due. Who fought against that Hydro diversion? The raising, whether it should be 8 feet or 30 feet; who fought it and fought it and fought it? Who won an election on that thing, on that plank, that we would only raise it 8 feet compared to their 0?

The Minister of Finance, in those days, asked a question over and over again: What's the difference between 30 feet and 8 feet? Well, My God, Mr. Speaker, I have Grade 9 education and I can answer that one. But now he is Minister of Finance, and that figures.

Mr. Speaker, the price of oil has increased almost 500 percent in the last five years and the oil companies' profits increased 43 percent in the first quarter of 1979. You know, the federal government recently offered the oil industry concessions worth \$4 billion but the present Canadian Petro . . . , who has just enjoyed its 175 percent increase in profit in the first three months in 1979 said that was not enough.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this pork barrel government is investigating everything that is working well, including Manitoba Hydro. Why are they not investigating the oil industry, which is taking much more money out of the pockets of the people of Manitoba than Hydro ever will.

Well, I can only conclude from this, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Cohen, the First Minister's employer, friend and boss has demanded more profits. The master's voice has spoken and it will be heeded.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget was so bad that the so-called Honourable Minister of Finance couldn't defend it, so in desperation, he called the First Minister of defence. It was so bad that the First Minister couldn't defend it either, so in his usual oily manner in desperation, attempted to divert attention away from it by attacking the Federal New Democratic Party. My God, Mr. Speaker, what a ploy. Then he does it every day in the House, Mr. Speaker, during Question Period. Have you ever known him to answer a question, that First Minister?

They're trained like a bunch of parrots, a bunch of owls. He says something, . . . I don't think it's funny, but they laugh and they clap their desks to cover up the fact that he can't answer the question. My God, it's so obvious, Mr. Speaker.

He's stated that he'd like to appoint a truth squad. I guess some Tory hacks need jobs, the rate's good — \$75.00 an hour, to investigate the truth of political commercials.
—(Interjection)—

My son runs a polygraph machine in Ontario, Mr. Speaker — he's a detective, that's his job to learn the truth. He'd have a ball over here, a real ball.

Mr. Speaker, in Chile the intellectual and political associates of our Tory friends have a "death squad." They execute those who disagree of their government. Here the Tories want a "truth squad" who so decide that only Tory political commercials are truthful.

Let's look at some of the commercials. In 1977, they said there would be no more expensive inquiry commissions, like the CFI Commission; remember, that's the one the Roblin, Gurney Evans, Steinkopf, and our honourable Leader signed this secret agreement in 1965, and this Cabinet group laid the foundation for the fraudulent activities that followed. And this is a direct quote on Page 9-11 of the CFI Report: "But now they've a \$150,000 commission which has cost \$2 million, and that is truth, no Tory advertising. In 1977, they said they'd create a better environment for our doctors, but last year Manitoba became the only province since the Second World War to suffer a net loss of doctors." That's truth in Tory advertising.

"In 1977, they said abolition of estate tax would keep money and businesses here." They abolished the tax on the rich which affected one and a half percent of Manitobans.

MR. SPEAKER: The member has five minutes.

MR. BARROW: And today, money and business is leaving the province so fast, that the bird-brained Minister of Economic Development is throwing away millions of dollars of taxpayers money in a desperate attempt to keep them here. That is truth in Tory advertising. What's that? Moulting.

In 1977, they said the province would pay 80 percent of education costs, but now the President of the School Trustees' Association has stated the provincial share of education costs have dropped below the 74 percent paid to the New Democratic Government and this will mean higher property taxes. That is truth this Tory advertising? Is it truth or fiction?

Mind you, they are at least consistent with their philosophy. They reduce taxes for the rich, and increase them for the poor. It may be stupid, Mr. Speaker, but at least they're consistent.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour said that he's puzzled why people are leaving Manitoba, and he's going to appoint a committee or commission to investigate. I guess there's one more Tory out there who hasn't got his hands in the pork barrel — he'll be working for \$2.95 — no, it'll be \$75.00 an hour. Everyone knows why they're leaving. One reason they're leaving is the average wage, it's the second lowest in Canada. 3,000 jobs in Nelson River were destroyed just for political revenge.

The Minister of Health has admitted that Welfare payments have increased 50 percent because of lack of jobs. When the New Democrats were in office we reduced the Tory Welfare rolls by 35 percent; and in 2 more years we'll do it again, Mr. Speaker.

Winnipeg has just suffered the worst inflation of any city in Canada; Manitoba has just suffered the highest increase in unemployment of any province in Canada. Manitoba construction workers are suffering a 34 percent unemployment rate. The Minister of Housing is feathering his own nest, I guess.

But the Minister of Labour is puzzled, and he's going to pay some Tory \$75.00 an hour to investigate why the people are leaving. The minister may not know why they're leaving, Mr. Speaker, but everybody else does. Go out on the street and ask somebody — let him ask anybody and they'll tell him. They'll tell him that the Manitobans are not waiting until the next election to vote against the government, they're voting now. They're voting with their feet by leaving, Mr. Speaker. On Tuesday they voted with their heads.

You know, Mr. Speaker, he decided that the working people of this province should be punished. He's punished the labour people, Mr. Speaker, and he did. He made the Minister of Tourism the Minister of Labour. He showed his contempt for labour, all right, but Mr. Speaker, that wasn't bad enough, he said, "I'll show them contempt to a greater degree; I'll put the Member for Thompson in that portfolio." My God, Mr. Speaker, he's stooped to the lowest point in the barrel. And it played very well in the union because the altercations was the unions versus a personal attack on Dick Martin. And Dick Martin said, Mr. Speaker, "What can you expect from a pig but a grunt?" Mr. Speaker, that's the feeling in the north of the Minister of Labour.

Well, Mr. Speaker, my time must almost be up. I know you want me to go on, but I'm bound by the rules. And unlike the Member for Lakeside, I do have respect for the decorum of this House.

But Mr. Speaker, talking to one of my constituents in the federal election and I asked him what he thought. "Well!" he said, "Mr. Barrow, with Trudeau we're going down the drain; and with Mr. Clark we'll go down faster." Well, Mr. Speaker, with this government, we've gone down the drain. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

HON. ROBERT BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, let me congratulate the Minister of Finance for the excellent Budget that he brought down several days ago. The reaction from my constituents as well as people in rural Manitoba has been indeed very gratifying and we feel that it's an excellent way of starting off and continuing our program of developing meaningful jobs in the Province of Manitoba without trying to create all these short term Make-Work Projects.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me say on an item that isn't that large in the particular Budget, but that I have fought for a number of years is the removal of sales tax from the fire fighting equipment that municipalities are buying. I made that speech when I came in the House for three years in a row trying to get the previous administration to remove that particular thing; it's not that big a thing, but they refused at that time to do it and I think that is one particular thing that I find very gratifying that has now been removed and been done away with.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing that I'm very happy about is the Hydro freeze. I think that when we're talking to people involved in different institutions, and it's been mentioned here before, whether it be hospitals, personal care homes, educational facilities, they can now budget properly as far as the increase or the amount that they will have to budget in their yearly budgets for Hydro consumption, and I think that will be one step forward to try and alleviate some of the increase in costs in the inflation that we have before us.

The other thing that I would like to mention is the sales tax cuts on granaries as well as clothing for children up to the age of 14. I think that's a very positive move. Out in rural Manitoba, where a lot of the children are helping on the farms and doing all kinds of things with their parents, helping to make a family economic unit viable, this will be of benefit to that particular family, and I praise the Minister of Finance for doing that.

Mr. Speaker I would like to today deal with several points that have been brought up by the Member for Inkster, by members opposite over the last little while, by the Leader of the Opposition and I would like to: No. 1 deal with some of the allegations that have been made about the winding down of the MDC.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, from the outset that the Member that was in charge of the Manitoba Development Corporation before this government took over, took it over when it was in pretty bad shape, and I've told him that; I mentioned that the other day in the Committee, and to a certain extent I felt sorry for him, because the Member for Brandon East had started all these grandiose ventures like William Clare and Saunders and Morden Fine Foods; he had started these things up. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the members opposite constantly refer to CFI. If they will check back in the record, I have gone on record saying that no government, and I said whatever political stripe, and I've maintained that all along, can run a business efficiently. And I'll tell you I have things here today which will show that. So, Mr. Speaker, let's just use the statistics and show what happened when the Member for Inkster was Minister in charge of MDC. What did he do with that?

He knew No. 1, Mr. Speaker, that that thing was going to be their nemesis. He knew that, because they were having big problems there and he had to, somehow, try and wiggle his way out and wind this thing down. —(Interjection)— Now, he says, "Well, you guys are winding it down." But let's look at the statistics. In 1971, the new loans account of that particular portfolio of the MDC was 50 new loans that company made. In 1973, they made 45 new loans for a total of \$2,900,000.00. Mr. Speaker, at that time they had 52 employees employed there. In 1974, from 45 loans they dropped to 13 loans and, lo and behold, they dropped to 48 employees. So, Mr. Speaker, you see the slide starting. And out of those 13 loans, the total amount was \$713,000 loaned. Well, Mr. Speaker, anybody that knows anything about business knows that 13 loans for a total of \$713,000 is no formidable force in the marketplace. It can't be with 48 employees, Mr. Speaker.

Then in 1975, get this now, we dropped from 13 new loans to 5 new loans for a total of \$681,000, and we dropped to 46 employees. So what's happening? We're slowly winding this thing down because he realizes . . . listen, this Saunders thing is going to kill us; we'd better do something about this William Clare; we'd better do something about Morden Fine Foods, and try and wind this whole thing down. So, in 1976, Mr. Speaker, they're down to 3 new loans for \$367,000.00.

Here is this big corporation which is now down, Mr. Speaker, from 46 people the year before to 32 people — that's 1976, that's the NDP, that's not the Conservative Government, it's the NDP that did that. Then, Mr. Speaker, in 1977, they're down to 2 loans for \$135,000.00. 22 employees — dropped another 10 that year. And they have the gall to get up and accuse us of winding down the Manitoba Development Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Transcona accused us of that the other day in the Committee

meeting. Don't say you didn't say that, because you did.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the thing that really disturbs me and the Member for Inkster in this particular occasion was not true to his form. I remember coming in here as a new member, and the members of that particular group that had been in the 1969 government, 1967, 1969 government had chastised me for giving our dear friends at Simplot a loan and not converting that loan into an equity position.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster said if the government takes the risk, the government should benefit from any accrued interest or accrued profits that come. But, what does he do? In 1977, Mr. Speaker, MDC okays a loan to McCain's. Was there an equity position taken? No, no equity position, Mr. Speaker. So we are now waiting . . . that was the one big loan that was made, and we are waiting to disburse that to that particular company. But, Mr. Speaker, in that particular case, they knew how bad this whole thing was going and they did not take an equity position because they were afraid of the political consequences, and he strayed at that particular time from his principles, as far as government ownership above everything else.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are down now at the Manitoba Development Corporation to 10.5 employees right now, Mr. Speaker, and I expect that will go down somewhat more. But we are not having people sitting around, giving two new loans for \$135,000 and spending something in that particular year, spending a total amount of \$700,000 of taxpayers money in the operation of that particular company. Now, we loaned \$135,000 and spent \$700,000 in wages and expenses. Now, —(Interjection)— this is good business, Mr. Speaker. Further to that, say that when I brought these figures up at the Economic Development Committee, the member said yeah, yeah, we were cutting down the loaning, but we were looking after some of the companies, some of the problems that we had inherited and had developed throughout the years. Well, Mr. Speaker, that means that out of this \$700,000, the year before the costs were \$1.4 million in 1976 — that - means that we were subsidizing these government-owned companies by management, which was being billed to the Manitoba Development Corporation. So how can you say that Morden Fine Foods statement accurately represents what the total costs were, because we might have had four or five people seconded to that particular industry, whose expenses were charged to the Manitoba Development Corporation, and that is not my statement, but the statement from the Member for Inkster when he mentioned that those people were employed in other things looking after some of the problems that they had.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the members say we are winding down MDC, let me tell you that they knew what kind of a mess they had, and they were consciously winding that thing down and the figures bear it out very clearly. Let's examine some of the things that they were dealing with, and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is leaving right now, but I'd like to mention something of Venture Tours — the Member for St. George brought that up.

You know, Mr. Speaker, in 1977 in October, when we took over, one of the first things I had to do is go to Cabinet and ask for a special warrant. For what? — for the operating deficit of what else, our famous M.S. Lord Selkirk. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have here the statement, and I would like to read the Provincial Auditor's Report, October 31st, 1977 — that's when the bird grower from Burrows was the minister. —(Interjection)— No, no, here's the business acumen that our members opposite profess that they were so great at. Let's read the . . . this is the Provincial Auditor's statement, not mine. It's right in the report. The corporation's operations for the fiscal year ending October 31st, 1977, consisted of its normal operations and the operations of Gull Harbour Resort Hotel, commencing March 4, 1977. The accounting records were not in satisfactory condition. There was no effective accounts maintained to provide separate accounting for each corporation. Therefore, comparative statements for the corporation's normal operation could not be prepared, nor could any analytical audit be carried out — none.

Mr. Speaker, the Board of Directors of the M.S. Lord Selkirk hadn't met since 1976, since the beginning of 1976. It goes on to say, in view of the condition of the records and the method of operation, we are not in a position to express an opinion as to whether or not the accompanying financial statements prepared by us for records and information, such as they were, present fairly the corporation's financial position as of October 31st, and the results of its operations and changes in its financial position for the year ending at that time.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what had they done? They had taken a boat which was, or an asset which was a drain on the Manitoba Development Corporation, and included the year before \$250,000 in the Tourism Estimates for the loss. Well, that wasn't enough for that year, they required another \$112,000 to head that off — of course, they didn't repay any of the interest or principle that the Manitoba Development Corporation had. The next year, Mr. Speaker, they budgeted \$251,000, but that was for the operation of Gull Harbour, which they knew was going to be a pretty heavy money loser, and I've got documentation for that, and also they knew, Mr. Speaker, that the \$104,000 that was budgeted into the Tourism Estimates, would not be enough. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was

an election year, of course, and you don't want to include maybe \$.5 million and get everybody excited for the operation of one boat. So, when we came along in the beginning of October, what did we have to do? We had to pass a special warrant. Mr. Speaker, one on October 26th for \$165,000, and one on November 30th for \$112,000. So we're looking at \$277,000 already. Then when we looked at the mess that the books were in, and then we looked at what the cost of operation was, that we were subsidizing every person that rode on that boat, to the tune of \$35.00 a day. In other words, we might as well have gone out and advertised in the Minneapolis Herald — come to Manitoba, we're going to give you a free room at the Holiday Inn or at the International Inn — that's the type of tourist attraction we were dealing with. —(Interjection)— So, Mr. Speaker, that's good business — that's real good business.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to deal briefly with the one thing I think that really is a real shame. We blew \$40 million on one particular item, and you know, it wasn't the MDC that really did it, because when you look at the schedule of payments, the Orders-in-Councils that were passed, this particular company was operated by the Cabinet and not by the Development Corporation.

Back in September of 1974, let me just read a few off here, how the money was flying out of your coffers at that time. September 1974, \$600,000; October 8th, 1974, \$600,000; October 18th, \$592,000; October 23rd, \$785,000; November 13th, \$475,000; December 2nd, \$600,000. Mr. Speaker, it goes on, every month just about we're passing more than \$.5 million in the maintenance of this particular facility.

A MEMBER: Let's hear some more.

MR. BANMAN: January 10th, \$400,000; January 17th, \$365,000; January 29th, \$550,000; February 12th, \$550,000; February 26th, \$400,000; March 13th, \$600,000; April 2nd, \$900,000; April 29th, \$800,000; May 1st, \$700,000; May 16th, \$900,000; May 28th, \$600,000.00. Mr. Speaker, it goes on until finally the Member for Inkster realized that this whole thing was going down the tube and he realized that the green bucks had to stop here. And that's when they put that into Receivership, Mr. Speaker. But they were pumping money at a rate of \$1 million a month, and this wasn't the MDC Board that was doing it, it was done under Part 2 of the Act, and all the members that sat on the Treasury Bench at that time, were involved in pumping that kind of money into an operation, Mr. Speaker, which they knew was going down the tube.

You know, the Member for Inkster has the gall to get up and say we gave away Morden Fine Foods, because there was \$1 million worth of inventory. Well let me tell you what kind of inventory we're talking about when we're talking about Saunders. Saunders Aircraft, and I'm just going to pick out one aircraft that was sold because I think it was the only one that was sold. In September of 1974, Saunders Aircraft sold an airplane to Otonabee. It was Aircraft Manufacturing No. 008. The cost of production, the book value of that aircraft, according to the auditors that were doing the books, was \$1,139,000.00. You know what we sold it for, Mr. Speaker — that was the cost, that was inventory; we sold it for \$619,000. We lost \$.5 million on the sale of one aircraft. —(Interjection)— Talk about fire sales. It's absolutely horrendous what went on here. Mr. Speaker, they lost \$.5 million on one aircraft that was sold. So let's deal with some of the others, some of the businesses — and that was in 1974 when the government was already directly pumping \$1 million a month into the thing, and trying to keep it afloat.

A MEMBER: Taxpayers' money.

MR. BANMAN: But, Mr. Speaker, some of the things that happened with regards to , for instance, the Colombia deal are absolutely, to put it in the previous First Minister's words, mind-boggling, absolutely mind-boggling. They sold aircraft, Mr. Speaker, to Aces, which was the Colombian Aircraft Company.

Mr. Speaker, because I haven't got enough time to deal with this, , I'm just going to read a few things into the record here. They had, Mr. Speaker, effective December 15th, 1973, a new financial arrangement was set up because they had defaulted on lots of the others, and they couldn't collect. In conjunction with the purchase of the Aces third aircraft, and Mr. Speaker, they sold Aces an aircraft here for \$489,000.00. The cost of building that aircraft was close to \$1 million. A down payment of \$51,000 was received, leaving a balance of \$437,900.00. Now, Mr. Speaker, when the whole thing was consolidated, what happened is, we had to refinance \$1.2 million on three aircraft. We had to refinance the part sales to them for \$27,000.00. We had to refinance the spare parts we had sold them for \$25,000.00. And then we went ahead and included a parts account, which they had bought some more parts for another \$52,000, which brought a total refinancing deal together of \$1.384 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this was in 1973. What happened in 1975? Well, that's history of course.

We had to go down there and repossess them all, and the total amount owing by Aces on September 30th, 1975, was \$1.35 million, when we refinanced \$1.384 million.

Mr. Speaker, they flew these two airplanes for two years at whose expense? Manitoba — Manitoba's expense, and then we had to go pick them up with time expired engines. and the airplanes were in terrible condition, and we had to fly them back here, and we had to bring them back here. Now listen, Mr. Speaker, that's one of them.

Let's talk about another one — let's talk about an aircraft that we sold the Alberta government, not the Alberta government, an Alberta company. Mr. Speaker, we sold an aircraft to Bayview. We sold that aircraft with spare parts and everything included, for \$632,000 — we lost \$400,000 on this sale — we're doing a little better on this one. Mr. Speaker, they financed that airplane, used spare parts, flew that airplane for 2,800 hours, and then we had to go and repossess it and the balance owing as at September 30th, 1975 when we repossessed it, was \$545,000 — sold it for \$632,000 after 2,800 hours of flying, we got it back and they owed \$545,000, then we sold this aircraft to Otonabee in 1977, two years later, for \$320,000, after doing some extensive repairs to it.

Mr. Speaker, you talk about mismanagement and the waste of taxpayers' funds — we've got it. And then the Member for Inkster has the gall to get up and say. Morden had \$1 million worth of stock. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I tell the members, I tell the people of Manitoba, there was no \$1 million worth of stock there. He might have written it in or they might have had Brights stock on the shelves, which they said was worth \$1 million, but, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't. And, Mr. Speaker, just like he was saying, or like the members would have us believe that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 12:30 p.m., I'm leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 p.m. The Honourable Member will have 20 minutes.