

# THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, April 17, 1978

Time: 8:00 p.m.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we proceed, let me draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my left, where we have 19 Brownies of the 157th Winnipeg Brownie Pack under their Leader, Mrs. Nina Tackaberry. This group is from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

We also have in the gallery to the right, 15 Scouts from the 1st Crestview Scout Troop under Mr. Sproules. This Scout group is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Labour.

On behalf of the members, we welcome you here tonight.

## BUDGET DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to speak to the Budget Debate, firstly, I would like to assure the Member for Selkirk, who challenged us backbenchers on this side of the House before he finished his speech to rise and make our feelings known — I would just like to assure him at this stage of the game that we are all very capable of making our feelings known, and what he reads in the paper is not necessarily a reflection of how the people all feel in the back here.

As a novice politician, I would like to take this opportunity to maybe make some of my views known in terms of being a member of the Legislature for the first time, and I have certain trepidations in getting up and speaking to the Budget Debate. As the Member for Ste. Rose indicated to me during the Estimates that I have a lot to learn, I want to assure him that I am very pleased with the learning process and I find it a real challenge. I just hope, I sincerely hope that in the learning process, I will never get that conceited that after a few terms in the House here that I will not have an open mind and be prepared to learn some more. And in listening to some of the orators opposite there, I sometimes wonder whether they have reached that stage where they cannot accumulate any more knowledge in terms of what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to sort of give my very naive impressions of the House proceedings as such. In listening to the members opposite criticizing what is happening, I get the definite impression that there is a tremendous amount of grandstanding going on, and playacting. I want to refer to the Member for Rupertsland who spoke for 40 minutes on the horror of a 200-unit condominium that is not even in the making. It amazes me when I sit here and listen to these things, you know, exactly what the purpose is of this kind of discussion.

I've had some of my constituency members attend the House here and listen to proceedings and I've got their impressions, and they are wondering what is going on here at times. Every individual seems to have a full 40 minutes to expound on whatever he wants, and they wonder how we get any work done here. And in my learning process naturally, I certainly sometimes feel the same way.

I was taught from home in the old tradition that if you criticize give constructive criticism. If you can't do that, keep your mouth shut. And in this House, seemingly, that is not the rule. It is a matter of criticizing, never mind the constructive criticism.

In my constituency and after people have been here, there has been a certain reservation about the validity of politicians. Sometimes there seems to be a shadow over politicians. The Member for Inkster stood up the other day and said he was proud to be a politician. I feel the same way. I feel very sincere about it. I am proud to be a politician. The first time that I appeared in this House, here, I thought I had accomplished something very dramatic by being a member representing the constituency of Emerson. When I get back, sometimes I get the impression from my constituents that it isn't that proud a position to be in, and I have certain misgivings, or I was wondering why. And I started thinking about this thing. Why do people not trust politicians?

Then I started checking out a little bit and certain things came to my mind. I would like to make reference to some of the things here which may validate the conception of people when they criticize politicians.

Four years ago, after the past previous election, in one of my rural municipalities a third order drain was built to the extent of over three miles without the rural municipality even being aware of it until the machinery moved in. They had never requested it. And in checking this thing out we find that one of the staunch supporters of the past government was very instrumental in this thing. Then you have to sort of pull your neck in and say, "Well, you know, is that politics or not?"

I'd like to refer to pre-election, last fall, when the former Minister of Agriculture appeared in the Village of Grunthal at a meeting with the Broiler Association, with the broiler farmers and he indicated, at that meeting, that if the NDP stayed in power that before December he would sign the federal Marketing Board.

**A MEMBER:** Who said that?

**MR. DRIEDGER:** The former Minister of Agriculture.

**A MEMBER:** I didn't hear him say that.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** And when the present Minister of Agriculture made the announcement that he had signed with the national board or that he was going to sign, the former Minister of Agriculture got up and said, "Never, never would we have signed it because it's only for six farmers."

I have made the broiler farmers aware of his statements and I wonder if he would be prepared to come back and speak to them again sometime.

I'd like to refer to things like the Whitemouth Grazing Co-op, which involved the co-operative organization within government, the environmental people and the Department of Agriculture, where it was indicated that if they developed Crown land as a grazing co-op they could get a grant of \$65 an acre and they could develop the land. It was indicated at that time that they could also qualify for an MACC loan. By the time the smoke cleared they had spent \$10,000 of their own money, the land still belonged to the Crown and they had no assurance of ever getting a crop off it.

I am happy to say at this stage of the game that the present Minister of Agriculture has resolved that. It is back to Crown land again. The people have their money back and everybody is happy.

I'm referring to some of these things rurally because I'm a rural member and these things are closer to me than some of the other problems possibly. I also would like to make reference to, let's say, the interference in agriculture of the past government and I just want to bring these things out at the present time because possibly in the future we can talk much more positively in agriculture a year from now.

Questions that got thrown to us during the course of the last government — I'd like to make reference to the bird houses and fence posts throughout the country. We're told it's a government project. How do you explain this to farmers? Bird houses all over the country. It's supposed to be a very constructive program.

I'd like to correct in the record the Member for Ste. Rose when he referred to one of my constituents by the name of Peter Friesen and he indicated that he was involved in the cow-calf operation and he had three cattle. For the record, I want to indicate to the Member for Ste. Rose that he has over 300 head of cattle, not 3 cattle. Maybe your arithmetic isn't quite balanced there.

I'd like to make, at this time, some reference to the interference in agriculture by the previous government — the beef program. There has been a lot of activity right now in response to the supposed voluntary checkoff that the present Minister of Agriculture is presenting and certain elements are trying to raise all kinds of flak about it relating to the fact that we had a vote approximately a year ago and it was turned down and for the record, I would like to straighten out the facts. I was one of the people that voted and there is no resemblance to what is happening right now to the vote that was subjected to the beef farmers at that time. I'm a little concerned about the direction when government gives direction. I'd like to refer to a few years ago when farmers were supported to seed alfalfa instead of wheat — the year that wheat went way up. I'm concerned about when the farmers were getting a \$3,000 grant to go into the beef program when the prices already were going down. A lot of individuals joined that program on the basis that government knew what they were doing and in the meantime ended up in substantial debt and still are.

I'd like to make reference to the dairy operation. At one time, there used to be a certain amount of trade in the quota system or the transfer of quotas. If a man sold his dairy operation, he could transfer his quota. Under the system previously, if a dairy farmer decided to sell out, he sold his cows to the market, the quota went back to the government.

The same thing applied in the broiler industry. A man could sell his barns but he could not transfer his quota which indicated to me interference by government, they were so concerned about controlling everything. Everything had to be controlled by government. We had an opportunity to establish a community pasture in the Sirko area in the southeast corner and the provincial government would not go along with it because they had to give up the provincial Crown land to the Federal Government so they scrapped the idea. Here again, the program is full in progress.

I'd like to express some concern in terms of municipal involvement. The municipalities at this stage of the game have hardly any authority left, especially in the planning field and specifically because no proper direction has ever been given to them or to government. The municipality approves a plan of subdivision, the government rejects it and if, by appearing before the municipal board, we're looking at six months to a year before even a five-acre site can be cut up in a case where we have land that is classified "5" and "6".

I don't really mean to be critical of the former Minister of Agriculture. I think his intentions were relatively noble. —(Interjection)— I think they really were. But I think that he was handicapped with a Deputy Minister who just never understood the agricultural frontier.

Mr. Speaker, at this stage I'd like to compliment the Minister of Finance on his Budget. I do not intend to talk in depth of the heavy stuff in there. I'd like to just make reference to some of the lesser things that affect my area. I'd like to talk of things like purple gas for the timber cutters, for the timber industry, I think it's very commendable. The opposition has always indicated that we're talking to the big guys. This is for the little guys and I'm very proud of it.

I'd like to refer to purple gas for diesel farm trucks. I'd like to talk of municipal consideration in terms of gas tax, fuel tax exemptions on off-highway equipment. I actually, Mr. Speaker, being a novice I draw my own conclusions sitting back here and listening to the activity that goes on, and when the Minister of Finance presented his Budget the other night, in my opinion I think the opposition were shocked. I think this is one of the reasons why they've been reacting the way they do,

because I think it's a tremendous Budget.

I think it is a Budget that affects the average people — the average people, which is very hard for them to conceive. Sometimes when I've been sitting here and listening, especially to the Member for Inkster when he indicated at one stage of the game, that if we listened long enough we might start to believe. And sometimes I've almost had my reservations, almost, till I go home to my constituency and then I get faith again. Because the support, the response in my constituency is very positive. After spending a week out here when I get back out there, I feel like a hero, when I start doubting a little bit here sometimes.

What I would like to say to the members opposite, really, is that I would like them to continue criticizing the way you do because as long as you do that, I win my brownies back home.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to once again, compliment the Minister of Finance. I think it's a very commendable Budget. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. BEN HANUSCHAK:** In joining in the Budget Debate there was one point that came to my mind that I thought I would draw to the attention of members opposite, because this does reflect on government's expenditures and in turn on the revenues that they require to meet those expenditures. I notice on the highway map published by the Honourable Minister of Highways that he advertises — (Interjection)— Now the Honourable Minister has forgotten. I will draw to his attention, on the back of it in red type "Manitoba Moods, a provincial quarterly. Manitoba Moods is a colorful magazine designed to enhance Manitoba for provincial residents and their visitors. Subscriptions cost \$4 per year." I telephoned the office, I wanted to pay my \$4, order a subscription, they refused to take my money, because they say that the future of this magazine is uncertain.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the Honourable Minister's colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, to take this matter under advisement and check into it, and if he should find that there is some evidence of misleading advertising, then I would suggest that he ought to take appropriate action against them because surely a government publication and —(Interjection)— Well, that's another problem. That too could be the subject of a speech, but I won't deal with that tonight, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that we will find some more appropriate occasion to deal with that when we come to dealing with his Estimates or whatever. But we will skip that for the time being.

But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, there was expenditure of public funds to advertise a publication, which I believe is now extinct or on the verge of becoming extinct.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we heard the Minister of Education outline some of the details of a program which was announced in the Budget to deal with student summer employment. I think it was described to us as being a Job Creation Program for students, a Job Creation Program in the private sector, assistance of \$1.25 an hour to defray the wages of those under 18 years of age, I believe, and \$1.50 for those over 18 and under 24, up to a maximum of \$1,000.00.

Well, at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to indicate to the Minister, who is not in his seat at this time, that we will be most interested to see whether in fact an employment program created in this fashion will accomplish what I believe the Minister would want to see accomplished, whether his Party does, whether his Government does, or not, I don't know. In fact, I would doubt it very much. That is to say I doubt very much whether this program would in fact create additional employment for those in greatest need of jobs to go to university or to attend any post-secondary institution. Because I fear, Mr. Speaker, that in the absence of the type of criteria that we had when we were government, in our student summer employment programs, and that is, we did look at the student's financial need, and the criterion was very simple — if the student was eligible for student aid then he stood first in line in getting summer employment. But that criterion appears to be absent from this Minister's program. So I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that all that this would really lead to is nothing more than a form of private sector incest, where two neighbours in business, each having children attending university, so one — even though there is a rule that you cannot hire your sons and daughters, wives, husbands, etc. — but one hires his neighbour's son or daughter, and the other hires the other. So they hire each other's children, which according to the guidelines for the program as indicated by the Honourable Minister this afternoon, there'd be no violation of them, it would be quite proper and quite acceptable. So really

what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is those who may be in a better position to obtain employment, those who may be of lesser financial need, will be the ones who receive employment under this program as opposed to those whose chances, opportunities for getting employment, might not be as good and whose financial needs may be greater. So I doubt whether this program would result in what the honourable member — and I will come to him in a moment or two — what the Honourable Member for St. Matthews alluded to when he did make mention of the fact that we have not, up to this point in time, extended the benefits, or provided accessibility to post-secondary education to any greater degree to the lower income families, or to the sons and daughters of lower income families. To some degree we have, yes, by our Student Aid Program, but we are not at the point as yet where one could say that accessibility to post-secondary educational institutions are equally open to all regardless of economic status. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this program which the Honourable Minister of Education announced, or elaborated on this afternoon, which was announced in the Budget Speech, will correct that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the debate during the Budget Speech was indeed rather interesting to hear because for the first time in, well, four weeks that this session of the House has been sitting plus the

two weeks of the fall session, this is the first time that we have heard from a number of the backbenchers. I don't know, it could be that that may end up being the only time that we'll hear from them, I don't know. But nevertheless, we did hear from some. And we heard —(Interjection)— now, the Honourable Member for Wolseley asks me whether I have a microphone in the office, I presume listening in on his caucus meetings. No, I don't, but I think that the conduct of the backbenchers in the House and the control that's exercised over them is quite apparent to all, without the benefit or the assistance of a microphone. But I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that the backbenchers will take every opportunity that they will have to express their views and to speak their minds, which I realize on occasion is difficult, taking into account a number of factors; one, the program, the platform of their own party, and the control exercised over them by some of the occupants of the front benches.

I was impressed, Mr. Speaker, with the ability of the Honourable Member for Wolseley in so quickly and rapidly sensing and obtaining a reading on the impact of changes in tax structure. I believe the honourable member — he spoke on Thursday night, the Budget was brought down on Monday night, and within about 60 hours he was able to indicate to the House that he could see a change in the buying patterns, people were buying more. You know, I'm sure that had I asked a similar question of the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Finance would have told me, "Well, I really don't know, we'll have to check it out, we'll have to review it, study it. I can't give an answer right off the bat." The Honourable Member for Wolseley stood up in his seat and after taking a stroll down Broadway Avenue, Sherbrook, wherever else he went, and this was the conclusion that he came to. Not only did he come to that conclusion but he also was able to analyze the purchasing habits by age categories, because he found the younger people buying more. It could be, Mr. Speaker, it could be that perhaps they were taking a somewhat short-sighted view of the future. They may have happened to still have a few dollars in their pockets which they were able to earn in better times under our government, and now with the Conservative government in office and well, giving a brief, what appears to be tax relief by a reduction in sales tax — which is not really relief of any kind when you take all factors into account — but perhaps blinded by that, they're out spending the few dollars that they have, but knowing full well, I would think, that the financial pressure and burden will increase next fall when they're hit with a higher tuition fee, when they're eventually perhaps hit with a higher insurance premium for an automobile that they may own, when they're hit with having to pay higher transit fares, and so forth. So, a momentary period of enjoyment that they may be having now.

The Member for Roblin, perhaps the Member for Wolseley may have noticed, he is not quite so ready to just give an off-the-cuff assessment of legislative changes governing taxes, because I asked him if he could indicate the number of constituents within his riding who are the direct beneficiaries of the repeal of the Succession Duty and Gift Tax Act, and he told me that he didn't know. He is still studying the matter. And I hope that some day he will inform the Minister of Finance and inform the House of the extent to which that change in legislation brought in last fall will directly benefit his constituents. But I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that — well, I wouldn't hold my breath, and I wouldn't advise you to — I would suspect that that will probably occur about the same time as he'll table the Hydro bill, after which he is still looking, I believe.

The Honourable Member for Wolseley — he of course also claims to be an expert on matters related to tourism — his priority was, well, two. Those are the first two points that he mentioned. One, stand-up bars and canned music. Well, I would suggest he send a copy of his speech to the Musicians Union and obtain the benefit of their views on his proposal. I'm sure that they would be only too happy to express their thoughts to him. And then he went on to speak about the parks, about opening up the parks. He said, "We've got to open up the parks." But to who, Mr. Speaker?

**A MEMBER:** Jarmoc.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Open them up to the likes of Jarmoc? Is that what he means when he's talking about opening up the parks? Open them to, you know, to investors, speculators, privateers? And in the process of opening the parks to them, and this, Mr. Speaker, is our concern; it's our concern about the news that had come out about four or five weeks ago about the proposed action of this government, is that in the process of opening the parks up in that manner, the government will in fact be closing the parks to others, for other uses . . .

**MR. WILSON:** How many people own canoes?

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** . . . yes, for the canoeist, for the individual who is also concerned about the preservation of that which really is part of the beauty of the park, the natural beauty contained within it. But the Honourable Member for Wolseley I'm sure that he would endorse the construction of condominium developments and luxury resort hotels and whatever and the boardwalk type of entertainment places on every square foot of our provincial parks.

I sort of feel sorry somewhat for the Honourable Member for Wolseley because he has a bit of a problem and I think one of his problems is — and this extends from the days when they sat on this side of the House when he wasn't able to quite see the distinction between government and opposition. You know, Mr. Speaker, on one occasion he had received a letter from a constituent of his, from one who is no longer a constituent. I checked the telephone directory; he moved out and I don't blame him, Mr. Speaker. Anyway, this constituent wrote to the Honourable Member for Wolseley asking him

Monday, April 17, 1978

a purely political question and the question was this. He said, "Dear Mr. Wilson. You may have noted that this government" — meaning our government — "had ordered the relocation of Whiteshell Service" — I believe the name of the company is called, which was based on one of the lakes in the Whiteshell which flew aircraft to outlying fishing lodges on the lake, from its former location where it was based from the days when the operator only flew one aircraft and now his operation had expanded somewhat and now it's become an annoyance and a nuisance to the users of the park in that general area. So we agreed with the other users of the park that the landing base for this flying operation should be relocated. And he was relocated. So this constituent writes to the Honourable Member for Wolseley bringing this to his attention and pointing out to him that he agrees with the decision of our government. And this was last spring, May or June. And he says "It's likely there is going to be an election in the near future and we would like to know and I, as a constituent of yours, would like to know where you stand on this matter. In the event your party were to form the government, would you support the decision of the previous government or would you reverse it?"

So the Honourable Member for Wolseley sent a copy of that letter to me for my comments. Mr. Speaker, it was purely a political question and the honourable member will recall the . . . oh, yes, and this constituent also indicated to the Honourable Member for Wolseley that he may want to check with the shadow minister in his caucus on this matter. So I wrote — (Interjection)— Well, I'm not quite sure who the shadow minister was at that time. Maybe it was somebody from Great-West for all we know. That's quite possible. Anyway, I wrote back to him a polite letter, a very polite letter. I reminded him that I'm not his shadow or the shadow of anyone in his caucus.

**MR. WILSON:** It wasn't a polite letter. It was far from a polite letter.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** And No. 2, I think I also pointed out to him that I feel that he would no more welcome advice from me on a political matter than I would from him so we let it go at that.

**MR. WILSON:** It wasn't a polite letter.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** The honourable member says it wasn't a polite letter. Well, that was all that I said and, Mr. Speaker, you can judge for yourself whether it was polite or it was not polite.

As I indicated a moment ago, I realize the problem that the backbenchers have and this becomes apparent practically every time that anyone stands up and opens his mouth in debate. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable Member for Roblin was speaking about — he called them edifices — that the government built. I'm not quite sure, Mr. Speaker, just what he meant by edifices. Perhaps at some time during this session he should take the time to explain to the House more precisely which public works structures he regards as edifices and in particular which ones he regards as being unnecessary and that he would want to see razed or whatever. Is he referring to the schools in his constituency which were built with public funds? Is he referring to elderly persons' housing, to nursing homes? Is he referring to the government building built in Portage la Prairie which his colleague, the Member for Portage la Prairie, praised because he said that housed within it is an opportunity for employment for — I've forgotten how many hundreds of residents of the town and the Rural Municipality of Portage la Prairie. Are those the edifices that he's complaining about?

Because I also have a very distinct recollection that the Honourable Member for Roblin, as a good MLA for his riding, concerned about the welfare of his constituents, if at any time there was any concern expressed by a school division about planning and approval of an application for assistance for the building of a school, certainly the Honourable Member for Roblin made himself heard and expressed his concern to me and urged me to proceed with all due haste, to see to it that the application is processed and he expressed the wish that whatever the school division was asking for, by way of financial assistance, that it would in fact receive it. Now he is talking about being critical of some edifices built by us. — (Interjection)— Now my colleague, the Honourable Member for Elmwood says that perhaps anything larger than a chicken coop is an edifice and perhaps so. Then in his opinion, then there were many edifices that we had built and I suppose that he is including all of those structures as edifices of which he is now critical.

The Member for St. Matthews is having a real problem as is the Member for Wolseley, as is the Member for Wolseley. But the Member for St. Matthews perhaps even to a greater degree. You see, the problem that the Member for St. Matthews is having is when he is in this House, he is sort of torn betwixt and between. He tries to behave like a Conservative but he's got a problem because he knows that if he behaves like a Conservative back in his own riding, then that's going to have a negative effect on his future electoral chances. So he tries to be all things to all people and hence we heard him speak about his concern about the underprivileged, his concern about the senior citizens, his concern about the students from lower income families and so forth. — (Interjection)— Yes, his concern about cats and dogs.

In fact that was one of the planks in his election platform when he said in one of his pamphlets that every person should own a home and a dog. Well, Mr. Speaker, now I don't know whether it was his intent to make it mandatory that everyone should have a dog. What about the people who don't like dogs? — (Interjection)— But they still have to have a dog. Some people don't like dogs.

**A MEMBER:** What about goldfish?

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** He made no reference of that. Now, I don't know, maybe I will take up the

suggestion. No, I wouldn't do it because it wouldn't be proper. But word will leak out eventually. It could be that at his caucus meeting he's pushing for the abolition of sales tax on dog food, because he considers it so essential, you know, that every person should be able to feed his dog, perhaps even some form of subsidy for dog food for those who find it difficult to make ends meet. Because after all with the increase —(Interjection)— and so forth.

**MR. WILSON:** I'm all for a neuter clinic.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** So it can create a problem. But he, Mr. Speaker, is having a real problem. He thinks that he can play this dual role in his caucus, put on the act of being a Conservative, but from time to time make it appear that he's not really a Conservative, but really he's a socialist at heart, but he's there working with that gang trying to bring about some change, bring about some reform, bring about some legislation that would be socially useful. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that he will soon learn that it's not going to work over there and he ought to talk to some of his colleagues who have been around here longer; some of his colleagues who have been here previously in his part: and talk to the constituents of some of his colleagues who are now gone.

One that comes to mind, the one-time MLA for Churchill, Gordon Beard. Gordon Beard tried that, it didn't work. They just froze him out. They just froze him out and he continued sitting in that capacity for awhile until eventually he broke ranks with the party and sat as an Independent, because he just couldn't get to first base with them.

But the Honourable Member for St. Matthews and other members in the backbench who may have similar hopes and aspirations that they'll be able to bring about some change in the minds of the occupants of the front bench and some of the seats behind them. —(Interjection)— Now, the honourable members in the backbenches say they control them. Well, that will be interesting to observe. And up to this point in time, the impressions that anyone gets of the behaviour of that side of the House, be it from this side or be it from the gallery, is not as the honourable member just indicated, that the backbench controls the front, but really it is the reverse; and that the front bench has a very tight control and a very tight rein on the back bench.

So try as much as you would like, as much as you would want, to bring about whatever changes you feel are socially desirable to meet the problems of the people in Emerson constituency, over in the east end of Emerson constituency; to deal with the problems in Gimli constituency; of the people living around Inwood and Komarno and up through there, to deal —(Interjection)— The Honourable Member for Emerson says that we didn't even know that they were there.

Well, as we go through the Estimates, Mr. Speaker, we will demonstrate to the Honourable Member for Emerson that we knew very well that they were there. And we will demonstrate and we'll be asking this government about those programs. We would want to know exactly, on the whole host of programs which this government had instituted commencing in 1969, and continuing on until this momentary or temporary change in administration which had come about last October 11th. —(Interjection)—

The honourable member wants to know what programs, and as we go through the Estimates in the Health Department, in Education, in Agriculture, in Mines, in Tourism, and we will outline all the programs, we'll spell them out in great detail for the benefit of the honourable members of the back bench.

I'm glad that the honourable member asked that question because I think that they could do well, they could profit from an education exercise of that kind. Because, you know, Mr. Speaker, most of the back bench, with the exception of one or two, this is their first term in office, and it could be — and I don't fault them for that — but it could be that three, four or five years ago we may have instituted certain programs that did not catch the attention of some of the members sitting in the back, and of which they may be unaware today. And of course, many of those programs may now become history under this government. So we should remind them, during the Estimates debate, during the Budget debate, at whatever opportunity that we have in this House, we should remind them and outline to them the programs which the New Democratic Party Government had brought into being for the benefit of the people of Manitoba, for the benefit of all of the people of Manitoba and not just for a select few.

Not just for a select few because I think that Session this government rushed into within six weeks after its election, within a month and a day or so after being sworn into office, to deal with what? To deal with a couple of pieces of legislation, that was their top priority. Legislation to benefit, to assist whom? All the people of Manitoba? Family farms? How many family farmers? Even the Honourable Member for Roblin who has been in this House now for at least twelve years, I think the Honourable Member for Roblin is senior to me in terms of service in this House, or perhaps not. No, he was elected in June of 1966. So anyway, he's been in the House for 12 years. I asked him how many of his constituents would the repealed Succession Duty legislation directly benefit. He couldn't tell me. He said he was still studying the matter. We'll be interested to hear the results of his study. I'm sure that the type of assistance that he could offer is something that the Minister of Finance wouldn't want to pass up because he would find it invaluable, because that is the type of assistance that he would appreciate from each and every backbencher.

Maybe that's an exercise that each member ought to do, just go out and find out for yourselves exactly how many constituents in your riding the repeal of the Succession Duty legislation would benefit. How many around Sprague, how many around Tolstoi, how many around Vita . . . ?

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Now you know the names.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** The honourable member says, now I know the names. I knew them long before the honourable member knew them. —(Interjection)— Long before then. And in the riding of the Honourable Member for Pembina and the —(Interjection)— I know them too. But anyway, coming forth with that type of legislation to benefit them and then following up, you know, those were their prime concern, the wealthy.

**A MEMBER:** No, no, Ben.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Yes. Then reading the Budget Speech. Mr. Speaker, what is in it for my constituents? What is in it for the person on the minimum wage? What is in it for the person on a fixed income? What is in it for the son or daughter who may be attending a post-secondary institution — a son or daughter of one on the minimum wage, or whose parent in on minimal income? What is in it for them?

A \$100 fee increase; at least a \$100 fee increase. At least a 20 cent a day transit fare increase, which is going to amount to \$40, \$50, \$60 during the academic year, never mind the transit fare if they should be fortunate enough in finding employment during the summer months.

Then put the three percent sales tax reduction along side of that, Mr. Speaker, and a freeze on the critical home repair program.

The Honourable Member for Wolseley wants to make another speech. He wants to speak. I believe I hear him talk about a pub; he wants a pub at the university, or another pub at the university. Well, he will have to find his own time. I don't believe that the existing rules would allow him to speak again on the Budget Debate, but I'm sure that if he finds an opportunity either now or later he will take advantage of it and give us the benefit of his views.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I've said, in the Budget Debate there was nothing for my constituents. There was nothing for the vast majority of the people in the Province of Manitoba. For a select few, perhaps, but for the majority of the residents or the citizens of this province, nothing.

So that, indeed, does disturb me, the fact that there is nothing in the Budget Debate coupled with the attitude that has been demonstrated by this government up to this point in time in the manner in which they have dealt with a number of programs, programs either dealing with our natural resources, or programs designed for the development of our human resources, programs designed to give men and women a second chance, as it were; and seeing those programs cut — either cut out completely or cut down considerably.

These are the programs that are affecting people of the type such as in my riding, people in the north in remote communities, and people in many rural areas, and those are the ones who are going to suffer. Those are the one who are going to suffer by this callous action and conduct that we have seen demonstrated by this government.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to offer my support and my endorsement of the Budget Address introduced into this House last week by my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Finance, which won't come as any shock to anybody on that side of the House and I doubt it will come as any shock, Mr. Speaker, to you or anybody on this side of the House.

I should separate those two phrases. It won't come as any shock to you, nor will it come as any shock to anybody on this side of the House.

Sir, I want to say first of all that I think that it is important that the people of Manitoba, particularly the opposition, recognize the efforts that the Minister of Finance has made to bring a fiscal message into this Legislature, that recognizes the challenge facing Manitobans today. And I don't believe, Sir, that the opposition, in its reflex reaction — its knee-jerk reaction to defeat and dismay, and disappointment and disorientation — has ever stopped to acknowledge the kind of effort and the kind of conscientious commitment that the Minister of Finance has put together, has devised, for the people of Manitoba in a very trying economic period and in a very trying economic circumstance.

I think that it's understandable that the opposition — like any opposition — would move to the political attack with respect to a Budget message. And I'm sure that when we were in opposition that we frequently attacked and criticized messages delivered by the government of the day, but I believe that there has to be, at the same time, a grudging recognition and a grudging admiration — articulated or not, and it hasn't been articulated — a grudging recognition and a grudging admiration on the part of honourable gentlemen opposite, particularly members like the Honourable Member for St. Johns and the Honourable Member for Inkster who have had considerable experience in fiscal management of the province's affairs — a grudging admiration for the effort and the sincerity of the commitment that the Finance Minister of Manitoba today, notwithstanding political affiliation, has had to bring, and has brought, to the particular circumstances of the day. That kind of admiration, or that kind of recognition, I would expect would come at some juncture of the debate from honourable gentlemen opposite such as those to whom I've referred, and it may before the debate is over. Whether they like the message or not I believe that both of them and some of their colleagues — (Interjection)— do. . . Well perhaps there'll be an opportunity for the Honourable Member for Inkster to speak again and satisfy the kind of ambition that I have in this respect. I want that grudging respect to be articulated, Sir, and I would be prepared to bet you, Sir, that, as I look into the burning

eyes of the Honourable Member for Inkster and I look into the carefully shrouded and shielded disappointment, the carefully concealed bitterness over the defeat of last October, that he does recognize that my colleague, the Minister of Finance, faced a very formidable challenge in terms of putting a Budget message together that was reasonable and viable, and that he believes that in his heart but he's too good a politician and too much of a politician to stand up and say at this juncture' but I believe, Sir, it'll come before this Session is over.

We may have to go into speed up, we may have to be here all hours of the night into the month of July, but it'll come, Mr. Speaker, because even the Honourable Member for Inkster, who toiled in the trailings of the coal cart that his father worked on so conscientiously and about which we've heard so much over the past eight years, will be the first in the end to admit that we face a challenge today that requires the kind of hard work, the kind of dedication, the kind of spirit that the honourable member's father — and I mean this sincerely — demonstrated in those difficult years when all of us had to work very hard and had to learn to take no occasionally for an answer. And there have been many years in the past decade or two when Canadians, when Manitobans have not had to take no for an answer. They've not had to take no for an answer. But it doesn't matter whether you're a socialist or whether you're a capitalist, Mr. Speaker, sometimes you have to take no for an answer.

And having come out of that environment, being the realist that he is, I am quite sure that the Honourable Member for Inkster recognizes deep down that this was a message that had to be delivered. He wishes that he had been there to deliver it and I don't deprecate that. I don't make light of that, Mr. Speaker, I can understand that. I am a politician, I have been defeated too. All of us have won a few and we have lost a few. I can understand that, but just for the record, just as an agreement between the Honourable Member for Inkster and me, I want to suggest that he probably, as a dedicated politician and a person who understands economic difficulty, does have that respect for the Budget message.

So having got off to that agreement' Mr. Speaker, between the Honourable Member for Inkster and myself, that there is a necessary and a responsible and a courageous message there, I want to just dwell for a minute or two on the fact, Sir, that there have been some pretty serious efforts made by the Opposition to discredit what this government is trying to do in the area of reduced public spending, in the area of fiscal responsibility and restraint, and I dismiss it, Sir, as pure politics. I dismiss it as pure politics. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is a position born of fear. It is a position that emanates from the fact that there are honourable gentlemen on those benches opposite, not all of them by any means, but there are some like the Honourable Member for Inkster, perhaps the Honourable Member for St. Johns, the Honourable Member for Logan, I think, probably the Honourable Member for St. Vital, and a few others who are realistic enough to recognize that had they been re-elected as the government of this province in October, God forbid, had they been re-elected that they would have had to take some of the very steps that we are taking to set this province straight.

Now what they can't live with, Mr. Speaker, what they can't stomach, and I don't intend to rub it in because it is a difficult political position to absorb, I understand that, but what they can't live with is the fact that we beat them to the punch. We beat them to the punch. We took a look at the province, they took a look at the province, they recognized that their support, that the commitment among their supporters was fading. They had to make some promises, all of which we have now been hung with, but they had to make some promises, but in their hearts they knew that they were going to have to move down a path of fiscal responsibility and they wanted the chance to do it, and we got the chance and we beat them to the punch. Now they're not going to get the chance to do it and that is what sticks in their craw, that is what sticks in their craw. It doesn't stick in the craw of all of them, because there are doctrinaire socialists over there who were hot-eyed radicals in 1969, and the only difference today is their eyes are a little more hooded by age and dismay and defeat, by virtue of the fact that they haven't had the opportunity for the new paradise, the new Jerusalem that they hoped that they could put in place. But there are some of them, Sir, that are reasonably pragmatic, at least. . .

**MR. ENNS:** Name them. Name all two.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Name one.

**MR. SHERMAN:** If I did name those two they would be up on points of privilege. I really don't want to get into that kind of an exchange with them.

But I do say that there are a couple that are pragmatic politicians, maybe not pragmatic planners, maybe not pragmatic people in terms of the way they approach the economy and the way they approach the balance sheet, but they are pragmatic politicians, and they recognize that the great chance to set Manitoba straight has slipped out of their grasp because we are doing, we are doing it, and that is what they can't live with, and that is what they fear, and that is really what is behind most of the waspish attacks that have taken place upon the message delivered by my colleague, the Honourable the Minister of Finance.

It is the only position that they can take, Sir. It is the only position that they can take. There sits a tattered, ragged' miserable, defeated bunch and what else can they do? They have got, Sir, to shake this government, they have got to shake this government, and I understand that kind of politics. They have got to shake this government. They have got to rattle us. They have got to make us stop and reconsider. They have got to make us hesitate. They have got to make us worry and wonder whether

we are doing the right thing. They have got to throw us off stride. They have got to slow us up, and that's the rationale for the particular attack, the particular approach they have taken since this House went in on March 16th and particularly through the Budget Debate.

I want to tell you something, Sir. We are not going to be intimidated or be thrown off stride or be forced to hesitate by that kind of activity, or by that kind of argument or by that kind of reflex reaction, because we know, and as I have suggested we know that they know without admitting it, that we are doing the things that the people of Manitoba wanted done, that we were elected to do, that we were campaigning to do, and that take courage. Courage has been brought to bear in the Estimates process and courage has been brought to bear in the Budget, and whether the members opposite want to admit it or not doesn't bother me because I know that politically they can't admit it. But it is there, and as a consequence, Sir, we put them on their guard right now. I put them on their guard right now, that that kind of argument, that kind of waspish attack is not going to have the effect or the result that they hoped it would have. It is not going to throw us off stride. We are determined to do what has to be done, and they might as well live with it, they might as well accept it, they might as well face up to it, because it is here and it is going to be done.

Sir, the Budget introduced in this House last week by my colleague, the Honourable the Minister of Finance, like the 1978-79 spending Estimates, tabled by the same gentleman a couple of weeks earlier, are reflections of what this government was elected to do, reflections of what this party campaigned on and for last fall, and reflections of what we have been saying is wrong with the Province of Manitoba for the past four years, at least. They are also reflections of what the people of Manitoba came to feel about the province, of what the people of Manitoba came to feel was necessary. They are, notwithstanding all the gnashing of teeth and all the complaints and complaints from the other side as I have suggested, honest and courageous positions to take. The Estimates' position and the Budget position are honest and courageous positions to take, and that is what surprises my honourable friends opposite more than anything else no doubt, because they have not for some time seen a political party, a political Leader, and a political party stand up and say that they were going to do something and do it. And that is the reason, Sir, for the fear and the sound and fury on the other side of the House, and I think it should be clearly stated at this point in the Debate that that is all it is — political fear and sound and fury. It is understandable, but at least let's call a spade a spade, and define it so that there is no distortion and misrepresentation in the public mind as to what is being said over there and why it is being said.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, we have had to stand up and have the courage to say, "No", to risen expectations, not merely rising expectations, but to expectations which have been fueled and fired and motivated and generated and promoted by the likes of honourable gentlemen opposite for far too long. Not only in Manitoba, I don't blame it all on the previous administration in Manitoba, they were ably abetted every inch of the way by that fumbling collection of maladministrators that we've had in Ottawa for the past 15 years. —(Interjections)—

Well, that's right . . . my colleague, the Honourable Minister without Portfolio, the Government House Leader, points out that there was a rather questionable liaison taking place in the marriage bed in Ottawa for 2 years during that period. That's right. —(Interjections)—

When Pierre Trudeau talked about the State having no place in the bedrooms of the Nation he did not extend that to the Federal NDP. Anyway, Sir, we've had the courage to say, "No." And will continue to say no, as long as we have to, as long as it's necessary to say so in order to develop and follow through on practical programs required for the economic and social well-being of Manitobans — and that starts first in our view, and we believe in the view of those who gave us our mandate in October, with a healthy and viable economy.

Mr. Speaker, part of our difficulty, at the present time, derives from the host of promises and quasi promises and pledges that were extended by this government in one form or another over the past few years — many of them geared directly to the election campaign of 1977 — but some of them disseminated prior to that campaign. Not the least of them being some of the half-commitments that I find myself challenged with in my particular portfolio of Health and Social Development. We have found that, in addressing ourselves to the expectations that were given cause to rise and that were promoted by the suggested promises and the half-promises and the full promises of the previous administration, that there was, in our view, a total irresponsibility applied insofar as the fiscal means and capacity of the taxpayers of Manitoba in the future is concerned.

So we are stuck with now having to do the housecleaning necessary in a fiscal sense, to draw the difficult lines, to resist the entreaties and the approaches and the appeals in the interest of the well-being of Manitobans down the road, that were fired up by the previous administration without regard for who was going to pay for what over the course of the past 8 years. And that, Sir, is not a condition or a situation to be dismissed lightly, it is one that is responsible, in very large part, for some of the difficulties that we encounter at the present time in translating and interpreting our position to honourable members opposite, to the media and to the public. Not that that is a cause of concern, one expects these challenges in politics and in government, and we are confident that the story we must tell, will be told, will be understood and will be appreciated. But at this juncture in our administration we have had to take some steps, undertake some measures that have, perhaps, produced reactions in some sectors of the community that have been rather more severe than we would have hoped. And we would like to make it clear that those positions are necessary because of the catalogue of half-baked and half-made promises that were given to the electorate by the previous administration, and which we now must wrestle with and assess.

Well, the fact of the matter — the Honourable Member for Inkster says, "Why do you have to do

that?" He knows as well as I do that when expectations are filled up by whatever government, by whatever kind of administration, one then encounters the kinds . . . of approaches and the kinds of pressures that sometimes, early in an administration, can lead to decisions and courses of action which may not be entirely understood.

But the reason is clear. One major example of that was the kinds of projects and programs that were given approval in principle by the previous administration in the capital construction field, in health facilities and health services, without any regard for the half a billion — not half a million — half a billion, \$500 million price tag that Manitobans were going to be saddled with 15 to 20 years down the road in terms of the cost of money, and in terms of operating costs, over and above the \$135 million capital costs that were to go into that program.

Well now I say to the Honourable Member for Inkster, it is very simple to prove.

**MR. GREEN:** A question to the Honourable Minister.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster with a question.

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, would the Minister agree that one of the first things that I was faced with, as Minister of Health in 1969, was an approximately \$90 million Health Sciences Centre Planning Capital Program, which was a commitment of the previous Conservative administration, which he is now talking about?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, what I'm talking about is a half a billion dollar program, not a \$90 million — that's what I'm talking about. Well, in my view, and in the view of this government, there is a difference between \$90 million and \$500 million. I don't think there was a difference in the view of the previous government.

In any event, Sir, the Honourable Member for Inkster and his colleague, the Member for St. Johns, and others on that side of the House, cannot deny that there was a build-up of expectations and promises and half-promises, that were —(Interjection)— The Member for Inkster says it was the same program . . . it had expanded far beyond that program in dollars, both immediate and downstream, Mr. Speaker. So we have to make the hard decisions that say, "We can't go ahead with this now. We can't go ahead with such and such now, the decisions have to be made in practical and perhaps even selective and preferential terms, as to what can be proceeded with, in the immediate future."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the reaction from the Honourable Members for Inkster and St. Johns is to be expected, and it's typical because they know full well, Mr. Speaker, that some of the things they are crying about, and their colleagues are crying about today, some of the action that they are calling for — some of the so-called crisis that they are confronting us with — were legitimate causes for action during the eight years of their administration and they did nothing about them. They did nothing about them. You can't have it both ways.

**MR. GREEN:** Are you going to put up or shut up?

**MR. SHERMAN:** You can't have it both ways. You can have it both ways if you're wasting government money on public garages and on public monuments in parks and in various other extravagances. You can have it both ways. —(Interjections)— Well, Mr. Speaker, the government inherits the crisis and suffers the absolutely immoral, immoral political outcries and criticisms of the NDP opposition. We get them crying about the hospital in Snow Lake; we get them crying about fire safety at the Manitoba School for Retardates; —(Interjection)— Yes crying. We get them crying about personal care beds and extended treatment beds. Where were they from 1969 to 1977, Mr. Speaker?

Do you mean to tell me, and Manitobans, Mr. Speaker, that fire safety only became a problem at the Manitoba School for Retardates in October, 1977, because if they do I can tell them that there is not one person in Manitoba who will believe them, Sir. Do you mean to tell me that the Snow Lake hospital began to disintegrate, began to crack, and buckle and heave on October 24th, 1977, because I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, there is not one person in Snow Lake, let alone Manitoba, who will believe that kind of garbage?

The Leader of the Opposition, speaking in the Budget Debate, possessed the political nerve to talk about the Conservatives representing a perversity of logic, and yet he and his colleagues stand up in this House and engage in that kind of immorality, that kind of deceit, that kind of a — and I use the unparliamentary term, of hypocrisy — day after day, week after week, in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, when they sat on this side for eight years and let Snow Lake and let Portage disintegrate in terms of the kinds of standards they are demanding now.

Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, that two or three of these things are long overdue in being said, and they're going to be said several times, over and over again, during the next three or four weeks, during the next three or four months, until the baying, defeated, miserable opposition that is raising these phony cries — and that's what they are, phony crisis and phony cries — understands finally, Sir, that their contrived arguments and their contrived crisis simply don't wash and are not going to be acceptable to us, or through us, to Manitobans generally. The only description for that kind of conduct is political immorality, and I don't think that the Honourable Member for Inkster very often, if ever, if ever engages in political immorality. But I say to him that his party is engaging in political

immorality when it tries that kind of phony, deceptive, spurious, argument. —(Interjections)—

So, Mr. Speaker, you know we get the Member for Inkster and the Leader of the Opposition making public statements inside and outside the House about the terrible thing, the terrible thing that the administration at the Victoria Hospital is doing, because it dared, it dared — in a time of restraint, working with responsible human beings employed at the hospital, both organized and unorganized — dared to make the suggestion that maybe, to meet the challenges of the hour, to preserve the jobs that everybody would like to see preserved, that they would agree to an adjustment in the contract that had been reached between the union and management at the hospital.

**A MEMBER:** Do you know the definition of lock-out?

**MR. SHERMAN:** I know exactly what the definition of . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm not interested in the legalistic, technical arguments that are going to be raised by the Member for Inkster at this juncture. I'm talking about the morality of a position taken by him and his leader when we are in a period in which we are asking for, appealing for, because Manitobans need the spirit of co-operation among all sectors of our economy and all sectors of our community, and that includes many more people simply than organized hospital workers. It includes the whole spectrum, virtually, of our society, including construction workers who put up with a good deal of frustration and delay in the last little while.

**MR. GREEN:** You want more lock-outs.

**MR. SHERMAN:** But they are contributing, and they are co-operating to the challenge that has to be met.

And the administration at that hospital made a suggestion for discussion purposes, as a possible option or alternative. But what do we get from the so-called responsible leader and second in command of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, we get the inflammatory kind of speech making which is calculated to make the leaders of that union reject and repudiate out of hand, even the concept of sitting down with management and talking about something that could be worked out. — (Interjection)— You do. The Leader of the Opposition called it deceit, and although I don't have the speech of the Honourable Member for Inkster in front of me, I'm sure he seconded the position that his leader took, and they were quoted in the newspapers and inside the House and outside the House as dismissing that as a kind of deceit on the part of my colleague, the Minister of Finance, and this government. And yet they, occupying a position under the parliamentary system which invokes some sense of responsibility, have the cavalier irresponsibility and lack of regard for the economic challenge that we're in and the job that the people of Manitoba are trying to accomplish through their duly elected government to make the kind of speeches that are calculated to scuttle and jettison that kind of a conversation, that possible kind of an arrangement even before it starts. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't call that responsible opposition. I don't call that responsible parliamentarianism. — (Interjection)— Well the Member for Inkster can groan all he wants to but his leader has referred to our position as being one of perversity of logic. I want to say to him that I refer to his position and his leader's position as one of the most crass political immorality that could be concocted or conceived.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that the final area that disturbs me is the outcry and the argument of honourable gentlemen opposite that they would do this or they would do that if only they were in office or if only they had been re-elected because such and such is needed, because this is needed and that is needed, and such and such is a crisis, and such and such is a priority. Well, Mr. Speaker, we know what the areas of need are and we intend to act in those areas of need but we will act in those areas of need because we and the people to whom we are responsible recognize and understand there are areas of need, not because those whipped sycophants opposite are crying out for us to act in those areas of need, not because of that, Sir, but because we know there are areas of need and we're going to move in them as soon as the taxpayers of Manitoba can afford it, but not because of the caterwauling opposite from those who can't accept the position that they are now in in this province and from those who are now crying out for us to assume the responsibility and take the rap, yes, take the rap, Sir, for things that they neglected to do for eight years. So we will do, Sir, we will do the things that need to be done. We will do them because the people of Manitoba know they need to be done not because the NDP is screaming and crying about having them done.

So, Sir, there they sit, there they sit mumbling again amongst themselves because out of the abject despair and disappointment and bitterness of defeat and the fear that they have lost the opportunity to do the things that they know need to be done in this province and that are now being done by the duly elected government of the day, they have nothing to do but raise false crises, to raise false specters, to cry wolf, to off-load their responsibilities of the past eight years on this administration and to snipe in their mean and petty way from the opposite side of the House. So let them sit there and snipe, Sir. They're picking and pecking over the remnants of their own ruinous eight year administration. They're picking and pecking over their own shortcomings and that's what they can't take. This party, Sir, and this government will not be bothered or thrown off stride or concerned or intimidated by that, and that's why I stood up tonight to say that to them and the budget speaks to that, the people of Manitoba spoke to that last October and the people of Manitoba still speak to it, they still speak to it today, and we'll follow through.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed Motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable

Minister of Highways.

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS(Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, as a rule I'm prodded into making a few comments by some outrageous remarks coming from the other side of the House but I'm happy to say that prodded by the courageous remarks made on this side of the House and the obvious immediate effect that it had on members opposite when none chose to rise, none chose to speak, none chose to throw back, even just a little bit of those comments just made by, so capably made, by the Minister of Health. Mr. Speaker, we want that to be properly recorded in Hansard, that possibly the former government has just received one of their worst tongue lashings during the course of this session, and they sat silently by and they took it and they licked their wounds.

**MR. GREEN:** I'm glad you said I was silent.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, the budget and fiscal matters of course, give us the opportunity that I do like to talk about because it does really divide the two groups as presented in this House, and while I'm not particularly prepared to make a whole in-depth thesis on this subject matter at this time I was prompted to rise at this time as the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was speaking this afternoon, earlier. Because the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has yet to learn the true color of our friends opposite. In his very capable address he challenged the honourable members opposite with the questions that he posed and he also accorded to the honourable members opposite the concept that perhaps they didn't know — I think the actual challenge that he made was, what right do we have to burden the coming generation, the young people, with the kind of moneys, the kind of over-expenditures that we have been led to be making in the public area and in the provincial area generally, and in this country generally, during our generation, during our lifetime. He was followed immediately by the Member for Transcona and suggested that what was wrong with having future generations pay for such capital projects as Transcona. Well of course, that's ridiculous, it's a ridiculous suggestion. Projects, capital projects like Hydro projects, the billion dollar projects are prorated on 50, 60, on the lifetime of that plant. And future users and Hydro users pay for those plants, and are properly paid for those plants in those ways. We're talking about the level of current expenditures, the level of current over-expenditures, and of the kind of capitalizing of moneys that should have more appropriately been in current account spending in the first instances. Those are the kind of things in expenditures that we're talking about.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Transcona also rose to spend a great deal of time in his particular contribution to the budget at this time on the concern about the tinkering or the interference or whatever words he used with respect to a particular report that was presented to this Chamber some time ago by the Minister of Corporate and Consumer Affairs. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister, in presenting that report indicated (a) by Foreword and by letter that this was not government policy, not even the tinkered or changed or re-drafted report if the honourable members want to accuse the Minister or the government of having changed or made some editorial changes in the report more to our liking. But the point that really is of interest in this matter — and I am prepared to make a deal, by the way, with honourable members opposite, I am prepared to make a deal with the honourable members opposite. Well, it's 9:30 in the evening and why not make a deal with the honourable members opposite.

Because of course I think at issue is not the actual words or sentences or whatever were added or deleted from any given report, it was perhaps that you would accuse us of some polishing up of a report or changing something to reflect politically a more palatable position for us at a particular given time. Well, you know, the Honourable Minister of Corporate and Consumer Affairs — and I may be getting into all kinds of trouble, but, Mr. Speaker, I'll buy that if I can make a trade with these gentlemen. If they are prepared to acknowledge and charge us with the real serious question behind that whole free-for-all that was made with respect to this report — of course what concerns you is that in doing this we are demonstrating our real and our true position on the given matter, in this case, rent control. Mr. Speaker, I'll accept that charge at this moment if honourable members opposite will accept my favourite unabridged document of the Guidelines of the Seventies which was also tinkered with and polished and changed a little to make it a little bit more politically acceptable, particularly in an election year. If they'll accept that as an even trade, I'll accept all the nasty things that the members opposite, the Member for Transcona had to say about my colleague, the Minister of Corporate Affairs. . . .

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Would you permit a question?

**MR. ENNS:** . . . If he is prepared to accept that trade as an even one I am then prepared, Mr. Speaker, to let the record stand for itself. We'll accept the responsibility of having made some changes in that report to make it more acceptable to us in the broader political palatable way if honourable members will accept that the same criteria applies to the Guidelines of the Seventies.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a point of order?

**MR. CHERNIACK:** No, Mr. Speaker, I believe the honourable member agreed to my asking him a

question.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Would the honourable member agree that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs made it clear in his letter that he was sending in a report which he attributed to the authors of that report as listed on the report, and not to the government nor the government's position whereas the paper he refers to was one which was never attributed to the writer of that draft which he has in his possession, indeed that the name of the writer is not known to him or to me. Will he not agree that that's true?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, all that that demonstrates is that the leakage from wherever wasn't quite as bad or severe back in '72 or '73 as it is in '78, and I'll leave it with that, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit me. . .

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I now insist on proceeding with a few coherent remarks in my speech. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the other thought that couldn't escape anybody because perhaps the most serious tinkering with professional advice given to governments from time to time, and that really is a charge of some note and worth replying to by the Honourable Member for Transcona. The most serious demonstration of that having taken place in the recent annals in the history of Manitoba, is that twenty-one pages of tinkering that Messrs. Durnin and Cass-Beggs did with multi-million dollars of research that affected the basic thrust of the Hydro development program in Manitoba and that is costing us millions of dollars in increased Hydro rates today and that will cost untold generations of Hydro users those millions of dollars.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** He didn't sign your name, he didn't sign your name to it. Who's name did he sign to it?

**MR. ENNS:** That, Sir, was by far the greatest tinkering and brushing aside of professional advice being given to any government. That, Sir, will never be matched again, and, Mr. Speaker, let's put that on the record. In those millions of dollars worth of studies, those ten years worth of dollars in studies — I'll just use one example — were such kind of documented evidence and proof that said that if you are prepared and if you can contain within the realm of some \$50 million the projected hydro development at Jenpeg at the north end of Lake Winnipeg, it may be economical. But \$50 million was the limit. We have \$300 million installed at that north end of the lake — \$176 million where we are trying to install some flat-bellied Russian turbine suckers that still aren't working and I predict never will work adequately and satisfactorily.

And I predict there will be only one thing and I must say, and again I am in conflict with my colleagues — I've probably caused my friend the Minister of Corporate and Consumer Affairs some difficulty and now I'm going to be in trouble with my friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce because I am concerned about having sold the MS Lord Selkirk as soon as we did. I really am. Because as surely as I stand here, within our lifetimes and perhaps even within this decade, there will be a bronze plaque put on the site at Jenpeg. Long after the Russian turbines have rusted and have been thrown out, the gates will be open, wide open and there will be a free flow out of Lake Winnipeg. It will not be economical to operate that highly uneconomical plant and we will simply let moss and green grass grow over the \$300 million investment which could have built schools, which could have built personal care homes, which could have built the hospital at Snow Lake, and which could have prevented the hydro rates from increasing as outrageously as they've done, and they haven't stopped yet.

Mr. Speaker, there has never been in the history of Manitoba, that kind of a tinkering, that kind of mismanagement of public funds. —(Interjection)—Well, Mr. Speaker, and I apologize, the Honourable Member for Inkster is quite right, we have a commission that is inquiring into this matter and I should not have dealt with it. He should have called me to order, Mr. Speaker. It was brought on by the question, Mr. Speaker, it was brought on by the question: "Who's tinkering with whose reports?" That's the only reason why I chose to raise the matter. . .

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would like to . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Before I recognize anyone else I want to read to you from Section 143 of Beauchesne: "Whilst a member is addressing the House no one has the right to interrupt him by putting a question to him or by making or demanding an explanation." The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**MR. GREEN:** I'd agree, but I would submit to you that Beauchesne permits a member to consent to be interrupted with a question. The member has a right to say he doesn't wish to be interrupted.

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to a question from my honourable friend and colleague opposite, the Member for Inkster, Her Majesty's loyal House Leader.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the honourable member can tell me who tinkered with Cass-Beggs' report? Does the Cass-Beggs report reflect the view of somebody other than Mr. Cass-Beggs?

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all let's recollect the speech given by the Honourable Member for Transcona this afternoon. The fact that certain reports were changed or amended and certain deletions were made, and the kind of intimidation this brought about on certain members, let's remember whom this government intimidated — board members of Manitoba Hydro — bringing about the resignations of the former Liberal premier of this province, D. L. Campbell, the ridiculing of a former premier of this province, calling his arithmetic "schoolboy arithmetic", schoolboy arithmetic, and I'll tell you Mr. Campbell's arithmetic today is proving out to be pretty right, the resignation of a senior Hydro management person. You talk about pressure and intimidation that was exercised by changing directions, deletions of reports.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the reports are voluminous, but I happen to know that a great deal of time was spent in this House and in Committee, arguing about the deletion of certain words, certain pages, certain paragraphs that were contained in some of the original draft reports that were presented to Hydro at great expense, and then the ones that were presented to Committee a month or a year later by the then Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, Mr. David Cass-Beggs. And there was a great deal of debate and the annals, the Hansard, their history is full of days of discussions as to why certain paragraphs, why certain sentences were deleted from highly technical Hydro reports having to do with expenditure of multi millions of dollars — multi millions of dollars.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, those things will, of course, all hopefully come to light in a more judicious way with the work that is being done, I understand, elsewhere in this building, who is doing it not in the heat of debate. Goodness knows, the question of Hydro has been debated often and long enough, and will be continued to be debated often and much longer in this Chamber, but for the moment I'm quite prepared to accept the admonishment given from his seat by the Honourable Member for Inkster that perhaps we should let that Commission of Inquiry carry on for the moment, that is, in fact, carrying on.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has attributed something to me that something should be left to the Tritschler Commission. I never said that. I ask my honourable friend what is the purpose of the Tritschler Commission, because I believe it has no purpose?

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable House Leader came very close to being out of order on this latest interjection. I was prepared to sit down and let him question me again as is my usual habit, but I am not prepared to accept facetious and frivolous interruptions to my remarks just at that point where I was going to get serious about the division on budgetary and fiscal matters between us.

**MR. GREEN:** If the honourable member attributes remarks to me which I did not make and wishes to have the record show that I made those remarks, I submit that I have the right to get up and say I did not make those remarks. The honourable member says that I said that the matter should be left to the Tritschler Commission. I made no such statement.

**MR. ENNS:** I would accept the correction given by the Honourable Member for Inkster. I must indicate to him that from where I was standing it seemed to indicate to me that he was objecting to discussing the Hydro matter at this time because of reasons of the Tritschler Report being under way.

**MR. GREEN:** I accept the fact that the Commission doesn't mean anything, so you can discuss it as much as you want.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to, of course, raise one other with honourable members opposite which has some serious overtones in terms of their whole report. You will recall another occasion when I have indicated to them that in their greater plan of things there is really little room for cooperatives. They're seen as a redundant form of organization. Well now, I would like to think that this is not the case, but was that part of the reason why for nine months that administration failed to respond to the requests or to the needs of the Cooperative Implement plants with respect to financial help or some arrangement? Could that have been in the back of their mind that they really weren't prepared to assist, or come to the assistance of an organization that their planners and their thinkers call redundant and out of date? I wonder, I wonder, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker I want to, particularly for reasons of some of the newer members of the House, indicate that there once was a member in this Chamber — he sat somewhere in the area where the Member for Dauphin right about now is sitting, or in that general area, a member for Crescentwood, as a matter of fact — a member for Crescentwood, he was there. He was a unique individual, I suppose, in the sense that he provided us in this Chamber many opportunities, many opportunities of examining the members of the ND Party, particularly because he had a habit of challenging his own front bench in a particular way, and often provoked them, often provoked them into making statements that I am sure they would not otherwise want to make.

For instance, it was his position, it was his position that taxation as such, even the highly progressive taxation as such, is not really an effective method of redistributing wealth. And the

Honourable Member for Inkster on that occasion was a Minister of the Treasury Bench, agreed with that statement, agreed with that statement' and Mr. Speaker, we agree with that statement — we agree with that statement. What taxes levied at various levels, of course, do help provide services at different levels, and it's in the provision of those services, you know, that we hope to bring about a standard of living that is acceptable to most, hopefully to all Manitobans.

And, Mr. Speaker, can it really be said that we — I take and include the eight years just previous under the administration of the New Democratic Party — and can it really be said that we in Canada generally as a society have failed so miserably in doing this? Can it really be said that our health care programs are the worst? Can it really be said that our education programs are the worst? Can it really be said that our university students are paying outrageous amounts for their tuition fees when we, the general public, pay 90 percent of it? I don't think any reasonable people can say that. So then really, Mr. Speaker, what is the bent and what is the direction and where lies the responsibility of honourable members opposite when they show an absolute disregard, an absolute disregard about the capability of providing a competitive business climate. They have an absolute disregard about whether a manufacturer in Manitoba can compete with (a) his sistering provinces in Ontario or other parts of Canada, not to speak of our greatest trading partner, the Americans, or the rest of the world. Mr. Speaker, the reason why they show that absolute and total disregard is because they do not share a concern about the collapse of the present system. And let's lay it out, gentlemen, let's lay it out. The Honourable First Minister, or the Honourable Member for Inkster has said that he doesn't care, he doesn't care if an insurance company comes into this province and provides insurance free to all Manitobans out of the goodness of their heart, they'll still be kicked out. They'll still be kicked out. There was no qualifying that statement. It was simply a clear signal that business better not be associated or get too comfortable doing business in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, it really is a paranoia with honourable members opposite if you stop to listen to their speeches. There's not a concern about level of service, there's not a concern about level of education services, there's simply a constant envy of somebody that has something more, of the rich. There are so few rich in Manitoba — you know I think it was their own Party president, at their own convention just a few years ago, in making a report to the Party, that suggested, I think it was Muriel Smith that said the difficulties that the New Democratic Party is going to face in the future is that they are going to have to find other sources to find money from because we're running out of rich. We're running out of the rich. That's documented, written, and most of you members were at that convention when she told you that. Most of them were there.

Mr. Speaker, the problem with honourable members opposite is, and that's the serious one, is they do not care. Of course, they see, they welcome the collapse of our businesses; they welcome the collapse of our ability to have a healthy private sector. Oh, yes, the former Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has said so on many occasions in this House. "If you don't want to play the poker game with me, out you go."

Mr. Speaker, how then can we not take more seriously the kind of plans that were talked about in the unabridged version of the Guidelines of the Seventies reports which had these kind of aims and ambitions. In the manufacturing sector there are specific references to canned foods — well, we're in it — pharmaceuticals, drug sundries, glass, automotive windshields, laundry detergents, baby foods. In the service industries they have proposed that the Crown Corporations enter into the life insurance business — well, we're in there — the fire insurance business, retailing of all kinds, tourist business, hunting and fishing business, hotel business — you know it frightens me how many of these things we're already into in the eight years that we have been in here.

I don't know — I believe it was the Member for St. Johns asked about the author of this. Well, I will tell you this. It surely must be your Dave Young. It surely must be your Dave Young that wrote this. Because it's with frightening clarity — do you see the program and the outline of the future? I haven't read this for a little while. I'm just going to carry on for a little bit. They also proposed to establish Crown products for marketing divisions in the American markets, foreign markets, Canadian markets. Mr. Speaker, we haven't demonstrated the ability to lose enough money right here in Manitoba, we're now going to lose money in America, we're going to lose money in Europe, we're going to lose money all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the difficulty that honourable members opposite face, the difficulty that we have to understand on this side of the House is that we are dealing with a party that is basically populist in its political approach. You know, it's very difficult not to make a nice socialist speech. It's very difficult. You have to really work at not making a heart-ringing, heart-throbbing socialist speech.

But, Mr. Speaker, the difficulty that I have is in recognizing that that's not the end of the road. The former Member for Crescentwood, he recognized it. He recognized it and he indicated that he saw no great improvement in that great redistribution of wealth that he thought he was going to be part of when he worked and joined and was part of the government caucus during the years of 1969 to 1973. There seemed to be kind of a passive admission on the part of some leading members of the front bench at that time that, "Yes, that's true, wealth isn't in fact being redistributed on the scale as we would like it to, but we have to be pragmatic about it. We can come about this only over the course of years, after we have choked out the ability of the private sector to perform; through higher and higher and higher taxes." Because you see, one domino falls into place — that's the domino theory from the Honourable Member for Pembina. As taxes rise, rise, rise and the private company can't compete any more and begins laying off people, then the cry is — and it comes right from you — "We have to provide them with assistance." And then if governments give them assistance, then they fall into the trap of becoming corporate welfare bums at the next election. Then you withdraw that assistance, the

company collapses and the government moves in.

Mr. Speaker, that's the scenario that of course we have stopped and that is the scenario that we have every intention of seeing firmly stopped. And in addition to what bothers my honourable friend for Inkster even more than those reasons attributed by my colleague, the Minister of Health, is the fact that I can recall with some satisfaction as we, prior to our proroguing the last session and I refer not to the mini-session but the last session when they were still the administration, in one of his speeches — and there was lots of election talk in the air — but he stood up in his chair with some satisfaction, saying that maybe it could happen, that a change of government might take place. He thought it conceivable that the time could come when a Conservative administration would be formed. But of one thing he was certain, Mr. Speaker, that we would be gutless. We wouldn't make any change and everything would just stand still. Everything would just stand still and then in due course the socialists would take over again and then the onward wheels would turn inevitably onward into socialism.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there have of course been other things which interfered with that game plan. There has been a determination exhibited by this administration, a determination that hasn't been exhibited in many years by any government. Mr. Speaker, I'm fully prepared to acknowledge that that government did many courageous things and carried out many election promises when they became government in 1969. But, Sir, in most instances, those were the kinds of things that a populist government does for people. When you are handing out more tax moneys, when you are handing out more candy, when you are giving out more presents, that is fun to do that. It takes a lot of guts, what my Ministers are doing. That is where it counts; that's where you separate the men from the boys.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour. Before I recognize the Minister of Labour, may I point out that it is 10:00 p.m. The hour being 10:00 p.m. . . .

**MR. GREEN:** I'm sorry, does the record show that a speaker has been recognized? — (Interjection)— Because I would prefer, Mr. Speaker, to call it ten o'clock. Have you recognized the speaker? Ten o'clock, no speaker recognized.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I have recognized the Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. GREEN:** I did not hear the debate being adjourned. There was no question being put. If the debate has not been adjourned, you have not yet recognized the speaker and have called it ten o'clock. Tomorrow somebody will get up and you will recognize them. If you want to recognize the Minister of Labour, that is your concern, that's right.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Very well. The hour being 10:00 p.m, the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 p.m. Tuesday.