

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, March 27, 1978

Time: 8:00 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona has ten minutes.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was speaking before about housing but I'll stop now. I see that the Minister responsible for Housing isn't here and we'll certainly have sufficient opportunity to review the lack of housing policy and lack of housing programs in the Estimates.

I'd like to take a look at the immediate impact of what I'd call Conservative mismanagement on my own constituency of Transcona. During the supper break I had a chance to go back, visit my constituency and take a look at what's happening there and reflect on it.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to list some of the things that have happened there and will be happening. The people of Transcona are facing a 40 percent increase in transit fares, largely, primarily brought about by a cutback in provincial cost-sharing of the transit subsidy. That means that a lot of people are going to be picking up this fare through a flat fee which is regressive. It's a regressive form of taxation, Mr. Speaker. It would be much better if the transit deficit was picked up as it was before, 50 percent by the province, so that we build up ridership in public transportation. This is quite important in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, because my constituency is quite dependent on public transportation. It's always used it very heavily and given its location — just beyond the green belt of Winnipeg — it certainly does require a good form of public transportation.

We're also facing tremendous increases in school taxes. The Transcona School Division is going to increase its mill rate by over ten mills. That's a 24 percent increase in school taxes. We're also going to have a very large increase in municipal taxes — something in the order of at least 15 percent — so we're talking about increased property taxes for the constituents of Transcona of at least \$200.00, at least \$200.00. Now that's going to be offset, Mr. Speaker, by tax returns from this government of on average of \$13.00 a family going up probably to \$26.00 a family. That's on average. My constituents will not be benefiting from the \$500.00 a year tax cuts that these people are providing for constituents in other constituencies. They also don't benefit from the abolition

They also don't benefit from the abolition of succession duties. They, in fact, pay their fair share. They're going to be required to pay more than their fair share. I'm starting to get a good idea of what Mr. Lyon when he was Conservative leader meant when he said, "If the Conservatives are elected people will pay more than their fair share," and frankly the constituents of Transcona are being forced by this government to pay more than their fair share.

We've had a senior citizens' home cancelled in Transcona; we've had the closure of the Water Services Board depot in Transcona. Again this won't save money, this reminds me of the freeze on the audit positions. And then what they're going to do is they're going to not freeze the audit positions but they're going to use the money to pay private firms for auditors, even though their overhead costs are 150 percent compared to the auditor's - overhead charges of 25 percent. So, Mr. Speaker, those types of things don't save money and they help create more unemployment and the unemployment in Transcona is increasing, and the small businessmen in Transcona are feeling the pinch from the lack of consumer demand, and that holds true for the electrical contractors, and that holds true for the lumber people. —(Interjection)— Possibly. That's right. 8127-0

And Mr. Speaker, they have accomplished all this in just five short months. Give them another year, give that fellow right there another year, Mr. Speaker — the fellow who has a hard time adding — and then we'll see what the list of things in Transcona is, that have been cutbacks and increased unemployment. So we look forward to that, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to constantly raising the list with these people, because, Mr. Speaker, the style of politics has changed from the 1920s; people remember what people say, and they hold the people accountable for their actions.

I'd like to turn now to another thing that is happening in Manitoba, and really, it's on the verge of an epidemic. People call it Sterling Lyon's disease, other people call it amnesia. This is the tremendous increase in forgetfulness amongst Treasury Bench people. And the strange thing is that this form of disease only seems to strike Tories, and it only seems to strike Tory Ministers. People have mentioned that I have been a civil servant; I was one in Ottawa and I was one here. I was somewhat disillusioned by Pierre Trudeau breaking his promises when I worked in Ottawa. He said he was going to do a lot for regional development; he never. I am proud to say that in the eight years of working for this New Democratic Party government, they didn't break their promises. They didn't break their promises.

But, Mr. Speaker, we had this increase in forgetfulness starting last year when the Conservative Leader couldn't remember that he was being paid three thousand bucks under the table. Secondly, he couldn't remember that he had signed the CFI agreement. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, and this relates to the Minister of Finance, the Premier and the Minister of Finance couldn't remember that during the election they had sent a letter to the Chairman of the Council of Women saying that the Family Law would not be changed; she said that that was deceit. I never heard the Minister of Finance get up and say anything about that situation, but she called it deceit.

MR. CRAIK: No, she didn't.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, she did. Can you read? Read the report then, read the report of Law Amendments Committee.

They don't remember about Autopac, they said they wouldn't change Autopac. Now the Minister responsible for Housing says he wants to change it because the performance prior to 1969 was so good, conceivably. What nonsense. What nonsense.

The Minister of Labour can't remember that she told a group of women that she was anti-union — she can't remember that, even though that group was willing to swear that she said so.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Government is trying to drag us down and drag us back into the economic philosophy of the 1920s, even though that was proved to be obsolete, even though it was proved not to work, historically, and, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative government is trying to drag us back and down into the style of politics of the 1920s where people promised people anything, because people weren't around to hold people accountable for what they said. Now, we don't like broken promises any more in politics and people are quite indignant when that happens, and that's one of the major reasons why the public is raising such an outcry against this government, because they break promises; there is very little integrity.

And, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to let ourselves be pulled back and down into that obsolete economic philosophy and into that obsolete politics. We're going to stand here and we are going to hold people like you, like the Minister of Tourism, accountable for his lack of confidence, for his lack of candor in the House. We are going to point out to the Minister responsible for Housing he has destroyed a program without coming up with anything in its place; we will point out that the Minister of Labour has alienated labour; we are going to point out the fact that these people should be held accountable for their actions. We will do so in this House, Mr. Speaker, and so will the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, allow me to enter the Throne Speech debate at this time by offering you best wishes from myself and to your colleagues, the Deputy Speaker and the chairman of the committee outside of the House. I look forward to working with you, Sir, as we did during the short session that we had this fall, and I for one am happy that you have made your decision to remain in this office to act as our chief magistrate in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I share the comments that the last speaker made at the introduction of his remarks that he is feeling more comfortable or he is getting a greater feeling of the House and what this Chamber is all about as we begin this session as distinct from the short mini-session that we had in November and I have to share that feeling that he has, the Honourable Member for Transcona. I think all of us feel and welcome the session; we really do feel that we are getting our first session under our belt and that we have the time and that we have the opportunity, certainly those members on the treasury bench have had the opportunity of acquainting themselves with some of the responsibilities, some of the problems, indeed, Mr. Speaker, to put it mildly, some of the mess that we have been left with to clean up, and so can feel not in simply a provocative way, but indeed, Mr. Speaker, in a more informative way to enter into the debates at this particular time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me at the outset touch on a few things pertaining to agriculture. Agriculture is never that far from my heart, even though I do not have the immediate responsibility for that portfolio. I am concerned that the Honourable Member for Brokenhead isn't here, but I note that other noteworthy critic, about the only other agricultural critic that that side can muster, is the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. He, of course, has laid down the democratic rules that this government and the present Minister of Agriculture have to follow in terms of dealing with commodity groups, Sir. He is talking about the withdrawal of basic and fundamental democratic rights. If we don't extend to a particular commodity group a vote on a voluntary formation of an association that has no compulsory feature to it, that anybody can opt out of in terms of the check-off — anybody can opt out of. And yet, Mr. Speaker, this same member was deadly silent as his Minister of Agriculture and his administration put in a compulsory hog marketing board that not only had a compulsory check-off much higher — 1 1/4 percent per carcass weight with no opting out — had the power of telling a hog farmer how many hogs he can produce, when to produce them, and where to deliver them to, and when to keep them back home on the farm and let them get overweight.

But that was no problem of democracy a few short years ago. This same member had no problem about democracy when the milk producers had imposed on them a compulsory marketing board with no thought of a vote, with a compulsory check-off. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, we're speaking about democracy and how one's conception of democracy changes, —(Interjection)— how one's conception of democracy changes when we move from this side of the House to that side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, if it weren't for — talking about the milk producers for a brief moment — if it weren't for the efforts of honourable members like the Member for Rock Lake, the Member for Morris' indeed, I myself might have had something to do with it, the milk producers of this province would have been saddled with a \$10 million plant that nobody wanted — the crocus plant, and the check-off on that would have amounted into the millions of dollars.

But Mr. Speaker, there was not a question, there wasn't a suggestion of a vote being held. Indeed there still has no vote being held on those two commodity groups. But we are being prattled to by the Member for Ste. Rose that we are foregoing democratic procedure if we allow a commodity group to form, to perform, to associate themselves in a voluntary way with a check-off that, I will admit, has compulsory features to it in the sense that it is taken from all. But anyone that doesn't want to contribute can sign out of it. —(Interjection)— That's not possible for the hog producers of this province. That's not possible for the milk producers of this province. So let's not confuse the issues of democracy in this manner. No, let's not confuse the issues of approaching the farm community in the manner and way which that government approached the farm community.

And by the way Mr. former premier, that, of course, was one of the basic weaknesses and the reasons for your downfall, that you could condone a government and a Minister of Agriculture to put into the hands, \$20,000 a year, into a relatively small handful— three or four hundred farmers that happened to form a political club that was close to your heart — the NDP wing of the party, whereas you gave the major farm organizations a pittance — three or four thousand dollars. You could sanction the giving of \$20,000 to the National Farmers Union organization that has a membership of 346 members in this province. No, that kind of blatant disregard and failure to read the rural mind is why you have the members representing rural Manitoba on this side and not on that side, despite the untold millions of dollars that you poured into that sector. And you tried to buy that sector, but they cannot be bought Mr. Former Premier, and I think in your memoirs someday you will acknowledge that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to just let my friends opposite know that although it is my concern to tend to the highways of this province, attend to the public buildings of this province, which I hope to attend to them with some dedication and concern, that my heart nonetheless is never that far removed from agriculture and that from time to time I will be making my comments in support of and in conjunction with the Minister of Agriculture, who I have no doubt, no doubt at all, will represent farmers in the Province of Manitoba as they have not been represented in the last eight years. He will represent all farmers, all farmers. He will not single them out by class. He will not single them out in labels, you know, successful from the non-successful. He will treat them all with a kind of compassion and concern that farmers traditionally have had and ought to have had for the Ministry of Agriculture.

Farmers are very funny people. They regard their Department of Agriculture as their department and that is the way they ought to regard it. That is the way they ought to regard it. And, Mr. Speaker, that is why we have a Minister of Agriculture on this side and not on the other side.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, you know there is a great deal has been said in the last few days, the opening days of this session, and even preceding this session, and perhaps the words "dogma" and "doctrine" have kind of been uppermost in the minds of members opposite. They have accused us, the new government, of approaching things in a dogmatic and a doctrinaire way. Mr. Speaker, they have a fixation about that word and I suggest to you it is principally because they themselves are the dogmatic and doctrinaire people in this Chamber.

You know, Mr. Speaker, nothing demonstrated that better very early on in this session when they, and even the experienced members on that side of that House, who ought to and in fact do know better, would not extend to a new member giving his maiden speech in this Chamber the usual and the normal traditional respect that new members deserve. I am referring to the Member from Portage la Prairie. When he made his speech in this House the glee with which honourable members attacked him, the derision, the scorn, and the sneering, because the honourable member happened to point out a number of significant things that the public sector had achieved in his constituency. They couldn't believe that. You see, because the scenario goes this way, Mr. Speaker, the scenario goes this way and it has been well established from their dogmatic point of view that we are supposed to be the saviours and the praisers of the private sector, and they are going to be the praisers and the salvation of the public sector. That is the scenario that they in their dogmatic way have carved out the ideological positions in this House. So that when one of our members breaks that rule and has something good to say about the public sector he is greeted with hoots and howls of derision.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter, of course, is that we have no such dogmatic approach to things. Indeed, one of the first serious decisions that this new government had to face, having to do with the Manitoba Telephone System and the cablevision companies of this province, caused a considerable 180 degree turn — for those of you that remember the debates of just a year or two ago when we, as government, decided that yes, the public sector ought to own the hardware of the cablevision industry. There was no doctrinaire, dogmatic approach attached to it. It was a question of apprising ourselves of the facts of the situation and acting in a prudent and a responsible manner, Mr. Speaker.

But that's not the scenario that honourable members opposite have set out for themselves. Every time a private sector, a business, a company is mentioned, you know, it's a knee-jerk reaction from honourable members opposite. And they don't quite know how to handle it when on this side we are prepared to acknowledge, in the true spirit of things, a mixed economy. . . Need I remind honourable members opposite that, you know, it didn't take eight years of the NDP administration to provide that kind of climate for co-operatives to blossom forward, for credit unions to develop into the strong and healthy and viable financial institutions that they are. They were there long before the NDP arrived; long before the NDP arrived. And I need not point out to honourable members opposite, that on those very specific areas where they are the strongest — coincidentally, they also vote the strongest Conservative — Steinbach, Winkler, Altona, Mr. Speaker, the co-operatives, the credit unions, had

nothing to fear from a Conservative administration. They had, quite the contrary, a great deal to fear from that administration because, of course, we haven't forgotten the kind of advice that your task force gave that administration with respect to the particular matter of co-operatives.

I think the Honourable Member for Transcona who was the senior member of the think-tank of that day, he will remember these words. Mind you, they were somewhat abridged, you know, for palatability when it came to the election but this is what the big thinkers had to say about co-operatives back in 1972. "At this point," and this is a quote, "it may be worthwhile to consider whether co-operatives might not be a redundant form of organization. After all, if rational and extensive use is made of Crown Corporations on both the provincial and municipal level as a means of counting private monopoly, power and breaking down barriers to entry, is there any need for co-ops? Is there any need for credit unions?" Thank God that is one egg that we don't have to unscramble.

The former Minister of Finance's banking institutions that he set up . . .

A MEMBER: You hit a nerve, Harry.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways is implying that I wrote the document. I didn't write it. Could he table it and table the names of those people who wrote the document?

MR. ENNS: I'm more than prepared to table it although I suspect it's been tabled a half a dozen times. The author of these words are, I believe, a Mr. Marc Eliesen. They were written to you, they were written to you. But, in any event, that was all part of the fuzzy thinking that took place in that think-tank called the planning and priorities group, you know, that planning and priorities group that were going to restructure the whole government.

They ask a further question. "Is there any way of drawing a line between the proper area for co-ops and the proper area for public enterprise?" You have to remember, Mr. Speaker, these were the heady days when they were going to set up Crown Corporations in all the municipalities, along with the banking organizations that the Minister of Finance then brought in. "In many cases, there are no grounds for rational choice between the two instruments, particularly at the local level, thus a retail outlet owned and operated" — they're talking about the local grocery store here now, baby food, soap manufacturing, — "thus a retail outlet owned and operated by the local government through its municipal and development corporations, would accomplish the same objectives as a consumer co-op in terms of expanding the range of services in remote communities."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask you. What government did the co-operative movement or the credit unions have to fear? Mr. Speaker, intuitively, instinctively, they knew the answer. They knew the answer. And, again, Mr. Speaker, I point to the benches here where the co-operative movement is the strongest; in the farm and rural areas. None of us would be here without the overriding support of the co-operative and credit union movement. They know where their friends are and where their enemies are. So, Mr. Speaker, let's put that particular aspect to rest that we, in the Conservative Party, have a hang-up; that we, in the Conservative Party, approach with such a doctrinaire fashion that we cannot acknowledge public, co-operative or other areas of concern.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's just measure that. Let's just measure that for a moment.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: I believe the honourable member undertook to table the paper he was reading from.

MR. ENNS: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I have no problems with tabling this document. This is what was known as the NDP Manifesto for Manitoba. It first appeared in the unabridged version but then when we got close to the election time and then it got into the Guidelines for the Seventies, the language was cleaned up, tidied up, and it became a much more, you know, acceptable document that the government saw fit to distribute. But we have fortunately preserved for history, Mr. Speaker, some of the more quotable quotes that came from that famous think-tank known as the planning and priorities committee which, thank God, no longer exists.

Mr. Speaker, I would only ask the honourable member this, that insofar as this is the document belonging to the House Leader, I know that he wouldn't want me to get into difficulty with the House Leader, however, I'll table it in the hopes that, you know, if the House Leader wants it back and it happens to be his only document, that perhaps I can have some commitment for the House that we'll get photostatic copies maybe made in fifties or a couple of hundred so that we can pass them out so that we all have them, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Honourable Minister suggested that he would like to have the permission to be able to get several hundred copies of that document back from the Clerk of the House and I would think that in the profligate manner in which they handle things, they would no doubt have those copies or would make them. I want to ask the honourable member on the point of order or maybe it's privilege, on behalf of a person who is not in the Chamber, will he confirm in some way that he knows that Mr. Marc Eliesen, as he calls him, prepared that document?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, that was my information. If it's incorrect — I, after all, was not privy to that particular group that was advising the think-tank at that time but that was my information. I'm not passing it off. It is an unsigned document. If you wish to disregard it, or if you wish not to honour the authenticity of the document, that's a matter for honourable gentlemen opposite to decide, and I have no problem with it. However, Mr. Speaker, the language, Mr. Speaker, is so crystal clear — you know, it just cannot be mistaken — the language is so crystal clear. It's like — would you doubt Shakespeare if I quoted you line or verse right now? Would you say it was Harry Enns that said, " .. once upon a midnight summer dream," or something like that?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The point of privilege has been raised as to who is the alleged author of that document. I, Sir, don't wish to pursue that point of privilege. I wish to pursue another, and I believe more important, point of privilege, and that is that any suggestion by the honourable member that that document was adopted as government policy is simply incorrect. None of that, Sir, was adopted as government policy and a perusal of the guidelines document would prove that to be so.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I want to point out to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that there was never at any time any attempt made by the Speaker, that this was the policy of the former government. He just pointed it out as being one of your papers. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the First Minister to underline that particular point because it also gives me the opportunity that certainly such speculative stories having to do with, for instance, a task force report have not been adopted or part of government policy.

Certainly such other reports that have been alluded to at election time as fixed and firm government policy, such as the TED Report, have never been adopted as part and parcel of government policy in its totality or in its position.

A MEMBER: The TED Report was tabled in the House.

MR. ENNS: It was tabled in the same way as the Guidelines of the Seventies have been, or some of this has been tabled —(Interjection)— that's right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the very last sentence uttered by the Minister of Highways constitutes my point of privilege. He is suggesting once again that that document which he read from was subsequently tabled as an inherent part of the "Guidelines for The Seventies" which was admittedly, and we never denied it. We reconfirm it now; "Guidelines for The Seventies" was an intention of government policy. But that document which he has just read from was never accepted and never incorporated into Guidelines for The Seventies, and therefore it is not comparable.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that the records should show that the document tabled by my honourable friend was published by the Conservative Party of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Let the record also show that in the sense that we had some difficulty in understanding the language of my honourable friends opposite that the italicized comments were taken directly as quotes from the document which formed the unabridged version of "The Guidelines Of The Seventies".

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, there are some tender spots in that area. My point, Mr. Speaker, was not in raising old history but simply an indicator that from a doctrinaire dogmatic point of view the co-operative movement, the credit union movement, had nothing to fear from this government.

Indeed, Sir, they flourished under years of this administration, years of Liberal administration and years of coalition administration. They only came into some jeopardy during the eight years of this administration when that kind of thinking was allowed to prevail in the back rooms of that party.

Mr. Speaker, unless there is a Point of Order I would like to proceed with my speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Inkster have a Point of Order?

POINT OF ORDER

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, yes, it is a Point of Order and it was raised by my honourable friend. My honourable friend said he had the House Leader's copy and he hoped that the Clerk would be able to make him one.

I ask him to note that on the first page of that document published by the Conservative Party copies are available at Conservative Party Headquarters, and therefore I would ask that the Clerk not prepare it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, just let me remind you that the simple fact remains that it has become abundantly clear that they certainly weren't available at their headquarters. They certainly weren't available at their headquarters and I can understand that. What was available, as a very much improved glossy document costing ten times this amount that became politically more powerful as that administration moved into an election year '73.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (Cont'd)

Well, Mr. Speaker, the point that is obviously being made with reasonable success is that we don't have, and don't have to apologize for, a dogmatic hangup about whether we on the one hand can approach and support a public venture whether it is by government, whether it is by co-operative association of individual Manitobans or farmers, or whether it is a co-operative of credit unions or financial organizations. That will never embarrass us, as you have tried to embarrass the Member for Portage la Prairie, about being proud of those achievements by our fellow Manitobans. Because that is just a question of being pragmatic and making those things work that work best, from time to time.

But, Mr. Speaker, what is the problem? What is the hangup with the honourable members opposite? And by the way, Mr. Speaker, you know that was being demonstrated daily from before this session started, from when it was announced that somebody from the private sector was going to be helping this government in their reorganization of government in their thinking and their approach to government. We heard one former Minister, one member after another member decry that we had sold out to the corporate interests, that Great-West Life was now running this government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that of course wasn't always the time. I can read them back chapter and verse when their Minister of Industry and Commerce at one time stood up in this House and had this to say, "and I would like to take this opportunity to point out that we have had very many good Manitobans who happen to be businessmen who are assisting us in helping to develop Manitoba. Let me take this opportunity to mention them because it's very seldom that they get mentioned. They are doing this voluntarily. They are doing it without pay. They are doing it without remuneration. They are doing it for the good of Manitoba, and in co-operation with the New Democratic government of Manitoba".

Now, Mr. Speaker, you see when the private sector helps them, then people are acting in good faith, for the good of Manitoba. When the private sector helps us then it becomes sinister. Then it becomes evil. Then it becomes terrible. And that was said by the Honourable Mr. Evans in this Chamber not so many years ago, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask my honourable friend whether the parallel would not be this: that whereas it was, let's say, less common for business —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please, order please. The Honourable Minister of Highways may proceed. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, getting on to the more serious aspect of it, and this is the more serious aspect, because there has to be a concern expressed about the very dogmatic way, the very doctrinaire way with which this opposition is now showing its antagonism toward the private sector. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for not being in the House at the time the former Minister of Mines and Resources, the House Leader, the Member for Inkster made his remarks, I as a rule try to be in my seat when he is speaking.

I have read his speech in Hansard and I have of course the news reporting of that speech and I would like to spend just a moment on this, in his approach that he took in expressing his concern about the government auto insurance, Autopac. Mr. Speaker, I want you to follow this. He does not say to me as the minister responsible or to this government, "Don't tinker with Autopac because it's an acceptable service to the people of Manitoba." He doesn't express any faith in Autopac that it can in fact compete fairly. He doesn't charge us with the responsibility that we do not unfairly impede the operations of the Crown corporations. What does he do, Sir? His message is, "Down the tube," to the private sector, "Don't dare come to Manitoba. The one-way street from Toronto to Winnipeg is also a street back to Toronto, so double up your costs." And what he would like to say is then, "Great West Life we want to see you down that street, and would like to see International Nickel down that street, and we saw Falconbridge down that street. We want to see everybody down that street." That's the message that the Honourable Member for Inkster is giving. M

Monday, March 27, 1978

And Mr. Speaker, that is not being lost; that is not being lost by the honourable members because what honourable members don't fully appreciate, you know, honourable members don't fully appreciate — I know it's fair game and they think that it's politically very astute just to hit the big guys, INCO, BACM, Great-West Life — but that's because they just don't think like we think on this side. If I buy my first little bulldozer and decide to go into the construction business, I hope some day to be BACM. But of course their thinking is precluded from that thinking because of the two and a half times one formula which the Honourable Member for Inkster can't even think that. You know, if I have 50 head of cattle, I can't ever think of having 200 head of cattle because it breaks the two and a half times one formula. And that's their problem.

While they may think that they are making political marks by hitting Great-West Life, and let's face it, gentlemen, if we would have hired somebody from Eaton's, it would have been Eaton's; if we would have hired somebody from Hudson's Bay, it would have been Hudson's Bay; if we would have hired somebody from Simpsons-Sears, it would have been Simpsons-Sears. It's just the general impression. I ask the honourable members opposite, I ask them to search Hansard, when is the last time that something praiseworthy has been said about the private sector from any of the members opposite? I ask you to read Hansard. —(Interjections)— Yes, 1971, Hansard 1971, I'll give you the page, June 15, 1972 prior to the election. Ask yourselves; search your own conscience.

Now, we talk about a mixed economy; we talk about a balanced economy. Where is the balance? Where is the balance when all you have to do is mention a private concern and it is greeted with derision. All you have to mention is Great-West Life and it is greeted with boos. Mr. Speaker, you have gone out of your way, you have gone out of your way to shit on the private sector. Now, you have considered doing . . . —(Interjections)— Well, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition set out the new guidelines for decorum in this House at noon, see, and we said we were quite prepared to follow them. The House Leader said he wasn't, but that has never stopped me. You search your conscience. When is the last time you —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I must ask all members to kindly refrain and let one person speak at a time in this Chamber. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, having to do with Autopac leads me into that other area that has been dealt with to some extent in this Chamber. But of course it also points out how different the media, for instance, views how different parties keep election promises. Mr. Speaker, in 1970, with the introduction of Autopac, and there are those around here who remember that session very well. I admit that there are a goodly number now that weren't here in that session at that particular time so forgive me if I repeat a little bit of that history.

The administration that then was elected in 1969 had clearly earmarked as one of its planks the introduction of government auto insurance and it has always been acknowledged, at least by myself in this Chamber and certainly by the media, and credibility was given to that regime for having the guts to bring in and carry out basic and fundamental election promises. Mr. Speaker, let's also remember what that promise entailed, and the one member that is in this Chamber that knows perhaps better than anybody else, unfortunately he is not in this Chamber, the Member for St. Boniface, he knows what I am speaking about because as he was making out the application form for his job security, for his entry into the Cabinet, he was also signing that pink slip for many hundreds of Manitobans, for many hundreds, if not thousands, of Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, these weren't company presidents. Mr. Trites didn't lose his job in Wawanesa; Mr. Horsford didn't lose his job at Royal. But you know who did lose their jobs? Secretaries, file clerks, independent insurance agents. —(Interjections)— The point is, does somebody dispute that that was not a massive disruption in the employment in Manitoba at that time?

Let me put it a little more graphically for the Member for Wellington who seems to have some particular compassion for how we treat people. Let me put it in terms that he can understand. How would he feel if he or a constituent of his, to put it more properly, had just moved to Manitoba and bought a \$50,000 or \$60,000 home or business and then by action of this Legislature had that home or business confiscated and he is left still paying for that business that is no longer there? And there are people in Manitoba today who are still doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I will not tolerate an interruption unless it is on a point of privilege, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George on a point of privilege?

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member knows not what he speaks of because there was no disruption in terms of employment for the agents of this province of whom he is talking.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I point out to all members of the Chamber that points of privilege and points of order are very clearly spelled out in Beauchesne and the Rules of our Chamber. I wish the members would read them rather than bring up points that clearly, quite clearly, are not points of privilege but are nothing more than debating points. I rule the member's point of privilege out of order. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I am the first one to acknowledge, and I thankfully acknowledge, that in the intervening years that a goodly number of them have found new occupations, have joined

Autopac in one form or another. I have also acknowledged that there was a transition payment made to those that chose to avail themselves of that help. It wasn't great, but it was there. But, Mr. Speaker, the point is where there is a whole line of adjusters that were done out of business just like that, there was no room for private adjusters any more. Hundreds of people were without a job just like that. But, Mr. Speaker, that is fine, that didn't bother the news media when by public actioned the we pull rug out of hundreds of jobs, that didn't bother anybody, because the public can do no wrong. But, Mr. Speaker, and above that, it was an election promise that the NDP had made in 1969.

But, Mr. Speaker, we made an election promise in 1977, and the election promise was that we were going to reduce the public service, that we were going to trim the fat, and that we were going to cut back on the size and scale of government operation. Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what we are doing. But when Conservatives carry out an election promise, my God, the wrath of hell falls on them. When we carry out an election promise that is not fair game any more. When we do away with succession duties, when we do away with mineral acreage taxes, when we do away with this and with that, which were all part and parcel of our election program, then it is terrible.

Mr. Speaker, coming back to the point . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I want to inform again every member of the Chamber that you will have an opportunity to take part in debate. If you are willing to wait, your time will be allocated to you. The Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: I want to thank you for subduing the unruly behaviour of members opposite here. It makes it extremely difficult for me to make the point that I am trying to make with the Honourable Member for Wellington, who felt that we in a callous and cold-hearted way when dealing with this regrettable and unfortunate situation where separations of service are taking place. . . . Let me tell the honourable member something, that above what your progressive labour legislation calls for, special steps were taken to provide generous separation allowances, that in some instances senior people are walking away from the government services with over \$10,000 in their pockets in severance pay and walking into a \$35,000 . . . a couple of weeks later. Mr. Speaker, don't charge us with callousness or cold-heartedness because every employee that is in this unfortunate position is being dealt with as fairly and as generously as can be dealt with, indeed above and beyond, certainly above and beyond what the labour legislation calls for. That is a matter of record, that is a matter of fact.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what does it all boil down to? It boils down to the fact that honourable members sense a degree of frustration. Firstly, they honestly didn't think that we would have the guts to do the things that they even know, indeed even the first Minister so much as indicated it had to be done, the reducing, he said, by several hundred. So I mean at least let us agree with. . . . I don't want to put it on the footing that the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose put it on, I mean like if you are going to — (Interjection) — I am not even going to get into that. We have this tacit and candid admission by the former premier, the Leader of the Opposition, that what we are doing is partly right. So again, as the Leader of the Opposition would like to say, we argue about statistics, and whose statistics do we go by?

Well, Mr. Speaker, at least we have that admission by the Leader of the Opposition that what we are doing, particularly with reference to staff cutbacks, is partly right. It is not that we are wrong, or that he is right, it is just a matter of statistics. Where is right and where is wrong? I suggest that we now have the responsibility, having reviewed the estimates, having looked at the departmental's programs, having looked at our financial situation, and when the Minister of Finance brings down the budget, and we table the estimates, that we will be able to justify with a great deal of elbow room, everything that has taken place so far in this administration. Mr. Speaker, what I further suggest to the honourable members opposite, they sense deep down a frustration because they know that the majority of Manitobans out there believe that we are doing the right thing. They know furthermore, they know that by far the majority of Civil Servants know we are doing the right thing. So despite the active efforts on the part of the President of the MGEA right now, despite the active intervention that he is meddling with right now, the biggest labour union of Manitoba is by and large accepting the necessity of what is going on in the government today. So we can expect the frustrations of individual people as they are affected, we can expect the demonstrations from time to time, but, Mr. Speaker, there is no standing cry in the community outside that says that what we are doing is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, more frustrating of all to the honourable members opposite is that despite their election predictions about what would happen if the people of Manitoba were so foolish to elect a Conservative Government those things aren't taking place. Despite the fact that they said, and Blakeney said, "Vote for the Tories and Medicare premiums will be re-introduced", they are not being re-introduced.

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

MR. ENNS: Despite the fact that they said, "Vote for the Conservatives and senior citizens will be thrown on the streets", that is not being done, Mr. Speaker. They said, "Vote for the Conservatives and Autopac rates will triple like they did in B.C.", and that has not been done, Mr. Speaker.

I can talk about Hydro rates but that subject matter has already been discussed with some eloquence by the Member of Inkster. So, Mr. Speaker, honourable gentlemen opposite are faced with

this difficulty, they know that politically, under more normal times, they ought to have us right now by the short ones, but they can't really bring it about because their timing is wrong, the people expect the restraint program this government is bringing in, the people support it or else we wouldn't have that confidence in what we are doing, and, Mr. Speaker, a year from now, fourteen months from now, eighteen months from now, when we have the economy of this province back on track and the basic social programs in place working and operating better than ever, Mr. Speaker, that's when they have shot their bolt and that's when they find themselves in difficulty.

Mr. Speaker, we're prepared and we have demonstrated the capability and the willingness to suffer the slings and arrows that the honourable members will hurl at us in the intermediate and the short term. But we know, Mr. Speaker, because I have that feeling every day when I go back to my constituency — I get that encouragement every time I go back to my constituency — that what we are doing has to be done and what we're doing the majority of Manitobans support.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, if you'll just listen maybe you can learn something because so far I found out that you don't know anything.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, they are interrupting me. To begin with may I congratulate you on the speed with which you mastered your difficult job. Judging by the special session and your performance since this session began, I feel confident you will render fair and impartial judgment in keeping us in order. I mean both sides. And for this occasion, Mr. Speaker, I wish you well.

My congratulations also go to the Mover, the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, and the Seconder, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie of the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could also congratulate the government on its performance since taking office. Unfortunately there is no cause for congratulations. The performance of the government up to this point has caused distress and unhappiness to many people of Manitoba and there is nothing in the Throne Speech to give us hope for a change of direction. Mr. Speaker, I notice now that when the civil servants are coming here to this building they are not smiling any more, they are really sad.

Mr. Speaker, they are not asking each other or greeting each other like they used to before, "How are you? How's your family? How was your vacation?" No, the only one expression they have now and they are whispering, "Who will be next to be fired?" This is the expression they have as civil servants under their administration. Although there are many words in the Throne Speech the government might have said only one, just one word, restraint, only one word.

The word "restraint", Mr. Speaker, is a good word and I am in favour of many kinds of restraints. I particularly favour restraints in the use of energy and material goods. I understand it costs over \$200,000 a year for electric power in the Norquay Building and around \$100,000 for the Woodsworth Building and, Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering because many times I notice that during the night the whole buildings have a light on and we have to pay for it. This is the way to save some money.

An American President became noted for shutting off the lights to save power. If considerable savings can be effected by eliminating waste of electrical power I am in favour of it. If building materials, paper or other goods are being wasted in any government department, I am all in favour of restraining such a waste.

Such restraints can be effected without causing hardships to anybody, but restraints on Child Care Centres, Mr. Speaker, cutting back on low-cost housing, helping the building of senior citizens' homes, cutbacks in essential services, eliminating jobs and adding hundreds of civil servants to the ranks of unemployed, these are the kind of restraints that hurt many people. This also helps to depress the economy still further.

Mr. Speaker, I remember and I think that you remember as well, on the special service held in the connection with the opening of the 31st Session of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Manitoba, on March 16th, 1978, at the Holy Trinity Anglican Church. I saw you there and I saw many ministers and backbenchers. I had the honour to represent this side of the House because I would like to let you know, Mr. Speaker, that I am the only Minister on this side; and many of them, they will not be a minister any longer and I still will be a Minister.

Mr. Speaker, let me just remind you of a certain phrase from the lesson of the 28th Chapter of Deuteronomy which is known also as the Fifth Book of Moses, and were reciting, everyone of us who took part at that service. We had many Clergy and Bishops from other denominations and I am quoting: "Today I offer you the choice of life and good, or death and evil. If you obey the commandments of the Lord your God by loving the Lord your God, by confirming to his ways, by keeping his commandments, statutes and laws, then you will live and increase and the Lord your God will bless you in the land. But if your hearts turn away and you do not listen, I tell you this day that you will perish. I summon Heaven and Earth to witness against you this day. I offer you the choice of life or death, blessing or curse."

Mr. Speaker, next day when we had the opening Session here, I saw hundreds of people demonstrating in front of the building. They weren't only from Point Douglas constituency or Winnipeg Centre or Transcona. No, I saw them from Assiniboia, from St. Matthews constituency, even from Charleswood, Mr. Speaker. You think they came here with a blessing to the government? They came with words of curse. Mr. Speaker, they didn't come here to ask luxuries. They came here to ask a daily piece of bread which you are taking from them. — (Interjection) — Well maybe you didn't listen to them, but I was among them. Maybe your ears are closed completely.

Mr. Speaker, I was not here during the depression years of the "Hungry Thirties", but many books

and articles have been written about that period. There have also been a number of TV programs to remind us what it was like in those green days and, Mr. Speaker, who is creating such a climate now? The government under the leadership of the Premier whose name is Sterling Lyon. — (Interjection) — I don't want to comment. He is a good friend of mine. That doesn't mean I agree with his opinion. The Conservative Prime Minister of that period, R. B. Bennett, also followed a policy of restraint. He told people they must tighten their belts. He didn't say how far — but just tighten — their belts. Families on relief got just barely enough to live on and no more. That was the policy. The single unemployed were sent to the Government Relief Camps to work for twenty cents a day. Imagine! But all this restraint only made economic conditions worse. The country was in a depression because of the sharp decline in business. The stores were filled with goods that couldn't be sold, and of course, everytime people were laid off their incomes came to an end; they had nothing to buy with. They had to keep from starving by government relief.

Mr. Speaker, I made a few calls and I visited some corner grocery stores and you will be surprised. They said already that their income came almost to half because people don't have the money. Mr. Speaker, I have never been in business for myself and I don't profess to know everything about economics, but one thing I do know is that no business can carry on without enough customers. This is logical like two and two makes four. Customers are the lifeblood of business, but people who are cut off from their jobs and their pay cheques don't make very good customers. Mr. Speaker, my people used to say, they are still saying, "no money, no funny", and this is the case.

Oldtimers among Manitoba civil servants will still remember their restraint program of the thirties. They did not have the present member for River Heights in charge of the job-cutting Task Force. But government employees were laid off and salary was cut by 25 percent. In writing of the period, Professor Murray Donnelly said, "They have cut civil servants' pay to the point where it put many of them below the poverty line." But all this restraint, all the lay-offs and salary cuts only helped to make things worse. It sharply reduced the purchasing power of more people in the community. The less money people had to spend, the worse it got for business.

Mr. Speaker, let's take, for example, a family whose name might be John Malinowski, a young couple with two children. They just built a house worth \$50,000.00. They put \$5,000 as a downpayment and this John Malinowski worked for the government, he knew that his job was a good job, he is satisfied and he will continue. He worked for six or seven years and according to his income — let's take a round figure, \$1,000 a month — his expenses became approximately between \$500 and \$600 a month. Every month he has to meet these payments and all of a sudden he is getting cheque and pink slip that his service is no longer required. What will he do? Mr. Speaker, tuis is the question. Where will he go? It is very easy to say, Well, your service is no longer required, but what happens to his family? How will he support that family?

Today we are, Mr. Speaker, in the same situation. Instead of the government giving a lead in maintaining employment, the government is following the example of private industry by massive lay-offs of the government workers. The sharp drop in buying power of the laid off workers is bound to result in a further decline of business. Is this the aim of the government? Is this the way to create a good climate for business?

Mr. Speaker, during the election campaign the First Minister, in every speech, talked about how many jobs he would create under a Conservative Government; private enterprise was going to perform miracles in creating jobs. Over and over he kept saying there must be and there will be jobs, and I am quoting, Mr. Speaker, "There must be and there will be jobs." In one of his election leaflets he said he had a vision of Manitoba, a province of young people fully employed. A lot of young people believed in him and probably they voted for him. But, Mr. Speaker, how do you call such a person who promised the people of Manitoba — there must be and there will be jobs — if the situation changes 180 degrees, almost opposite.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, a paper — Tribune — it is not a New Democratic paper by any chance, no — dated Friday, March 10, 1978, Mr. Speaker, and talking about — there must be and there will be jobs. We are reading in this paper, Mr. Speaker: Northern Affairs maybe 200 people will be laid off. Where is the word — there must and there will be jobs?

Going further, Mr. Speaker, Renewable Resources up to 150, Health and Social Development 12 to 15, the Department has asked to keep 250 employees whose terms expire March 24. And going further, Mr. Speaker, Education — 3 employees, Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation — 21 contract employees, Mines and Natural Resources — 20, including 4 permanent civil servants, Continuing Education and Manpower — 15 FOCUS staff whose contracts expire March 24, Corrections—12, Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs — 17 members, Municipal Affairs — 4 staff, Civil Service Commission — the 4 members of the Affirmative Action Section, Cooperative Development — a few, not yet decided, Finance — possibly 2 or 3 in the Succession Duty and Gift Tax field. Mr. Speaker, again, I am asking my Premier, my Premier, I am asking him . . .

A MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, would the honourable member give the title of the document he is reading from and the date so we have some reference to it.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I just said, he probably dreamt, he didn't listen — I said Tribune, Friday, March 10, 1978 — is that enough for you?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Point of Order I will rule out of order. Carry on please.

Monday, March 27, 1978

MR. MALINOWSKI: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, again I am asking what the paper said — how many people will be without jobs? Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, at a time when private industry is laying off workers by the thousands this government says we must depend on private enterprise to provide jobs. How? How? Mr. Speaker, if you need a pair of shoes, if you need milk, if you need a piece of bread, if you need a suit, if you need a house, I don't care and I believe that you agree with me that you don't care who made it as long as it is available. All of a sudden we are saying nobody else can do it, just private enterprise.

At a time, Mr. Speaker, when we have over a million unemployed, the Minister without Portfolio, I don't know the number, but the Member for River Heights boasts about how many hundreds of jobs his Task Force has already eliminated. Isn't that wonderful.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, I am sorry to interrupt my honourable colleague, but I know there is a tendency on both sides of the House for conversation to take place and I am not suggesting that one side is any better than the other, but in the past few minutes there has been such a loud hub hub of conversation from opposite that it is, in this part of the House, difficult to hear the speaker.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Sorry but I didn't hear a word of what my Leader said.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Point Douglas please.

MR. SCHREYER: I am just saying, Mr. Speaker, that there is such a loud hub hub of talk that I cannot hear the speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am having a little trouble also, but I will admonish the people for making so much noise that /d. Wcannot be heare wish to hear the speaker from Point Douglas.

MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I am aware that no provincial government alone without the cooperation of the Federal Government can solve the unemployment problem. But I am pleading with the government not to make the situation worse by its policy of massive lay-offs of civil servants.

I fail to understand the objectives of this government and I am not quite sure if anyone of the government's side does. Who will gain and what is to be gained by adding another thousand or two thousand to the ranks of the unemployed? Who will gain in a cutback on building and the other things I have mentioned? Mr. Speaker, I have here a clipping of one of the First Minister's election leaflets with a picture, nice smiling fellow, of the Conservative Leader and his statement about full employment for young people. I would like to quote and put this on the record: "I have a vision for Manitoba, a province of younger people fully employed and older people secure in dignified retirement."

A MEMBER: You would have a nightmare.

MR. MALINOWSKI: "Of family farms that are bountiful and prosperous and at the North whose abundant resources are being developed by Northerners themselves; of children well educated for a bright and productive future here at home; both job security and a financial stability for every Manitoban."

MR. WILSON: Cross the floor — get over here.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I am coming back and asking, where are the jobs for those people? Continuing, I agree with this statement 100 percent: "We do not have this blessing today," that's the fact. We don't have that kind of a blessing today, but opposite.

Mr. Speaker, the aim of a balanced budget is a worthy aim if this is achieved by a policy of fair taxation according to ability to pay. But this government almost in its first ten minutes in office, gave up \$5 million in revenue to the wealthiest people in the province who had no need for it.

MR. WILSON: They had all moved away.

MR. MALINOWSKI: The Inheritance Tax was the fairest of all taxes. To make up for the loss of revenue the government is practising restraint on those who need Child Care Centres and other services. Why is the burden of restraint forced upon the poorest member in our society?

MR. CHERNIACK: They don't vote Conservative.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Oh, I see. I am sure those in the upper income brackets will not suffer the

latest bid from the government's restraint program.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the government for at least one thing, something that was not in the Throne Speech. I notice the Conservative Government in Ontario raised the Medicare premium to over \$500 a year for a family. That is the highest in Canada among the provinces where Medicare is financed out of premiums. I am glad that Manitoba did not follow the lead of the Conservatives in Ontario by reintroducing premiums in Manitoba on the same level. So at least right now, okay. — (Interjection)— Well listen, I can't baptize a baby before it is born, you know, I have to wait. So we'll see. I'm talking about what happened right now. —(Interjection)— But it was the NDP Government which abolished the Medicare premiums and introduced a more just method of financing. Had it not been for the NDP Government, Manitobans would likely be paying the same Medicare premiums as the people in Ontario. It is a well documented fact that the Honourable First Minister and his colleagues favour Medicare premiums.

Throughout the election they loudly proclaimed they would not reintroduce premiums, otherwise they would not have been elected, naturally. They didn't say a word. But their job creation election promise quickly turned into the job of destroying reality with massive layoffs.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing not with the figures, we're not dealing with a piece of furniture, we are dealing with human lives, human lives. And talking about this layoff, before it was just 1,000 or 2,000 people, it's not enough, Mr. Speaker. We'll have to move it at least by three, at least by three. And again I have to ask the Honourable First Minister, my Premier, where is his promise? There must be and there will be jobs.

I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, how every one of you, if you are just sitting at the table, if you're starting to eat — it doesn't make any difference, it might be lunch or supper — knowing that your people, people who vote for you, people who brought you here, they are hungry. I am asking what kind of a Christian are you?

Now talking, Mr. Speaker, about speed-up, selling Crown Corporations, I'm just wondering, Mr. Speaker, what kind of a type of selling we are dealing with; what kind of a selling is it, a special sale, Easter sale, spring sale, cleanup sale or strictly Conservative sale?

MR. LYON: Try cleanup.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Cleanup, that's what it is. I'm afraid so.

Mr. Speaker, my time is running out. I would like to mention certain things which are going in my mind. I was attending service on Good Friday and we were celebrating the stations of the Cross where an innocent man, who was 33 years old, he was crucified. This figure, Mr. Speaker, is going in my mind, 33. Now I came to the point that 33 members on the other side, they are crucifying people of Manitoba and this is inhuman. I'm glad the First Minister is in his seat and I would like to repeat again that I am ashamed to have such a Premier of my province. I am ashamed. Because, Mr. Speaker, if you are dealing with human lives. . .

MR. LYON: You'd better get used to it.

MR. MALINOWSKI: . . . this is an entirely different situation because it's almost no value, you can't buy it. But let's make a comparison with the dollar. They are putting dollars before human lives, there's no doubt in my mind. And, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government right now is looking for a credit in a Canadian bank for \$1.2 billion and in the U.S. market, \$1.5 million to keep a dollar at a certain level. Not a human life and not for the working people; for the big outfits who are dealing outside of Canada. —(Interjection)— No. If this is the case like the honourable member said, so let's think about when you are getting your cheque and try to think about those who are not getting any cheques at all because of your administration. You put them out completely.

MR. WILSON: Where are they?

MR. MALINOWSKI: And, Mr. Speaker, there are 37,000 in Manitoba right now without work. You are making fun of it? I would like to see you go home and your wife will ask you, "Listen, I don't have a cent to buy a quart of milk for my children, or our children."

MR. WILSON: How come the Immigration Minister says we need 12 million more people in Canada?

MR. MALINOWSKI: Well, I'm talking about Manitoba. I'm talking about my government here. I just mentioned about the Federal Government already.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks I would like to come back to that prayer which you are saying on behalf of all of us before every sitting. Aren't they beautiful words? Wonderful. I would like to put them on the record: "We are assembled here before Thee to frame such laws as may tend to the welfare and prosperity of our Province." Our Province, not the Conservative province, not NDP province, our province.

"Grant O Merciful God, we pray Thee, that we may desire only that which is in accordance with Thy Will; that we may seek it with wisdom and know it with certainty and accomplish it perfectly for the Glory and Honour of Thy name and for the welfare of all our people. Amen." Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. DON ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Congratulations on the continuation in the most highest office of this Chamber. I'd like to congratulate the Honourable Member for Radisson, although he's not in his chair, for his appointment recently to the Deputy Speaker position in this House. I know he will carry out his duties faithfully and with integrity and trust.

I'd like to congratulate both the Mover and the Seconder of the address on Friday. The job was very commendable and, Mr. Speaker, I particularly want to congratulate the Seconder for so ably pointing out in his constituency what a mixed economy can truly deliver to the people responsible enough to direct it properly.

Mr. Speaker, just a very few days ago we listened in this Chamber to the Throne Speech. I think at this time I would find it very appropriate, although there were many pertinent facts laid out in the Throne Speech, I would like to take this particular opportunity to read one paragraph for the benefit of all members in the Chamber and particularly the members opposite. I quote:

"My Ministers inform me that they are committed to the restoration of confidence in the Manitoba economy. And to that end my government has reaffirmed its belief in the fundamental importance of a strong and competitive private sector. In the same connection my Ministers recognize the dependence on a growing private sector in our mixed economy to generate wealth and to create permanent employment opportunities, particularly for the young people of our province."

I think, Mr. Speaker, that that paragraph ably defines the goals and the objectives of this government and I would highlight several words from that paragraph: Confidence in the Manitoba economy; strong and competitive private sector; dependence on the private sector to generate wealth and provide permanent employment opportunities.

Now in the debate on the Throne Speech we found many of the honourable members opposite have viewed statements in the Throne Speech with considerable ridicule, teeheeing and hawhawing, because they cannot quite comprehend just what we envision as the private sector. We know very well what honourable members opposite envision as the private sector. They see such venerables as Great-West Life, INCO, CPR, etc., etc., as their total envisionage of the private sector. That is where their tunnel vision, their tunnel vision on the private sector, indeed, becomes very shortsighted.

My concept and my party's concept on the private sector includes naturally CPR, Great-West Life, INCO, and other multinational organizations. They are part of the private sector that we know in our mixed economy. But fundamentally important to us on this side of the House are the myriad of smaller, independent businesses and companies who provide the wealth of manufactured products that our industry and our consumers need, and provide, incidentally, the majority of the jobs in this province.

Our concept of the private sector is a total concept of the private sector, not a blindered one which allows the multi-national to be maligne, and allows the socialist dogma and theory to attack through taxation, through legislation, that very corporate organization.

Our friends across the way — and they are across the way now because of their blindered tunnel vision on the private sector — are sitting over there because a lot of the legislation and the taxation that they brought in aims specifically at defeating and beating the multi-national corporations — the giants in the business and corporate world — did nothing but in fact enhance their position in the business sector by enabling them, because they are large enough to pass on any legislation and any taxation and any increase in cost. They can protect themselves and pass those additional government costs on to the consumer. But in their blind fury to get at the multi-national they fail to recognize that their taxation had the greatest implication on the smaller company who couldn't protect themselves on the marketplace, and in fact probably ran into serious financial difficulty and were bought up. And who were they bought up by? Those very large multi-national that these gentlemen opposite were bent on destroying.

They have been the greatest friend of the multi-national; in their bent to get at them they have made them stronger.

I have faith in the private sector in Manitoba, and especially in our smaller and independent companies and service industries that we have in this province. I have faith in them that they will expand and provide the employment that we need for the end of the 1970s and all through the 1980s. I have faith in them because the vast majority of those private companies have survived eight years of negative and antagonistic government under the NDP Party. If they have that kind of adaptability, toughness and survivorship to last eight years of a regime totally bent on destroying them, then certainly they are going to thrive under our understanding and sympathetic government that knows private sector is required to create the wealth that this province needs.

I would like to reiterate for some of my colleagues comments left with us last week by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. He touched very well on the aspects of agriculture. His points struck home with me because I come from an agricultural constituency. I know the importance of agriculture to the province. I know it's very fundamentally important to Pembina Constituency. But I think one very important thing was drawn out by the Minister of Agriculture in his address, that we, in this Assembly, must never fail to realize and to recognize, and that is that 50 percent of the people of Manitoba are directly connected to agricultural production in one form or another.

In other words, gentlemen, where agriculture goes so goes the province. And I don't think that has ever been more ably demonstrated than approximately 12 months ago. We were facing in this province a spectre of drought in our agricultural community, and also the spectre lowered crop prices. Business in Winnipeg tightened up considerably, retail sales were down. Things did not look

very healthy. As a result our friends opposite saw fit to postpone an election from June to the Fall in the hopes that things would improve.

Well, we did end up in rural Manitoba, in agricultural Manitoba, with a reasonably good crop last year. As a result we saw a return of consumer spending, a return of confidence in the economy, and more importantly on October 11th we saw the defeat of the NDP government — a government who had no sympathy and no justice representing agricultural Manitoba.

Although we don't have the Member for Lac du Bonnet here I have some comments that I think are appropriate for him. I received many, many, many comments from my constituents in Pembina that they are overjoyed — they are gleeful — that finally we have a Minister of Agriculture who truly understands agriculture, who truly knows what agriculture is all about.

Also the Minister of Agriculture has enlightened us that no longer will we be going forward on the socialist bent of the land-lease policy, better known as the state farm program. It's to be disbanded and replaced — hopefully — with a program of . . .

MR. URUSKI: Public financing.

MR. ORCHARD: . . . private long-term financing so that young farmers can own their land — not the government own it but young farmers own the land.

It is interesting to note, also, that the Minister of Agriculture pointed out that prior to the instigation of the state farm program that 190 people were receiving mortgage money, help and assistance from MACC for a year. Under the state farm program that slipped down to 150 per year.

The state farm program wasn't working but socialist dogma insisted it stay in place despite the fact that fewer people were deriving benefit from it. We intend to change that, and soon you will see a return to the 190 to 200, to 250 young people being helped into agriculture.

One must be very careful, however, when he lays criticism upon the former Minister of Agriculture, the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet. One must be very careful.

MR. FERGUSON: He hasn't been here all day.

MR. ORCHARD: That's right, he hasn't been here and he isn't here now. But a person should be gentle with the man, and I think the saying is appropriate "forgive him for he knew not what he was doing". And really, how could the former Minister of Agriculture know exactly what he was doing when he was being served — or better phrased "being mastered" — by the former Deputy Minister of Agriculture, who pulled the strings. —(Interjection)— Pardon? Oh, the Member for Inkster indicates "Red Bill". That could be quite an appropriate term, yes.

Never in the history of the democratic process has one non-elected official done more to defeat the government than — I will quote the Member for Inkster — "Red Bill" did to help the Conservative cause in winning the election October 11th.

Mr. Speaker, the proof is in the pudding. Before October 11th, there were such venerables in the House as the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Mr. Toupin. There were several others. Now who do we see in those theoretically agricultural constituencies? We see my colleague from Springfield; we see my colleague from Emerson; we see the colleague from Gimli. The very, very last remnant of agricultural representation that the NDP Party had we now hold. Thank you kindly, "Red Bill".

It's coincidental also that in late October I had the opportunity to attend an agricultural graduate reunion in the public building down the street here. I was talking to an ag. rep. who I graduated with, and he is an ag. rep. and according to the Minister of Agriculture he must be one of the very few ag. reps. left with more than two years experience. Once again I don't think it is anything but a clear reflection of the poor policies that the former Minister put out. But in talking to my former classmate, who is an ag. rep., I asked him what his reaction was to the election of October 11th.

Gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, he said it was like having a weight taken off his shoulders. He was looking forward to the next meeting of agricultural representatives with the government. He was looking forward to it because he would not have to have the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Bill Janssen, there stuffing socialist dogma philosophy down his throat. And he was glad, and he was relieved and pleased that finally a government recognizing agricultural needs in the province was elected, and he would be working for them.

But also we can't entirely blame the former Minister of Agriculture or his Deputy Minister for the seemingly lacking agricultural programs. I think in no small way the former Premier, himself, is as much to blame as anyone.

It is coincidental that earlier this evening we got into somewhat of a discussion, shall we say, on the use of reports as government policy. And I have with me, as a matter of interest, the Winnipeg Free Press, Saturday, September 10, 1977. The headline reads "PCs Aim To Throw 7,000 Families Off Land — Schreyer". Now, here is Schreyer's direct statement: "The Conservatives issued a report which said their target was to reduce the numbers of farms to 20,000 by 1980 the Premier said" — a direct quote. He is attributing that to Conservative policy when it wasn't Conservative policy just as earlier on this evening the Leader of the Opposition jumped to his feet, as did the Member for St. Johns, and chastised the Minister of Highways for using a quote which they were very disturbed was going to be misconstrued as NDP policy. Exactly the kind of distortion that the then Premier was using in election campaign, and very much interesting here is that if we follow back into Hansard — if

we go back to Hansard in the mini-session — we have the very same man, the Leader of the Opposition, hailing his party in the last election as having run a picture-book campaign of honesty and integrity, and decency. And we didn't do anything wrong and we were picked on by everybody, including 49 percent of the voters.

That same fellow is claiming the cleanest campaign — no distortion of the facts — and here he has it: "Conservatives issued a report which said . . .", saying that it was Conservative policy.

Now, earlier on today in the afternoon we had the Leader of the Opposition accusing us of being liars, in a context of sorts. Are we to assume that the then Premier was lying here?

A MEMBER: He wasn't lying; that's socialist integrity.

MR. ORCHARD: That's socialist integrity; correct.

MR. LYON: It's like expecting a vulture to say grace.

MR. ORCHARD: The then Premier, I submit, was using the grossest, most indecent method of scare tactics available to anybody in a democratic election, and yet he stands on his feet not four months ago and says, "We ran the cleanest campaign — a picture-book campaign. Somebody should write a book on our clean campaign." Fantastic.

He also went on on that very same day and this was an article at Portage la Prairie, he also went on to say that the NDP drum needing beating because we are the Saviour of the farmers. We brought new farmers. We saved 7,000 farmers. We brought them the stay option. We brought them the Farm Development Program. We brought them water services. We did this; we did that. A whole list of things that the former Premier attributed to the salvation of so many farmers in this province.

Well, we heard earlier on from the Minister of Agriculture that 2,600 people partook in the Farm Diversification Program. The state farm program, if one-quarter section was allocated per farmer, would have helped another 1,000 farmers.

Therefore, we've got 3,600 farmers if we give you total credit for helping them — keeping them on the farm. Why did the other 3,400 stay? What did you do for them? What gimme gimme did you have for them?

What we have here, perpetrated by the then Premier, is the grossest example of deceit and trickery ever perpetrated upon the electoral public by any leader, and is especially shameful and shocking when coming from leadership you can trust. The voters in Manitoba — 49 percent of the voters in Manitoba — solved that little logo quite decisively.

So here we have, Mr. Speaker, the then Premier claiming all of these things — the rural water services, the stay option — all kept farmers on the farm. And in reality what kept farmers on the farm from 1973 on was a small economic wonder: \$5.00 per bushel wheat, \$3.00 per bushel barley, \$2.00 per bushel oats, \$9.00 rapeseed, and \$12.00 flax. The very operation of the free market economy in the world grain system kept those farmers on the farm. The very system that socialist dogma would have destroyed, controlled beyond benefit to anybody. And here he is on one hand wanting to destroy it and on the other hand taking credit for its workings and what it has done for agriculture in this province. Like I say, the greatest and most shameful and shocking display of election trickery, and by "leadership you can trust."

Now, consider all this in view of the fact that since 1973 the farming economy in this province has boomed. It has been good without exception since. The grains economy has been excellent. 1973, '74, '75, '76, '77. That's five, count them. And what has happened meanwhile? What has happened meanwhile that we've had five years of excellent farm economy in a province that is better than 50 percent dependent on the farming economy? We have our honourable friends opposite financing this province into a \$225 million deficit in the face of the finest agricultural years we will ever have. That's responsible government; that was truly leadership you can trust.

Following further, I think it is only important at this time that I divert a little bit. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews yesterday pointed out another aspect of the leadership you can trust that is indeed questionable and I refer to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's speech on Monday, March 20, page 32 to be exact, where he states that the Department of Treasury and Economics and Inter-Government Affairs, Ontario, says that more than 97 percent of Manitoba's, etc., etc. I would like all you members to check that particular page. He is attributing that statement to the Ontario Department of Treasury and Economics and Inter-Governmental Affairs when in fact it was written by his own Finance Minister. That is leadership you can trust when he will wilfully distort the facts and use incorrect figures? Hardly leadership you can trust.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I shall ask the honourable member if it is not a fact that that excerpt was published in the Department of Treasury and Economics and Inter-Governmental Affairs of the Province of Ontario during the course of 1977, 26/76. It was published in that document. That's all I said. — (Interjection) — Well, I gave my honourable friends the reference so that they could check to see the context in which it was printed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

Monday, March 27, 1978

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the comment from the Leader of the Opposition. He is absolutely correct. It is quoted, as he says, it is a statement of the former Finance Minister, Mr. Saul Miller. But the context in which he leaves it for members over here and for the press and for the public to interpret is that that is what the Ontario government thinks of Manitoba province. That's the kind of impression that he is trying to leave with the taxpayer. Leadership you can trust? Exactly.

I submit, hogwash. Leadership you can trust.

MR. SCHREYER: I gave you the reference to check for yourself.

MR. ORCHARD: Which we did. The problem is in the distortion of the facts. The distortion of the facts is the problem, misleading the public of Manitoba to believe that that is what Ontario thinks of our taxation system when in fact it is what your own finance minister thought of the taxation system in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the honourable member, in addition to the fact that it was published in the Ontario document, is the honourable member now suggesting that the data quoted there is substantially incorrect? Is that what he is suggesting?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not suggesting that the information here is incorrect or not. I am not in a position to pronounce whether it is incorrect. The interpretation left on the public of Manitoba is incorrect. That is what is deceitful and distrustful. —(Interjection)— Yes, Succession Duties, name the game. Let's give the wrong figures.

Now, during the course of the Throne Speech Debate, we have not only the Leader of the Opposition but several others over there ringing the bells and saying, "Well, I can't understand all the problem with a \$225 million deficit. Other provinces have it; other provinces have big Civil Services. Why are we so bad by having it?" Well, if you have got cancer in your arm and you have got cancer in this arm, which arm is better off? You have both got a problem.

They talk about the balanced budget that they came out with for three or four years in the first part of their administration and only lately have they run into a deficit of some \$225 million and if you average the \$225 million back, well it amounts to some less than \$40 million per year, which is quite all right. You are doing wonderful, fellows. The question is, where was the trend to your administration? It was level, balanced budget, and then in the last year it dies off. How many more years would it have taken before you hit rock bottom? And that's what the people of Manitoba soundly decided — you didn't get the chance to hit rock bottom. They talked about the balanced budget.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order or a question?

MR. SCHREYER: I merely wanted to ask the honourable gentleman if he would permit a question?

MR. ORCHARD: I would permit a question in due course when I finish, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 10:00 p.m. and the hour of adjournment, the member can complete his remarks the next time we get to that subject. Does the Acting Government House Leader have a point of order?

MR. ENNS: No, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Finance that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved by the Minister of Highways, seconded by the Minister of Finance that the House do now adjourn. Is that agreed? (Agreed) The House is then adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon (Tuesday).