



FOURTH SESSION — THIRTIETH LEGISLATURE  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**  
DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS

26 Elizabeth II

Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Peter Fox  
Speaker



**VOL. XXIV No.52A TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1977 2:30 p.m.**

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan):** Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the loge on my right where we have the Honourable James Taylor, Minister of Energy for the province of Ontario, who is being hosted by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

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

We also have 29 students, Grade Seven Standing, of the Queen Elizabeth Junior High School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Beauchemin. This school is located in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, the Minister of Health and Social Services. We also welcome you.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. STERLING R. LYON (Souris-Killarney):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. With respect to the upcoming conference of the western Premiers later this week, can the First Minister advise the House if one of the agenda items to be discussed at that conference will be the question of the Mackenzie pipeline and the recent announcement from Washington favouring that route for the transmission of gas from the north shore of Alaska and Canada.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, Premier (Rossmere):** Mr. Speaker, the matter of the Mackenzie Valley pipeline as such is not on the agenda. However, there are at least two agenda items which are broad enough in scope to encompass any discussion that any one of the four Premiers might wish to initiate or raise relative to the Mackenzie pipe proposal.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder, also referring to the same conference later this week, if the First Minister could advise whether, in his opinion, it would be appropriate at this time for the four First Ministers to be discussing their attitude toward the possible usage of the Federal power of disallowance with respect to the Quebec Language Bill No. 1, as to whether or not that would be appropriate at this time, having regard principally, of course, to national unity.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, there is specifically an agenda item having to do with the current state of Confederation and the contemporary problems of Canadian unity; under that heading, therefore, questions having to do with language and the like would appropriately fit. I cannot guarantee that the suggestion that has been made will be specifically discussed, although I wouldn't be surprised if it were, at least to some degree.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary on that same point. I would not expect the First Minister to be able to advise the House at this sitting as to whether or not this government has formulated any policy on that point, but in view of the fact that this suggestion about the usage of the power of disallowance has been made by a former Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Honourable John Diefenbaker, would the First Minister undertake to advise the House in due course as and when his government has formulated a point of view with respect to that proposition?

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that the invoking of the power of disallowance by any former Federal administration has been made during our lifetime. I can recall on one occasion where a bill was reserved for the pleasure of the Governor-General-in-Council and, indeed, it was not met with much pleasure by the Governor-General-in-Council.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River Heights.

**MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK:** Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate whether his government has, in fact, commenced any study of the language bill in Quebec and its constitutionality.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the general intent of the provisions of the bill but we do not feel that there is any onus incumbent upon us to have a definitive position in advance of opportunities to discuss this among the several provinces and appropriate Ministers and First Ministers. This process is commencing and we propose to leave it there.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Is the First Minister suggesting that there is no undertaking on the part of the government with respect to an examination of the bill with reference to the Constitution and its constitutional provision?

**MR. SCHREYER:** I didn't suggest there wasn't any import, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that the principal and primary onus is that of the Government of Canada. The provinces do not exercise

powers of disallowance. My honourable friend should know that.

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

**MR. DAVID BLAKE:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable, the Minister responsible for Renewable Resources. I wonder if he could inform the House if the study his department did on the bog areas in the Marchand region were responsible for the re-routing of the Hydro transmission line to the United States.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources.

**HONOURABLE HARVEY BOSTROM (Rupertsland):** Mr. Speaker, we did make a submission to the Planning Committee of Cabinet with respect to re-routing the hydro line. There was some dispute with Hydro as to whether the line should go through a particular area of the provincial forest in that general area. As a result of my department's representations, the line was re-routed to the satisfaction of both my department and Manitoba Hydro.

**MR. BLAKE:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister might advise the House during this study what advice or representations were sought from scientific people or naturalists' societies or other people interested in the route itself.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, there are scientific people that are working for my department. They are experts in the area of forestry and wildlife and on other matters that are renewable resources and they gave their professional comments on the particular location of that area, taking into consideration the possible impact on the environment. I am sure any advice or comments by members of the public were also taken into consideration since many of the people in my department, Mr. Speaker, are represented themselves personally as citizens in those groups that you mentioned.

**MR. BLAKE:** A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister might advise if the environmental reasons or cost factors were the major quotient in arriving at the decision.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Well, Mr. Speaker, luckily, in this case, there was no significant difference in cost so that the environmental factors were able to take precedence and there was no dispute at all as to a cost factor.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Corrections. I wonder if the Minister can confirm the reports that the Youth Detention Centre on Kenaston Boulevard is suffering serious problems of over-crowding to the extent that over 200 boys were in detention over the weekend when there were only facilities for 150 and that many of them had to sleep in the public areas and corridors at that time.

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

**HONOURABLE J. R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Central):** Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that the capacity of the Youth Centre is approximately 150. It has been overcrowded for quite some time.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Can the Minister indicate that as a result of these overcrowding conditions that in fact juveniles with very serious cases of disturbance are being mixed in with first-time offenders and those who are just there on certain remand cases?

**MR. BOYCE:** The people who are rather difficult are segregated as best we can. Everyone in the community admits that the only way we can solve this problem is by keeping people out, in co-operation with the different components of the criminal justice system, including the Winnipeg Police, who are initiating programs to try, as best we can, to keep people out of the Youth Centre.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister indicate that, as part of the general problem at the Detention Centre that there has been a close-to-80-percent turnover in the working staff of the Centre within the past year, and that there is very little training going on with the workers who are presently at the Centre to provide for this major transfer and turnover?

**MR. BOYCE:** Eight percent staff turnover would have been a valid figure about a year ago. It is cut down to about half of that and we are trying to make it attractive as far as staff is concerned also.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. BOB BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and would ask the Minister: In light of the federal transport commission's new proposal, I wonder if the Minister could inform the House whether his department will be taking any steps, through representation, to maximize the opportunities for Winnipeg, which would become one of the key locations in the new VIA passenger rail service that the federal commission is proposing?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Industry and Commerce.

**HONOURABLE LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, the new proposals, the proposals of the Canadian Transportation Commission, do allow for up to 60 days for the provinces or any other interested parties to make representation to the federal agency, and therefore we do plan to submit our views. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that we are concerned with some of the proposals pertaining to rail passenger service in Canada, the adjustments to the rail passenger service. There is a certain slowdown in the transcontinental service, and there is a certain rescheduling which we believe will not be in the interests of promoting greater use of rail passenger service. We are very

concerned about rail passenger service, Mr. Speaker, because not only is in energy-efficient, but as the Member for La Verendrye has indicated, such type of rail service is very important in the Winnipeg area because many, many jobs are related to the servicing and maintenance of railway passenger equipment.

I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that it is the intention of the government to again draw to the attention of the Federal Government in the next 60 days that a regional experimental service be implemented connecting Winnipeg-Calgary, Winnipeg-Edmonton, so that fast daylight service can be provided. We think it is this type of service for which there is a great need and which will be most appealing to the traveling public.

**MR. BANMAN:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House whether the government will be making any representation, since Winnipeg is going to be one of the key areas in this, to try and get more maintenance and overhaul work for Winnipeg?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, we did make representation to the Railway Transport Committee when it held its formal hearings last year in Manitoba, and we submitted a very comprehensive brief of on the entire matter. In our supplementary brief, if you will, in our response to the federal position, we will certainly keep uppermost in mind, as I have already indicated, the importance to Manitoba, the matter of jobs, the matter of maintaining Winnipeg as a very vital hub in the rail transport system in Canada.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister for Corrections and Rehabilitation. The question stems from the statement made by Judge Manly Rusen when he called the regular check-ups on prison dormitories to be a barbaric and inhumane arrangement, and it is with respect to the suicide a few days ago in the city jail. What is his department doing about the suggestion of the judge?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

**MR. BOYCE:** Well, I would prefer not to comment on the judgment, but nevertheless there has been a problem there because it was staffed as if it were a part of the police responsibility to operate the lockup, so they have been understaffed as far as a custodial facility is concerned.

Last Thursday, for example, in a remand situation in the Province of Manitoba we had 65 people located in the Public Safety Building and 80 in Headingley. We're trying to adjust, the province is taking over operational control of the Public Safety Building, effective as of the first of last month we have accepted financial responsibility. There is an interim period where we're coming to agreement as far as the lease of the facilities and what renovations we can do to make it easier to operate it as a custodial facility.

One of the problems is that as remands have increased they seem to have stabilized. But nevertheless it has created a problem within the system. I don't know if the public is generally aware that there are as many people in Headingley Jail at the moment as there were three years ago in the total correctional system in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable the Minister of Labour and I would like to ask him whether he has received any indication from the Federal Minister of Manpower of that Ministry's inclination to consult with Labour Ministers, including the Honourable Labour Minister for Manitoba, before implementing his proposal announced last week to base unemployment insurance qualification requirements on regional employment conditions?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Labour.

**HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY (Transcona):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did receive a communication from the Honourable Bud Cullen, the then Minister responsible for Manpower and also the Minister responsible for the Unemployment Service Commission. I believe it was yesterday that I received his communication and, as the honourable member points out, there was a suggestion that we would have a conference to which I am prepared to participate in. I have to say with regret that due to business of the House — and I'm not asking my honourable friend to accept this as a reasonable excuse — but I haven't been able to thoroughly read and analyse the letter that I received from Mr. Cullen, but intend to do so within the next day or two. And I am prepared to have consultation, as I indeed did about three months ago, with Mr. Cullen as to the effects of changes in the legislation.

**MR. SHERMAN:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the Minister for his information. I would ask him whether he would consider, in going into those consultations with the Federal Minister, suggesting to the Federal Minister that a fairer application of the program might see it based on employment opportunities rather than on unemployment levels?

**MR. PAULLEY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think that it would be improper for me to indicate to my honourable friend and members of this Assembly that I have already raised objections with the federal authority as to the application of a percentage figure of unemployment to the provision of jobs. Because in my opinion, whether we have 13 or 14 percent unemployment rates as is prevalent in

some jurisdictions, we in Manitoba are just concerned with an unemployment rate of 6 or 7 percent insofar as the individual input is concerned. I want to assure my honourable friend that that is the attitude of the present Minister of Labour in Manitoba and I'm sure that I would have the concurrence, not only with my colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce who is also involved, but the Minister of Manpower and all my colleagues in government. We are concerned with the individual; not the numbers of individuals who may be adversely affected as a result of unemployment.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River Heights.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister in the absence of the Finance Minister. It has been reported that the Finance Minister of Ontario is now on a speaking engagement in the United States to calm investors with respect to investment in Canada. I wonder if the First Minister is in a position to indicate whether the investment brokers who handle the bond dealings and debentures for the province have in any way indicated any concern about confidence in the Canadian market, particularly in Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, I am aware that there is some uneasiness on the part of investment dealers in the United States and perhaps some of the European investment houses with respect to eastern Canada . . .

**A MEMBER:** Ontario.

**MR. SCHREYER:** But insofar as Manitoba is concerned, Mr. Speaker, our bond and debenture credit rating is AA, all systems are A-okay.

**MR. SPIVAK:** I wonder if the First Minister will confirm to the House, and this is the question that is being posed to him, have the investment brokers with whom the province deals in any way indicated a concern or shown a lack of confidence because of the situation in Canada with respect to Manitoba.

**MR. SCHREYER:** I just finished saying, Mr. Speaker, that on occasion, which I don't pretend has been frequent in recent months, but nevertheless on occasion, there has been some dialogue or discussion as between our Minister of Finance, our Deputy, myself, on one or another occasion, with investment dealers. There is a vague concern expressed about stability in Canada with particular reference on Quebec and central Canada. There has been no suggestion of apprehension or concern on their part insofar as the Keystone province is concerned. But then again, we cannot divorce ourselves from the sort of general overlap of impression that is left because of the widespread publicity in other parts of the world which is superficial as a result of the November 15th election in Quebec. I am not aware that there is any real concern; I have never heard of a single item of concern expressed with respect to Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, etc. etc.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Then there has been no recommendation made to the First Minister or to his Finance Minister that in any way deals with the people who are involved in the investment field to explain Manitoba's position and Canada's position, as has been the case with the Finance Minister in Ontario.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, that is being done all the time as a matter of normal course. Every time that the Minister of Finance and/or his Deputy and/or myself meet with bond and brokerage and investment bankers, we do dialogue with them with respect to economic prospects, nationwide, in our own province, in our own region of Canada, and that is done in the normal course of events and we shall continue to do so.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. Can the Minister indicate whether the government has yet decided whether they are going to appeal the decision by the County Court in reference to the parking ticket of Monsieur Forest on that language issue?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, no decision has been made. It's up to Mr. Forest and his counsel to determine whether to proceed with the trial.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate at this date what the position of the province is in relation to this particular issue? Are we awaiting a trial issue or would the Minister indicate if the decision of the County Court isn't going to be allowed to stand?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, there was a statement which was issued and a statement will be made to the Court if the matter proceeds on for trial. As I indicated earlier, the decision as to whether to proceed on with the trial rests with the other side, not with us.

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

**MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister. In view of the questions asked by the Leader of the Official Opposition with regard to Dominion Day, can the First Minister indicate if he has ever heard the Leader of the Official Opposition express a policy of his party . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. Order please. I wonder if the honourable gentleman would cooperate and keep his questions brief and terse. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

**MR. SHAFRANSKY:** Can the First Minister ever recall hearing the Leader of the Official Opposition ever express a policy of his party with regard to the things that they would do.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that honourable gentlemen opposite expressed the policy in brief and terse terms. On the contrary, it is difficult to know what their policy is. But apart from that, if the question has to do with Dominion Day and Canada Day as to the appropriateness of one or the other, one can only express personal views. Canada Day is a very appropriate nomenclature. Dominion Day, on the other hand has to do with the earlier years of our country, at which time the title was taken from biblical source, "Dominion from Sea Unto Sea," and I would think that biblical source is ageless, even a hundred years from now there is nothing wrong with the word Dominion.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Morris state his Point of Order.

**MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw your attention to the question period rules which you circulated to the House at the opening of this Session which offers guidelines as to the questions that may and may not be asked. I draw your attention to one of the rules which states that "a question should not be asked which does not relate to the responsibility of any Minister of the Cabinet." Surely what the Leader of the Opposition does outside this Chamber, or indeed inside this Chamber, does not come under the responsibility of any Minister of the House. It is a violation of the rule on that particular count and on other counts as well, Sir.

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

**MR. SHAFRANSKY:** Yes, a question to the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management. Can the Minister indicate whether the questions asked by the Leader of the Official Opposition yesterday appurtenant to the position taken by the Manitoba Hydro since 1969 with regard to the CRD, or is he still living in the past when the plan of the Tory Government was to flood South Indian Lake . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** . . . that it relates to a matter of past history which is clearly outlined in our rules.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN (Springfield):** Mr. Speaker, I'll be dealing with . . . —  
(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. TOUPIN:** Mr. Speaker, I'll be dealing with something of past history. It is a question posed of me yesterday. —(Interjections)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. TOUPIN:** Yesterday during question period, the Honourable Member for Brandon West raised certain questions about the upcoming CRTC hearings on cable television. In response to the honourable member's query about the number of applications and when they are to be dealt with, I am informed that seven applications involving a total of 29 communities beyond Winnipeg are to be dealt with by the CRTC hearings to be held here on June 7th. The scope of the application ranged from individuals who are applying to serve only one or two communities, to two groups in western Manitoba which are planning to serve some 20 communities. I am sure that like myself, the Honourable Member for Brandon West will find this a most encouraging development for western Manitoba communities.

The honourable member also asked whether the government intends to support one application over another. And the answer, Mr. Speaker, in regards to the Department of Communications, is no.

The honourable member also inquired about the relationship between a group called WestMan Media Co-op Ltd. and the Provincial Department of Cooperative Development. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Co-operative Development, in keeping with its normal mandate, has assisted WestMan Media Co-op in two ways. First, the department has guaranteed 50 percent of a loan of some \$25'000 which WestMan Media has secured from a credit union in Brandon. Secondly, the department has provided the staff support to advise WestMan on incorporation procedures. The listing of 309 Legislative Building for the address for WestMan Media Co-operative was an administrative error. The application for incorporation was filed on behalf of the group by my Deputy Minister of Co-operative Development without a mailing address. As a result, the Companies Branch used the address of the department in the same manner that they frequently used, for example, the address of the legal firm which applies for incorporation for one of its clients.

Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Brandon West is interested I could supply to him, or any other member of the House, the names of the 29 communities involved.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. G. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Honourable the Minister for Public Works. Could the Minister advise the House, in the case where architectural firms are needed is it the policy of his department to hire Manitoba-based architects where they are qualified?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Public Works.

**HONOURABLE RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood):** Mr. Speaker, my memory could be wrong but I believe that in every instance, without exception, of appointments that I have made they have all been Manitoba architects. I can't think of any exception to that.

**MR. G. JOHNSTON:** Another question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. Regarding the Provincial Government building being constructed in Dauphin, is it correct that all the architectural work is being done in a Calgary office?

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, the firm that designed the Dauphin office building is a Winnipeg firm of Sivertson James, and to the best of my knowledge they are local architects, they have a local firm, I don't know if they have any association with Calgary. To the best of my knowledge they have done all the design work here.

**MR. G. JOHNSTON:** I would ask the Minister to check and inform the House if this firm has not moved to Calgary.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

**MR. EDWARD MCGILL:** My question is to the Honourable the Minister of Co-operatives. I thank him for the answers he has supplied to questions posed yesterday. I wonder if he can tell the House, in view of the loan guarantee that has been given to WestMan Media Co-operative, is his department represented on the Provisional Board of that Co-operative?

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

**MR. TOUPIN:** Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, I'll check and if it is found that we are represented I will inform the House.

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if at the same time the Minister is doing that research would he find out if any of the members of his department hold memberships in this Co-operative or have in any way an equity position.

**MR. TOUPIN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. BLAKE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed, I suppose, to the Minister in charge of Corrections, or maybe for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In view of the controversy surrounding the location of the maximum security penitentiary to be built in Manitoba does the Minister have the assurance of the federal authorities that it will, in fact, be built in Manitoba, regardless of location, and not move to another province in view of the controversy on location?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

**MR. BOYCE:** The correspondence between the province and the Solicitor-General's office is that we would co-operate with the Solicitor-General's office if they decided to locate such an institution in Manitoba. The announcement emanated from Ottawa in the first place that they were going to increase their capacity, and one of the contemplated facilities was to be located in Manitoba, and they were looking for a site to see if they could be accommodated.

**MR. BLAKE:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. So the Minister is saying that there is no assurance that the penitentiary is going to be built in Manitoba.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Speaker, I could not give that assurance, but indications are that if they are able to come to some agreement with the community of Selkirk that it might well be located in that community.

**MR. BLAKE:** I would direct a question then to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, in view of the number of jobs involved, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if he has had meetings with the federal authorities in connection with locating the penitentiary in Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I want to assure my honourable friend I am very interested in new jobs for Manitobans but I have not been involved. My colleague the Honourable Minister of Corrections is very competent and very capable of handling this . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Roblin. Order please. The Honourable Minister for Corrections on this same question.

**MR. BOYCE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have inquiries from two regional development corporations and several communities and I have given them the names and addresses of the officials in Ottawa with whom they should be in contact.

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

**MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, I wonder when the Minister of Agriculture can get us the Order for Return No. 39 which he accepted May 28, 1976.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Agriculture.

**HONOURABLE SAM USKIW (Lac du Bonnet):** Mr. Speaker, I am not aware as to which Order that is, but certainly . . .

**A MEMBER:** Thirty-nine.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, I know the number 39, I don't know what it relates to but hopefully you will have

it soon.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. BANMAN:** I direct my question to the Minister in charge of the Manitoba Development Corporation and would ask him if Evergreen Peat Moss Company which is owned 50 percent by the Manitoba taxpayers has been placed in receivership?

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

**HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, the company declared insolvency some time ago, I don't know whether it has been put into receivership but that would be one of the means in which an insolvent company is dealt with. The company is owned 50 percent by rugged private enterprise individualists.

**MR. BANMAN:** I wonder if the Minister could then tell us how many taxpayers' dollars, Manitoba taxpayers' dollars, have been invested in this bankrupt company?

**MR. GREEN:** Unlike what occurred during the Conservative administration that material is all put on the record, made available to honourable members, and entitled to ask full questions of it when the Chairman of the Manitoba Development Corporation appears before a Committee of this Legislature, something which the Conservative administration never did, and won't do . . .

**MR. BANMAN:** A supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister could then confirm that the Manitoba taxpayers have invested \$300,000 in this bankrupt company.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that the fact is that with the change of policy that this government instituted some four and a half years ago, that \$300,000 represents 300,000 over \$135 million of losses of the Manitoba Development Corporation, which was carried on for the \$135 million under the policies which exist in other provinces, and the policies which were pursued by the previous administration. Now, I recognize our responsibility for having carried on those policies for roughly half of that total, but since the policy has changed the difference has been \$300,000 loss in the last four-year policy, \$135 million in the years before that.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. G. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Honourable Minister for Renewable Resources. In light of the statement made over CBC Radio yesterday, by the Chairman of the Brandon Winter Games, that the Department of Renewable Resources is in favour of building a ski hill in the Souris Bend Wildlife Management area. Can the Minister inform the House if that statement made was correct and, if so, what are his plans there?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly have not made that statement that we are in favour of a ski hill in a Wild Life Management area and therefore I must say that it is not a policy or recommendation from this department.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. PAULLEY:** Mr. Speaker, other day the Honourable Member for Virden asked me questions pertaining to a fire incident in Brandon. The question at that particular time was as to whether or not an investigation was being conducted in Brandon, as to whether or not an investigation was being held and whether or not I would subsequently receive a report. Out of courtesy to my honourable friend I do want to indicate to him that I have received an interim report from the Fire Commissioner's office. I was in Brandon over the last weekend; I took the opportunity to go down to the site of the fire so that I was a little more knowledgeable about what went on. My honourable friend referred to a youngster of thirteen or fourteen coming out of the building with his clothing ablaze and so all I can do, Mr. Speaker, is to now recognize my obligation to my honourable friend. I have received a partial report from the Fire Commissioner's office in respect to the fire itself. It does appear, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as related incidents concerned as to whether or why the young person was in the building and other circumstances are of such a nature that they are under investigation by the Police authority. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend would recognize that it would be improper for me to make any further disclosures. I do hope and anticipate that I will be able to relate to my honourable friend after the investigation has been completed all aspects of the incident.

### HANSARD CORRECTION

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

**MR. SHAFRANSKY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make a correction in Hansard, April 29, 1977 2:30 p.m. on Page 2594 in the paragraph where it states, "Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to the Honourable lemen" — it should read the Honourable Gentlemen from the other side. I was referring to the Member for Wolseley.

Also, on Page . . .

**A MEMBER:** I think you were right the first time.

**MR. SHAFRANSKY:** I really don't understand, Mr. Speaker, how they could make that mistake but your staff . . . and in the same Hansard, Page 2598' in the last sentence, and I am quoting my Leader and it states here that "government once", it should state "This government, warts and all, is the best

damn government this province has ever had."

### ORDERS OF THE DAY — BUDGET DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance and the amendment thereto by the Leader of the Opposition and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. The Honourable Member for St. James.

### NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Before we proceed, the Honourable Member for Radisson have a matter of procedure?

**MR. SHAFRANSKY:** I wonder if I could have the indulgence of the members of this House to make a non-political announcement on behalf of the Fifth Estate, they wish all of you to know that you are all invited after this afternoon's sitting at 5:30 to a reception in Room 247. You are the guests of the members of the Press Gallery.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Just so we won't have the honourable member get up tomorrow and ask for another correction, it's the Fourth Estate I believe he is talking about.

### BUDGET DEBATE, Cont'd

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

**MR. GEORGE MINAKER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have listened with interest to the Budget Debate this year and it has been quite varied. Yesterday particularly when we had one of the honourable members, the Honourable Member for St. Johns, make accusations that the Progressive Conservative Party was going to raise the sales tax to a certain degree; and we had another honourable Minister stand up and make comments in his usual manner that he believed that the government should be in the business of creating jobs and constructing everything and very proud of his Public Works buildings and so forth. Then we had an Honourable Minister stand up and say that he wasn't worth his salary which is quite rare in the House because quite often it is voted against, but we had a Minister make this statement yesterday in the House so it's been quite an interesting debate, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that I might be able to add some interest to the debate and I hope that possibly some of my comments, some of my suggestions, might be taken seriously by the government and maybe even put into action.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I am very happy to see that the government has finally decided to stop taxing the students that were the major portions of the citizens who were paying the small amount of tax, yet it was still a provincial tax, when they did not have to pay the federal tax. It was usually either the retired senior citizen or the low income or, more particularly, the student that was faced with this problem and I am glad that the government has finally recognized this situation and has made attempts to correct it, or will be attempting to correct it.

I was also happy to see, Mr. Speaker, that the government has finally realized, to some extent anyway, that they should remove the provincial sales tax from insulation but, however, just on residential dwellings. Again, Mr. Speaker, here is an indication of this basic thinking and lack of understanding that this government presently has with regard to trying to conserve energy. I would particularly like to point out that, again, the major portion of the non-renewable resource, the fossil fuels that are used for space heating, the major portion of it is used in commercial and residential buildings. Now, if we want to save energy, we want to save the fuel, then why do we draw the line at this particular level of strictly residential heating and strictly residential insulation?

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that once again, this is this false front that this government puts forward when it tries to portray the role of being a leader in the conservation of energy. The prime example, one might say, happened today with the Honourable Minister asking me why haven't I got on my sun power button — why am I not wearing it — and I answered the Minister very plainly, "When you stop taxing sun power." I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to you and to the Honourable Minister of Public Works, that if he reads the Revenue Act that was amended last year by his government, that he will now be paying a revenue tax for the hot water that he is heating with his sun and using to heat a building because it is there in the Act, Mr. Speaker. This government portrays the role of wanting people and industries and businesses to try and conserve energy, but it is happening right in this province today, right in this City today, that there are industries that will be double taxed if the government follows its legislation it passed last year in Bill 87. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that if one looks at the Revenue Tax Act, that there were amendments put through last year that said "Hot water or steam is a taxable commodity if it is used to heat a building." It also states very clearly that it doesn't have to be bought, as long as it is produced it is a taxable commodity. This is exactly happening in Winnipeg at the present time, where people who are using a fossil fuel for their process or their industry, and they reclaim the exhaust heat and produce hot water to heat their facilities with, they will be taxed five percent on the value of that steam or hot water. There are companies faced with

**Tuesday, May 3, 1977**

this problem right now. As a matter of fact I believe one of the refineries in our city is faced with this very particular problem.

So here is a government that is trying to promote conservation of energy, yet they are prepared to double-tax those people who want to conserve energy. And if you look at the Act, and I suggest the Honourable Minister of Public Works read under Section 2H, IV and V in the Act, and then further read in the Act Section 3, IX, Consumption of Taxable Product, On Which Tax Not Paid. I suggest that the Honourable Minister will be breaking the law if he does not pay a revenue tax on that hot water that is being heated by the sun, in the same way that the refinery or these other industries that are reclaiming heat from exhaust to produce water to heat their buildings or steam to heat their buildings are being taxed at the present time. So I hope that the Minister and his government will correct this fault, that they will encourage conservation of energy and will maybe take a second look at also including insulation of any buildings that will conserve heat to be sales tax exempt.

Mr. Speaker, I was also somewhat pleased that at long last the government has recognized, but very faintly, that senior citizens who have retired from the marketplace, retired from work, have paid their fair share of taxes and should not be taxed on education. This government obviously doesn't believe in that policy but they are prepared to put off them paying the tax.

Mr. Speaker, that's been in existence for years. Any time somebody doesn't pay a tax, the city can lien their property, but all they are doing is putting off the lien, they are making it exempt. But they still put the lien on the property and eventually when the sale takes place, the legal firm comes in who is representing the estate, and I went through it many times when I was on St. James Council, that homes had to be liened because of welfare or social assistance and so forth. But really, this is all this government is saying, is that it is prepared to make sure that the senior citizen doesn't have to pay that education tax, but it will slowly be cleared off the books when the estate is settled.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that people who are 65 or 70, regardless of what effect they may have in terms of wealth, have paid their share of taxes in terms of education tax. They have paid their fair share. They profited by the educated people that maybe they have worked with or worked for them, and they also benefited by their children and grandchildren being educated in our school system. But I think there has to be some time in life that people have paid their fair share and should be exempt from this type of tax. Obviously this government is not quite prepared to accept this principle at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the Honourable Minister of Finance, I am sorry he is not in at the present time, with regard to the rebate program there is a discrepancy that occurs. I'll say it may not occur that often, but there is a basic principle that has to be looked at, and that is with regard to tenants who either rent a home or rent an apartment in an apartment block. What happens at the present time is someone who rents a suite that has the light or the heat included in their rent can use the value of their rent when they calculate out their tax rebate. However, a person who maybe rents a home where he pays \$120 a month but has to pay that additional, say, \$50 for heat or utilities per month, there is a discrepancy occurs. It is contrary to the belief and the philosophy of this government, because in most cases it occurs in the low-income area.

I have a sample calculation that has been worked out where someone who rents an apartment for \$170 per month with all-inclusive, having its light and heat included in that rate, can claim the \$350 rebate. However another person with the same general income could be renting a home for \$120 a month and \$50 per month is his rate for paying the light and the heat, and I don't think that is out of line nowadays because most places are running in that general order. Mr. Speaker, that gentleman or lady can really only claim 20 percent of \$1,440 rent for their tax consideration, which amounts to \$288.00. So instead of being able to claim the \$350 like the person who is paying the \$170 per month for a suite and making the same income, they can claim \$350. So there is a discrepancy there and I hope the government will look at this. It was brought to my attention by a constituent of mine who was concerned because the discrepancy does exist at the present time. It is a matter of changing the interpretation of what can be included in terms of cost to rent a space or a building or an apartment.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to make comments with regard to what I call the big false impression. The other side seems to like to start calling out about the big lie, the big lie that is being promoted by our party. I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this government for many years has been promoting a very big false impression. Every year they stand up and say that the people in Manitoba are paying less taxes nowadays, that they are not being overtaxed and that that is false. They are better off now than they ever were.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that some basic statistics, when you look at economies, lie. It is a very simple fact that since this government took over the administration of this province they have more than tripled the cost of government in our province. It has gone up something like 320 percent yet the population has only grown — what? I think it has grown something like nine percent, so there aren't more bodies here that represent the 300 percent increase, there are approximately ten percent more people.

The real situation indicator that I see is the labour force. Since this government took over, the

labour force has increased about 19.5 percent. It has gone from something like 373,000 people to the present day 444,000; I believe it is. I believe it is lower now but we are taking the year-average type of approach on this. The working force that pays for all this 320 percent increase in government costs is only increased by some 71,000 workers. Now you tell me where is the money coming from? You mean to say that the 71,000 new workers are paying this additional amount? Because when one looks at the average weekly income for Manitoba, the spread over that past eight years, it has gone from something like \$107 a week to \$216 a week as the average income. So it's only doubled. The income is only double for the 444,000 workers in our province yet they have tripled the spending. We have got 71,000 new workers. Are they paying for it? Is that what the government is saying, that the 71,000 are now picking up these something like \$700 million? Not very likely, Mr. Speaker, so there obviously is a greater tax burden on the people of Manitoba at the present state of affairs and at a greater percentage of tax. Mr. Speaker, one of the interesting things that comes out is that of the 71,000 new workers in our province, who is the biggest increased employer? It's the Government of Manitoba. It's right there in the book. They had something like 19,000 people working for the government and their different Crown agencies in 1969. Now it's 29,000, close to 30,000. So, lo and behold, the working population in Manitoba has only increased 19 percent in the eight years the government has been in power, but the government's employment of its own staff and its own people that it gathers in around itself to work for the government, has increased by 50 percent.

Now we see what's happening, Mr. Speaker, is that we are getting into a stage in our economy that the government cannot understand why there's so much employment around, why that they cannot have the jobs created because they were busy trying to create all this employment within their own works and they've run out of money. This is what we've been trying to tell this government, Mr. Speaker. You cannot work within your own little wall, within your own little economy of the government do it, let the people be government employed and it's coming home to roost right now. It's coming home to roost right now. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Public Works obviously doesn't understand basic economics.

**A MEMBER:** I sure as hell do, you don't.

**MR. MINAKER:** He believes that the government can go on its own and keep creating jobs and is completely independent of outside money. This government is following that philosophy, Mr. Speaker, because what do we read in the report that the Minister of Industry and Commerce presented to a particular service he was having for small business people in Manitoba the other day. I'll read to you what the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce said. He said that Manitoba's government has changed the emphasis of its industrial development program so that it will rely less on attracting outside companies in future, according to Leonard Evans, the Industry Minister. Mr. Speaker, now we're not even interested in outside money, outside investment, the government's going to do it alone. It's going to handle it itself.

Mr. Speaker I don't know whether the Honourable Minister of Public Works has ever played in a crap game or in a card game, but I can tell you one thing. If you play amongst your friends, you pass the cards around, you throw money in the pot, then eventually, particularly if there's a banker that sits there, the house takes out 10 percent. You know who ends up with all the money. It's the house man, the government, the government. And this is what is happening. If the money keeps trading hands within the province alone, who is going to end up with all the money? The government is, because it taxes every transaction and this is what is slowly developing and they haven't got enough money to create jobs — permanent jobs.

They've scared off the miners, th'ye scared

They've off the prospectors, because the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has very often said in this House, "Well, you guys can come along with us if you want, if you don't, well we don't need you." And he stands up very confidently in the Budget Speech and says that exploration in Manitoba hasn't dropped from last year. It hasn't dropped, I agree with you, it hasn't dropped but who is doing all the exploring? —(Interjection)— No it isn't, Mr. Speaker. I suggest that this year, the past year, Mr. Speaker, that private exploration participation has fallen off some 25 percent and I ask the Minister of Mines and Resources to say that that is wrong. The government has now taken on the major role of exploration for minerals in this province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, I hope we find them. I hope we find them.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Resources said in the Budget Speech that this government, if it was a Progressive Conservative government, would make sure that there was never any development of government-owned resources. Mr. Speaker, the Minister has I guess been so absorbed through the years of being a New Democrat and creating that class warfare between private enterprise and public and the labour forces against the employers, that he firmly believes that because I'm a Progressive Conservative that I want to see the public of Manitoba fail. Mr. Speaker, I think you can honestly say that the majority of the people in this Legislature want to see Manitoba

become successful and survive, or they shouldn't be here. Mr. Speaker, I hope that we start to find some mines. We're spending the money. Competition will be good for the north, but I tell you this, Mr. Speaker, that there is no way that you will ever convince me that a government operated mine will be more efficient than a privately operated mine. There's no way that you will convince me that the public will get more money out of a government operated mine in the long run than they will out of a privately operated one. We'll get the tax revenues. We'll get that income tax from the workers.

Mr. Speaker, this government is afraid of competition because they've driven it out. They've driven out the little prospector; they've driven out the small miners, but they were very careful that they kept the legislation that would keep the big guys in there. They would keep those big ones in there — the Hudson Bays, the INCOs, the Falconbridges. They'd keep them here. They wouldn't change the regulations — (Interjection) — that's exactly it, Mr. Speaker. The backbencher, the Honourable Member from Fin Flon said it — they're next and that's the truth, and that's what's driving out this private money that will come in and create jobs in the north.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. MINAKER:** Miners in Fin Flon want competition up there. They don't want to just work for the government. They don't want to just work for Hudson Bay. They want to work for other mines. They want to have the choice and they laugh, they laugh, Mr. Speaker. They don't realize what the people of the north want and they live in the north. Part of the year they live in the north.

Mr. Speaker, this is why we have unemployment. Because this government has made up its mind that it doesn't want outside money. It's said it. The Minister of Industry and Commerce said it the other day. The Minister of Mines and Resources has said it for years, and now they wonder why they have unemployment. They wonder why the youth of Manitoba are looking for jobs. They wonder why they are running out of money. They wonder why, they wonder why they have to cut back, or try to cut back, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest those are some of the basic economics that the Minister of Public Works doesn't understand. Those are the basic economics that the Minister of Mines and Resources does not understand.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest when the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources said the other day in the Budget Debate that, given time, in the long run, given time — that's what he said, give me time — that the public would benefit greater by the development of their resources, that they, the public, develop them rather than the private. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Resource and I'd ask the First Minister, is it not a fact that some four years ago there was a presentation and an offer from a present oil producer in our province that they were prepared to set up a pilot project. They were prepared to invest money to produce oil in a water flood system and, not only that, they would produce 40 percent, 40 percent of the oil per day that we are now presently producing. Is that not a fact? Now, I ask you — it's four years later — why hasn't it proceeded? Why hasn't there been some encouraging? Because the encouragement was some kind of recognition that water flooding under present taxing conditions by this government is not economical. We're giving away some 4,000 barrels per day right now. We're giving away an efficient recovery method of oil reserves that we don't have that much of in our ground. Why? Because this Minister says given time. A fossil fuel, non-renewable fossil fuel, where there's people prepared in this province to gamble, prepared to try and produce this oil. What is our answer? Is that not a fact? I ask the Honourable Minister, ask the First Minister. Four years ago he was approached on this. Now what has happened? Because they won't give up that money. Given time — they still firmly believe that the government can do it best. In the meantime we're buying oil from Alberta every day. We're buying 4,000 barrels of oil every day that may have been able to be produced here in Manitoba and I say, is that not a fact, Mr. Speaker.

This government is so obsessed that it believes it can do it. It believes it's got to be government owned. It believes it's got to be government employed. Now it wonders why it's in this problem that it's in right today with the young people looking for work because you cannot operate as a little embryo in a large economic world and this is what this government would like to do. Its Minister of Industry and Commerce has said it again, "We don't need that outside money. We're not interested in the outsiders anymore."

Mr. Speaker, we see what's happening. This government says, give me more time. I say also if you want more time you want more money. We saw what's happened with Saunders. The Minister stood up and said, "We have made a political decision that we will keep going, give me more time," when the MDC said we will no longer take the responsibility of putting money into this company. What did it say with regard to Flyer? The Minister said the same thing again — give him time. That's becoming a very very common line coming from the Minister of Mines these days. Give it time or give him time.

Mr. Speaker, this government will still not accept the responsibility of its, I say, major mistake in the level controls of Lake Winnipeg because, in simple physics — and the Minister of Public Works I believe, being an economic expert, probably also is a scientist or an expert on engineering being in Public Works — but Mr. Speaker, in simple physics, in simple hydrology physics, we're not getting any more energy out of Lake Winnipeg with the lake level control. That water rolls down that hill,

turns those turbines eventually. It's just a matter of how long you retain it or when you allow it to go down and this government was prepared to spend \$300 million for a very expensive short term measure, really. It's there where a drought occurs like it's occurring right now that it might or may be able to be used during the winter months to supplement the flow. But that energy, if it had to roll down the river in the fall or in the summer would still have been used by those turbines. So we are not getting any more energy out. It's just that we're deciding when we get that energy out.

Yet on the other hand, Long Spruce will be coming on stream and Lake Winnipeg will no longer be required to handle that shortage of energy. It was there as a safe gap. But in the meantime, the Hydro was negotiating with the Northern State Power or Power State for buying their summer peaks, selling their summer peaks and buying their winter peaks, an exchange of energy which would have handled this or will handle it. Yet we now have \$300 million invested. Some what? \$20 million \$24 million a year in interest costs. To do what? To satisfy that one in 20 years when the drought might occur and you can utilize that energy in the winter. But you're not adding any more energy to the system, you're just selecting when you're going to get that power and you've got to compare that cost of power difference between purchasing in the winter — or even if it's available, I grant that is one of the considerations that has to be taken. But they are negotiating that right now. Mr. Speaker, this government has failed to accept that responsibility of that decision and, Mr. Speaker, it will haunt them. It's there to haunt them and unfortunately it will be a burden to all of us here in Manitoba until doomsday. And when is doomsday? I don't know. It's election day for the government. — (Interjection)— Yes, Mr. Speaker, we'll find out.

Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate part is, like many of the comments that have come from this side of the floor, they don't go in very far to the people over there. They don't really want to listen. They don't want to hear, but the people of Manitoba know and the people of Manitoba hear and the people of Manitoba are indicating. So maybe it's to our advantage that the government members are ignoring or wish to ignore these things that we're saying, these things that the people of Manitoba are saying. Because, Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Minister of Public Works said, the doomsday for this government will be election day when the First Minister decides to call that date. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Continuing Education and Manpower.

**HONOURABLE BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows):** Mr. Speaker, in listening to the contribution of the honourable members of the Opposition to the debate on the Budget, if one could call it that, a contribution that is, or debate. — (Interjection)— Well, being a Budget there's no question about that, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure that you would agree with me on that point.

You know, it brings to mind a comment made by the Honourable Member for Brandon West because in listening to their, if one would call it a contribution, no doubt they would voice their criticisms of government programs but you know, interestingly enough at no time Mr. Speaker, did we hear any expression of the program of the policy of the Conservative Party. We have never heard the Conservative Party indicate to the people of Manitoba — and this is the forum within which the Conservative Party has an opportunity to speak to the people of Manitoba — indicate what it would do if it were to become the government. Not a word, Mr. Speaker.

As a matter of fact even listening to the previous speaker, he had mentioned many criticisms but at no time did he indicate what his party would do if were to become the government. There may be a reason for that, Mr. Speaker. The reason may be that the members of a party on the other side probably were instructed that they do not speak for the party; that there is only one person who speaks for the party and that is their Leader and he says what he wishes to say — for the time that he is the Leader. And I will come to that in a moment, too. Because you may know, Mr. Speaker, that when the Tory Party held its annual meeting on March 31st to April 2nd, the Leader stated in his opening remarks — and this was related to the so-called "policy papers" — what he stated, he said that while . . . — (Interjection)— I'm not sure who wrote this. No, I would rather suspect that it was one W.F.W. Neville and William R. McCance who were the authors of this paper. I don't know. But anyway the Leader said, and this was an invitation to participate in discussion of policy-making, but he stated this caveat. He said: "But while we may change some of the emphasis and some of the policy outlines contained here, the general direction of these policies reflects the kind of government we will be in Manitoba after the next election" — that is providing they become the government. In other words, the Leader said: Look fellows, this is what we're going to do. You want to talk about it. You may, sure, you have some views to express. Go right ahead but I want you fellows to know that this is what I intend to do if I were to become the government. And I hope that Leader isn't holding his breath until that day.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't surprise me not to hear any expression of policy from the other side. You know it reminds me of a few days ago when the Honourable Member for Brandon West — and this was during the debate of my Estimates of Continuing Education — and I raised the same question with him. I said, "Now here you are criticizing certain programs of my department but why don't you tell me what would you do if you were the government?" And his reply was, "I'm here to question the Estimates of government not to express the policy of my party."

**Tuesday, May 3, 1977**

Well, you know Mr. Speaker, I'm really surprised that the Official Opposition hasn't learned by its own experiences and by the experiences of other parties in the past. And I'm surprised that the Opposition doesn't reread Hansard from time to time, doesn't reread Hansard from the years of 1966 to 1969, and it would find that during those three years in particular — and also in the years prior to that — but certainly during that three-year period there was a very very determined and a concerted effort made by the New Democratic Party in the debate of the Estimates of a department, in the Budget Debate, in the Throne Speech Debate, to do two things. One, to criticize, analyse, question government programs, but in the same breath, in the process of doing so, to indicate, to outline, the policy of our political party, the course of action that we would take if we were to become the government. This we have not heard from the so-called "opposition" in this House; not one word.

As I mentioned a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, that I rather suspect that these so-called "policy papers" were probably / written by a committee. The the introductory comments to the various sections were likely written by the Leader and then the stuff inbetween the introductory comments by the Leader that were issued as they moved from session to session were apparently written by someone else. And I would suspect that whoever the authors were — the objectives were probably written by the Leader and then their objectives set out, Mr. Speaker, as to what the party's goals are; and then the Progressive Conservative program, that was probably written by someone else. And I think that in writing the programs — whoever wrote them — the authors probably were mindful of a document. And you may recall this document because reference was made to it in the House previously; not in this session because I wouldn't want to repeat what had been said in this session because you would rule me out of order. But at previous sitting of this House, a document entitled "Confidential No. 44 Manitoba Treasury Board." There have been references made to it: Project Working Papers, Project No. 2, June, 1968 Financial Management and Planned Program Budgeting. You may recall references having been made to that document, Mr. Speaker. Within it the entire strategy for the conduct, for the preparation for an election campaign was laid out.

You may also recall that during debates in this House during this session the statement was made by my side of the House that all that that side of the House is interested in — all that the opposition's interested in — is gaining power. And of course the opposition pooh-poohed the idea. They said, "Oh, no, no, no; we're interested in working for the benefit and the welfare of our people."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that — particularly the Leader who . . . I'll have to check back. I'm sorry that I did not have the opportunity to check, Mr. Speaker, to find out whether the Leader was a member of the Treasury Board in June, 1968. I rather suspect that he was. I know that he was at one point in time while that political party was the government of this province. What approach did the Treasury Board suggest should be taken to the election campaign? Here's what it says: "In Manitoba the government seeks election in 57 constituencies. In some of these a government finds greater difficulty in obtaining a plurality than in others. In the purely political sense, therefore, some constituencies have greater . . ." — (Interjection) — My plurality? I can't recall what my plurality was; I was elected with a majority. "In the purely political sense, therefore, some constituencies have greater impact on the government's overall ability to maintain itself than others. We suggest a waiting of constituencies according to their threat to the overall security of the government."

It is merely a desire to remain in power, Mr. Speaker. That's all; it's very clear in here. And then the waiting goes on in this fashion from the least to greatest importance as follows: "assigning one point to constituencies which can be classified as solid opposition, seats traditionally held by the opposition where voting patterns are stable and there is little chance that government action could shift the balance."

Then they said, "Assign two points to the constituencies that could be classified as solid government, seats traditionally held by the government and where voting patterns are stable and predictable: Three points to those classified as volatile opposition, seats held by the Opposition where changing population patterns, age groupings or other factors make prediction of voting patterns difficult; four points to those ridings that could be classified as volatile government seats held by government where changing population patterns, age groupings or other factors make prediction of voting patterns difficult; five points to those ridings that could be classified as marginal opposition — those are seats held by the Opposition but with a slim margin and with some stability of voting patterns; and six points to the marginal government seats, seats held by the government but with a slim margin and with some stability in voting patterns."

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it becomes quite apparent that the Tories — this time round — have resurrected this old paper of theirs which their Treasury Board had prepared in June of 1968 in preparation for the 1969 election. And all that they've done was taken the same paper and substituted the words "government" for "opposition" and wherever "opposition" appeared in their guidelines substituted the word "government".

Mr. Speaker, just to indicate to you that it's merely hunger for power that motivates the Tory Party, let me continue quoting from this paper which had been tabled, by the way, in this House a few years ago: "Each of the some 300 programs of the government has a differing impact on the political scene

in each riding." Now listen to this, Mr. Speaker: "In some areas, for example, hospital services to Indians are of political significance." In another riding: "Vocational basic training for skill development meets a greater felt need that is more powerful." I want to underline this, Mr. Speaker, "and is more powerful in eliciting political response than the hospital program for Indians."

That was their prime concern "eliciting political response. Indeed programs which are vote-getters in some ridings may have a depressing effect on the electorate than others. A systematic comparison of each program against each riding yields information which focuses attention on those programs which are most important to the political security of government." Again, that was their prime concern at that time.

At this point in time, of course, they are not politically secure, Mr. Speaker. We know that. But their hope is to follow the same guidelines and the same course of action to regain political power. — (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry says, "Right", but the Honourable Member for Fort Garry will recall what happened in 1969 when that political party adhered to and followed the guidelines that it had set out for itself a year prior to the election.

"This appraisal, unlike the analysis", and here they take a swipe at another one of their own committees, "unlike the analysis in the Planning and Priority Committee which deals with long-range needs" — you know they're saying, "Well, we do have a Planning and Priority Committee that is more concerned about the long-range benefits for the people of Manitoba but this appraisal aims at the short-run." It aims at the short-run, looking twelve months ahead or within whatever period of time they had hoped to call the election. It aims at the short-run. It considers the impact of programs in the context of the short-range political situation. That is the extent of their vision today, Mr. Speaker. That is the extent of their vision today; merely a desire, a hunger to grasp power within the next . . . The statutory limit is about, what, fourteen months or so for the calling of an election, fourteen to sixteen months because I believe that it can run thirty-five days beyond the five-year limit, I think. So it's at least thirteen months.

And that's the extent of their range of vision, Mr. Speaker. It considers the impact of programs in the context of the short-range political situation. Now, they repeat this point, Mr. Speaker, time and time again. "Its time horizon extends to the next general election, and to the extent that program effort cannot shift, or can appear to shift, that rapidly to the election following." That is the extent of their range of vision, Mr. Speaker. "A process we suggest . . ."

Then they evaluate programs, and they assign a minus one value where program effort has a negative impact on the political scene, zero where program effort has a negligible effect, plus one where program effort has a favourable impact, and plus two where program effort is exceptionally important. — (Interjection)— That is zero budgeting. But what happened, Mr. Speaker, it didn't even work out to zero budgeting when whoever wrote the objectives and then tried to translate those objectives into programs, it worked out in a negative figure, Mr. Speaker. It worked out in a negative figure, and therefore that is the reason why, as one reads through this document, if that's what one would call it, if one reads through this document, one would find the inconsistencies, the inconsistencies between what appears in the first portion of each section, a type of Progressive Conservative objectives, and the second section, Progressive Conservative program.

For example under objectives, one finds dealing with native people of Manitoba, "To build into all programs as they affect natives, the greatest possible scope for native control and native initiative." But then translating that into program one finds a very innocuous phrase introduced by way of introduction to the sentence, "Where necessary," in whose opinion I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, but "Where necessary these will be started," and this refers to northern development projects involving native people and so forth, "Where necessary these will be started on a joint venture basis between the institution funding the development and the native peoples." So somebody from the Tory Party is going to take it upon himself to determine where this is necessary to allow for a greater scope for native control.

And then, there are two sections here, one titled "A Renter in Manitoba," and the other "The Tenants in Manitoba." I presume a renter is synonymous with lessor, I would think. Well, to the lessor . . . no, I am not quite sure, maybe they aren't sure either what they mean because they speak of the renter and they speak of a tenant. I would give them the benefit of the doubt that the renter is a landlord. Well, to him they are saying that their program is to establish clear criteria for the removal of rent controls "once increases in rents and other living cost factors have been stabilized." So all they are saying to the landlord is that well, they are going to establish criteria for the removal of rent controls; to the tenant they are saying to remove rent controls. Well, I am not quite sure just to what extent they intend to move, that is insofar as taking immediate action, to remove rent controls, or merely to talk about, to discuss the establishment of criteria for the removal of rent controls.

Then, about taxation in Manitoba. Some of this, Mr. Speaker, if you have had an opportunity to read through this, you will find that it just makes no sense whatsoever. For example with reference to taxation in Manitoba, "To end confrontation between the taxpayer and his government." Between which taxpayer? I am not aware of any confrontation between the taxpayers in my constituency and

this government. I am not aware of any confrontation between the taxpayers in the majority of other constituencies. In fact I am not aware of any confrontation between the taxpayers in all of the constituencies in the Province of Manitoba and this government. There may be some disagreement, difference of view, between some taxpayers and this government, but to say that there is a confrontation between a taxpayer and this government is absolute nonsense, Mr. Speaker.

Then they are going to — this is their objective — “To restore a climate in Manitoba where responsible private enterprise is encouraged to flourish.” Now they are talking about private enterprise, and in the same breath they are talking about considering — and this, Mr. Speaker, just doesn't square with their general philosophy. They talk about considering “the cost and effectiveness” . . . Ah, yes, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. They are not saying they will do this. They are going to consider “the cost and effectiveness of diverting some funds currently used by the MDC to assist and support employee group purchases of equity in businesses.” In other words, Mr. Speaker, try to be all things to all people. They are saying to the employees: “Now look, fellas, we appreciate, we accept the fact that you ought to have an interest, be a part owner in the business for which you work.” But all they are saying is they are going to consider the cost and effectiveness of diverting some funds currently in the MDC to assist in this, to allow for this to happen. How long will it take them to consider the cost and effectiveness of doing this, goodness only knows, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to repeat this because this had already been referred to in debate earlier in this House, you know, that as far as northern development in Manitoba is concerned, you know what they are going to do? “To work with native people to assess employment opportunities in traditional activities, i.e., hunting, fishing . . .” You know, back to the old occupation of 100 years ago, back to hunting, back to fishing, the old traditional methods and so forth. There is a good Conservative principle, Mr. Speaker.

And then, Mr. Speaker, this would really impress the vast majority of the population of the north. If you were to go to the people in Shamattawa, go to the people in Brochet, go to the people in Wabowden, go to the people in whatever community, in Nelson House in northern Manitoba, Norway House, Berens River, and if one were to say to them that the Conservative Party will “assure that northern residents receive full and equal benefits from the general reductions in the levels of taxation” that they hope to bring about. You know, Mr. Speaker, that is the policy, that is the program of this government.

And then you know I looked further in this so-called document. I was very interested, mind you, I hadn't noticed a thing about post-secondary education, not a thing, and one would have thought that education would be a matter or prime concern to this party, not a word in this document, not a word, not a word.

So then I thought well, maybe there is something about my other department, Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. Yes, Mr. speaker Speaker, I found three lines. I found three lines, “A Progressive Conservative administration will continue the development of Manitoba's provincial park system, concentrating on intensification of use, rather than expansion of acreage.” Let's make greater use of each and every square foot of the existing park area, trample the vegetation, trample it all down to the ground, make greater use of it. You know, that is their concept of efficient use of our natural resources for recreation purposes, of our waters and rivers and lakes and streams and forests. More intensive use, crowd more people into the Whiteshell, crowd more people into Hecla Island, crowd more people into Spruce Woods, crowd more people into every provincial park, and the more intensive the use, that's the more efficient use of our provincial parks in the opinion of that side of the House.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite apparent that the party on that side of the House is a shambles. They can't even formulate a position paper or a series of position papers on party policy. This of course is quite obvious; it is quite obvious right from Day One.

You know when they came into this House at the commencement of this session, this was the first opportunity that the one occupying the seat as the Member for Souris-Killarney has the opportunity of leading his party. Yes, the transient leader. You will recall the cartoon that appeared in one of the newspapers not too long ago upon his being nominated as a candidate for Charleswood. I forgot the details of that cartoon, but anyway he was being asked, he appears at an inn or something and either the innkeeper or a resident of Charleswood or somebody says to him, and there is the leader with his grip bearing a Fort Garry sticker, and and bearing a Souris-Killarney sticker, and he says to him, “Do you plan to stay awhile?” or words to that effect. “Welcome to Chareswood; you plan to stay awhile, I hope.” Well, who knows whether he will stay awhile or not because of the manner in which they change leaders.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I checked, I quickly checked through Hansard, I checked with some colleagues of mine, with three or four colleagues of mine, just to make certain of my facts, and I asked, I said now I am not blaming anyone because all of us are in and out of the House and I may have missed some speeches, and I wanted to make certain and therefore checked with as many

members as I could. I wanted to make certain whether at least one member of that side of the House during the Throne Speech Debate, during the Budget Speech Debate, or at whatever opportune moment rose to his feet and gave thanks to his previous leader. You know after all he led a political party for a period of time, and I would think that it would only be the nice thing, the proper thing to do, to thank their previous leader, rather than just kicking him out with a few stab wounds in the back and this sort of thing, the way they did to theirs. Not one word, Mr. Speaker, not one word from any of that side, expressing at least one word of appreciation for the time and the effort devoted by the previous leader to their party. Not one word.

And now the present leader, I am not quite sure, Mr. Speaker, whether he is all that welcome, as in the cartoon to which I made reference. Now you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that in Souris-Killarney he wasn't all that welcome because there was some question amongst the locals whether they wanted him to run or not. Then, of course in Charleswood, well, there was an invitation extended to him, and I extended a similar type of invitation to him about two weeks ago. I invited him to run in Burrows, and my invitation was every bit as valid as the one that he received at that time, because the invitation . . . . The Honourable Member for Minnedosa has a question to ask.

**MR. BLAKE:** Mr. Speaker, I wondered if the Honourable Minister would allow his wife to be the campaign manager for our leader if he would run in Burrows?

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** If I would allow my wife to be campaign manager? My wife is at liberty to be campaign manager for whomever she wishes to be campaign manager, but I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, for the last three elections, my wife has preferred to work on my election campaign and I have every confidence she will continue working on my election campaign in the next election.

So I extended the same type of invitation to the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition to run in my constituency, and it was just as valid as the invitation that was extended to him. Now of course he was nominated, but after reading some of the comments made by one Mr. Wong, it really makes one wonder whether he is all that welcome or not. In fact, Mr. Speaker, you know, by his party having railroaded him into running in Charleswood, what they are really saying to him is they want to get him out. They want to get him out because they want to get him the hell out. That is what they want to do. They want to get him out, because, if they wanted him to remain as leader, there would be . . . .

Now, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, I heard his question, and let me explain to him, let me explain to the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, that if the Conservative Party would want to retain the person presently elected as Leader as Leader, and he, not having a riding to run in because . . . well, I suppose he looked at Fort Garry, but you know Fort Garry isn't all that appealing because things have changed in Fort Garry over the last few years. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, in the last election it was a pretty close, three-way race in Fort Garry. Well, you know that is not too attractive or too appealing for a leader to run in. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that there would be some member who enjoys, not a plurality, but a majority, of the few that there are — there aren't that many on that side who enjoy a plurality, you know I'll admit that, but there are four or five who do — that somebody would say, would be man enough to say to his Leader: "Now, look, we want you as Leader, we want to make damn certain that you get elected to this House, here is my seat.

You know, nobody has offered his seat. Nobody has offered a seat of that kind, so what kind of a seat does he get? He gets a seat within which the government support has increased by 50 percent from 1969 to 1973. —(Interjection)— That's right, the government support has increased from 18 percent to 27 percent, which is a 50 percent increase. And that side of the House should know, they should know because they had that experience in 1969, what that could indicate to them. That could mean a further increase which could well mean that the person whom they elected a Leader a few months ago will no longer be around within the next ten, twelve, fourteen months or whenever the election will be called. In other words, Mr. Speaker, they elected him as Leader. They have second thoughts about him being Leader. They haven't got the guts to kick him out themselves, so they put him in a riding where the electorate will kick him out. And then they will do the same thing that they have done, as has happened to previous leaders.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, you know, the great defender of rights of privacy of the individual, from a bank background, you know, Mr. Speaker, that our consumer protection legislation, The Privacy Act and other related legislation, that much of that, or what gave rise to that type of legislation, not only in our province, but in other provinces across Canada, was abuses within those areas by money-lending institutions, not excluding finance companies, banks, and the like. Now he has become one of the defenders of the privacy of the individuals. When he spoke about disclosure of income for my applicants for student loans. At that time, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that I said that really what the Member for Minnedosa is saying, he's not protecting the privacy of the individual, but what he's really saying is, let's bring in all the student loan applications into this Chamber and let's assess them publicly. And, of course, he was very indignant at that suggestion. "Oh, no, no, no, not I," said he. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection)— Now, again he repeats, "Bloody nonsense." You know, his party, his party, a grandfather was Premier, two or three Premiers ago, of his party in 1909, 1910, a fellow by the name of

Rodmond Roblin. You know, he had a student aid plan going then, he had a student aid plan designed to assist— because he didn't know any better, he called them "Ruthenians" which should have been Ukrainians — to assist Ruthenian teachers. In the sessional papers, and this was tabled in the House every year, and what was tabled in the House? The names of the loan recipients, the amount that was loaned to them, the amount paid by each one in that year and the balance owing, all shown there, all. His party did that. His party did that. His party did that and one could look down this list — (Interjection)— Well, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is that damn stupid about the history of his party — he doesn't even know in what years the government of Sir Rodmond Roblin was in power in this province. You had better check back in your history book and find out. You had better check back and find out —(Interjection)— about the year that you were born.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister has one minute.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** About the year that you were born and I'm quoting, Mr. Speaker, I'm quoting from a sessional paper that was tabled in this House — one from 1909, the other from 1910 — for the information of the honourable member. And the names are listed for everyone to see, who did not pay his loan. There are blanks opposite names, —(Interjection)— No, no, these are all Ukrainian teachers. You know, John Orsenich (?) borrowed \$304.00, amount paid in 1909 zero dollars; balance owing \$304.00. And so it went, ' and so it went. And then he stands up in the House — he's going to defend the privacy, the rights to privacy of the individual, as to the disclosure of his income and so forth, in applying for student aid.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, throughout the entire debate in this session, be it from the Throne Speech, the Budget Debate, at any other opportunity that there may have been for the Tory Party to indicate its policies' to state its policies, its platform, it was silent. Not a word. Not a word. You know' the Honourable Member for Roblin, I well recall when we were discussing Manpower training and I had indicated the government's priorities in the Manpower training program and he gets up and he asks me that, if in response to suggestions from the Opposition, if we would change our priorities. So I said, "Well, tell me what your priorities are and I'll tell you whether I'll change them or not." There was silence. There was silence from the Member for Roblin, absolute silence.

Mr. Speaker, and so it went, so it went through the balance of the debate of the Estimates of my department, programs for disadvantaged, student aid, the role and function at community colleges, universities, Youth Secretariat, Special Projects — not a word.

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

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, we have been entertained for the last 40 minutes by the unbelievably phrenetic activities of the Minister of Continuing Education. He spent the entire speech delving into the past, wiping the dust of the thirties out of his eyes, and indeed, Sir, that wasn't enough. He even had to go back to the Roblin years, to 1910-15, in order to bolster his own confidence and to find some material to enable him to convince himself that the government enjoys the confidence of the people of this province. Sir, all that whistling in the graveyard is not going to change the fact that the people of this province are fed up with his government and are going to toss them out on their ear whenever they can screw up their courage enough to call an election.

I have no criticism to offer the Premier for delaying the election, if indeed he intends to delay the election until this fall, I don't expect that he will go much beyond that because the timing becomes very critical the closer it comes to the deadline. But the Premier does have the right under the Constitution, to call that election any time within the five years. It is a matter of judgment on the part of the Premier and we are fully cognizant of the difficulties that he faces at the moment in attempting to which is normally pick a date that is suitable for the government' what government will do. Right now, the very fact that he has indicated a delay in the election is an indication in the minds of honourable gentlemen opposite that they are not in as happy a position as they would like to be.

The fact that the members of the government have, throughout the course of this debate, indeed, Sir, throughout the course of this session, spent their time — not in attempting to justify their programs, not in attempting to answer questions in relation to their programs — but more in an attempt to discredit — and they have been singularly unsuccessful — our Leader and the philosophy of the Conservative Party, because they are aware' Sir, that times do change and in spite of the fact that maybe 10, 15 years ago there was a trend and a tendency toward the government becoming a great deal more active in the affairs of the province. That tendency, that trend and that inclination on the part of the people of the Western World today has now shifted. Honourable gentlemen opposite know that. It has shifted largely because the experiment — and I call it an experiment in this province — has proven to be, an experiment with socialism has proven to be an abysmal failure. It has created more difficulties, more problems, and more problems, not only for the past, present but more problems for the future, than it ever could possibly have solved.

I know that the Minister of Continuing Education was frustrated beyond words with the Opposition because this Opposition has taken a fairly consistent position in respect to government spending. We have felt throughout the years that we have been in Opposition that we have a

responsibility, Sir, a responsibility to the taxpayers of this province and if nobody else is going to come to the aid of the taxpayer, then it indeed should at least be the Opposition. We have done that and we have done that consistently. We have criticized the government for wasteful spending; we have criticized the government for spending money that we felt was wrongfully spent and foolishly spent; and we have not advocated — except in those instances where we felt it would improve the infrastructure and the capabilities of people to earn more money for this province and to increase the wealth of this province — we have consistently advocated a reduction in spending and an increase, only in those areas that would redound to the benefit of this province. That, I know, is a frustrating experience on the part of honourable gentlemen opposite and perhaps when the First Minister gets up to justify — and this is what he does pretty consistently whenever a criticism is levelled at the government — his almost predictable answer is to compare Manitoba with other provinces.

Well, it's an exercise that I suppose is legitimate and he, more particularly, likes to compare Manitoba with those provinces that have Conservative governments. Well, Sir, throughout the years that I have been a member of this Legislature, and particularly in the years that I've been in the Opposition, I have never regarded or never taken the position that because Conservative governments in other provinces have done certain things that they were necessarily right. I think that if the honourable gentlemen opposite would search the records they would find that I have been just as critical of governments in other provinces for doing things that I believed that were wrong as I have been critical of governments in this province. I think that, Sir, the difficulty that we face and the problems that have to be resolved if we are not to face a catastrophic situation in the very near future — and I don't know of very many economists who have a rosy picture to paint for what faces our future generations.

Sir, the Minister of Continuing Education suggests that every political party should have a laundry list of programs for every conceivable consumer group in this province; that they should be le to come out with that list and say, "This is what we're going to do for the teachers; this is what we're going to do for one branch of the labour movement; this is what we're going to do for another branch; this is what we're going to do for the storekeepers and this is what we are going to do for other people." Sir, that is hypocrisy at its worst for any political party to do that.

In the first place' Sir, we don't know, because we don't have that information, what awaits a government that will take over from honourable gentlemen opposite. We may find ourselves in exactly the same position that Premier Bennett found himself in in the Province of British Columbia. All the good intentions that were enunciated, and all of the programs that were enunciated by the Premier of British Columbia when he took had to be postponed and set aside because, first of all, he had to straighten out the mess that he inherited. I suspect, Sir, that in this province' no matter what our intentions may be and how well they may be formulated, we are going to have to clear up a similar mess in this province.

I want to draw upon other people's experiences for a moment to explain that point just a little bit further. I want to quote from Robert Moss' book "The Collapse of Democracy." I think I did it last year, Sir, but I want to quote it again because I think this is a more opportune moment for me to do so because it is directly related to the very subject and the very point that was made by the Minister of Continuing Education. He is quoting Professor Hutt (?) who said, "Hutt is profoundly depressed by the way that modern electioneering so often degenerates into a fatuous kind of auctioneering. The politicians bid each other up with similar promises of greater material rewards, better social services, full employment and stable prices." And that's really what the Minister of Continuing Education is inviting us to do. "Radical proposals for reducing inflation, for redistributing income away from consumption and toward saving and investment and for blunting the edge of the strike threat weapon, get left outside in the cloakroom even as the urgency of the economic crisis mounts and such measures begin to appear as essential to the survival of parliamentary institutions."

Sir, that is precisely the situation that is faced in Great Britain today. It is not a question of who is going to do a better job. The real situation that is faced in Great Britain today is not only the survival of the economic life of that province but the survival of their political and their parliamentary institutions.

"Popular columnists and party apparatchiks are on hand to reassure those grooming themselves for re-election that such ideas are too hot to handle. Political realists agree in their club rooms that success will depend on the flattery and ever more costly bribery of the welfare man. That supreme achievement of natural selection in the socialist holiday camp, the ultimate consumer, who has been spoon-fed night and day with the pleasing idea that it is a responsibility of the state to provide for his every want and some of his fantasies as well, without regard for merit or exertion."

And then he goes on to point out, "Whether or not the parliamentary system that we have enjoyed in this country is not fatally drawn to reward those who offer the wrong set of promises."

Sir, I don't want to engage in that kind of fatuous auctioneering, but I do believe that the people of this country do want to know a general trend, a general belief or a philosophy on the part of a political party. And we have had two of them presented to us, Sir. We have the honourable gentlemen opposite

**Tuesday, May 3, 1977**

who believe and have stated on repeated occasions, greater and greater control of the individual by the state, greater and greater public domination and it was suggested by the Minister of Mines and Resources that indeed the slogan for the next election campaign is going to be, "The Public Can Do Better." They believe in that. I don't. And the members of this party don't.

One of the great mistakes that has been made, I think in this country, is the creation, of what Henry F . . . calls as "The Politics of Expectation." The public had been led to believe that greater and greater security, greater and greater opportunity can be provided by the state. And that Politics of Expectation were nourished in part by the illusion that an answer could be found to the systems of Marxism and communism, other than the spontaneity of free societies.

Sir, there are two alternatives: The continuous drifting towards the control of the entire economic life of this province or this country by the state, or a return to some form of individualism on the part of the people. I want to quote further from Henry F . . . who drew attention to this very thing in his book, "The Kennedy Years," in which he endeavoured in retrospect to outline the methods of the Kennedys and to comment upon them in the light of history. With the benefit of that kind of hindsight, I think Mr. F . . . has fairly accurately described the buildup to the situation that we now face. He goes on to say this, "In the total wars of the modern age, we are willing to surrender our individualism for the period of the war because we are persuaded that, if there is no victory, there is no future. And the danger is that this totalitarian spirit is then carried into peace. If we can perform such miracles in war, why cannot we perform them in peace? Such is the plausible cry. If we can build Pluto and Mulberry . . ." And this, for the benefit of perhaps honourable gentlemen opposite, and perhaps there may be some people in this side of the House, whose memories may not recall to them what Pluto and Mulberry were, they were the improvised pipeline in the artificial harbour that was constructed for D-Day.

"Why cannot we build schools and hospitals? The answer lies, and we should be grateful for it, in the people themselves who have recovered some of their individualism. They no longer have a single objective. Some want schools, others want hospitals. Some want coloured television, others want automobiles. Even those who want hospitals and schools may want universities and libraries even more. Which of these is the nobler aspiration is a matter of subjective preference and the people cannot, with a return of at least a measure of their freedom, be confined to any one of them. In a free society, when it is at peace, a government cannot override the variety of people's choices. It can only marginally influence them and in that margin, the politician works."

Sir, if honourable gentlemen opposite want to put their finger on any one single reason why they have lost the confidence of the people of this province, it would be on that particular point. As was pointed out by the Member for Lakeside a few days ago when he was responding to a speech that was made by the Attorney-General, and during the course of his remarks, the Attorney-General said that he was happy that he was able to achieve his objective. The Member for Lakeside responded by saying, "That is the difference between honourable gentlemen opposite and the people on this side of the House, we want people to achieve their objectives and we want to create a situation and a climate that permits them to do exactly that."

I think my honourable friends opposite are going to find that there is a growing body of opinion in this province that has the feeling that they are being denied the opportunity of achieving those objectives that are theirs and not the government's.

Sir, there are many examples of where the government have intruded and have denied that opportunity to the people of this province and there is no greater evidence of that than an unguarded statement that was made by the Premier last year, and it has been picked up during the course of this debate and supported by some — not too many — but some honourable gentlemen opposite, and that is the statement that nobody in this province should earn more than two-and-a-half times the lowest paid worker. Sir, that was described by the Leader of the Opposition pretty aptly in his response to the Speech from the Throne when he said, "Where is the opportunity for the young man or young woman who has the ambition, the ability, and the desire and the energy to reach the top?" Or to use the phrase used by the Minister of Northern Affairs, "to reach for the stars." How can he possibly ever achieve that ambition when he has to start climbing up a ladder that only has two-and-a-half rungs on it.

Well, Sir, like most socialist elitists, the Premier and his colleagues see themselves as a shepherd chosen by destiny to steer the ignorant herd . . . —(Interjections)— Well, I shall attempt to go over that again, Sir. The honourable gentlemen opposite foresee themselves as shepherds chosen by destiny to steer the ignorant herd into the paradise that they alone perceive.

Sir, if anybody ever needed any evidence of whether or not they perceive that paradise, they were contained in the words of the Minister of Public Works a year or so ago when during the course of remarks that I was making and when I was criticizing the government for trying to lead people of this province in a direction that they did not choose to go, the Minister from his seat responded, "But the people don't know what they want." Sir, if there is to be a line drawn between honourable gentlemen opposite and members of the party on in this side of the House, it lies right in that belief on the part of the honourable gentlemen opposite, they and they alone can perceive that paradise.

Sir, recently, Diane Cohen who is regarded as an authoritative tax expert, had written a series of articles, and I want to quote briefly from one that was drawn from the quarterly magazine, *The Financial Times* of Canada. And she starts out the article by using these words. "In the year 2076" — that is some time away, a hundred years from now — "Canadians may well be asking their historians, how did they let it happen? How did government grow so big, yield such power, become so unwieldy and take so much in taxes from its people? By then, it will be an academic question, an attempt to analyze to determine the logic of the past, but it is hardly a rhetorical issue. We have a great deal of government in Canada and it is very expensive. I want at the outset, Sir, to make sure that honourable gentlemen opposite before they start screaming, I want them to recognize and to know that I am referring to all governments in Canada, not just social-democratic governments or the government in Manitoba. I have levelled that criticism before on other governments and that is why I take very little stock of the Premier's comparison with other provinces because they are all on the same road to destruction.

"Forty percent of our national income is taken away from us and spent by governments. Already around the nation and across the political spectrum, big government and the taxes it collects has developed as a central political discussion among the rich and the poor, the young and the old in this Confederation called Canada. In fact, it has emerged as the focus of bitter dissatisfaction and disillusionment, a government that is perceived as inefficient, overindulgent, intrusive and expensive." Then in order to substantiate that argument, she goes on to point out that, "We in Canada, we have proportionately a larger civil service almost double the size than that in the United States. They employed some 2.9 million last year to serve a population of 222 million."

Miss Cohen went on to point out that the tax jungle and the burden that is currently being shouldered by the people of this country need not be." She also goes on to point out that "The turning point for the worsening of the situation came with the introduction of the new taxation policies that were introduced a few years ago."

Kenneth Eaton, an acknowledged giant in Canadian tax scene until his death some years ago, concluded a decade ago, that the Canadian graduated income tax schedule is a fraud. "The unsophisticated might be led to believe that the succession of increasing rates were of the essence in adding to the revenue yield of the income tax and that in the absence of this graduation, a flat tax rate to produce the same revenue might perhaps have to be around 30 to 40 percent."

He goes on to say this, "The startling fact is that graduation adds relatively little to the yield of an income tax. A flat tax rate of approximately 17 percent would yield as much revenue as the present schedule. David Perry of the Canadian Tax Foundation says that 16 percent would do the trick."

Then she goes on to point out the benefits of that kind of a tax rate. Then of course she also goes on to point out that there isn't a government in the country that has the courage to do precisely that.

And so that we will suffer under the staggering burden of a taxation system that does not, as perceived by its proponents, equalize the taxation burden on those who can pay the most or can afford to pay the best. It is destructive of the incentive of the people, it takes money from those who can least afford to pay it; but worst of all, it creates a rate of increase in inflation that is becoming more disastrous every year.

Sir, the Minister of Public Works who is prone to making statements that one should pay attention to because they are the essence of the thinking of honourable gentlemen opposite. For example, the little badge that he sent around, I don't know what useful purpose it will serve. It is going to have the effect of spending more government money, and perhaps a dozen civil servants were engaged in designing the thing, but I am disappointed that it does not contain the picture of the Minister of Public Works on it. I think it would be more appropriate because, after all, he is the native son of the Constituency of Kildonan.

But he made the suggestion there was nothing inflationary about putting people to work. Indeed the Minister of Finance made the same statement. And I, on the surface, would agree with that if one does not examine too carefully the method by which you put people to work.

The Minister of Public Works suggested that the way to put people to work is to have the government hire them. And he went so far as to make the suggestion, indeed the assertion, that government employees do create wealth. Sir, with that kind of thinking, and if they really do share that belief, then it is no wonder that we have got ourselves into so much difficulty. If it was indeed true, Sir, that we could take the money out of the pockets of one taxpayer and place it into the pockets of another one and then create wealth in the process, then we should be even wealthier than Yemen. Certainly there is enough of that being done.

I want to again draw on the wisdom of other people, because I know my honourable friends opposite will not necessarily believe me when I tell them, but Nobel prize winner Milton Friedman I think has some stature in the economic community, and he was commenting on President Carter's program in the United States and he was attempting to point out some of the fallacies of the economic package that President Carter was placing before Congress. Some of that package, Sir,

**Tuesday, May 3, 1977**

has now been withdrawn and perhaps it was at the urging and the suggestions of Mr. Friedman.

He was asked this question: Will President Carter's program of tax cuts and spending stimulate the economy? And the answer that he gave is, There is nothing in the package which will stimulate anything. How can the government stimulate the economy by taking money out of one pocket of the public and putting it into another pocket? The rebate plan, for example, would distribute \$50 apiece to most consumers. As a result those consumers will tend to spend more. But where will the government get the money to send out the rebates in the first place?

Then the questioner asked and posed this one, "But almost everyone looks on the rebate as a good way to stimulate the economy." And Mr. Friedman responded in this fashion, "It appears to be a stimulant because people are looking at the visible effects and paying no attention to the invisible effects. The \$50 rebate checks and the extra expenditure by consumers that will result are very visible. The people who will not have employment because the government will borrow the money or cause more inflation are not very visible and nobody notices them."

I am reminded of the illustration that was used by Henry Haslett in his book, *The Principles of Economics*. He used the illustration of what he called the broken window theory. It goes something like this. A thug picks up a brick and throws it through a plate glass window and everybody on the street, Sir, is going to be delighted because they say now that's going to create employment for somebody. The carpenters and the glaziers are going to have an opportunity of making some money in repairing that broken window. And everybody will see that there is employment there because there is going to be, right in the storefront window along the street, everybody will notice it. Haslett, What is not noticed, according to Mr. is that if the owner of that store did not have to spend money repairing that window, he would have spent that money on something of his own priorities. He might have bought a new suit or a new overcoat and the tailor would have been just as busy as the glazier. The employment would have been created just as surely. One significant difference: that when the government creates employment, and I am not going to argue against the necessity of governments carrying on their responsibilities as a government, and in the carrying out of those responsibilities there has to be buildings, there has to be structures to house government offices, and there have to be various things that have to be done by governments. But I am pointing out that when it is designed for no other purpose than to put somebody to work doing something that need not be done, or would not have been done otherwise, then it creates a situation where the taxpayer suffers because he loses that money and the recipient of that money gets only a portion of it because most of it, or a lot of it, is siphoned out in administration costs which increases the expenditure of government.

Sir, it is the application of these — I very kindly refer to as wrong-headed policies on the part of those who believe that bigger government is better government — that is creating, not solving, but creating more of the problems in this country than they could ever hope to solve. Sir, I find it a rather interesting exercise on the part of honourable gentlemen opposite.

I don't know if there have been two or even three, I don't think there have been that many, who have stood up and stoutly defended the government's program and have made any effort to justify it. As I said they have wallowed in the dust of the Thirties, they have gone even further back than that. Their desperate attempts to discredit the Leader of the Opposition are, in my opinion, wasted because words alone, I don't care how far honourable gentlemen want to go back, words alone will not destroy the Leader of the Opposition. He is made of somewhat more durable stuff than that. And if honourable gentlemen opposite expect that they are going to go into an election campaign by shouting invectives against the Leader of the Opposition, by attempting to convince the people of this province that we have no policies — and I think that the people of this province are pretty well aware of where we stand and the honourable gentlemen opposite are too, they are aware. And they find themselves on the wrong side of public opinion and, Sir, they will have an awful time attempting to convince people in Manitoba that a return to what they have experienced in the past eight years, and I am not going to condemn or criticize some of the improvements that have been made, because that does come from time to time. But I do say, Sir, that to attempt to suggest, or to attempt to convince anybody in this province that the mere spending of dollars is a recipe for victory is going to be a very difficult task.

The Member for Emerson, in his remarks on the Throne Speech, listed every single nickel that was spent in his constituency, and I suppose that he feels that he is going to go back to Emerson and say on that basis and that basis alone he deserved to be re-elected. I am going to tell the Member for Emerson right now, it will not work, because in the process they have discovered something else, that they have lost a heck of a lot more and they have lost something that is far more important to them and the odd bit of gravel that they've got on their roads — and I don't deny those things, they are important, building roads, building schools, building hospitals, nursing care homes, that we have accepted as a part of a government responsibility — but I think all of those things, Sir, can be done without the loss of the freedom of the people of this province. And on that basis honourable gentlemen opposite are going to be judged.

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

**MR. LES OSLAND:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter the debate at this time, just for a few moments. So often I get the feeling in the House that all the philosophizing on the other side and from our side leaves me a little adrift, really, in the storms or where my people find themselves. I think one night the Member for Lakeside and myself were discussing philosophical differences and we both came to the same agreement, that the two things that we were very much against were big business and big government. And I really feel that, after what I have been listening to for the last seven days, it has so little to do with what is happening outside this building.

Out of 23 communities in my riding, we have what is called four economically viable communities, that's all. Now Manitoba has been in the north for the last fifty years and that is what we have come up with. And at this point in time, I feel a little upset with things that have happened in the last year. One has been a statement by a Member of Parliament from the north who has come up with an answer for the people in Shamattawa, for instance, that the answer to this community, because it is uneconomically viable, to move the people. And then coming from the Liberal benches during the Budget Debate, there has been a position promoted that certain areas in the north should be developed and the rest should be just kind of let go and try and gravitate all the people into those three or four communities, and therefore they would be viable.

My position as a member representing the area is that because we have such things as mines and we have certainly got the hydro, every community in the north is viable. And we can't have everybody moving into Winnipeg. You have got enough mess down here now without us adding to it. I think this is also a feeling that comes from the farming areas that I hear so often. It is one of the most discouraging things to drive through the countryside and find some town dying on its feet, more and more farm houses being emptied, and one large farm that seems to be a viable industry. And somewhere along the line, I believe that the stay option that this party promotes is an answer that we can definitely make a better Manitoba for all of us to live in.

I would like to deal for a few moments with some of the thrashings that have been going on in our country. At the moment, November 15th became the big deal for Canada. All of a sudden the news media went crazy. We had a sort of a mature child grow up and decide it was going to stand on its own feet. Then we had all the reverberations of that position by the people of Quebec, that they were going to reassess their position and we had the big daddy government fly into the breach and start threatening economic measures that would make them suffer, and so on and so forth. The pitiful part was that out of it all, somehow or another, we lost the actual overall view of Canada which has been the east maritime against the west, the against the inland, and basically, the poor versus the rich. We just seem to have lost all of that, and all of a sudden now it is just French Canada. This is not the only problem that Canada faces.

I believe that participatory democracy, which is one of the things that came into vogue at the beginning of the Sixties, was something that would be an answer for all of Canada. Well, I don't really believe that big government from the federal level, big government from the provincial level, is the answer. I believe that the policy that this government has been pursuing which has got very little praise has been local government development, where we have mayors and councils now for the first time, not only receiving enough authority by which they can operate, but some support from the provincial level in order to support this. I think this will be the end and the answer that we are looking for.

One of the things that our Prime Minister has been crying about is that we must keep the federal state strong. And I agree with the idea that the federal state must be strong but it can only be strong as the local governments take over their responsibilities and develop themselves towards an economically viable community, wherever they may live. Thank you very much.

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

**MR. BLAKE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't have too much to add to the Budget Debate that hasn't already been said so I'll have my remarks concluded, I think, in sufficient time for the adjournment to be taken at five thirty.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget Debate has been covered at some length I suppose you would say, although the largest percentage of the speakers didn't really dwell too much on the Budget. It seems that the election fever was running high and they were more like election speeches than comments on the Budget.

The Budget itself I must say there is little to comment on in it. It was a pretty dull Budget, a sort of a stand-pat document, I would say. But more interesting, Mr. Speaker, was the announcement with it that there was going to be a work program—a make-work program—announced.—(Interjection)—Yes, \$27 to \$30 million is the figure that has been thrown around. I think that is the most interesting item that has come out of the Budget announcement as it was brought down in the House a week or so ago. I think that program is extremely interesting and we would like to know what it is. We would like to see it laid out on the table so that we might have judged it and I think it should have been included in the Budget Speech itself, and we would have had a little more meat to debate in the House.

**Tuesday, May 3, 1977**

They have said in the Budget that they will continue to improve social services and there is no question that that is one item that is high on the list of the present government. Just what the cost of the improvements might be we'll have to wait, I suppose.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the level of the debate in the Budget Speech has been somewhat disappointing. I have felt that many of the speeches that were made probably could have been left unmade and I suppose there will be many say that about my particular remarks right now. — (Interjection)— The Minister wasn't in the House this afternoon. He said, "Which ones?" We have just heard one from the Minister of Continuing Education that could have been left unmade. And you know, Mr. Speaker, it seems odd that we sometimes wonder, on this side of the House, whether the honourable gentlemen opposite really talk to each other and really know what's going on over there because we had a good example. Our Leader made the statement up north referring to some \$50 million worth of Public Works and the Premier, or the First Minister, got quite incensed over this and he said, "What is he talking about? What \$50 million program?" And we find that in effect the Minister of Public Works had announced a \$50 million program, but apparently he hadn't told the First Minister about it.

Just today, Mr. Speaker, I just happened to open Hansard and the Minister of Continuing Education and Tourism went on at some great length and attacked our Leader, which has been the theme over there, to attack and try and discredit our Leader and the party here on most occasions. And I suppose that's fair game in debate in this House, but the Minister of Continuing Education went into it again this afternoon saying that the reason that our Leader was jumping around and finding a place to run and we were going to run him in Charleswood because we wanted to get rid of him, that we were going to run him there and the voters were going to turf him out. And I happened to open Hansard and the Minister of Public Works was speaking the other day and he says that the Leader of the Opposition doesn't have the courage to run in seats such as that. He is "a man who will only run in a safe seat", and I'm quoting from Hansard Page 2637 of Monday last. "Souris-Killarney 'easy pickings', Charleswood 'a a lead pipe cinch'." Well, I think the two Ministers should get together and find out whether it is considered a safe seat or whether it's considered a challenge to run in a seat such as Charleswood.

The Minister of Continuing Education of course takes every opportunity to try and put words in my mouth in connection with the Student Loan Program, and he knows where I stand on the Student Loan Program, and the accusations that he is trying to accuse me of are utter nonsense. I pointed out in his Estimates what I thought was wrong with the particular program and my comments are on the record for all to see.

But, Mr. Speaker, the other members that have gone on before and speeches that I feel have not really contributed too much to debate, but others have given us some food for thought. I think the Member for St. Vital made an interesting contribution when he went on to the Estate and Gift Tax, his fascination with this Estate and Gift tax. He has written letters to the editor about it and it is interesting to hear him get up and defend this gathering in all the wealth from those that have acquired a little bit when they pass from this world. It is just extremely interesting to hear that, and the Member for St. Matthews joins in with his remarks and says that the federal people should get back into the field and reinstitute gift tax and they are willing to fight an election on that. Well, I don't think it's that much of an election issue, Mr. Speaker, but it just points up one thing; that the members opposite can't stand a winner. They just don't like a winner. If somebody is diligent and works hard and acquires a few assets around them, and a fair bit of material worth, over his lifetime of hard work, I don't see anything wrong with that. The members opposite do' they feel that he should turn that all back in when he is ready to hand in his gun. And I just particularly don't go along with that, Mr. Speaker.

I think what has prompted some of the speeches from members opposite is the fact that they are extremely worried. As I said, election fever was running high, I think the Member for St. Matthews has got a candidate on his tail there and he has got him just going up the wall. He doesn't know how to defend against this chap and what the outcome of the next vote might be, whenever it is called.

These are the things that I think have prompted some of the speeches from the members opposite. The Member for St. James mentioned this afternoon the problems in the mining industry, and I think the members for the north, while they chip away from their seats, I think they realize how important the mining industry is in the north. I have faith in the north, I feel there is much more wealth up there, there are many more finds going to be made regardless of who they are made by. It seems a little odd to me that the geologists that leave the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company seem to find other employment and then go back and find mines that they have been tramping over for quite a number of years when they were employed by the company. But we all know that there is ore there. It is just a matter — (Interjection)— I didn't say that there was anything wrong with that at all, Mr. Speaker. I don't want the Member for Flin Flon to put words in my mouth.

**MR. BARROW:** Would the member entertain a question?

**MR. BLAKE:** Certainly I'll entertain a question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**Tuesday, May 3, 1977**

**MR. BARROW:** Well are you insinuating the geologists were crooked, the HBMS geologists, that worked for years and years and go back and make a find? Is that what you are insinuating?

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

**MR. BLAKE:** I just said that in my remarks, I'm not saying there is anything wrong with that, Mr. Speaker. It just seems a bit odd that it turns out that way. I suppose it's a coincidence but I'm not accusing them of any wrongdoing. No, I am certainly not. It

**MR. BARROW:** Yes you are.

**MR. BLAKE:** / could be company . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please.

**MR. BLAKE:** It could be company policy that they only drill so deep and that is as far as they go and if another company drills deeper and finds something that's fair game. —(Interjection)— No, I'm not backtracking one little bit.

We know that the members opposite would love to see the whole mining industry nationalized but I would like to see him get up on a platform in the north and say that when the election rolls around because I'm sure that the miners up there don't want to see that, and I think that the Member for Flin Flon is well aware of that. —(Interjection)— Well certainly he is a miner but I would like to see him get up on his platform when the election is called and use that in the north. —(Interjection)— —(Interjection)— Yes, surely. Well, he can go on, Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Flin Flon is content to nationalize the mining industry in the north, he can go ahead and campaign on that basis and say so publicly.

The mining industry, Mr. Speaker, is, as I say, of great importance to the north and I am sure that they are going to continue to find untold wealth up there and we will see mines continue to develop under whatever government. It just appears that it may be a little more difficult for them to come in and develop under this particular government and exploration, as we know, in the private sector has slowed. The Minister of Natural Resources will argue that the government has filled the breach there by their natural resources exploration department and using taxpayers money, I don't know how many millions have gone in there but obviously there has been an awful lot of public money go in there.

I think some of the speeches worthy of comment, Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for River Heights made an excellent contribution to this House when he spoke on the Budget debate and, unfortunately, there were three people on the opposite side of the House during a great part of his speech. It was most unfortunate because he had a lot of good material there and I am sure the members that were in the House listened intently and went away from here realizing that he was right on target.

We had occasion, Mr. Speaker, to question the business ability of the members opposite and I won't get into debates on many of the ventures that they have gotten into because they have all been covered so thoroughly before. Mr. Speaker, when you mention Chamber of Commerce to members opposite, they certainly get upset and I think that the Chamber of Commerce is a pretty wide-ranging organization in the rural areas and has a pretty good finger on the pulse of what is going on in rural Manitoba, especially in the business community, but in rural Manitoba they are certainly concerned with agriculture because, as we all know, it is so important to our way of life and the members on this side are certainly representative of the rural area and we're well aware of the contribution that the Chamber makes.

It is interesting to hear members like the Member for Ste. Rose, I suppose, who has maybe never belonged to a Chamber of Commerce or has never had business dealings that would lead him to belong to the Chamber but to hear some of his remarks when the Chamber of Commerce name is brought up, is somewhat disturbing because I don't think really he intends to pass that reflection on to Chamber members that he sometimes indicates in the House.

These are the things, Mr. Speaker, that have occurred in the Budget debate that I think would have been better left unsaid but I suppose in the heat of argument and debate that these statements are made and I suppose if we all had some time to reflect on our speeches, we may make considerable changes from time to time. The attacks that have been made on our leader, Mr. Speaker, have not had the desired impact that members opposite would have liked them to have had. I think he has laid out our policy as far as the Budget debate went and as far as was necessary in spite of what members opposite might wish to say. We certainly are prepared to go to the people with our alternatives to this particular government; we are not going to scrap student aid, such as the Minister of Continuing Education would like to attribute to me, that I am going to just allow everybody to come in and borrow and obtain student loans with absolutely no investigation or anything else but he knows that's certainly not true, because I was involved in granting student aid for many many years when I was involved in the finance world.

I suppose that these are the things that we try to make political points on and that's all well and good when we are debating the government's program and the government's spending Estimates. I think we have some Estimates to come before the House yet and I think they will get the required

**Tuesday, May 3, 1977**

---

examination that the people of Manitoba that elected us would expect us to do of them and when that is cleared away, I am sure the First Minister and the other members opposite will be anxious to take their case to the people as those of us on this side of the House are.

So, Mr. Speaker, I realize that there is an important speaker to follow me and we will all be waiting with some anticipation to hear the debate that has gone on for the past number of days being concluded and if I were to use my full allotted time, I would be usurping my authority or my privilege for being allowed some minutes this afternoon. With that, Mr. Speaker, I will relinquish the floor to the First Minister.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister but I am prepared to call it 5:30. (Agreed) I am now leaving the Chair to return after the supper recess at 8 p.m.