



ISSN 0542-5492

**Fifth Session — Thirty-First Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS**

---

**30 Elizabeth II**

---

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Harry E. Graham  
Speaker*



MG-8048

**VOL. XXIX No. 59 - 2:00 p.m., WEDNESDAY, 15 APRIL, 1981**

Office of the Queen's Printer for the Province of Manitoba

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty - First Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

---

Name	Constituency	Party
<b>ADAM, A. R. (Pete)</b>	Ste. Rose	NDP
<b>ANDERSON, Bob</b>	Springfield	PC
<b>BANMAN, Hon. Robert (Bob)</b>	La Verendrye	PC
<b>BARROW, Tom</b>	Flin Flon	NDP
<b>BLAKE, David</b>	Minnedosa	PC
<b>BOSTROM, Harvey</b>	Rupertsland	NDP
<b>BOYCE, J. R. (Bud)</b>	Winnipeg Centre	Prog.
<b>BROWN, Arnold</b>	Rhineland	PC
<b>CHERNIACK, Q.C., Saul</b>	St. Johns	NDP
<b>CORRIN, Brian</b>	Wellington	NDP
<b>COSENS, Hon. Keith A.</b>	Gimli	PC
<b>COWAN, Jay</b>	Churchill	NDP
<b>CRAIK, Hon. Donald W.</b>	Riel	PC
<b>DESJARDINS, Laurent L.</b>	St. Boniface	NDP
<b>DOERN, Russell</b>	Elmwood	NDP
<b>DOMINO, Len</b>	St. Matthews	PC
<b>DOWNEY, Hon. Jim</b>	Arthur	PC
<b>DRIEDGER, Albert</b>	Emerson	PC
<b>EINARSON, Henry J.</b>	Rock Lake	PC
<b>ENNS, Hon. Harry J.</b>	Lakeside	PC
<b>EVANS, Leonard S.</b>	Brandon East	NDP
<b>FERGUSON, James R.</b>	Gladstone	PC
<b>FILMON, Hon. Gary</b>	River Heights	PC
<b>FOX, Peter</b>	Kildonan	NDP
<b>GALBRAITH, Jim</b>	Dauphin	PC
<b>GOURLAY, Hon. Doug</b>	Swan River	PC
<b>GRAHAM, Hon. Harry E.</b>	Birtle-Russell	PC
<b>GREEN, Q.C., Sidney</b>	Inkster	Prog.
<b>HANUSCHAK, Ben</b>	Burrows	Prog.
<b>HYDE, Lloyd G.</b>	Portage la Prairie	PC
<b>JENKINS, William</b>	Logan	NDP
<b>JOHNSTON, Hon. J. Frank</b>	Sturgeon Creek	PC
<b>JORGENSON, Hon. Warner H.</b>	Morris	PC
<b>KOVNATS, Abe</b>	Radisson	PC
<b>LYON, Hon. Sterling R.</b>	Charleswood	PC
<b>MacMASTER, Hon. Ken</b>	Thompson	PC
<b>MALINOWSKI, Donald</b>	Point Douglas	NDP
<b>McBRYDE, Ronald</b>	The Pas	NDP
<b>McGILL, Hon. Edward</b>	Brandon West	PC
<b>McGREGOR, Morris</b>	Virden	PC
<b>McKENZIE, J. Wally</b>	Roblin	PC
<b>MERCIER, Q.C., Hon. Gerald W. J.</b>	Osborne	PC
<b>MILLER, Saul A.</b>	Seven Oaks	NDP
<b>MINAKER, Hon. George</b>	St. James	PC
<b>ORCHARD, Hon. Donald</b>	Pembina	PC
<b>PARASIUK, Wilson</b>	Transcona	NDP
<b>PAWLEY, Q.C., Howard</b>	Selkirk	NDP
<b>PRICE, Hon. Norma</b>	Assiniboia	PC
<b>RANSOM, Hon. Brian</b>	Souris-Killarney	PC
<b>SCHROEDER, Vic</b>	Rossmere	NDP
<b>SHERMAN, Hon. L. R. (Bud)</b>	Fort Garry	PC
<b>STEEN, Warren</b>	Crescentwood	PC
<b>URUSKI, Billie</b>	St. George	NDP
<b>USKIW, Samuel</b>	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
<b>WALDING, D. James</b>	St. Vital	NDP
<b>WESTBURY, June</b>	Fort Rouge	Lib
<b>WILSON, Robert G.</b>	Wolseley	Ind

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**Wednesday, 15 April, 1981**

**Time — 2:00 p.m.**

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Presenting Petitions . . .  
The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MATTER OF PRIVILEGE**

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a question of privilege affecting all of the members of the House. In doing so, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that I have no choice but to do it at this time and I was of the opinion that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would be addressing himself to the Budget tomorrow but in any event, in view of the rules of the House, I have no choice but to raise this matter at this time.

It concerns, Mr. Speaker, a matter that has been dealt with in a different way by the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for St. Vital. On Friday last the Member for St. Vital read from a document which he was not able to table because it was unsigned in accordance with your ruling but which he did give a copy to the Minister to whom the Manitoba Hydro reports. During the course of the discussion on this question, Mr. Speaker, it was indicated that the document was unsigned and undated and therefore not capable of being identified. It was also indicated, Mr. Speaker, that the document never came to the attention of the Minister to whom Hydro reports, and I'm not questioning that particular problem at this moment.

What I am questioning, Mr. Speaker, are the statements that were made in this House which certainly raise a question of the privileges of all the members and parliamentary privilege itself. In referring to the matter which was raised by the Member for Riel, the Minister to whom the Manitoba Hydro reports, used the term "half-hoax". I think those are his exact words, "half a hoax" or words to that effect. In referring to the same issue and same material the First Minister of the province used the word "fabrication" and, Mr. Speaker, if the Member for St. Vital has wittingly or unwittingly, and I'm certain that if it was done it was done unwittingly, but I am by no means suggesting that it was done, but if the Member for St. Vital has been unwittingly the subject of a hoax or a fabrication on the Members of this Assembly then certainly that is a question of privilege that has to be looked into because, Mr. Speaker, it goes to the essence of Parliamentary privilege that there not be a fabrication presented in this House and there not be a half-hoax perpetrated on this House. Two members of this House, both members of the Treasury Branches, use those terms in describing what the Member for St. Vital was dealing with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, much has been made of the fact that this document was undated and unsigned. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there other ways of identifying documents; one of them, which is clearly available for the Minister to whom Hydro reports,

who could immediately and with the power that he has expose this hoax and demonstrate this fabrication. Apparently he has not indicated any intention to do so, indeed, he has indicated a studied reluctance to do so. Mr. Speaker, I indicated the other day that I had reason to believe that the document was prepared by Steward Martin and, if so, that it was a subject of legitimate presentation to the Minister to see whether he had ever come into contact with it. The members of the government choose to use the word fabrication and hoax.

Mr. Speaker, I have available to the Minister and to the House a document sent to me on March 15, 1974 when I was a member of the government which is addressed to the Honourable Edward Shreyer, Premier, the Honourable S. Green, Minister of Mines and Resources and L. A. Bateman, Chairman Manitoba Hydro — and I can tell the members that I have taken only the first page but I am certainly willing to make available the entire document to the government which they now have in their possession. The reason I am dealing with the first page is that I don't know whether the government would wish the entire document, which was a personal and confidential document and I don't think that I have any problems with it but if the government doesn't wish to make it public that I leave to them. If they want me to make the entire document public I will.

On that document, Mr. Speaker, there are printed-in corrections stating recent indications show, and I would ask the Page to take one of these documents and make it available to the members concerned, the Member for St. Vital, the Leader of the Opposition and the Minister of Finance — and I'm prepared to have it tabled if tabling is acceptable or necessary.

I'm also, Mr. Speaker, going to table Page 5 of the document that was presented by the Member for St. Vital, which also has on it printed corrections, Mr. Speaker, containing the words, "what appears to be". Now, Mr. Speaker, I have had some training — although not a great deal I will admit — in handwriting comparisons and I would ask the members of the House to note that the letters "w", "h", "a", "t", "e", and "s" appear in both documents, Mr. Speaker, in handwriting, printed. I would ask the members of the House to note that although there is a difference in size which I can explain by indicating that in one document it is an insert, and in the other document it is a replacement, that the letters "r" are identical; the letter "e" is identical in both documents; the letter "t" is identical in both documents; the letter "s" is identical in both documents; the letter "h" is identical in both documents and the letter "w" is identical in both documents.

Now I can, Mr. Speaker, without any difficulty indicate that the March 15th document of 1974 was sent to me by one Steward Martin, that that is absolutely the case. The other document which bears the same type of correction appears to have been sent by the same person. I indicate now, Mr. Speaker, that I am not the expert and furthermore I am not able to be as sure of the typewriting as I am of the printing, but there are experts available to this House through the Attorney-General's Department

which could easily, Mr. Speaker, which could easily clarify this matter and given the fact that it has been suggested that a hoax and a fabrication have been perpetrated with regard to this document, I am not asking, Mr. Speaker, on this question of privilege, as to whether or not the Minister to whom Hydro reports told Mr. Wedepohl that if Hydro insists on proceeding on this advice he would disqualify the whole board. I'm not asking on this question of privilege or have it determined as to whether or not this was a legal opinion given to the Minister through the Chairman, or given to the Board of Directors of Manitoba Hydro. I am asking Mr. Chairman for the members of the Treasury Bench's charges to be examined because members of the Treasury Bench have charged that the Member for St. Vital has been engaged in a hoax on parliament and is dealing with fabrications, Mr. Speaker. There is a very very easy way of dealing with this matter, namely, by asking Mr. Martin whether it is so. But if that has proved to be of great resistance to the government benches, and understandably so, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that what is important now to we members of the House is to determine whether the Member for St. Vital has fabricated something or is engaged in perpetrating a hoax on Parliament.

Now surely the members of the Conservative party would want to expose that fabrication, would want to expose that hoax and bring out the fact that indeed, and I say that nobody would suggest wittingly and I'm not even suggesting unwittingly — although if it was done it was certainly done unwittingly.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is a very important matter; that it is a matter effecting the privileges of the members of the House; that it is privilege of the most serious nature, namely, whether a hoax or fabrication is being perpetrated. Mr. Speaker, I think that anybody looking at these documents — and I have several copies available to anybody who wishes to make the comparison that I make — I'm not asking that my comparison be accepted, I'm suggesting that the comparison can be properly made through the Attorney-General's Department, that the Attorney-General's Department would be available to the members of the Committee on Privileges and Elections and that all members of the House would agree that this is a question of privilege, would agree that it's being raised at the earliest possible moment, in view of the fact that the suggestion of fabrication arose merely yesterday and my locating of the March 15th memo, Mr. Speaker, was done last night, that it is being raised at the earliest possible moment and that it affects the privileges of the honourable members of the House.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Member for Burrows, that;

WHEREAS a matter has arisen affecting the parliamentary privileges of the House in that a member thereof has read from a document which is, as yet, unidentified and which on its face appears to be a submission to the commission conducting an inquiry commission by the government, which submission was never made; and

WHEREAS the question has arisen as to whether in fact the document is a submission that was to the Board of the Manitoba Hydro Electric Company; and

WHEREAS a member of the House has used the words with relation to the document that it was part of a half-hoax, and another member of the House has used the word "fabrication" with respect to the said document; and WHEREAS it is a matter affecting the privileges of all of the members of the House if one of them has been unwittingly induced to engage in any matter which can be referred to as a hoax or a fabrication; and WHEREAS the question of the origin and validity and authenticity of the said document is readily ascertainable,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the question as to whether or not a fabrication or hoax has been perpetrated in the House be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, with a couple of the assertions made by the Member for Inkster one could possibly agree first of all, that he raised the so-called question of privileges at the earliest possible time and secondly, that he in confirmation with your rulings at previous occasions, he has presented a motion to substantiate his alleged question of privilege. However, Mr. Speaker, what he is attempting to do in this question of privilege is nothing more than to regurgitate a matter that has already been dealt with by this House. Our rules are quite explicit in that particular matter. No one is permitted to introduce a document into this House that is not properly signed, and not being signed it is incumbent upon that particular person to take the responsibility for it.

The Member for St. Vital has not accepted the responsibility for the document and therefore it is inadmissible insofar as this Chamber is concerned and once a matter has been dealt with as being inadmissible, I don't know by whatever devious ways may be invented by honourable gentlemen opposite, how it can be re-introduced into this House once it has been dealt with. The document itself is one that has been ruled inadmissible and therefore not subject to re-admission into this Chamber.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I have not as yet seen the letter that the Honourable Member for Inkster put forward. I have not had the opportunity as yet to check the records as to the use of the words that he alleges were used in this House. I would like to take the matter under advisement until I've had a chance to check the Hansards.

The Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I did not hear but if we're going to now make a rule for the goose, let the rule be for the gander. The Member for Morris, when he rose, did not say he was speaking on a point of order. (Interjection)— He did not say he was speaking on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, just as the Leader of the Opposition did not say he was speaking on a point of privilege and was chastized for that. The member spoke to the Motion. (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the member spoke . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please. There is no Motion before the House.

(Interjections)— Order please, order please. No Motion can be before the House until it has been read by the Chair.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, then I wish to speak to the point of order that has been raised.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** If you're ruling that my friend spoke on a point of order, then I can speak to the point of order and urge something on you, Mr. Speaker. I did not deal with the document or its tabling, I dealt with a document that was read from, a copy of which was given to the Minister to whom the Manitoba Hydro reports, my question of privilege deals with two things that were raised new yesterday. One, that this was a . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The Chair has asked for the House to allow the Chair the chance to read the Hansard to check and I have asked the House to have the right to take this matter under advisement. As I have asked to take the matter under advisement . . .

The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order.

**MR. GREEN:** The Speaker will always have a right to take something and I'm not challenging that. What I am asking is that no ruling be made until we have a chance to direct ourselves to the point of order. Because if you are now going to take it under advisement as if the point of order has been debated and make a ruling, then you will not have given myself or any other member who wishes to speak to the point of order that has been raised, the right to do so. So I would request, Mr. Speaker, if you are taking the matter under advisement that you indicate that people will have an opportunity to speak to the point of order when you have checked Hansard to see if the words "half-hoax" and "fabrication" were indeed used.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I am loathe to take your silence as acquiescence unless you tell me that I may do so. I gather that members of the Opposition, including myself, will have an opportunity to speak to the point of order before a ruling is made. I would ask for your assurance, otherwise, I wish to speak to the point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster on the point of order.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, the Honourable Member for Morris has indicated that I wish to deal with a document which was not tabled. That is not the basis on this question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

The basis of this question of privilege and it is contained in the motion and I want to make sure, Mr. Speaker, now that you have indicated that there is a problem, that you have before you the two documents which I have indicated contain the

handwriting or the hand printing of Mr. Steward Martin, and I take it that you have a copy of the motion. You must have a copy of the motion.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that what we are dealing with and what the order deals with is that it has been suggested that the Member for St. Vital and the Leader of the Opposition have been participating in something which was described as a half-hoax and participating in something which was described as a fabrication. If two members of the House have been participating in a hoax or a fabrication that is the question of privilege, it has nothing to do with anything else.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on the point of order.

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot take exception to you undertaking to look at this matter under advisement but I want to point out to you that you already have another matter under advisement pertaining to this subject matter from yesterday. You now will be dealing with this under advisement. What the opposition is insistent on having, Mr. Speaker, is a full debate in this House and this matter being referred to committee. This cannot be dealt with . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. The honourable member is speaking to a point of order. He must speak to the subject matter of the point of order and not launch into a speech.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. PAWLEY:** To the motion.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member is out of order.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MS. JUNE WESTBURY:** Speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member stated he was speaking to the resolution. Order please. I have recognized the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge on the point of order.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, addressing the point of order the suggestion was made by the Minister of Government Services that this is a repetition of a previous matter. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that in making that point of order he is in error because the point of privilege that was brought to us today refers to a reflection on the attitude and the ethics of another member, the Member for St. Vital, Mr. Speaker. I suggest therefore that this is a different matter and has no relation to the points of privilege that have been raised here on other days. Mr. Speaker, we had new words introduced today. The word "devious" was brought in by the Member for Morris.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I hoped the honourable member would address her remarks to the remarks made by the Acting Government . . . The honourable member may continue.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, thank you. The Member for Morris who raised the apparent point of

order, Mr. Speaker, refers to devious ways invented presumably by the Member for Inkster. Mr. Speaker, this is a further accusation. I don't see how this varies very much from the words that have been used in reference to the Member for St. Vital. This is a cancer that is spreading through this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. For goodness sake and for the sake of the reputation of all members of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, I urge the government to send this whole dismal matter to the Committee of Privileges and Elections.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on the point of order.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order the Member for Morris has suggested that we are dealing with the document, the document that was referred to by the Member for St. Vital the other day. Mr. Speaker, we are not dealing with that particular document.

We are dealing with statements that were made by the Minister responsible for Hydro that this document is half-a-hoax, Mr. Speaker. We are dealing with statements by the First Minister that the document is a fabrication. This is a matter which I understand to be the subject matter of the Member for Inkster's motion of privilege earlier this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morris knows full well that there is no duplication between the matters that were discussed earlier dealing with the document itself and matters pertaining to this being a fabrication or half-a-hoax.

Mr. Speaker, I take exception to statements by the First Minister, statements by the Minister responsible for Hydro attempting to attribute to one of my colleagues, one who sits within my caucus, one who is part of the Official Opposition as being involved in a half-a-hoax or a fabrication. Mr. Speaker, it is a direct reflection upon a member of this House and it demands immediate action, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Honourable Member for St. Vital on the point of order.

**MR. D. JAMES WALDING:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order. If it is of assistance to you in coming to a decision on this matter, I was the one who used the word "half-hoax" in this House yesterday and I did so in reading from a transcript of a television show of the evening before, it was a direct quote from the Minister to whom Hydro reports.

As far as the other word that has been mentioned this afternoon the word fabrication, I recall to my memory that the Honourable First Minister used that word in the House yesterday afternoon. Insofar as it is directed in my direction, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is a reflection on me as a member and I believe a reflection on the House and I do urge you, Sir, when you take these matters into consideration, to consider that implied slight on a member of this Assembly.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. I want to thank the Honourable Member for St. Vital for shedding some light on the subject.

The Honourable Member for Rossmere on the point of order.

**MR. VIC SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As indicated by the Member for Inkster and by our leader, the issue is the statements being attributed to members of this House that there have been half-hoaxes or that type of thing perpetrated and in order to assist you, Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of the transcript of a television program on which the Minister in charge of Hydro was quoted as follows.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I believe the Honourable Member for St. Vital just dealt with that subject matter.

The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You indicated previously that you wished to take this matter under advisement in order that you could look at Hansard. You wished to take the matter of the record of what has been said by members, and here I'm giving you a firsthand opportunity and I would hope that you would take advantage of it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The honourable member is just repeating what was given to this House by the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order.

**MR. GREEN:** I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I heard the words "half-hoax", and I heard them attributed to the Member for Riel, but whether they were said, Mr. Speaker, in the House or outside of the House, a question affecting the privileges of an honourable member, if a member outside of the House says that he is engaged in a hoax, that is still a matter of privilege.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Boniface on the point of order.

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest, as you are taking this under advisement and we want to proceed with the business of this House, I wonder if we could settle this by you calling a short recess, and having the member that made the complaint, the House Leader and the Leader of our party, retire to your Chamber and listen to the tapes and see what has been said.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. I have asked for the permission of the House to take the matter under advisement. Can we now proceed with the routine business?

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

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside)** on behalf of the Honourable Attorney-General, introduced Bill No. 50, An Act to amend the Summary Convictions Act.

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson)** introduced Bill No. 51, An Act to amend The Fire Preventions Act.

**HON. GARY A. FILMON (River Heights)** introduced Bill No. 52, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

**MR. BRIAN CORRIN (Wellington)** introduced Bill No. 49, An Act to amend The Landlord and Tenant Act.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** At this time I should like to introduce 40 students of Grades 5 and 6 standing from the J. A. Cuddy Elementary School under the direction of Miss Brooks and Miss Hunt. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Government Services.

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

### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister to whom the Manitoba Hydro reports. In view of the fact that the Minister now has in front of him a document which I indicate to him I received from Mr. Martin, which has a very similar, in my view, the same printing in a correction that is contained on a correction in the document which he received from the Member for St. Vital, would the Minister clear this entire matter up by making a simple phone call to Mr. Steward Martin to find out whether the document which was given to him by the Member for St. Vital is, in fact, Mr. Martin's document?

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

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Mr. Speaker, I thought that the day before yesterday we had come to some resolution of the procedure that might be followed in this matter, it was initiated by a Member of the Opposition and the suggestion was found agreeable to the House I thought. That course of action was to have the client, who may well be the person who was connected with this seven sheets of paper with the information contained, have a look at it and pursue it back through what may possibly have been their legal counsellors at that period in time. I agreed to that course of action; I would think it is a reasonable one.

So I have agreed to take the Hansard to show that the House would like that information, to forward it to the Hydro Board who is the client, who can pursue it, with the recommendation that they do pursue it and provide any information they can on it. I have undertaken today to send over the seven sheets of paper with what's contained in them, to ask them whether they can identify them and to furthermore, if they see fit, to pursue it through their legal counsels. That, Mr. Speaker, is what I thought we had agreed to and I think it's the logical course of action. They are the client; the government is not the client.

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

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I want to clarify for the Minister reporting for Hydro that I believe he is referring to questions I asked and which he answered; one of which was

designed to say that if Mr. Martin requests Hydro to release him, he would recommend it. After I asked him again, twice, I think, whether he is prepared to recommend that they should release him regardless of whether or not he asks, and I think he said he would, that doesn't need the agreement of the whole House. It just means that I pressed him for answers and I got an answer, which was the last question I was allowed to ask in a series of questions. I am satisfied that he gave an undertaking, but that isn't a matter that the House should agree to, and I don't think he should repeat that the House arrived at an agreement as to the way he would proceed. All he did was answer my questions.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister has left it in the hands of an outside-of-the-House board as to whether or not this question is going to be resolved and therefore we don't know, would the Minister go one step further and ask Hydro if he thinks he needs it — and I'm not sure that he does — whether they will give him their permission — that's almost comical him asking them to give permission, but I repeat, Mr. Speaker, whether he will ask the Hydro chairman, whether he has the Hydro chairman's permission to telephone Mr. Steward Martin and ask him whether the document that was given to him by the Member for St. Vital is in fact Mr. Steward Martin's document.

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, we undertook to pursue a course of action the day before yesterday and I have pursued that course of action. I think the matter should rest that way for now.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, is the Minister interested and would he take those steps which are necessary and available to him, to determine whether that is Mr. Martin's document if the course of action that he recommended doesn't give any further information to the House?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, again I have given my answer on the matter.

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

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, to make sure that there is no misunderstanding. I thought I heard a few days ago the Minister say that if the board agree that he would go along with it and he is now saying that he is recommending to the board? Am I understanding him correctly? Because it's not the same thing at all.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, it's in Hansard, the member can read it.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I'm asking the Minister if he is saying now today that he is, or has, or will be recommending to the Board of Hydro that they release Mr. Martin from any obligation. I think he's shaking his head indicating yes, but I'd like to be able to read it in Hansard. —(Interjection)— Well, could you answer me then? That today he will

recommend to the Board or has recommended to the Board, would he please tell me if I'm right or wrong?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, the member has it on the record, he can read it. I've said today that I forwarded that recommendation that they give consideration to first of all, attempting to identify the document or — I'm careful now whether it's a document or what it is, I don't know what the proper name is for the seven pages of paper, Mr. Speaker — to see if they can identify it; secondly, to give consideration pursuing it through their legal counsels that they had at the time all this supposedly took place.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

**MR. HENRY J. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question I want to direct to the Minister of Agriculture and it's a question relating to the shipment of grain through the Port of Churchill. In view of the comments made by the chairman of the National Harbours Board a number of weeks ago in commenting to the efforts of the Canadian Wheat Board, I wonder if the Minister has any further information to inform the House as to what commitments the Canadian Wheat Board are prepared to make through establishing grain shipments through the Port of Churchill?

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

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, as the member may or may not be aware, there is a commitment by the Canadian Wheat Board to move some 280,000 tons through the port this year which is somewhat lower than what has been the traditional amount of grain that has been exported through that port. I think it's important that the commitment be lived up to that was requested by the three western provinces at a meeting several weeks ago in Yorkton, that at least 3 percent of the grains from the Prairie Provinces be committed annually through the Port of Churchill.

**MR. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question I wish to direct to the Minister of Highways and Transportation. In view of the fact that an interchange agreement was made last year between the Canadian Pacific and the C.N., I wonder if the Minister of Transportation could inform the House whether any agreement has been reached with regard to the movement of grain from the Churchill hinterland, Saskatchewan and some parts of Manitoba that would be going through the Port of Churchill this year.

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

**MR. DON ORCHARD (Pembina):** Well, Mr. Speaker, that exchange agreement was in effect last year to expedite the movement of grains from C.P. lines in Northern Saskatchewan primarily via the C.N. line to Churchill, and to date I have not been advised as to whether the Canadian Wheat Board presently has

sufficient grain stocks on C.N. lines in the normal shipping pattern serviced by the Port of Churchill.

Should they make the determination that they do not have sufficient grain stocks on CNR lines in the Churchill operating area, then no doubt they would be very interested in renewing an interchange agreement with CPR to avail the Port of Churchill of grains which would be available for shipment on C.P. lines through the Port of Churchill. To date I haven't had an indication as to whether that circumstance exists. However I would be prepared to pursue that as soon as possible with the Canadian Wheat Board and with the railroads.

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

**MS. WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Health and refers to the Main Street Project and the Detoxification Centre at 55 Lydia Street on which I asked some questions last week. Mr. Speaker, will the Minister confirm that these two programs which were formerly funded on a two-year basis have now been reduced to a single-year funding?

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

**HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** I'm not sure that I confirm that, Mr. Speaker, but I certainly can confirm that the whole Main Street Project concept and the whole detoxification facility concept which involves the 55 Lydia Street matter, are in a state of flux and re-examination at the moment.

The Alcoholism Foundation and my office are working very hard to attempt to find a suitable site and location for a sub-acute detoxification centre. Lydia Street is moving into temporary quarters. The Main Street Project, as far as the Main Street patrol is concerned, is basically a city idea and concept although the AFM has always provided a considerable amount of funding for it.

In overall terms AFM funding for the downtown Winnipeg alcohol problem is up, not down, it's up substantially. But we may not be expending additional and increased amounts of money on the Main Street patrol, that's a City of Winnipeg project essentially, and does not necessarily fit into the main plans of the Alcoholism Foundation.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister referred to this last week and again today as a temporary solution or a temporary facility. Am I then to understand or is the House then understand, Mr. Speaker, that the building at 105 Galt Street is also referred to as 105 Duncan Street, is not being purchased for the use of the Detoxification Centre?

**MR. SHERMAN:** I can't answer that question, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member would have to check with the city on that point and with the Main Street Project.

The Alcoholism Foundation provides a certain amount of money for alcohol agencies in the community, one of them is the Main Street Project. The Main Street Project makes its own rules, sets out its own objectives, does what it wants to do and the member will have to check with them.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with a final supplementary.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, in referring to this matter the other day, I referred also to the threats of dismissal against anyone speaking up who is employed at the Detoxification Centre and the Minister stated that he had no knowledge of that. Well, I now have a copy of the letter, Mr. Speaker, signed by the President of the Board of Directors of the Main Street Project calling on staff people who have criticized the move to resign. I wonder if the Minister would tell the House whether he approves of this kind of attitude from organizations to which we are contributing as taxpayers, this attitude towards their staff people, Mr. Speaker. There is also a letter signed by the Executive Director, dated and signed, calling upon the staff to resign if they are not prepared to work at the proposed new location. I wonder if the Minister would comment and state whether his government approves of this kind of threat being offered by organizations to whom we, the taxpayers, are contributing.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I would have to suggest that I think it would be high presumptuous of me to comment; that's obviously an internal matter between the Main Street Project people and their employees. We, through the AFM, respond to the needs of alcohol and anti-alcohol agencies. We don't attempt to dictate to them what they should do or to interfere in their internal matters. I would have no inclination to comment on that matter, Sir.

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

**MR. BEN HANUSCHAK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Labour and Manpower. Last Friday he had stated that he is hopeful that once the business community recognizes the labour force is willing and able that we will see an even stronger expansion of employment opportunities. Does the business community now recognize that the labour force is willing and able to work?

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Burrows is twisting the version, the intent and the content of the words around. The words simply mean that now people have exercised that God-given right, spring is here, the sun is shining, the birds are out, the grass is getting green and people are getting a little eager to get out and get to work. That's what I was talking about, now that they're out and wanting to work, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister says that I was twisting words around. I was quoting the Minister verbatim, word for word, so my question to the Minister is based on the quote which the Minister is alleged to have made expressing a hope that once the business community recognizes that the labour force is willing and able that conditions will improve, has he informed the business community that the labour force is willing and able to work, because he has claimed that the business community is unaware of the fact? Has he informed the business community?

**MR. MacMASTER:** I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the member would look at the increase in the work force

in that particular month and he'd appreciate that people are coming out into the work force in larger numbers. That's exactly what the article says if he reads the entire article.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may make a statement in respect to the Business of the House. As has been the practice in the past, the House will not be sitting on Friday but will be sitting on Monday. That's for information as apparently there have been quite a number of people that are making inquiries as to when the House will be sitting. I am advised also by the staff in the restaurant that if the House is sitting on Monday that the restaurant will be open.

I would also like to say that I believe that agreement has been reached, and that perhaps can be verified by the Opposition House Leader, that the House would sit tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock until 12:00 and from 2:00 till 5:30, and then would not sit in the evening. If that arrangement is agreed upon then those will be the hours of sitting.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is that agreeable? (Agreed)

Before we proceed with the business at hand, on Thursday, April 9, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition presented a Motion to the House which read:

THAT WHEREAS allegations have been made that the Minister of Mines and Energy resorted to threats and intimidation against former members of the Hydro Board; and WHEREAS the Minister made misleading statements to the Public Utilities Committee and the House;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the House refer the matter to the Committee of Privileges and Elections.

This motion was rejected by the House by a vote of 20 to 6.

On Friday, April 10th, the Honourable Member for St. Vital attempted to present a document to the Legislative Assembly. This document was ruled out of order as it was considered incomplete and a document that was not properly before the House. This ruling was accepted by the House without a recorded objection.

Yesterday, the Honourable Member for St. Vital rose on a matter of privilege based on, according to him, statements and misstatements by the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro and statements by the Minister responsible for Hydro and the Deputy Premier.

In considering whether or not a prima facie case has been made of a matter of privilege which would give to this motion precedence over the pre-arranged program of public business, I have looked at the substantive evidence which has been given to the House over the past few days. I've come to the conclusion that no new evidence has been offered since the decision of the House on April 9th and must therefore rule that the motion of the Honourable Member for St. Vital does not meet the requirements of a matter of privilege and therefore must be ruled out of order.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** We'll proceed with the business as indicated on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. PETER FOX:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. In view of your ruling and we on this side, at least those from my caucus, believe that the ruling is not in concurrence with what we believe, I must respectfully challenge your ruling.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Ruling of the Chair has been challenged. Shall the Ruling of the Chair be sustained?

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. FOX:** Ayes and Nays, please.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Call in the members.

**MR. GREEN:** Yeas and Nays, please.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Call in the members.

Order please. The motion before the House is a challenge to the Chair.

**A STANDING VOTE** was taken, the result being as follows;

### YEAS

Messrs. Anderson, Banman, Blake, Brown, Cosens, Craik, Domino, Downey, Driedger, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Filmon, Galbraith, Gourlay, Hyde, Johnston, Jorgenson, Kovnats, MacMaster, McGill, McGregor, McKenzie, Minaker, Orchard, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Ransom, Sherman.

### NAYS

Messrs. Bostrom, Boyce, Cherniack, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, McBryde, Malinowski, Miller, Parasiuk, Pawley, Schroeder, Uskiw, Walding, Ms. Westbury.

**MR. CLERK:** Yeas 28, Nays 21.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I declare the ruling of the Chair sustained.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Member for St. Vital has now shown you the transcript of yesterday's proceedings in which the Premier of the province used the words "fabrications put forward" in dealing with the charges and content of the submission made by the Member for St. Vital and the Leader of the Opposition.

You've also had the Member for Rossmere indicate to you that he has a transcript of a radio or television program in which the Member for Riel, the Minister to whom Hydro reports, used the words "half-a-hoax". These are the two phrases used directly in the motion. They have been used and I

think that to the satisfaction of a motion in a prima facie case in any event, they have been used on that basis, Mr. Speaker, it would appear to me. I respectfully suggest that you make a ruling on the motion that was made earlier in the day.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. I have asked the Clerk and the Assistant Clerk has checked with the Queen's Printer, the Hansard should be out later on today. At that time I will look at the matter.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### BUDGET DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak pertaining to the Budget last evening. However I want to mention at this point, Mr. Speaker, that there is another issue that weighs heavily upon the minds of all members of the opposition at this point in time and that is the massive cover-up pertaining to the actions by the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro. Mr. Speaker, if there is any thought for a moment on the part of those on the Treasury Benches or those in the backbench of the government that the Opposition will be dissuaded from pressing this issue further, they better have some second thoughts. Mr. Speaker, we shall not be stonewalled, we shall not be blocked, we shall not be frustrated in our efforts to obtain the truth of this matter and we will persist in our efforts to do so.

Mr. Speaker, last evening when the Minister of Finance was speaking, he'd made reference to the erosion of civility in Manitoba's political life. As he spoke he was pointing towards the Official Opposition when he should have been pointing towards the First Minister of this province. We can all recall when the First Minister in the very first few months after his government assumed office, referred to the women of this province as being raters. We can recall only last week when the opposition attempted to obtain, Mr. Speaker, information pertaining to Hydro and demanded that indeed there be a reference to committee, the First Minister told us to politely go to hell. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I recall the First Minister in speaking from his seat, telling the Member for St. Johns that he could corkscrew himself to his seat and the Minister of Finance piously stands in his place as he did last evening, and suggests that there has been an erosion of civility in Manitoba political life. Yes, but from whence has that come, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, I will be dealing at some length with the matters pertaining to the Manitoba Hydro; the actions of the Minister responsible for Hydro; the stonewalling which has been the practice of the day for the past week and more by members of the government — I say this, and members can bring forth a motion to refer these remarks to committee if they wish; the deliberate cover-up by members of the Treasury Bench in this government. I challenge them to bring forth a motion, maybe that is the way indeed that we can get this matter to committee to find out the truth in respect to this matter, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, last evening we were treated by the Minister of Finance to what was called the 1981 Manitoba Budget Address, and Mr. Speaker, we had been looking forward to this Address; new Minister, first Budget Address. We had expected that indeed the First Minister, probably in some bent of enthusiasm, would offer Manitobans some exciting new courses of action. It was based upon hope, idle hope, but the hope was there. Instead, Mr. Speaker, we were treated to an empty Easter basket on the part of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, I found myself asking last night, is this all that we can expect after three-and-a-half years of Conservative party government in the Province of Manitoba? Is this all? Mr. Speaker, the Premier said two years ago that the economy had been turned around; the Minister of Finance last year said there were blue skies ahead. Manitobans looked with anticipation to that bright new era that the First Minister had talked about in 1977 leading up to the October 11, 1977 election. But, Mr. Speaker, Manitobans have been waiting patiently for three-and-a-half years.

I find, Mr. Speaker, in my going about the province that more and more Manitobans, and many that voted Conservative in the last election, many that worked for the Conservative party in the last election are asking the question, what was all this for? People are asking, Mr. Speaker, for what, especially after last night, for what have we sacrificed for this past three-and-a-half years? What have they been doing with declining real wages? It was the Minister of Health last year that indeed said that Manitobans must become accustomed to working hard and being underpaid. Manitobans are asking what was this all for, that their sons and daughters indeed would be forced to leave Manitoba in order to obtain employment elsewhere in Canada? Well we face, Mr. Speaker, unprecedented out-migration from the Province of Manitoba of our sons and daughters.

Manitobans are asking in rural areas, in Northern Manitoba, that have had to give up their jobs and give up their opportunities as a result of the restraint policies that this government embarked upon during the first two, two-and-a-half years of their government; the people of Northern Manitoba and the people of rural areas are asking, what was this all about?

Then we have Manitobans asking what was it all about that fees for so many provincial services have increased more rapidly than consumer prices. Mr. Speaker, others are asking in Manitoba, from the business community, what was this all about that so many businesses went bankrupt last year? The highest indeed, by way of record, for 10 years in the Province of Manitoba.

Was it for all this, the Budget last night, that growing numbers of farmers are facing threat of foreclosure? Since 1978, Mr. Speaker, this government has been talking about how they have turned things around. They talked about that in 1978, 1979, 1980 the blue sky. The First Minister indeed it was the early part of 1979, assured Manitobans that he was sleeping soundly at night, and was not worried about the state of the economy in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, as the First Minister slept on we saw more and more evidence of what was happening in

Manitoba. We were told that if things weren't as they should be they were going to be better just around the corner; then we were told, Mr. Speaker, that we were indeed building a sound foundation in Manitoba, a sound foundation for future economic growth in the Province of Manitoba; and that indeed, this Conservative government had commenced that approach of building that strong foundation, replacing what had taken place prior to 1977. They asked Manitobans to take medicine though the taste, they indicated, would be bitter. Mr. Speaker, that indeed was in the time of some vision that this government still had, the vision indeed that still prevailed.

But, Mr. Speaker, what did we have last night from the Minister of Finance? Mr. Speaker, last night we had an admission of failure; an admission that after three-and-a-half years this Conservative government has failed; this Conservative government is bankrupt of ideas; this Conservative government has no further initiative or thrust; this Conservative government is tired and run out of steam, Mr. Speaker; this Conservative government should be replaced, and indeed, Mr. Speaker, will be replaced.

Mr. Speaker, one of the promises that was made in 1977 by the now First Minister is that the economy of the Province of Manitoba would soar under a Conservative government, that there would be jobs and opportunities for all young Manitobans; that there was a place in Manitoba for all Manitobans to participate in the building and the constructing of a province free from what the First Minister referred to as stifling Socialist ideology. That's what the First Minister said back in 1977. But, Mr. Speaker, do you know that we've had 0.0 growth in the past three years in Manitoba; under this great new Conservative adventure, under this ideology of neo-Conservatism, under this ideology of acute protracted restraint, Mr. Speaker, acute protracted restraint, but only become acute protracted disaster for so many Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, this Minister of Finance, the First Minister, the Treasury Bench, the entire Conservative government, Mr. Speaker, abandoned that foundation that they said they were building, last night. Mr. Speaker, last night they admitted indeed that they had failed and they had failed miserably. Instead, Mr. Speaker, the Budget Address last night was built upon apologies; apologies were being tossed about like confetti, Mr. Speaker. I believe the first 40-50 pages of the Budget were, what, Mr. Speaker? They were alibis and apologies.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that members were somewhat restless on this side of the Chamber last night; but Mr. Speaker, it can be understood when indeed, rather than receiving a Budget Address as is traditional and which is normal, and which we have indeed been the recipient of for the past twelve years, even by the former Minister of Finance, instead, Mr. Speaker, we receive a speech that would have been better given in Killarney at a Conservative meeting — not in 1981, no, not in 1981 — it would have been more fitting for 1977, 1977 Killarney. Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of speech that we would have expected Brian Ransom candidate in the constituency of Souris-Killarney to have given in 1977. A document of alibis and apologies, a document trying to explain to Manitobans why there has been such poor performance — poor

performance — on the part of this Conservative government.

Mr. Speaker, if they couldn't dig up enough excuses, apologies and alibis they had to indeed even enter into extravagant hypothesis about how a New Democratic party government would have been even worse. Mr. Speaker, they wouldn't leave it to the test but they had to engage in fantasy as to how things would even be worse if there had been New Democratic party government in '78, '79, '80, '81.

Mr. Speaker, after the next election honourable members across the way will no longer have to engage in figments of imagination; we will again have a New Democratic party government in this province. A New Democratic party government that will proceed to turn the economy around in this province, turn the economy around in this province so that there indeed can be the assurance of an improved quality of life for all Manitobans.

The Minister of Finance, by my calculations, would have been much better off if he had dropped out about the first 40 some pages that were fillers last night — fillers. My colleagues say more; I'm trying to be modest in my observations, Mr. Speaker. But there was so much filler that I'm sure as a result of this budget address being prepared and distributed that only the pulp and paper industry would have enjoyed some benefit as a result of the Budget last night.

Mr. Speaker, a colleague of mine said, and I think said quite correctly, that the actual highlights of this Budget wouldn't barely fill a postage stamp. The Minister has said that restraint has given the government flexibility to choose options, but then, Mr. Speaker, he chose to do nothing. He proceeded to blame his economic problems on the former government, the Federal Government, on the weather, on international forces beyond his control, on the fact that times used to be better and that people were accustomed at some time in the past to better times. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if you observe and read this budget address carefully you will find that every possible factor was blamed except for their own promises that they had made to Manitoba 1977 and their ineptitude and their incompetence in carrying out those promises since 1977.

Mr. Speaker, I know that they will have alibis further; they will dig up some more alibis, but, Mr. Speaker, I say to you and I say to honourable members across the way, I wish the First Minister was present this afternoon so that I could point out to him that those kind of alibis, those kind of apologies, that kind of whitewash that we received last night just will not wash with Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, it was the fourth Budget by this government. It was a rerun of their 1977 election campaign. It's now 1981, for the benefit of the Minister, three-and-one-half years later. Manitobans are now asking, Mr. Speaker, has this government been a good government for Manitobans. Is this a government that has kept faith, kept faith with people? Does this government do what it promises to do? Mr. Speaker, increasingly I am hearing from the people of the province of Manitoba that it is, first a bad government, secondly it's a government that cannot be trusted and it's a government that must be replaced, and will be replaced.

The latest Budget recalls Tory failures, apologies for failure. In the words of Robert Service, "a

promise made is a debt unpaid". Mr. Speaker, much can be made of this government's debts, its unbelievable ability to undertake no major new programs or projects, yet, Mr. Speaker, as it proceeds along that path it runs up one of the largest deficits that Manitoba has ever seen. For what purpose, Mr. Speaker? There has been no new project, there has been no new initiative, there has been no new program, there has been no new fresh thrust. And yet, Mr. Speaker, we have this government of neo-Conservatives, this government that said they were going to balance the Budget ending up with, in fact, the largest projected deficit that Manitoba has ever been confronted with. For what purpose, Mr. Speaker? Yet, Mr. Speaker, that is not the greatest unpaid debt of the Conservative government. Neither tricks, neither new promises that they will reinstitute undoubtedly in the next few weeks and months, stunts, are going to wipe out what was delivered.

In Rossmere on October 3, 1977, the First Minister, at a Conservative rally attended by some 700 excited supporters, advised that if the Conservatives were elected Manitobans will lose the second highest per capita debt in the country. That was his promise — will lose the second highest per capita debt in the country. And what was to accomplish that, Mr. Speaker? — acute protracted restraint. Well, Mr. Speaker, under those policy thrusts we have observed a drop in investment in Manitoba, cuts in social programs, all geared towards reducing Manitoba from having the second highest public debt in Canada. The goal was to be achieved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we only need to look at this Budget to realize how false that 1977 promise was. Manitoban's per capita debt as we see in the tables presented are such that we are still the second highest per capita debt in Canada and restraint has seriously, in the meantime, injured the economy of the Province of Manitoba.

The present Finance Minister was certainly a true believer, by his record in Hansard. On March 21, 1978 he gave his maiden speech and he used that maiden speech to remind the world, and I quote, Mr. Speaker, "There is no such thing as a free lunch, wealth is based on resources. Without those resources we cannot achieve a higher and higher level of spending." Then the same man that talks about free lunches, that same man presented this Budget last night.

I wonder if the Member for Souris-Killarney would ask the same questions that he posed at the conclusion of his April 17, 1978 speech when he said, the youth of today would like to know the answer to these questions: First of all, should they tomorrow be expected to pay the debts that we incur today? And secondly, how can they be expected, he said, to pay the debts tomorrow that we are unable to pay today? Yet in the Budget tabled last night, Manitoba borrows an additional \$365 million, which comes to \$1 million per day, 1981, being borrowed by the people of the Province of Manitoba; yet this same Minister when he was speaking in his maiden speech asked, can we be expected to pay the debts tomorrow that we are unable to pay today?

Mr. Speaker, we didn't particularly subscribe to that doctrine because that is a doctrine that, come

what may, the books must be balanced, the debt must be reduced, the deficit must be reduced and in the process you implement restraint. But, Mr. Speaker, what has happened, we've had the restraint, we've had the impact upon the economy of the Province of Manitoba; at the same time, Mr. Speaker, we've had a 25 percent increase in public debt since 1977, 25 percent increase in public debt in the Province of Manitoba, in which this particular Minister has served as a member of the Treasury Benches during that period of time.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister will have to do some explaining and if he doesn't feel that he has to do any explaining to members of the Opposition then I suggest, Mr. Speaker, he will be required to do a lot of explaining to the people of the Province of Manitoba who will be awaiting his response.

And then, Mr. Speaker, we had the First Minister — what did the First Minister say in 1979? That in the previous government there were fiscal arsenists in office to pay rampage to public tax dollars. Fiscal arsenists, the First Minister said. That's what the First Minister said in 1979. I wonder how the First Minister defines his present government? Is it a government that consists of fiscal arsenists? Maybe there are some firebugs at loose, Mr. Speaker. Maybe we should find out where the firebugs are? The First Minister seems to be doing a pretty poor job of getting to the bottom of it.

Mr. Speaker, if it's not the Minister of Finance and if it's not the First Minister, then I wonder where are those that cheered on the Minister of Finance and the First Minister, 1978 and 1979? Mr. Speaker, what can they be thinking today? What can they be thinking today? Mr. Speaker, they will be asking themselves, can we trust this government any further. Mr. Speaker, I sense that the answer that they are arriving at, very very rapidly, is a flat, no. Are promises that are to be kept only those that they can be conveniently kept at election time. Mr. Speaker, what we have is a government that has destroyed public confidence and trust on the part of so many Manitobans of elected representatives. Mr. Speaker, this government will pay a price for their betrayal of their promises, for their betrayal of public trust. Manitobans want this government to be straight with this and this government has not been straight with the people of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, when I talk about being "straight", now I want to deal with the matters of the past week or 10 days because I want to talk about open government. This was going to be a government that would be open, would be a friend of the people. Mr. Speaker, people anticipated a government of such openness and such trust; unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, adequate numbers to put this government into office. But, Mr. Speaker, what we have had in the past 10 days has been a stunning revelation of just what we can expect from the government across the way.

I recall in committee, when the Member for St. Vital and I raised questions pertaining to whether Manitoba Hydro had sought or received a legal opinion, the answer that was given by officials of Manitoba Hydro who were rather new to Manitoba Hydro, weren't there during the material time, was to the effect they had checked in the minutes, they made some other contacts and that legal opinion was neither received nor sought. The Minister

responsible for Manitoba Hydro sat there and when the Minister responsible for Hydro was asked he said that the officials had answered the question fully and adequately. The Minister made those comments, Mr. Speaker, knowing full well that the officials of Manitoba Hydro had neither fully or adequately answered the questions that had been put to them by the Member for St. Vital. Mr. Speaker, the Minister responsible for Hydro has become an artist in hide-and-go-seek with the truth. Mr. Speaker, denials have been made and those denials end up in fact being no denials. The answers have become cute; the answers have become evasive.

Mr. Speaker, I want to at this point make some reference to demonstrate this to an interview that the Minister had on the "24 Hours" program on Monday night.

"The interviewer: Mr. Craik, you've been asked continually for the past few days if you remember or partially remember legal advice that was offered by Hydro Counsel, Steward Martin. I'm not going to ask you if you remember it — I guess you knew better. What I want to know is, how could you possibly forget any advice that would have been offered by really one of the best, most respected, most competent corporate lawyers in the City of Winnipeg?"

Mr. Craik: "Well, I think you really have to ask that first question. Was I given this advice?" And the Minister again on the program says: "And the answer is simply no. There is purported to have been advice given to Manitoba Hydro at the time, which is some two years ago. And I was advised by Manitoba Hydro at the time, by the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro at that time, that they had had a report from their lawyer, whether it was verbal or written, I presume it was a written report" — but then he says — "or kind of a discussion paper that outlined a number of grievances he had with regard to the Commission". Then he ends up saying: "It was a report to me".

So, Mr. Speaker, we can't very well figure out that response. First he indicates the report was to the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, then he ends up his remarks by saying it was a report to me.

Mr. Speaker, why didn't the Minister at least in that kind of confused manner, when this matter first broke in committee, not at least offer us that much information, as confusing and as contradictory and as mixed up as it is and evasive as it is, why did the Minister say the answers received are total, adequate, complete? Why, Mr. Speaker until the Member for Rhineland shed some light on the matter.

Then we further have the interviewer asking: "Didn't you vaguely remember something about this, though, with a host of other things, isn't that what you are supposed to have said?"

And the Minister says: "No, if the report was this one that is now knocking around, and there's a good chance that this one is not a legitimate report" — well, as we have been saying all along, the best way of finding out whether it's a legitimate report is to get the report into committee with the alleged author — "we don't really, no one really knows" — he says none really knows but there are some I believe, Mr. Speaker, that do know, Mr. Steward Martin will know — "I quite frankly have not read it, nor did I, you

know, see a report at that time. But if in fact the contents are construed to be some sort of a legal opinion, they contain a great lot of personal kind of observations about any number of things. That is, you know, purported to be the legal opinion on it, really I don't think is a very, something that is of very great substance".

Mr. Speaker, can you make anything out of that? Can you make anything out of that, the Minister's reponse? Isn't that the art of a denial is to confuse your interviewer such that the public wouldn't even know, Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the remarks what the Minister had said?

The interviewer proceeds: "So many people, Mr. Craik, would love to hear what Steward Martin has to say" — that's very true, Mr. Speaker — "I mean, he is at the centre of this. It's something he has supposedly said, you might have supposed heard. Why can't we hear from Mr. Martin, what he remembers? Why can't you order Hydro to allow him to be a witness".

Mr. Craik: "Well, let me tell you. When they engaged their legal counsel at the time I was never consulted on it" — that's his reason, Mr. Speaker, he was never consulted when Mr. Martin was hired — "they had three different legal counsels through the period of their hearings. They had Mr. Martin; they had two others from the Aikens MacAulay firm. Three that had an involvement. I wasn't consulted about any of their appointments" — then later on he says — "Why would I possibly now try and purport what Mr. Martin reports to me. He doesn't".

Then the interviewer says: "Right now, though the impartiality of the Tritschler Commission or whatever, I mean it's been thrown into question".

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that this was required to really throw the Tritschler Commission into question. Agreed, it's a legitimate question to the Minister.

It seems you should be rushing and bending over backwards to make sure, she says, that everybody understands that it was impartial. It seems that Mr. Martin is the only one who can answer those questions.

Now, what does Mr. Craik say?

"Well, Hydro can, you know, ask the firm or whoever they like to discuss it. You say that there is something that does not report, what it does not show up is a very severe difference of opinion, probably a fight between he, if he is the legal counsel involved and still that thing doesn't really pinpoint who the person was."

What an excuse, Mr. Speaker, what an excuse from the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro to not call an inquiry?

Then the interviewer: "But Mr. Craik, you can as Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro, you can say to Hydro, look, you know, we want to clear this up, this is important to the province. We have been having about it in the committee and in the Legislature. I order you to release Mr. Martin from solicitor-client relationship. Why can't you just do it?"

Then he goes to say: "You know, I have been under attack," by way of response, "for about the last week for ordering Manitoba Hydro to do such and such, and I have defended and said I didn't do it. Now, you are suggesting, now come on, why don't

you just issue this one order? I've never ordered them at any time what to do in their legal matters, it's entirely their place. Now, we had a recommendation in the House this afternoon that I agreed with. I said I will be quite happy to submit to the Hydro Board the Hansard copy of today's recommendation, that Hydro initiate some sort of discussion with the legal firm". A little different, Mr. Speaker, from what we understood today that they initiate some sort of discussion with the law firm to see what this is all about. "But I am going to tell you that I wouldn't be surprised that this in the long run, that this turns out to be half-hoax", half a hoax.

The interviewer: "Why half a hoax? Why could this matter possibly be a hoax?" I wonder why he just didn't say it's a hoax. I've never heard of half a hoax.

Then he proceeds to answer: "Because, if you really look at it, you know, an unsigned letter" — unsigned letter he says — "no date on it, no letterhead, and the only possible evidence I can find out is that one person at one time said they saw, perhaps, a one or two-page type of document".

Mr. Speaker, he suggests that it's half a hoax, that the seven-page document we have here can't really be the right one because he's spoken to someone that says a legal opinion was only a one or two-page document. Well, I would like to have the Minister attend in committee so that he could bring forth that unknown witness with the one or two-page legal document. If there is some document floating around that's only one or two pages outlining a legal opinion, Mr. Speaker, this House ought to know and the Minister ought to bring that information to this House.

Then he proceeds: "And they were the only ones I know of that may have been in the receiving line, you know, involved in the Hydro Board organization. They never, I haven't found anybody yet that ever saw a seven-page document. I can guarantee you that I never saw it".

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that after all that the Minister responsible for Hydro would have simplified this matter a great deal by simply phoning Steward Martin and asking Steward Martin, is this report yours? Is it half a hoax? Even today there is some strange reluctance, in fact the Minister responsible for Hydro, indeed yesterday by the First Minister, in just simply putting through a telephone call, a telephone call short of calling committee, to find out indeed whether that is a legal opinion authored by one Steward Martin.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to simply indicate that what we've had has not been openness. What we've seen in the past week or 10 days has been a government that Manitobans would trust; we've been stonewalled. The response from the First Minister when we asked for information is an invitation to go to hell. When the Member for St. Johns asked a question the other day the First Minister, from his seat, suggested that the Member for St. Johns corkscrew himself into his seat. Mr. Speaker, I don't particularly sense that this is a confident government; that this is a government that enjoys confidence in the truth of this matter. What I sense, Mr. Speaker, is that this is a government that's anxious to cover up something. Because, Mr. Speaker, if they weren't interested in covering up

something, they would simply agree let's get the committee to meet; let's bring the witnesses in; let's have those witnesses sworn in; let's bring the documents to the committee. Mr. Speaker, they might even say we'll stake our reputation as a government on this; that there hasn't been no cover-up; that indeed the government has been subject to the attempt by the Opposition to perpetuate a hoax; they could say that, Mr. Speaker.

Well, I want to tell the members of the government they may be afraid of the truth; they may be afraid of a committee to investigate this matter; they may be afraid of a committee to investigate this matter; they may be afraid of witnesses that may be brought in to give factual evidence pertaining to this; they may be afraid of documents that might arrive at the truth of the matter. But I want, Mr. Speaker, for it to be known that the opposition will not for a moment retreat from every effort, from every possible move to ensure that this matter is dealt with in a proper formal manner so that all the people of the Province of Manitoba may finally be able to arrive at the truth of this matter. The government need not think that we are simply going to lie over and let this matter go its own way because, Mr. Speaker, we're going to continue to persist; we're going to continue to raise this matter from day to day; there'll be new information; there'll be further revelations. Mr. Speaker, the government may continue to wiggle; they may continue to twist and turn; they can continue to offer us denials and half-denials and evasive response but they're not going to succeed in the path of obstructing the arrival of truth in this matter, Mr. Speaker.

But what it has demonstrated to Manitobans, although I didn't require this to demonstrate that, Mr. Speaker, but what it did cinch is the realization by Manitobans that this is not an open government, that this is a government that is deceived, this is a government that is covered up; this is not a government that indeed is confident of itself; that is what it has demonstrated, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I had spoken about the deficit and the public debt of the province prior to discussing the Hydro matter. I couldn't help but be somewhat amazed last night, Mr. Speaker, on Page 67 of the Minister of Finance Budget Address, when he stated: "In our view the deficit we are projecting remains within manageable limits". Then later on on Page 67 he stated: "Our government has in no way abandoned its long-term objective of a balanced Budget". This is from the same Minister of Finance, presided over by the First Minister, that suggested that the deficit in 1977 which was after a number of balanced Budgets or close to being balanced Budgets, it was indeed so wild and so reckless that the government of that day was incapable of governing. Yet, Mr. Speaker, what we find now from the Minister of Finance are the words: "The deficit we are projecting remains within manageable limits". What a conversion — like Saul on the road to Damascus.

Mr. Speaker, on the economic front what we have indeed is continued failure on the part of this government, a government that made certain promises and certain commitments in 1977. What has happened, Mr. Speaker, to the economy of this province during the past three-and-a-half years? All

that's required is that we look at the vacant store fronts; that we speak to the friends and relatives of those that have left the Province of Manitoba, the businesses that have shut down, Mr. Speaker. These have not been boom times regardless of any protests that the government may try to suggest or offer to us. The economy of the Province of Manitoba has performed below capacity; it's a government that assumed absolutely no responsibility; it's a government that had said it was going to put the private sector on trial, that the private sector would be expected to revive and to revitalize the economy of the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, during the period 1969 to 1977 the growth rate in the Province of Manitoba grew at a rate of 80 percent — 80 percent of the Canadian average. During the period of time, the past three years, that growth rate rose at a figure of only 10 percent of the Canadian average.

**MR. EVANS:** Less than 10 percent.

**MR. PAWLEY:** My colleague, the Member for Brandon East points out less than 10 percent. Yet the Minister responsible for this portfolio will suggest to members, ah but it's the world influences, it's the international market, it's the impact of Canada upon Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, it has been their policies of restraint, their policies of cutback, their policies of laissez faire, their policies of withdrawal from the economy, their policies of denying that government has any legitimate role in managing and activating the economy that has aggravated the economic picture in the Province of Manitoba during the last three-and-a-half years that has caused the Manitoba growth rate to slip further and further, to cause Manitoba to slip from a fourth or fifth position down to a ninth or tenth position by way of economic indicators.

What we have received, Mr. Speaker, is a Budget that would have been more fitting, in some ways, to meet some responses in 1978; what we have, Mr. Speaker, is a Budget in 1981 that doesn't at all relate to the circumstances of 1981 because what we have had is the needs of 1978, 1979, 1980 that have been compounded and a Budget that is totally ill-equipped and incapable of dealing with those needs in 1981.

Mr. Speaker, Harry Mardon, who now works for the government is one of those that is now in the public service, compliments of the First Minister and the Minister responsible for Hydro, once correctly ticked off Conference Board of Canada statistics as being too optimistic. But the former Minister of Finance, Deputy Premier, February 1980 gave a press release, economic picture for Manitoba, that was the sole subject of a press conference, was based upon Conference Board of Canada statistics and the Conference Board statistics clearly confirmed — and I know the members across the way don't like it, as to what has happened in respect to the economy of the Province of Manitoba — what can be projected for 1981, the fact that Manitoba to be the second lowest by way of economic trends in 1981, below every province but Prince Edward Island by way of investment intentions.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting that in the Budget, on Page 13, the Minister of Finance read to us these words and they're rather interesting for what he

omits: "And even according to figures accepted and published by the members opposite real economic growth declined from 4.2 percent in 1976 to .8 percent in 1977". Mr. Speaker, it's rather interesting that the Minister saw fit to stop at that sudden model year, it's amazing, Mr. Speaker, how now the model year for all criteria is 1977. How often, how frequent we hear every economic comparison that is made by the government of the day with the year 1977. Why didn't the Minister of Finance point out in his Budget Address that the growth rate for 1978, 1979, 1980 was precisely 0.0? Why didn't the Minister of Finance inform Manitobans to that effect?

Mr. Speaker, what we indeed are confronted with for 1981 is a situation by which in constant dollars there will be a decrease by way of construction in the Province of Manitoba, a decrease in constant dollars that will result in less housing, less factories, less offices, less commercial activity according to the Conference Board of Canada, which the Minister has criticized of recent date but the former Minister of Finance saw fit to rely exclusively upon in February of 1980; this is not because of hydro. Mr. Speaker, what we have indeed, as the Member for Rupertsland also pointed out very clearly the other day, there's been a net drop in mining activity in the Province of Manitoba, a drop in mining activity that has resulted in fewer miners, less output in the Province of Manitoba. There is more exploration in Manitoba at the present time because of the increase in world prices. Mr. Speaker, that's true in most provinces in Canada. But in three-and-a-half years less input, less employment, less real activity in mining in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, then we have as well forestry, agriculture and fishing and we'll be dealing with all those items during the Address on the Budget, dealing with the fact that what we're confronted with has been stagnant policies on the part of this government pertaining to those vital areas of the Manitoba economy. The only bright spot interestingly in the Conference Board figures was Utilities — 38 percent greater than in 1977. And this is somewhat interesting in view of the mismanagement and interference and demoralization that's been caused to Manitoba Hydro by the members of this government across the way and yet it is the one bright spot according to Conference Board of Canada projections for 1981 in Manitoba.

The present Minister of Finance went to great lengths in his Budget Debate to criticize the job creation record under the New Democratic party. He suggested that the annual growth rate was only 2.1 percent, 1973 to 1977. Mr. Speaker, what we have had since is 2.2 percent and yet the Minister of Finance sees fit of course not to comment upon a 2.2 percent increase insofar as job creation. Mr. Speaker, what this Budget was totally devoid of was any reference to what is happening in Northern Manitoba by way of unemployment in many of our northern communities of 80 and 90 percent; the Budget is void of any comment in respect to high rates of unemployment in the core area of the City of Winnipeg. This Budget indeed hides the facts of out-migration in the Province of Manitoba, hides reference to the depopulation which has taken place over the past three years in the Province of Manitoba. This government is now void of any

initiative, any effort to deal with what are the problems of job creation in the Province of Manitoba and areas in regions of high unemployment.

The Minister will indeed continue to try to skirt around job creation by saying the creation of jobs in the construction industry, as he said last night, would be generating soft jobs. Mr. Speaker, I tell the Minister responsible for Finance to tell that to the construction industry in Manitoba, to tell that to the architects and the engineers that have had no alternative but to leave Manitoba because of the bankrupt policies of this government.

Then, Mr. Speaker, on top of it we have shifts of policy, pointless uncertainty on the part of this government. The Minister of Finance in 1980 in October announced, obviously to attempt to avoid criticism of a projected \$200,000 million deficit, that he was placing 8 percent limit on expenditures. What we're confronted with of course, Mr. Speaker, is an increase in expenditures of 15 percent. Yet, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister said he was going to impose an 8 percent limit on expenditures in Manitoba. We had a Minister that must have indeed, at that time, knew that the Minister of Education was attempting to cook up an education support program that would cost a further \$70 million to Manitoba. Certainly this Minister knew there that would be need for additional pay increases in the hospital and personal care homes, nurses, others in this province, because of three years of restraint that was catching up. Yet the Minister announced at a press conference for all to hear that he, as Minister of Finance, was imposing an 8 percent limit on expenditures. Mr. Speaker, what a joke; what a joke.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister did some talking last night about inflation. On Page 20 of the Budget Address he commented that inflation is an international problem over which individual provincial governments have just about no control. But was that what the Minister said on May 24, 1979, Page 4617 of Hansard? I read, "Somehow we should simply go ahead and fuel the fires of inflation because we, as one government, would be unable to control it by ourselves". Mr. Speaker, that is a proposition that we reject entirely, the proposition that the Provincial Government can't control inflation. Concern, Mr. Speaker, about the fact that government expenditure, public debt, generated inflation, 1979, and what we have today, 1981, same Minister of Finance that uttered those words in 1979, is an increase in public debt by 25 percent, highest ever deficit the province has been faced with and yet the Minister tells us now, Mr. Speaker, that he no longer rejects the idea that a government can do something about restraining inflation. No, what the Minister now tells us is that inflation is outside the control of a provincial government. Mr. Speaker, another one of those flip-flops that we've become so accustomed to, the about-face that we find repeatedly from the government across the way.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the greatest flip-flop was tax credits. On Page 50 we read these words, "The ultimate result has been lower cost-of-living tax credits for couples where each has an income, including working couples and senior citizens, than for other couples with a similar net income, but where a single spouse is the recipient". He's changing his tune.

Mr. Speaker, it was in 1979 in May that the Minister of Finance told us that he was reforming, by White Paper reforms, the Tax Credit Program in Manitoba. When that program was being criticized by one Frances Russell that was writing a column in the Winnipeg Free Press, he wrote a lengthy letter to the Winnipeg Free Press, and I quote from the Free Press of August of last year: "This will result, the tax credit reforms", the Minister said, "in a significant decrease in the number of recipients. About 300,000 Manitobans will continue to receive cost-of-living tax credits. In addition", he says, "the change of the fair family income definition means that unwarranted cost-of-living tax credits will no longer accrue to secondary income earners in relatively well-to-do families".

Mr. Speaker, when we pointed out to the government that their tax credit proposals last year were such that it was like a huckster handing out a cigar, and that the cigar indeed would end up exploding. The Minister that was then responsible for the Finance portfolio suggested indeed that it was lies and more damned lies from Members of the Official Opposition. The Minister then went on, Mr. Speaker, a year ago when we pointed out, and I remember the Member for Lac du Bonnet bringing into the House sample income tax returns to demonstrate just what would happen. The Minister of Finance rose to suggest that anybody that would dare challenge these gigantic tax reforms would have a great deal of explaining to do in the spring of 1981; a great deal of explaining, said the Minister of Finance then, that we would have to do.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we've all observed who's been doing all the explaining in the past month in this Chamber, and outside this Chamber, about the changes that were made deliberately, that weren't a mistake, as the Member for St. Matthews would have us think, but by deliberate policy direction on the part of this government a year ago. Mr. Speaker, we know, because we received in excess of 500 responses to one little ad that was placed in the Winnipeg Free Press; over 500 responses, and 98 percent of those responses outlined decreases received by those of low income and moderate income, senior citizens in the Province of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at long last the government now tells us that they've changed their mind, and the tax credit changes of last year were wrong. They're little anomalies, they said. They ignore the fact of course, that it was clearly spelled out to them in this Chamber, that member after member rose in their place to point out the serious impact that this would have on moderate and low income and senior citizen families in the province. At that time they were greeted by the comment that indeed we were spouting lies.

Mr. Speaker, what we have now been confronted with is a government that is doing a flip-flop. They say they're going to change the procedure for next year, 1982, make those corrections. We don't know to what extent, Mr. Speaker, that remains to be seen. But what we do know is that \$15 million has been extracted from the pockets of low income, middle income, senior citizens families in the Province of Manitoba in 1981, extracted by way of deliberate policy on the part of this government and we know that \$15 million is not going to be replaced

by this government, that they've already, like hucksters as we said last year, extracted it from the pockets of those in need in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, if indeed it was such an innocent and simple little mistake, as members across the way would have us believe, then they ought to pay those that suffered as a result of those mistakes; they ought to provide rebates to those that suffered. Mr. Speaker, we shall be insisting, we will be demanding that the Minister bring in legislation in order to cause rebates to be paid for this year to all those who have been wrongfully done out of tax credits. Mr. Speaker, if there ever was an area of utter and complete and total incompetence on the part of a government it has been demonstrated in respect to the entire issue of tax credits.

Mr. Speaker, it was more than just an anomaly, just a simple little mistake as the Member for St. Matthews would have us believe. What it was, Mr. Speaker, was a policy which was first outlined to us away back in 1976 by the former Minister of Finance. When the former Minister of Finance announced to this Chamber that his government would make it as one of their principal priorities, the elimination of the Property Tax Credit Program in the Province of Manitoba; that's what he said, Mr. Speaker. What he was trying to do last year, because he didn't have the courage to wipe out the Tax Credit Program, he was trying to whittle it down, narrow it down, eliminate it through the back door. Mr. Speaker, he was found out this year.

Mr. Speaker, it's probably the reason we have a different Minister of Finance bringing in the Budget this year. Obviously the Minister of Finance that was responsible for the incompetence and ineptitude and in fact, Mr. Speaker, I have to say again, deceit, was obviously not the Minister that would be entrusted with the responsibility of making corrections for next year in the Tax Credit Program.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have a government that said that they were going to be the friends of the taxpayer. They've made reference in the Budget as well on Page 60, to the importance of ability-to-pay in taxation, very clearly spelled out. But we don't find, Mr. Speaker, references to just what that has meant to the low and middle income people of this province. They don't spell out that bus fares, just recently increased from 25 cents from when they first took office up to 60 cents, an increase of 50 percent, representing a tax of \$175, a discrimination between one that rides a transit bus and one that operates a car; they don't mention that tuition fees for Arts and other students have increased rapidly during the term of their government; they don't mention that the Pharmacare deductible was increased by 50 percent; they don't mention that the Autopac deductible was increased by 100 percent without any publicity, without any advertising, Mr. Speaker, they just simply increased the deductible for Autopac by 100 percent quietly hoping it wouldn't be discovered, just like the Tax Credit Program, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, they don't seem to ever give the people of the Province of Manitoba much credit for sophistication, much credit for intelligence. Mr. Speaker, they have been found out again and again, pertaining to their actions, because Manitobans have come to know what to expect from the government across the way.

Mr. Speaker, there's no mention in the Minister's Budget as to the increase in gas tax. Since last October provincial tax on gasoline has increased from 18 cents to more than 23 cents a gallon, a 30 percent jump and there is no indication by the Minister responsible for Finance what that increase in gas tax is going to be for 1981. I don't even know whether the Minister of Transportation knows; I doubt whether he does know; he would prefer not to know, Mr. Speaker.

But when we're speaking, Mr. Speaker, about increases in regard to tobacco and liquor, would you not have thought that the Minister of Finance was anxious to provide a total and complete picture, that he would have told us how many more millions of dollars have been extracted as a result of their gasoline tax policy, which means that every time gas prices are increased in Manitoba this government enjoys an additional chunk of any increase in gas prices in the Province of Manitoba. They're mum, they piggyback on every increase that takes place in the Province of Manitoba and, Mr. Speaker, I haven't had opportunities I might to find some reference, maybe there's some reference away back in the fine print somewhere, I don't know, but I just can't in a cursory examination. I leave it to the Minister to point out otherwise some reference to the gas tax, some estimate just what additional tax revenues might accrue to the Province of Manitoba because of their new found approaches and methods of imposing a tax on gasoline in the Province of Manitoba.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have had an addition as I mentioned, the Tax Credit Program that extracted millions of dollars this year from those of low and middle income, tax credits this year reduced by some \$15 million. We had the Hydro Rate Program three years ago, and what we're finding out now, Mr. Speaker, is that we didn't even require a freeze by way of hydro rates in Manitoba. The present hydro rate reserves would have paid for the hydro rate increases that would have otherwise have taken place. But instead, Mr. Speaker, they have seen fit to extract \$81 million from the Treasury of the Province of Manitoba of much-needed tax dollars to Manitoba Hydro — unneeded, unnecessary — Manitoba Hydro could have in itself absorbed any Hydro rate increases.

So, Mr. Speaker, when they tell us that they are the friend of the taxpayer, I simply pose to you, Mr. Speaker, with friends like that, who needs enemies?

Mr. Speaker, what we have seen is a need for a fresh and new approach in the Province of Manitoba. In the past number of months I have had opportunity to speak to many Manitobans, young farmers that thought that this indeed was a government that would represent the interests of farmers. But I found that the price of farmland has skyrocketed under this Minister of Agriculture because this Minister of Agriculture has permitted, since 1978, major loopholes to exist in The Farmlands Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, one of the first priorities of a New Democratic party government will be to remove those loopholes that exist within The Farmlands Protection Act in order to prevent foreign speculators and others from using the corporate veil in order to drive up the price of farmland in the Province of Manitoba; 20 percent increase in

farmland in the last year, interest rate of 20 percent. The Minister of Agriculture sits in his seat, continues to smile, continues to exercise no initiative, no thrust in respect to this.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to those in mining communities in the Province of Manitoba, mining communities that cannot understand why it is that we have a government that has failed to ensure that there be maximum return of mineral resource wealth to the people of the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, a priority of a New Democratic party government will be to ensure increased public participation in mineral development in the Province of Manitoba in order to ensure that there is maximum return to Manitobans of the mineral and oil resources in the Province of Manitoba.

I have spoken to small business people that thought that this would be a government that would be the friend of the small business people. But small business people that have been hit by constantly rising interest rates, bit by way of retail sales and a government that in fact had, as we witnessed last night, hardly an iota of program for the small business community in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why this government after three-and-a-half years, knowing full well that the business people of this province have been hit by ever-rising rates of bankruptcies and foreclosures, could not have undertaken some form of action outside of that misguided policy that the Minister of Economic Development is responsible for, that Manitoba Enterprises Program; a program that can be demonstrated, Mr. Speaker, that millions of dollars have been paid out to, most of the businesses that have received those grants would have started operations anyway.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister tells us that he is presently monitoring that program. What we will do upon forming government is to ensure that we have a form of policy by which interest rates will be abated, similar to that in the Province of Saskatchewan, by way, Mr. Speaker, of the small businesses in the rural communities in Saskatchewan. How much better it would be to abate rising interest rates with that money which has presently been used by the Minister of Economic Development by way of handouts.

Mr. Speaker, the business people of this province do not ask for handouts. What they ask for is some relief from rising interest rates in the Province of Manitoba, some relief from bankruptcies. This government has failed them, the result, Mr. Speaker, they ask, with friends like that, who needs enemies?

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have as well the people of Northern Manitoba. I know members across the way haven't availed of themselves of the opportunity to speak to many in Northern Manitoba, but I've spoken to those in communities where the high unemployment rate exists, some instances 50 percent, 70 percent, 80 percent, to those that are attempting to make do with large families.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Where Howard?

**MR. PAWLEY:** The Minister of Transportation says "where". Mr. Speaker, it's a sad and deplorable state of affairs when a Minister in a government is so totally lacking information as to what is taking place in the province that he is supposed to be

representative of. It's sad, it's deplorable. — (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I'll be glad to point out to him where that exists in the Province of Manitoba, and in the core of the City of Winnipeg within a brief distance from where we sit now, in case the Minister is not aware, unemployment rates of 50 and 60 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Churchill, the Member for Rupertsland, the Member for The Pas, the Member for Flin Flon will delight in giving the Minister of Transportation some information pertaining to this that the Minister of Transportation is so totally ignorant of the unemployment that exists in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, but what can we expect when it was the Minister of Municipal Affairs that told us it was better to keep people on welfare than to undertake job creation programs in Northern Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, one of the first priorities of a New Democratic party government will be to create job training, job creation, the development of skills in all those areas of high unemployment in the Province of Manitoba so that the best in Manitobans can be put to its true potential, so that people in the Province of Manitoba can contribute to ensuring that goods and services are being made by the people of the Province of Manitoba rather than skills and talents that do in many cases now, Mr. Speaker, lie dormant, be permitted to continue to lie dormant.

Mr. Speaker, if there was an area that I want to most associate myself with in this regard it's the real efforts that were undertaken by the former Premier of this province, Ed Schreyer, when he did indeed generate a great deal of job activity in Northern Manitoba; when indeed he did not respond as the Minister of Transportation just responded a few moments ago — where does it exist? The former Premier of this province knew when he was elected in 1969 that it existed; he went out to Northern Manitoba, he went out personally into Northern Manitoba; he undertook to create jobs in Northern Manitoba; he created those jobs, Mr. Speaker, and unfortunately this government has massacred so many of those jobs in the space of the past three-and-a-half years, and for that, Mr. Speaker, this government will be long remembered in Northern Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, another area that is of most concern to us is the fact that in 1977 Manitoba Hydro activity pertaining to the construction of Limestone was deferred by way of a motion of the Board of Directors of Manitoba Hydro. In 1978 Limestone was cancelled out completely by this government and we've been awaiting from 1978 to the present time of some announcement. The Minister responsible for Hydro tells us, and he's been telling us now in three Throne Speeches, that negotiations are under way in respect to an east-west connection. We still don't have any information tabled in this House by way of preliminary studies. We don't have any information. There has been no openness in the Chamber as to negotiations that have been taking place.

Mr. Speaker, we are not opposed to an east-west connection if it's not going to result in Manitobans, this generation and future generations, subsidizing the ratepayers of Alberta and Saskatchewan, as indeed is the case in Newfoundland and Quebec, British Columbia and Seattle in Washington,

Columbia Treaty; what we do call upon this government is to put all the facts on the table so we know.

But, Mr. Speaker, what we have had over the past three years has been a neglect of any effort to negotiate any firm non-interruptible sales with any of the utilities that could have taken advantage of the north-south line from Winnipeg to Minneapolis. Three years, Mr. Speaker, by which there have been no negotiations because this government has been negotiating the east-west connection. During those three years, Mr. Speaker, the cost of Limestone has increased from approximately \$1 billion to closer to \$2 billion. Interest rates have increased because of three years, Mr. Speaker, of delay; we've had very little to demonstrate for it; the cost is going to be much greater.

Mr. Speaker, the revelations of the last seven days, ten days certainly doesn't provide us with any confidence as to the type of leadership that the Minister responsible for Hydro is providing to Manitoba Hydro, is providing on this issue by way of development of east-west connection, the development of contracts north-south. All that we do know is that Limestone has not been proceeded with; the effect and impact of that, Mr. Speaker, has been the loss of a great deal of economic activity in Manitoba, the loss of a lot of construction workers, other skilled workers, with no certainty. Mr. Speaker, one of the undertakings that we will proceed to do is to ensure the orderly commencement at the earliest time of Limestone upon our achieving office.

Mr. Speaker, one of the fundamental differences between our party and the Conservative party is that we believe that it is fundamental that government must undertake a responsibility for the revitalization, the activation of the economy. In 1978 this government saw fit to withdraw economic activity from Manitoba. They froze personal care home construction, hospital construction, senior citizen housing, other forms of family housing were not proceeded with in Manitoba. Hundreds of millions of dollars were withdrawn from the economy of the Province of Manitoba. So it's no accident that the rate of growth in Manitoba is now only 10 percent of the national rate of growth compared to 80 percent of the rate of growth in the period 1969 to 1977.

The New Democratic party upon election will ensure that during times of sluggishness in the economy, in times of stagnation, that government will plan orderly development of construction of public projects in Manitoba, so we will not have as we have on the part of this Conservative government construction drought, drought by way of no government activity for three years, then suddenly a spurt of government activity during election year, money being tossed around like confetti in the development of various projects that should have been proceeded with a year ago, two years, three years ago. Mr. Speaker, how much better we would have had if we had a government that was committed to the role of government in managing the economy in an efficient and competent manner rather than a government that has resulted, by way of its economic doctrinaire theories, rigid ideological right-wing stance, which has abdicated its responsibility and which has resulted in Manitoba slipping further and further behind insofar as its relationship to other provinces in Canada.

We've had considerable debate in respect to health care in this Chamber this session and one of the areas that most concerned us and one sees so often in travels about the Province of Manitoba is the plight of our elderly and ill in personal care homes, personal care homes that are seeing their per diems increased 25 percent this year, double the rate of inflation. Though, I must point out to members across the way and again not referred to in the Budget, so many comparisons are made in 1976-77 that the rate of increase by way of per diems in personal care homes in the period 1976-77 never exceeded the consumer price index in the Province of Manitoba. This year it will exceed the consumer price index by more than double because of their policies.

Mr. Speaker, we will ensure, upon our assuming government, that the elderly and the ill in the Province of Manitoba in the personal care homes of this province will not be expected to carry the burden of inflation around their necks; that the rates charged in per diems in personal care homes will not rise faster than the rate of inflation. Mr. Speaker, the personal care homes that are being constructed by this government, constructed by way of their ignoring requests from non-profit and charitable groups, that are being opened and developed by private entrepreneurs, is a policy that we have debated at length in this Chamber and we've expressed our sharpest opposition to. We've asked the Minister of Health to at least supply, ensure that financial statements are supplied because of the subsidy that was poured into private nursing homes last year to the extent of \$1.3 million. None of such has been coming, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we shall ensure, upon forming government, that there will be no further construction of private motivated nursing homes in the Province of Manitoba. If they don't have the guts to ensure that they can be quite certain that a New Democratic party government will ensure that there will be no further construction of private nursing homes in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we've had such little legislation introduced this session which again is indicating, as well as the Budget, the vacuum that takes place. You know, Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult dealing with a Budget that is so completely void of any thrust or any ideas whatsoever. As I mentioned earlier, we have a Budget that was supposed to be the epitome of three-and-a-half years of Conservative administration, that should be an exciting document according to their ideology that they have advanced over and over again, but a document that has been nothing but a series of alibis, a series of apologies; a document that provides no insight into any initiative; a document that refuses and totally ignores the fact that there is need in Manitoba for a new economic thrust; a document that provides no social policy in dealing with health and education in the Province of Manitoba; Mr. Speaker, a document that has been a complete failure.

Somebody asked me the question last night whether or not this was an election Budget. Mr. Speaker, my only comment to them, that if it's intended to be an election Budget the Opposition are anxious, anxious to use it as an election issue. If it's an election Budget it is one that the Opposition

welcomes and, Mr. Speaker, if there ever was any convincing that there is need for a new government in the Province of Manitoba, that there is need for a government will undertake affirmative action in Manitoba, a government that will provide fresh ideas, that has been demonstrated by this document that was tabled in this House last night.

Mr. Speaker, in case there is any doubt the Opposition is prepared to campaign through the length and breadth of this province on the basis of the complete abdication of responsibility on the part of this government for the economy in Manitoba; how they have completely sacrificed and abandoned their commitments they made to Manitobans in 1977; how that commitment by the Premier of this province that he saw a new vision, a new vision for the young and for those of Northern Manitoba, a vision of how there would be opportunities for the young people in the Province of Manitoba; how indeed that vision has been dashed by the bankruptcies of ideas on the part of the government across the way; how that Premier that took office on October 11 boasted that he was going to balance the books, that indeed there would be fiscal responsibility in the Province of Manitoba; how he was getting rid of the high spending, reckless Budgetmakers of the period 1969-77; how indeed he celebrated the fact that the arsonists had been shuffled out of office in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, we're ready, we're anxious; we're anxious to campaign and to expose that hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker, how that government announced in Rossmere that it was going to be an open government, a new government, a government of the people in which documents and materials would be made available. Mr. Speaker, we are going to expose that government. We are going to expose that government for the fact that it is a government that has utilized deceit in this Chamber; that is a government that again and again has attempted to cover up; that the very fact the Minister of Finance used a letter, a letter to forward to 13,000 civil servants in this province, postage paid, compliments of the people of the Province of Manitoba, to place a partisan interpretation upon an action in which he himself indeed was responsible for about two weeks ago in this Chamber; he was responsible for, he can't duck his responsibility in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, we have a government that is so frightened and is so desperate that they are now spending thousands of dollars of public funds in trying to rescue their sinking ship in Manitoba.

The ads last fall, we all saw those ads last fall being spent by the Minister responsible for Community Services. In fact they were the ads, Mr. Speaker, of the sweet little old lady pushing the cart through the shopping centre. They were telling the senior citizens of this province what great friends they were of the senior citizens in Manitoba; what great friends they were of the senior citizens in this province. Mr. Speaker, they were telling the people of the Province of Manitoba that same message as the former Minister of Finance had, as a huckster, changed the Tax Credit Program of this province so that only senior citizens would find out about it when they were filling out their income tax returns. Mr. Speaker, why didn't the Minister of Community Services advertise in a massive scale: Senior

citizens of the Province of Manitoba you should be warned that when you make out your income tax returns this coming year you are going to meet with a great deal of confusion and frustration because of certain legislative changes that we introduced in the spring of 1980. Were there any such ads? No, Mr. Speaker. Why were there no such ads? Because, Mr. Speaker, they were only interested in trying to sell that which is the impossible in the Province of Manitoba.

Then, Mr. Speaker, if that was not enough, what were we confronted with this spring? Mr. Speaker, I haven't checked it out yet but I'm going to be checking out what the Minister of Economic Development has done. He said that his TV ads only cost \$62,000, were only going to last for six weeks. Now, I don't know whether it's the boredom from those ads, Mr. Speaker, but it seems to me they've been running for at least three months on the TV channels in the Province of Manitoba. And the Minister of Economic Development, Mr. Speaker, because he is so bankrupt of ideas and because he's led this province nowhere but down, by way of economic development in the Province of Manitoba, has no suggestion to the people of Manitoba by way of new policy thrust, but to advertise on TV, and he advertises on TV that Manitobans should be satisfied with Manitoba; that indeed Manitobans should stay in Manitoba and not join the increasing numbers that are leaving from Manitoba to Alberta, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and to Ontario. What a sad state of affairs, Mr. Speaker, when the Province of Manitoba by way of its Minister of Economic Development is reduced to those levels.

Mr. Speaker, what we have been confronted with is a pamphlet here in the House the other day being distributed to all members of the Legislature, a pamphlet compliments of the government of the Province of Manitoba, outlining — of course, not at the compliments of taxpayers' money — again, an estimate \$32,000.00. We'll be checking out that estimate, too, let me mention, Mr. Speaker, but I don't, for one, don't buy that estimate that the First Minister advanced in this Chamber the other day.

Constitutional Issues for the People of Manitoba. Picture of the First Minister, item No. 1, a friendly smiling picture of the First Minister. Was it McKim Agencies that prepared this, I wonder, McKim Agencies. I believe McKim Agencies are doing the public relations work of the Progressive Conservative party so I assume that they would have undertaken this work too in nice Tory blue, Mr. Speaker, ah, boy, Mr. Speaker, fit well into a Conservative party pamphlet kit; Robert Stanfield. Mr. Speaker, just to try to pretend, there's others inside with them, a picture of Allan Blakeney. No objection to that, Mr. Speaker, we have every respect for Allan Blakeney and the position that he's been adopting. To try to make an appeal to the Liberal voters in the Province of Manitoba, to undertake to make an appeal to the Liberal voters in the Province of Manitoba — a picture of D. L. Campbell. And just those Red Tories can be happy, Mr. Speaker, a picture of Duff Rublin from the days of the Sixties; and a picture of Claude Ryan. Mr. Speaker, we couldn't help but wonder, we questioned the First Minister, where is the picture of Rene Levesque? Where is the picture of Peter Lougheed? Where is the picture of Peckford down in

Newfoundland? And above all, why not Joe Clark; why not Joe Clark on this pamphlet?

Mr. Speaker, what I find despicable is that the First Minister rose in his chair to suggest the Opposition had not position in respect to the Constitution. But, Mr. Speaker, I ask, was it the government that was pressing for the establishment of a committee of this Chamber to deal with the Constitution? The answer was no. Was it the government after the committee was established that was urging that the committee get on with its hearings, Mr. Speaker? The answer is no, Mr. Speaker, and the government now has a resolution. Well, they haven't proceeded with that resolution.

I want to simply mention, Mr. Speaker, that it's rather a passing note that the First Minister talked a great deal about unilateral action on the part of the Federal government, and Mr. Speaker, I for one disagree with the unilateral action on the part of the Federal Government, but I know there has been unilateral action on the part of the First Minister of the Province of Manitoba. The First Minister of the Province of Manitoba introduced a resolution into this Chamber, but did he pick up the phone and call the Leader of the Opposition? I wonder if he called the Member for Fort Rouge? Did he call the Leader of the Progressive party? The answer is no, Mr. Speaker. He introduced his resolution into this Chamber, there was no effort on the part of the First Minister to see if there could be any resolution that would meet general agreement in this Chamber, and the First Minister has the audacity to complain about unilateral action on the part of the Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, what we have been observing in respect to this entire question of the Constitution is that the Prime Minister and the Premier of the Province of Manitoba and other Premiers, unfortunately, found this an issue that has been used repeatedly to divert attention from the real problems that exist within their jurisdictions and those real problems being economic in the Province of Manitoba — jobs for our young people, a suitable quality of life for working men and women in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just mention that I can't get excited about a Liberal Constitution, a Conservative Constitution, whatever constitution is developed in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, are not going to deal with the fundamental problems of Canada, fundamental problems of Canada that we've been afflicted with for the past 100 years because of governments that reflected the political philosophies of the Liberal party and the Conservative party in Canada.

Governments indeed such as this government, such as this government, Mr. Speaker, that has seen fit again and again to kowtow to the Premier of Alberta; that has supported the Premier of Alberta by way of additional energy prices. And they cloak that, Mr. Speaker, just as they utilize other skillful means, other very skillful means to conceal their real purposes, just as they use other purposes, means. They want additional prices for oil that will assist us in reaching self-sufficiency. Mr. Speaker, translate that to mean prices that are suitable to the demands by Peter Lougheed in the Province of Alberta, that's what they mean, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, who is Peter Lougheed attempting to satisfy in the Province

of Alberta? Who is he trying to satisfy — the multinational oil companies in the Province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, while the multinational oil companies become richer and richer, then let members deny that the increase in profits on the part of the multinational oil companies in 1979, 1980 and into 1981 have been not exorbitant; let them deny that. And while the Heritage Fund in the Province of Alberta has been fattened more and more, Mr. Speaker, they support the policies of the Premier of the Province of Albert; they continue to hold the coat for the Premier of the Province of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, that is why, if we do indeed appear exercised, we are exercised because we have had a Premier that has not been reflecting a Manitoba position pertaining to the constitution. What is required, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to matters pertaining to the constitution, not a constitution that's going to be made in Edmonton, not a constitution that's going to be made according to the whims of partisan interests in Ottawa or Regina, Mr. Speaker, what is required is a position by the government of the Province of Manitoba reflecting the needs of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, we do disagree with unilateral conduct and action on the part of the Prime Minister and indeed, Mr. Speaker, last September 5th that was made very very clear by way of statements, it's been made since, the Member for Rossmere went to great lengths several weeks ago to outline our position in regard to the constitution. So, who is the First Minister trying to kid when he stands up in his place and tries to suggest there isn't an Opposition position pertaining to the constitution.

Mr. Speaker, what is required in Manitoba is again a government — and it's going to be difficult, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have difficulty because there has been a great deal of damage that's been done the last three-and-half years to the economy of this province, there is no doubt about that, We've lost so many of our sons and daughters from Manitoba; we've had so many of our businesses that have been forced into bankruptcy that have been foreclosed upon the last two, three years; we've had so much by way of plant closure; we've lost hundreds of employees in this province.

Mr. Speaker, they talk about megaprojects. Before Christmas I recall the Throne Speech; in the Throne Speech I would have suspected that the megaprojects were going to be announced even before the new year. Well, I hope we have some announcements that are in the interest of the people of Manitoba. But, Mr. Speaker, was Swift not a megaproject disaster? Was the closure of the Tribune not a megaproject disaster? And, Mr. Speaker, certainly the megadisasters of the past year and two years, by way of increasing bankruptcies within the small business community in this provinces, are amongst the greatest.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's going to require a great deal of energy and effort, fresh approach, new ideas, to repair some of the damage that has been done since 1977 in Manitoba by this Conservative government across the way.

Mr. Speaker, by way of that I want to simply again stress the fact that our government will be active and not passive; that our government will be affirmative;

that our government's not simply going to depend upon T.V. advertising; that our government will ensure that projects and programs are initiated during times of sluggishness in the economy; that our government will ensure that there is orderly development of Manitoba Hydro because power in this province is as potash is in Saskatchewan, oil in Alberta and timber in British Columbia. And yet, Mr. Speaker, energy development of this province has been permitted to be neglected for the past three years. I want to say this, and unfortunately the Minister of Hydro isn't present, but he wouldn't be able to negotiate with Alberta and Saskatchewan at the present time if it wasn't for the vision, the designing, the plans, the thrust, the activist-type of government that was represented by the former Premier of this province, Ed Shreyer, when he ensured there was a development of that infrastructure that went into place in respect to Northern Manitoba. We wouldn't even be able to negotiate if it wasn't for that sort of thrust and initiative in the mid-'70s.

Mr. Speaker, they have attempted to discredit those efforts by the former government of the province of Manitoba and I noticed with interest, Mr. Speaker, that the First Minister the other day, in trying to answer feebly criticisms from the Opposition pertaining to the cover-up in regard to Hydro, said, well, it wouldn't require a legal opinion requesting application to the courts; all that would be required would be an amendment, an amendment to the Order-in-Council which established the Commission of Inquiry. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask what amendment in an Order-in-Council would have corrected the unfair and impartial manner by which the Tritschler Commission conducted its proceeding; what amendment would have prevented the massive denial of natural justice that the Tritschler Commission was responsible for; what amendment would have corrected the breach on the part of the Tritschler Commission of its betrayal of the best traditions of common law; what amendment would have prevented the leading questions which, in fact, numbered well in excess of 2,000 being placed by a council for the commission; what amendment to the Order-in-Council would have remedied attempts to harrass, to demean, and to vilify the Hydro employees that were called as witnesses, what amendment to the Order-in-Council would have remedied that, Mr. Speaker; what amendment would have remedied the Star Court Chamber process that went under way in this building but two months ago suggesting indeed that it was a fair impartial proceeding; what amendment to the Order-in-Council could have remedied the Star Court Chamber proceedings that were indeed taking place and the impact that that had on a lot of good sound public servants that had served Manitoba Hydro for years and years, and had served this province well?

Mr. Speaker, we've been noting the increasing anxiety of members across the way. You know, Mr. Speaker, if the government were so cocksure of themselves, also confident, then it's interesting to observe that they never seem to be able to present positive arguments by way of response; they never seem to be able to present program thrusts. Instead, Mr. Speaker, what we have is constant barrage of personal insults; what we have, Mr. Speaker, is the

attempt to create strawmen, women constantly; what we have indeed is a government that generates as many red herrings as they possibly can in this Chamber. What we find instead, Mr. Speaker, is a government that is lacking confidence in its own direction and for good reason. A government that was confident in 1977 that had found new direction; a government that was confident that it had new vision; a government that would turn the province around and improve the lot of all Manitobans, economically and socially, and in the process would balance the Budget of Manitoba. Instead, Mr. Speaker, we have had three-and-a-half years of protracted acute restraint. We've had the stagnation that has brought to the economy as a whole; we've had the serious impact that that has had on many social programs, health programs, in the Province of Manitoba. We have had the exodus of some of our best citizens from this province, young people, professional people, skilled people, to other parts of the province. What we've had in this province is growing cynicism and lack of confidence on the part of so many Manitobans in the part of this government to conduct the affairs of this province.

Mr. Speaker, the only response that we get from this government again and again, particularly from the First Minister, from other members, personal insults and barbs. If I can offer advice to the government across the way — continue the route that you are proceeding. Because the road that you are continuing to follow is the one that is leading to your own self-destruct. I would not for a moment want to advise you to do anything else, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, one of the best pieces of news that we had received was what was contained in this Budget last night, because it was an admission of failure, it was alibi, it was excuses, it was apologies, it was a resume, a regurgitation of the 1973-1977 period. It was not a Budget in the normal sense, in the traditional sense; it was a confession of wrong, of where a government had failed. In fact of a political party that after three-and-a-half years has recognized that the God that they once put trust in had failed; reminds me of a story that I read about a former communist in Yugoslavia. After Marshall Tito took power in Yugoslavia this former comrade of Marshall Tito found in fact that Yugoslavia was not advancing towards that kind of society that Marshall Tito had caused those that supported him to expect. New classes developed. The book was entitled, "The God that Failed."

Mr. Speaker, we have a government across the way that has struck out. Its ideology that it once put confidence in has not supported them in their time of need. They have deserted all that they once represented, once stood for. Mr. Speaker, the only problem is that they're caught now in abandoning their former ideological position but they can't accept an ideology that would say that there should be more active role, more affirmative role for government stimulating the economy, improving the quality of life. Because if they did that, Mr. Speaker, they would be admitting indeed that they were wrong along, that the Opposition was right all along. So they're caught in a no man's land, they're caught in kind of a twilight zone, Mr. Speaker, and that's the problem that we've been confronted with for the past three-and-a-half years in Manitoba. A government

that didn't have the guts and the gumption to carry out that which they represented that they would carry out in 1977, betrayed that commitment, that promise, now, Mr. Speaker, have nothing to offer in its place.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Member for St. Johns that all the words following the word "House" be deleted and the following added:

Expresses regret that in presenting a bankrupt budgetary policy the government

1) has introduced no significant new programs and nothing which would revitalize the Manitoba economy and halt the unprecedented outmigration from the province;

2) has ignored the serious problems faced by small businesses, farmers, northerners, working men and women and all other Manitobans struggling in a stagnant economy with high prices and high interest rates, offering instead a dismal apology for inaction and;

3) has broken faith with Manitobans by projecting the largest ever Manitoba deficit and by rejecting the government's own pledge to reduce public debt.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hour is 5:30. The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.