

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 95 students, Grade 9 standing, of the Schroeder Junior High School from Grand Forks, North Dakota, under the direction of Mr. Kulack, as our guests.

We also have 46 students, Grade 5 standing, of the Sherwood School under the direction of Mrs. Borody, from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood, the Minister of Public Works.

And we have 20 students, Grades 4 and 5 standing, of the Thicket Portage School under the direction of Mr. De Rook. This school is from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Thompson.

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

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY, Attorney-General (Selkirk) introduced **Bill (No. 59), An Act to amend The Human Rights Act.**

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the First Minister. It arises out of the statements made by Manitoba Hydro yesterday indicating that they would be . . . Excuse me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Labour as the Minister responsible for the Fire Department, having to do with the near tragedy in Brandon two days ago. Has the Minister ordered an on-the-spot inspection or inquiry that nearly cost the life of another youngster in the City of Brandon? This was through the Provincial Fire Training School practice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any near tragedy. I presume near tragedies are happening at all times, vis-a-vis in Brandon or anywhere else. But if my honourable friend would give me some particulars, I would be more than pleased to cause inquiries to be made and inform my honourable friend.

MR. MCGREGOR: To give a little more explanation to the question, Mr. Speaker, it was a case of the Fire Department burning down some old building and after it was well ablaze, a youngster ran out of that building with his clothes on fire. That's the kind of inquiry that I think is absolutely essential at this hour.

MR. PAULLEY: Then, Mr. Speaker, I would assure my honourable friend I will have the matter looked into and try and find reasons or causes for the situation that he refers to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Can we still expect any amendments to The Employment Standards Act this session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that if my honourable friend would take the time out to read Votes and Proceedings, he would note that there is an indication of amendments to The Employment Standards Act and I believe that I have made the announcement in the House further to the official documentation that some amendments are in the process of being documented. I am very hopeful that my honourable friend will have an opportunity in the forthcoming week to debate with me the contents of said legislation.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I would like to know when because I have read the Votes and Proceedings but it appears to me that piece of legislation seems to be moving at a very slow or crawling pace.

MR. PAULLEY: The wheels of justice oft times move exceedingly slowly but surely as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Can he confirm that the government has occasioned a study by the different departments as to the kinds of documents and information that they disclose or that they keep privileged for public information and

access?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, Premier (Rossmere): Negative.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Might not that answer indicate that the Member from St. Matthews who has sent a memo to these different departments is acting independently or is acting, in fact, on the instructions of the government?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, documents that are prepared at public expense, unless they have to do with personnel matters within the Public Service, or have to do with matters that are under current negotiation, or have to do with matters that have to do with the defense of the country, other than that I couldn't care less if my honourable friend gets whatever copies he likes.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. That was not my question. The question I asked the First Minister is, has the Member from St. Matthews been acting on the instructions of the Cabinet or the Government when he has requested from each of the individual departments for a report on the kinds of documents that they either keep privileged to themselves or provide access to the public?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, since I'm not specifically aware of the contents of that letter or memorandum, I'll have to check.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Mines and Resources, I wonder if the First Minister could . . . well, since the Minister is now entering the House, perhaps I'll direct my question to him. I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Resources could advise the House if the Department of Water Control, which he reports to the House, have increased the rates for filling dugouts from \$100, which they were charging last fall, to \$200 this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HONOURABLE SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, the increase took place some time ago, I think over a year ago, and has to do with updating it to recover full cost to the department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Mr. Speaker, will Section 123(2) of Bill 14 apply to the Hydro campsites at Long Spruce and Limestone?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would like the honourable member to be a bit more specific in regard to what respect.

MR. WILSON: Well, the government, Mr. Speaker, has a rule where they are going to take the power of policing the camps out of the decision of the company and put it into the hands of the Rentalsman and I wondered if the Minister might explain how the Rentalsman will police the camps, who will the government delegate the new powers of the Rentalsman to, in other words, under Section 126 the Rentalsman can delegate the policing and supervision of these camps to somebody else. My concern is for the production in these camps. In other words, you're allowing certain new rights under that section.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I now know a bit more of the subject matter, so I will take it under advisement and report back.

MR. WILSON: Well, my supplementary then is, could the Minister also explain how he could side with one rowdy person against the sleeping rights of countless other men who are there to work?

MR. SPEAKER: Question is hypothetical. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he can indicate whether there has been any discussion with the government or with him as Minister by Flyer Industries with respect to the sale of the buses to the City of Winnipeg and the sale price?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Mines.

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether the sale price of the buses to Winnipeg is a higher price than is normally tendered by Flyer to other buyers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the City of Winnipeg is able to check the price that they are paying for buses with other bus purchases throughout Canada. I might say to the honourable member that the City of Winnipeg and its representatives have been the strongest proponents of the Government of Manitoba continuing to keep Flyer as a viable enterprise in the Province of Manitoba. One of the strongest factors in our recent decision with regard to our attempting to maintain Flyer has been the urgings of the representatives of the City of Winnipeg. With regard to the price for buses, Mr. Speaker, Flyer, as does any other commercial enterprise, bids different prices at different times in accordance with the needs of their commercial enterprise. But with regard to the City, Mr. Speaker, they can check the prices that they are paying for buses with any other buses purchased in Canada.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, then, I wonder if the Minister can confirm that the government did not allow the price to be increased to be able to funnel more public money as a result of the direct subsidy given to

the City with respect to the purchase of Flyer buses?

MR. GREEN: False, Mr. Speaker. The price of the Flyer buses is one which was established by the Flyer Board. What the government did is not interfere with Flyer in the price that it was setting for its buses, on the understanding that with regard to the City of Winnipeg, it had to set prices which were the kind of prices that Winnipeg would have to pay for buses if they purchased them in any other place. But that does not affect what Flyer does in tendering, Mr. Speaker. Tendering is a practice, which perhaps the honourable member is not aware of, which results in different prices being given at different times in accordance with the exigencies of a company's operation at any one time.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder, then, if the Minister is in a position to assure the House that Flyer is so organized now that it is capable of knowing what its costs are?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the productive capacity of Flyer, as demonstrated over the last two years, in spite of the fact that it has to undergo problems which no private company has to undergo, and I don't say that as an apology, I say that as a fact, has been as efficient as any company in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Woleseley.

MR. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Would the Minister confirm that his department is now, because of the MPIC or otherwise, collecting cash bonds from small businessmen in his bonding policy, and refusing to pay interest on this large windfall, this large windfall of cash bond deposits which is going to the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I have no reason to believe that the department is operating outside of the regulation of federal laws and provincial laws and regulations as passed by this House or the House of Commons. If the honourable member has an indication that we are not, I would like him to be more specific.

MR. WILSON: A supplementary to that no-answer. Would the Minister confirm that money collected by property management people for certain security deposits, they must pay interest, and I wondered why the government doesn't?

MR. TOUPIN: My previous answer stands, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: My question is to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. Due to the fact that the bank tellers in Ontario have at long last seen the light and are seeking to become organized, will you encourage the bank tellers of Manitoba to move in the same direction?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the banking industry is under, of course, federal law, and I presume that that would apply to bank tellers as well as other employees in that jurisdiction, but I would highly recommend to the Minister of Labour at the federal level that he follow the policy of this government and extend free collective bargaining rights and free association rights to all employees in all industries.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. The Public Utilities Board, in examining a rate increase asked for by the gas companies, by the natural gas companies, has allowed a delay for consumer groups to come forward, to be able to prepare properly and make their presentation. I wonder if the First Minister would consider that as a possibility for consumer groups to come forward to deal with the rate increases of hydro?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker' just so my honourable friend knows, I regard that as a stupid question.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister does not consider that the rights of consumers with respect to a rise of the price of natural gas are not the same rights that they should have with respect to a rise of the price of hydro?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the rates to be charged by Greater Winnipeg Gas are determined and adjudicated by the Public Utilities Board to ensure that the rate base that is established is appropriate, and that the rate of return is appropriate, and to take into account costs of operation, costs of expansion. With respect to Manitoba Hydro, the rates are based on costs of operation, costs of expansion. If there were any surplus, which there is not, but if there were, it simply does not get dissipated, but rather is retained by the utilities so that the rates can be lower the following year. There is no diversion of funds. What is the point of my honourable friend's silly question?

MR. SPIVAK: Is it the position of the First Minister that consumers rights are not to be protected simply because Hydro is not organized for a profit?

MR. SCHREYER: Because Manitoba Hydro operates under a Statute of this House, the public interest is protected by a virtue of that statute, by virtue of the fact that any rates that are charged by Manitoba Hydro must be used by Manitoba Hydro for purposes of maintenance and/or expansion of the system, and therefore, since there is no diversion of funds, the public interest is protected in that

fashion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights. Final question.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder if the First Minister would not consider that the only occasion upon which Hydro has gone to the Public Utilities Board, and the decision by the Public Utilities Board at that time warrants the public interest being protected by such a review being made at this particular time?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend implies that any and all decisions of the Public Utilities Board would be to the effect of reducing a rate or reducing the amount of increase in rate. I can advise my honourable friend that I am aware of one occasion in which the Utilities Board urged an increase which subsequently was not implemented since there was no need for it at that time and for a period of two or three years. In the final analysis, Sir, a utility that operates under Statute Law, precluding any diversion of funds, that the public interest is protected by virtue of that Statute Law rather than by some administrative process.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister can confirm that one of the reasons for the high increase in hydro is because the government ignored the judgment of the Public Utilities Board in not raising the rates at that time?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons for the rate of increase in Manitoba Hydro rates is that there has been an increase in energy rates, be it fossil fuel or electrical, everywhere in this country and every jurisdiction in this country and this continent. My honourable friend if he wants to be silly and play games, of course could continue to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage La Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Honourable the Attorney-General in his capacity as Minister responsible for the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission. Is it government policy that Mr. Frank Syms is espousing when he has been attacking the breweries and distilleries for support of amateur sport?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a matter that is better dealt with within the Estimate review.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister another question in connection with this matter. Would he not consider it proper to reprimand Mr. Frank Syms for his unwarranted attack on an industry over which he is trying to exert a control because he does business with them?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not think it would be proper to reprimand the Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission. He has expressed his opinion in this connection and I think that it is an opinion that is shared by many.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister responsible for Tourism. The Assiniboia Museum Centre has been served notice that the Tourist Bureau will be relocated from that site. Can the Minister indicate to me where the Manitoba Tourist Bureau offices on that side of the city will now be located and perhaps give some reasons why, of the relocation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Tourism.

HONOURABLE BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Well, Mr. Speaker, I think, as honourable members know, as soon as — and this is within the power of the House — as soon as we get to the Estimates of the next department the Estimates of which will be considered, will be those of the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, and I think that that question could be dealt with more properly at that time.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It is of some concern to the Assiniboia Museum Centre, and we may not be in the Estimates for a couple of more days, so is the Minister prepared to answer that question?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge whether we'll be in Estimates of my department within a matter of minutes, which we could well be, or later today, or Monday or Tuesday, or Wednesday. That's up to the members of the House and as soon as we get to my Estimates that question will be dealt with.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate to the House if it was under his instructions to relocate the Tourist Information Bureau from the site at Assiniboia Museum Centre?

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Speaker, it was not upon my personal instructions but whatever had happened I'm sure that there is an explanation for it. I know there is an explanation for it, a good rationale for it, and that will be dealt with during the debate of my Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. I wonder if he considers it silly and playing games that Manitoba Telephone System must go before the Public Utilities for a rate increase.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the reason for the difference in procedure is because, frankly, there was a difference in provision several years ago. The matter is so unimportant that we have not seen fit to change the law as it existed in 1968. The reason it's not important, Sir, is because in both cases — Well, I can't be sure with respect to the Telephone System but with respect to Hydro — the statute law is very clear. There can be no diversion of funds to any other operation. So therefore any funds that are generated, if they are insufficient to meet operating needs, there must be a rate increase. If they are sufficient there need not be; if they are more than sufficient then they go into contingency and stabilization reserve funds. There is no diversion of funds outside of the treasury of the operation. Therefore the public interest is protected as well as it can be by having a superseding agency attempt to do a determination by hiring outside consultants.

I want to say to my honourable friend, the Member for River Heights, what we seek to avoid basically is the kind of procedure that was followed, for example, in Ontario two years ago when a rate increase applied for by Ontario Hydro was adjudicated to be acceptable or necessary at 26 percent. It was then referred to a Standing Committee of the Legislature as a fine entity to do rate adjudication and it was determined that it should not be more than 22 percent. The consequence of which the following year Ontario Hydro, instead of being able to operate at that level, had to come forward with a rate increase application of 30 percent. And this is indeed what I do call silly games.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, and I wonder if the First Minister would not consider that it's silly that Manitoba Telephone System has to go to Public Utilities for a rate increase but Hydro does not?

MR. SPEAKER: The question is repetitive.

MR. SCHREYER: I find that perhaps anomalous, Sir, but that's the way it was in statute law in the decade of the 1960s and, I believe, in the 1950s. If those that preceded us saw fit to write that law, I say to my honourable friend that that is one aspect of law we haven't seen fit to change. The importance of changing it is simply not there.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister for Recreation and Tourism. A few moments ago we had laid on our desk the Manitoba Vacation Guide for this coming year. Can he tell me why hotels are recommended in this book that have a no-star rating such as the Bell Hotel that is recommended for tourism?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Tourism and Recreation?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, there is no hotel that is recommended within the Vacation Guide. Hotels are merely listed.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Could the Minister inform us as to what a no-star rating means?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, it could mean one of two things. Either there isn't a rating on it . . . —(Interjection)— Yes, as for the longest time under the previous administration the Tourism and Recreation Branch did not rate facilities within National Parks and did not rate certain other tourist accommodation facilities or it means that the facilities contained within that establishment may be less than a one-star rating.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STERLING LYON (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Tourism assure us that the no-star rating does not refer to the fact that the Minister slept there?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, that's an interesting suggestion. Perhaps we ought to check out the hotels where members of the Tory Party sleep.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the First Minister. In view of the fact that the Leader of the Official Opposition seems to base his whole case on the advice of one engineer, could the Minister reporting for Manitoba Hydro indicate whether the Leader of the Official Opposition has asked if they would recommend other engineers and who they might be, to look into the whole question of the so-called "Spafford Report" and whether it is correct?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer a question of that kind except to say that if one engineer says such and such in a task force and X numbers of engineers say something else, that common sense would seem to dictate that one does take the consensus view and not the view of one solitary person.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Mines. Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. The Honourable Minister for Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it's the reincarnation of last night. I did want to indicate to the Member for Fort Rouge on a previous question that I now have received the agenda for the meeting of the Canadian Council of Resource and Environmental Ministers; a meeting of which I happen, not through any great ability but by accident of rotation, to be the Chairman, which meets on June 1st and 2nd at the Bessborough Hotel. Pesticide Use and Control in Canada is an item which takes up from one-third to one-quarter of the entire agenda at the instance of Manitoba. This is in relation to questions he asked the other day.

Could we proceed now, Mr. Speaker, to the Budget Speech Address.

ORDERS OF THE DAY — BUDGET DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, the amendment thereto by the Leader of the Opposition, and the amendment to that by the Member for Fort Rouge, the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I adjourn debate for my honourable colleague from St. Boniface.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Health.

HONOURABLE LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, we have been debating on the Budget, which should be one of the most important debates in this House especially a year when there are so many rumours of an election. But unfortunately the members of the Opposition or the majority, not all of them, most of them have decided not to really take part in this debate, not to discuss what the people of Manitoba are interested in.

I think that I must be honest. I think that yesterday the Honourable Member from River Heights really tried to participate and I hope that his remarks will be placed in front of the people of Manitoba, because he really tried to participate and tell the people of Manitoba and tell the members of this House what was wrong and how improvements could be made, and how this party would lose the election, and so on. I think he was sincere, but unfortunately he is not speaking for his party, he is no longer the leader of the party, that is probably why they chose to get rid of him and get somebody who, as soon as any debate starts, will make a beeline for the door, does not want to discuss the issues in front of us.

You know, I'm very sorry that my honourable friend from Sturgeon Creek isn't here today. I feel sorry for him all the time. I've never seen anybody who seems to be in so much bitterness all the time, and so much at odds with everybody, you know, in thinking that politics is the only thing in the world and everybody that doesn't agree with him . . . I don't know how this man can get up in the morning and come back to work and come in the session. He must suffer something awful. And I feel sorry because I think he is sincere, but I also think that he is quite naive. He doesn't want ever to be reminded of what the people or what the former government did. He doesn't want to talk about that.
—(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DESJARDINS: Neither does the Official Leader of the Opposition, he doesn't want to be reminded of that at all. —(Interjection)— Well, I am ready to discuss it with you and with any member of your party, but unfortunately most of your people will run out whenever we try to discuss it. And today I will try to discuss it with you — those that are left in the House.

It is evident, as the question asked by the Honourable Member from Roblin yesterday, that the Conservative Party feels that the government will defeat itself and therefore they don't have to do a single thing. They will evade, they will try to stay away from the issue — mind you there is a bunch of yelling. I think yesterday was probably the lowest that I have seen in this House and I've shared in some of these demonstrations' but the yelling like animals in this House, I think it is unfortunate and unfortunately it seems to come from all sides of the House. And you know, sometimes we feel that the public do not respect us and we are asking for it. We are asking for it the way we behave and the way that constantly there is not only accusations or discussions of programs and so on, but motives, discussing of motives. For instance, the Health critic for the Conservative Party, until I challenged him and he has been quiet since then. He has made all kinds of accusations that we have tried to get rid of doctors and that we have tried to do everything, which he knows isn't true and he has made statements that were exactly the opposite of what I had said.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the people of Manitoba must review the actions of some of the people who are now seeking to form the next government of this province. You know, I have been faulted and again this morning, that's supposed to be embarrassing. It doesn't embarrass me that I changed, that I crossed the floor, because I think I was always true to my principle. I haven't changed at all and many of the principles, the things that I was fighting for, these things came true. Not all of them but many of them. And I don't think that I have any trouble to live with myself, but unfortunately the whole party, the Conservative Party, has left. They didn't have to cross because there was no room here, they stayed on the side. They are so anxious and so thirsty for power they want to cross, but what have they done? They have abandoned their policies, their principles, and they don't want to discuss it, they don't even want to talk about them.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, this department, the Department of Health and Social Development, has over one-third of the total Budget of the Province of Manitoba. And you know, the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition, not too long ago brought out the resolutions from the NDP meeting and he made all kinds of jokes about them, but at least they came from the people. Some of them might sound very stupid to him, but they came from the people. They have the right. Now what do they have — they have a committee that says, give us the impression we'll review it, we'll edit it and

we'll do everything, and then we'll let you know. And on a department that deals with over one-third of the total Budget of the Province of Manitoba, in a year of an election, a fighting group of people that want to take over the government, this is the wishy-washy . . . they could have stolen that from us, from anybody. They are fond of saying there is not only one party that wants to do things and that's right.

But listen, in a year of an election, Mr. Speaker, a page and one-half on Health and this is what they say. Can anybody in the world be against any of these things?

The need is not for additional acute care beds but for alternate facilities. We have been telling them that. I remember them knocking the former Minister of Health when I was Chairman of the Commission. They were saying build more acute beds and now they are saying that it is a foregone conclusion. I remember during the last election my opponents were there, there is not enough acute beds. But all of a sudden, what are they saying now? They don't say you're right. They say, "No, no more beds".

To develop facilities capable of providing various levels of care so as to ease the strain on acute care facilities. Are you a bunch of Rip Van Winkles? That exists. These have been developed in the last seven years or so. These have been developed. They are not perfect, they never will be perfect.

To work in co-operation — (Interjection) — I'll come back to that. I'll come back, somebody said they are full. I'll come back to the future Minister of Health. I'll come back to that. — (Interjection) — To work in co-operation with health care professionals in Manitoba to maintain in this province the highly qualified health professionals that are being trained here. You know what verbiage is that? There is more consultation going on now than ever was before.

To work with educators to develop preventative health care in the province, to work in co-operation with other provincial and federal authorities towards a rationalization in cost control of the health care system in Manitoba and in Canada. What have we been preaching?

To develop the Progressive Conservative program, to develop an improved alternate health care facility by providing suitable facilities to support the needs of our growing elderly population.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a famous document that is going to rock the world.

Then the person that thinks he is going to be the Minister of Health, I've never seen anybody as wishy-washy as him. When he hasn't got something prepared by either one of his candidates, Dr. Krahn or somebody else, that he will recite in this House' he'll make statements, asinine statements, because he cannot make up his mind, because he wants to be everything to everybody. You know, yesterday, "What is this government going to do? What is the government going to do about the loss of accreditation of the dental profession?" You know, tomorrow he is going to say, "What the hell are you doing interfering with the universities, what are you going to do interfering with universities?"

We were at a meeting, in front of the nurses, and you know what he said. You know what he said and he said that and the Leader of the Liberal Party, who is not in this House, heard him as well as I did because he jumped on him too. He said: Do you know what the government will do when we're in power? Do you know who will decide the policies in health, who will prioritize? It will be the doctors, the nurses, the LPNs, the psychiatric nurses, the chiropractors' the nurses and the social workers, the nurses aides, it will be them; the dentists, everybody. The government will raise the money. That's exactly the statement that my honourable friend made. That's exactly the kind of statement he made.

Does he feel that he is getting anywhere, that they are helping to respect all of us as politicians by making statements like this? Does he feel or does he think that he would stay long as the Minister of Health if that's what he did? Does he think he could satisfy them? You know, he says, "So what. So what." And who would decide, because I would imagine that all the other departments would do the same thing. They would raise the money. Who would prioritize between departments? The doctors, the nurses, the LPNs, the psychiatric nurse — these people would, there's no doubt about that. He cannot face anything at all.

You know we heard yesterday that government defeats itself. But there is such a thing that you cannot win; if you are not there you can't win and the government, if for no other reason, will win by default because you are not there. It's a new ball game we've called and I am very sorry that my honourable friend, the Member from Sturgeon Creek isn't here, because he talked about secrecy, he talked about criticism and he talked about, you know, that this government felt they should be cheerleaders and so on.

Well, I did a little bit of homework and I am not going to talk about Stanfield or Diefenbaker, I am going to talk about people — he says, "I wasn't a member then" — but people who are on the front bench and if you ever crossed here, they would be your key leaders, your key leaders, your key ministers. And this is what they said on the role of the opposition and let me quote from Hansard of May 13, 1969, the Honourable Mr. Spivak, Minister of Industry:

"My reason for condemning the Leader of the New Democratic Party," in a question before the Orders of the Day, "stems from a basic criticism that I have, as a Minister attempting to try and encourage development in this province, with a tactic that has been used constantly by the

Opposition, of bringing into this House names of firms who are doing business here and in some way, through some suggestion or innuendo, suggesting that something is wrong, or in turn suggesting that the government is at fault. And I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and I say this with sincerity, that there has been a tremendous disservice done to this province by those on the other side who constantly bring names of corporations into this House for some speculative information or for some criticism on which that information has either not been checked or verified before the question."

r. Spivak says here in Hansard of May 13th: There is a constant urge on the part of the members in this House to stand up at an appropriate time and simply mention the firm's name, mention that there is some trouble involved and mention that the government is at fault. And in your attempt to try to imply that government has lacked leadership, in whatever form this may be, you are doing a tremendous disservice."

You see, when — he's not there — of course, it's practically God Almighty sitting there and everything is fine, shut up, keep quiet, we do the governing. But don't you dare, don't you dare. . . — (Interjection)—

I beg your pardon? — (Interjections)— Well, one at a time. You never want to speak and now that you have the chance, at least one at a time. — (Interjection)— The role of the Opposition, yes.

The people leaving the province, that is another key one. The same Mr. Spivak, on May 13th, 1969, says, "No doubt that we have a problem in this province, as well as eight other provinces in Canada, where people are leaving. That is to say, there are more people leaving than are coming in from interprovincial migration. It's not just peculiar to Manitoba, it happens in Alberta, it happens in Saskatchewan and it happens in all other provinces except Ontario and B.C. And I think that there is a recognition as well that we are always going to have unemployment problems. You are always going to live with an unemployment problem and certainly the Economic Council of Canada have said that in terms of virtual employment there would be an unemployment figure of 2.5 percent."

These are things that you want us to talk about. No, sorry, correction, that you don't want to talk about, that you are accusing the Opposition.

He also spoke to a group of businessmen before an election and this is what he said, Industry and Commerce Minister, Sidney Spivak: First he warned a group of local businessmen not to attach too much importance to the outcome of Tuesday's federal election.

Mr. Spivak was speaking to the Winnipeg Real Estate Board at the Westminster Motor Hotel — I don't know how many stars — "Whoever is elected, the course of action is pretty well determined," he said. He said he feels that there are factors and dynamics working in this country that will reshape our national identity and our economy and although a politician could give an expression to this progress, they have very little control over it.

That's your Minister of Industry and Commerce, who wants to come back and who tells us that when he moves here everything will be fine. But in this day, well then it wasn't so important, it didn't mean too much.

Now we've heard about the Manitoba Development Fund and we're told about the secrecy. There is a lot of criticism about this government, no doubt, because it has been an open government. And when you bare yourselves you are going to be criticized, you are giving For instance, when I was Health critic in opposition, the Manitoba Health Services Commission, and my friends will remember, passed in one minute or even no minutes because "that's a Crown corporation." They were never called in. We had no idea what was going on. And now they are being discussed, they are being discussed. These things are discussed. — (Interjection)—

I don't know what you are saying but I would like to hear because if you want to debate this, I am anxious and ready. — (Interjections)— It is an open government and there are so many problems. If you have no problems, the only criticism they can say is, "Why are you going to do that, it costs too much money. Why are you going to do that?" But these are the very people, you know, when you bring a program, that's where you're criticized. Who is criticized now for day care? A year or two years ago it was an excellent idea and now they want more. They might as well go to the people that give to them because they think that they have a chance. And all these pressure groups that you have, that you are encouraging although you are saying: "Oh well, you know, we can't spend all this money. You've got to save." There are these kinds of people, there is. The more programs you have, the more criticism you are going to have. And pretty soon it will be practically impossible to govern, the way it is going with the lack of respect and with the name calling and so from all sides of the House. — (Interjection)—

Listen to this, listen to this. — (Interjections)— My honourable friend said, "We have had some tools in our hands." That was Mr. Evans on the Manitoba Development Fund. "I brought in, with what tools we had, 100 million forest industry" — not 10 million like you said. Evans says 100 million forest industry. — (Interjections)— Guerney Evans. Guerney Evans. Guerney Evans. He is the one that brought that. Who is he? Who is he?

Now I won't have time to cover all of this, but let me tell you the understanding of one of your most respected members, the House Leader of the Conservative Party. This is what he felt. This is his

explanation, in all sincerity, that he gave about open government, about the people knowing. He said this:

"Mr. Molgat: Would the honourable member permit a question, Mr. Speaker?"

"Mr. Jorgenson: Sure, sure."

"Mr. Molgat: Has the honourable member seen the studies to back up whatever losses are involved in the flooding?"

"Mr. Jorgenson: I am not privileged to see the report any more than you are. They are the property of the government, the government in this case happening to be the members of the Cabinet."

And he left the room. He left the room, because he is not a member of this Cabinet, I guess.

"Mr. Cherniack: I was just wondering, would the member not feel that he would be more able to deal with this had he had access to those reports, the secret reports?"

"Mr. Jorgenson: The government makes the decision, not me. Under our system the government is entrusted with the power of making those decisions."

"Mr. Cherniack: Well, the question was"

"Mr. Jorgenson: No, if they are right or wrong, they take the responsibility. I am quite prepared to accept years of tradition in this Chamber, as in other Chambers throughout the Commonwealth and throughout the free world, in following the practices that are laid down for the smoothest passage for the business of the Chamber at this time."

"Mr. Desjardins: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member suggesting that the role of the Opposition is to take the word, a vote, on a question of principle only on the say-so of the government? This is exactly what my honourable friend is saying."

"Mr. Jorgenson: My honourable friend is at liberty to vote as he pleases on this issue."

I am not criticizing him, I am telling him the way it was a few years ago. Now all of a sudden you are talking about all kinds of documents. You don't hear anything. The backbenchers in your government did not know what was going on and they accepted it, they accepted it as tradition. They accepted it as tradition. —(Interjection)— No we aren't told other things. I think this is important to educate some of you people, and then to tell the people.

You know you are helping your friends. This is a good one here, "Forbes-Desjardins Clash." "St. Boniface MLA said he was not attacking defeated Conservative candidates, five of whom served on the commission. The Minister was debating, defending" And this is what she said about appointments. You know we hear that every day?

"Mrs. Forbes: The Forbes, government of the day is the people's choice. Governments at all levels have appointed people to boards, commissions and other posts in the public service as a matter of course. I wouldn't care to cast a reflection on any government, on any individual chosen to serve. These people receive their appointments because of their ability and their experience. I am confident all of the members of the commission will fulfil their duties with devotion."

And what do we hear today? "What did Murdoch MacKay get?" and all this kind of crap.

Now you had scandals also. Here is one. "It was said that an audited statement of Drake-Pearson Construction Limited showing that the company had made a profit of \$1,004,959.36 on \$1,617,953.00." That was some of your doings. You are the people who are going to move here and change the world.

Now another thing, this tax-back, you know, this rebate on school tax. This is awful, and then you guys are always advertising it. Notice, that went to every taxpayer, "This is your rebate on school taxes for 1965. The law allows a rebate of one-half of each separately-assessed school tax bill of \$100 or less, or a maximum rebate of \$50.00 on school tax bills over \$100.00. This is one of a number of measures the Legislature of Manitoba has authorized to transfer part of the tax costs from local taxpayers to the General Provincial Revenue. Signed, Duff Roblin." Your "Provincial Treasurer." I added that "Your" I thought that sounded good.

Now, advertising. The Deputy Minister of Tourism then, in 1968, "Our Budget hasn't been set as yet, and we can't hand out advertising contracts until it is." "But the Deputy Minister agreed, however, Mr. Kent's firm would continue to receive the Tourism Department's advertising account and has been handling it for a number of years."

You know you are not helping your friends. You would turn around and give it to somebody else. Now you know you talked about, because we might say things openly, you talked about the dissension, but there is no problem in your group at all.

You know, on November 27, 1967, I would like to quote, "He is just the right man, said Agriculture Minister Harry Enns, talking about Walter Weir on Saturday as the tide of victory began to roll for Walter Weir. And although he was barely croaking, through a voice laid low by hours of talking, shouting, and cheering, Mr. Enns bubbled with pleasure at the victory. Those people had lost two campaigns in a row, he said, referring to Industry and Commerce Minister Sidney Spivak and the machine working for Attorney-General Sterling Lyon. They are losing today the same way they lost with Duff Roblin."

And I say they are losing, because today, the same day, they lost the same way, they lost

Where is your leader now? Does he want to take part in that? No, he wants a brand new ball game. What is he going to do? You are going to be looking for another leader.

He never changes his mind. In 1969, June, this is what he said. "In an interview Wednesday night at Tory election headquarters, Mr. Lyon said he was surprised at the upsurge of the New Democrats, and predicted an early election, because I don't think the majority of Manitobans want a socialist government. He said, A coalition of the anti-socialists inevitably was to count. He also stressed that his retirement from active politics was permanent, not just a rest as indicated in recent newspaper reports."

Well, I don't know if he is a debater anymore, I haven't heard him. But he used to be one of the best. I had an awful lot of respect for him, but he is —(Interjection)— Oh, he is still arrogant, he has never changed, you know he comes out like gangbusters. In fact he chastised me at one time, this was in 1965. "He also lashed out at the St. Boniface MLA whose emotional attacks on government proposals have angered more than one member of the Roblin administration during the current session."

Okay, you know what that was all about, the famous pension bill, mostly for the Cabinet Ministers of the day. And we were successful in talking out and that was withdrawn.

Oh, yes, I've got to tell you what he said. "It is just not good enough in this day and age, he told Mr. Desjardins, to stand up like a bull in a china shop, going after every straw man in sight. You have to have some substance. Mr. Lyon said he was glad Mr. Desjardins had opposed the pension legislation, as that is probably the best indication that the bill is right."

You see his arrogance showing? Well, what the hell happened to the bill? He never got that pension. Maybe that was why he had to come back. I don't know.

No, let's talk. He says now that it is a brand new ball game. Let's talk about the present. Let's talk about the present. And he says you inherited, 85 percent of the programs in your department you inherited from us. Well, that is a joke. That is a joke.

You know, he's talking about the credibility of these people. Can any one on that side of the House tell me that he has a better reputation than the actual Premier, the present Premier of this province, all across Canada?

You know I don't think the man is really ready or fit to govern. You will not have this sarcasm and this arrogance as a Premier of a province. It won't last. He won't be able to last. He couldn't hit it with his people before. Now there is an about change. He is coming back. I think probably he is leaving because he can't protect his back when he is in the front row, I don't know. I don't know who is going to be

You know he will come out and he will say exactly what was said earlier. He will make statements, this is what happened, you're going to lose so much. And I heard him asking Mr. Bateman, you were forced into this by politicians? He said no, but he will keep on going. He has been told time and time again.

And he's talked about the north. Do you know my honourable friends, do you know that your leader used to be the Northern Commissioner and he doesn't even know that the north exists? You knew that? And he's the one that encouraged secrecy in government I had some of these notes where we were told, "We are not going to tell you anything. " In the last year before an election there was such a tremendous far-reaching amendment. All of a sudden, "now we will tell the Cabinet." That was something, such a change, that finally they were going to tell the Cabinet. Mind you, they were cutting ribbons all over the place and they were ready to flood the north, halve the north and give the other half away.

Now, okay, it's too bad, I guess time is going on. I don't know how much time I have. I would like to look at some of these programs that we . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Ten minutes.

MR. DESJARDINS: Ten minutes. I've only started, Mr. Speaker. I'm getting the time from Barrow.

The hospitalization and Medicare. You know, are you free enterprisers like you say you are? If you are, you should stand up here and let the issues, let the people choose. You are going to say, we are going back to what we were. We'll put in more premiums and your premiums, the premiums of people that weren't working, of senior citizens, were paying for the people on welfare, for the premiums of the people on welfare. That wasn't even coming from the Consolidated Fund. Now, all right, that was Socialism. Are you going to say today it's social reform and it's all right? You know you're talking about tax. Do you know how much the premiums would be? Do you know how much they would be here? They were \$204 then, they would be close to \$400 at this time. This is what they would be. They are \$385 in Ontario. That was in 1976 and these are the premiums. Now, you know, that doesn't count. I want to know and the people of Manitoba want to know, are you going to bring back these premiums? If not, there's no point in changing government if you're going to do exactly the same thing.

You've talked and there's one thing — if I'm running short of time, there's one thing I want to bring on this time. —(Interjection)— Well, I'm sorry that he wasn't here because I certainly wanted to talk to him.

I want to tell you because we've heard so much about shortage of beds, eh? You know, the expert up there feels that this is something new.

Does my time count, Mr. Speaker, while I'm looking for this thing. I can't find it. There's nothing to tell. They haven't done a damn thing in years except criticize. Except try to make money for a few individuals I guess. —(Interjection)— Well, yeah, maybe Nelson Shoemaker has it. It's very unfortunate and now . . .

Well, anyway, you're talking about the shortage of beds, maybe it's here. Oh yes.

In 1963, the survey of six Greater Winnipeg hospitals shows that the city on Thursday and Friday had about 1,700 people waiting to go to the hospital. You know, that's something new. That's 1963 but things improved. Well wait a minute now, this is what the Minister of Health at the time said, "There will be no waiting list if the hospital premium is doubled." I guess if you don't want waiting lists and going and taking his word and this year, with inflation, it would be what? —about \$800 premium that you would have. —(Interjection)— No, no, but that's not fair because things improve, things improve. That was in '63.

In 1966 — "the number of patients waiting to get into Greater Winnipeg hospitals has risen dramatically again this year. At the end of March it stood at 3,800. This figure is more than doubled the 1,700 waiting patients that the hospitals had to cope with a mere three years ago." "Throw out malingers," says doctor.

Mr. Speaker, I am bringing these things back to show that I think that we would have much more respect when we dealt with difficult things if we attacked when it was a time to attack but not all this same verbiage, the same repeating of things and so on, especially like the health critic on that side has been saying, the statement that he's made.

Like you know we could look at many of these programs. What did my honourable friend say, "We're going to turn the page to something new." He hasn't said anything, your leader hasn't said a single thing in this field of health. What is he going to do? You think, oh yes, he'll say that this government, these people cannot get along with doctors. There has been more discussion and everything with doctors. The only thing it is at the time with their union — I didn't see you defend the bus drivers or the people working in the hospitals — when that union, as is their right, wanted more money, that was the time that I was so much at fault because I said you don't opt out, you just don't work in the plan. Are you going to say, you know you think the doctors are going to be much better off with you? Because if you are right, if you are not traitors like I am in changing my principle, you are going to take away this thing and you are going to go back to the old fashioned free-enterprise system, the battle of the fittest and the doctor that can't compete will have to go. Do you think they want that? Do you think they want that, they want to go back to take a bag of potatoes or a chicken and have to do visits to the homes? Is that what you want?

A MEMBER: Not unless you take it to the Marketing Board.

MR. DESJARDINS: Is that what you want?

A MEMBER: Take it to the Marketing Board.

MR. DESJARDINS: You know, this is a joke? He doesn't want to look at what we're talking about — take it to the Marketing Board. What have I got, fifteen minutes? Five Minutes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I was going to take time — it's unfortunate because I've got all the programs here, what was done before seven years. All these things. We were told that the programs were there before and all the new ones. The paper programs that didn't exist at all. The personal care beds, the dental program.

Now, I want to know. You know, when we tried to bring these programs in it was always socialism and the leader of the party likes to turn around and call these people socialists and it's supposed to be something bad and I confess that the way I was brought up and some of these times I've used it myself and I thought it was awful, but what is the definition of socialism? You know, whenever a program is brought in it is socialism, it is awful, you're going to change it, but when it's here we can't change the social reforms. It's social reform. You know, look how damned I was for Autopac. What are you going to do? You're going to keep Autopac. That's the free-enterprising system. You're going to keep Medicare. You're going to keep Hospitalization. Are you going to keep Home Care? You didn't have a Home Care program. Are you going to keep Home Care? Are you going to say it's too costly. You're going to take out these powered motor chairs and all the help for the people that are the infirmed and the under-privileged. Are you going to stop that?

You know, you haven't told us anything and if you accept everything in the Department of Health, all in a lump sum you've accepted one-third of the total budget of the Province of Manitoba and you are saying that you're going to reduce the tax. How are you going to reduce the taxes? There's only one way, by bringing in the premiums. You know, how are you going to pay? How are you? You're either going to stop some programs, discontinue some programs. You told me that we're not doing enough in Day Care. You want the standards to be increased. You want more nurses on every floor. You want the Selkirk Hospital to get their credit back — one of the reasons is that they are short

staffed maybe. What are you going to do? That is one-third right now and I probably sounded like the biggest conservative during my Estimates because I tried to tell everybody that we've got to slow down and look at things the way they were. In fact, there were criticisms from that side that we weren't doing enough. And it's the same thing, this free-enterprise system. We don't want that. " But, Larry, what about my constituency. These poor people. Sure they have a lien against them, a lien, but they're good people, can't you do anything about it?"

You know, it is very very difficult and it's going to get worse to govern, to run any department. And maybe I'm naive or maybe I've been in the kitchen too long and maybe I'm getting old, but I think that we are losing out an awful lot because, you know, just let me say, this doctor is only interested in his pocket book. You will see the medical profession up-in-arms, call me every name under the sun, even if I . . . but let anybody say, and this is not a lecture to the Conservative Party, it's all of us and I don't know where it's going to lead us. But once in awhile, I think if we said all right that these things are difficult, but it's always so easy. You know, and if there's something that happens to you boys out there, we're happy and if something happens here — and that's the way we're going. And it's getting worse and worse and we don't have the respect of the public, don't have the respect of the public at all and it is now a chance to go ahead and criticize, criticize everything. And the pressure groups are pushing' pressure groups are pushing and there's always somebody in opposition, they will say, why don't you give them more. Why don't you want to help ?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that this group of power thirsty people on the other side will have to come out of their shell and if they are sincere they should want to come out of their shell, to tell the people of Manitoba what are they going to do that's going to be different. Are they going to cut taxes or are they going to cut programs? They can't have both. Are they going to cut taxes or are they going to cut programs. They can't have both, Mr. Speaker. Are they going to have one meaning of the word socialist, but social reform will be all right for the same program. I think that if these people, the great free enterprisers that they are, and if they want, if they don't want to just try it the way like my honourable friend said, because the government will defeat itself.

Well, I guess, I see you standing up, Mr. Speaker. I'll try to finish this another day.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hadn't intended to speak on this Budget Debate, but after a few remarks from some of the honourable friends across the way, feel inclined to make a few statements. I'd like to congratulate the Minister on his first Budget. I have the utmost respect for his ability, and in his quiet and efficient manner, he has handled many of the difficult portfolios on behalf of the government. The Budget is more or less an open-ended arrangement. We are forecasting a very small deficit, however, with the extension to special warrants, etc., anything can happen, and probably will. I think this government has been in a position that they have benefited greatly from inflationary trends, inflationary revenues. We realize that income tax, corporation tax, liquor tax, everything that basically goes to making up a very solvent economy seems to have been taking place under the past few years and the government in power happens to be in at that time. And everyone seems to be catching a little bit of election fever; there seems to be a tendency to talk about election issues. There are going to be, I imagine, the same as after every other election, many new faces, some by their own volition, and some by the wishes of the people. The Province has been in a very fortunate position revenue wise, but I think that they have no provision whatever for the fact that possibly we're reaching a period where we'll run into drastically reduced revenues. The province is facing possibly the worst drought in history. There's a possible chance that if there is no rain, that we could see anywhere from 5,000 to 10,000 head of cattle a day in the Union Stockyards. There is no feed left in the Country to take care of any shortfall in pasture. I think the Minister of Agriculture, if he takes a look at the hay permits, and the export permits to the United States, will find that there have been many hundreds of tons of hay moved to the United States to their drought area, not realizing that we were probably going to be in the same position.

Water is going to be another very serious problem, and basically there is very little that any government can do. We can drill wells, we can pump dugouts full if water is available, etc., but if there's nothing to eat why I think that we could be looking at a very serious problem here in the fact that seeding operations in the general area of the province, will be shut down I'm quite sure in the next 21 days if we don't have some precipitation. The cost involved in putting in the crop is just too great.

Last night the Minister of Mines and Resources went to great lengths to explain that under the Tory Government, the MDC have a secret list — he read off at great length a group of businesses he said that were non-existent now, or had been phased out or whatever the case may be. He gave no indication of whether or not any of them had made a profit, were still in business, whatever, and there was \$5 million involved, and when I asked him the amount of money involved, he more or less ridiculed and said, well now it will be \$10 million. But under the present set up. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Will the Honourable Minister of Mines state his point of order.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. On a point of order, I wish to advise the member that he

misunderstood me. It was with one company that \$5 million was involved, the other companies — there were additional moneys involved. The total amount would not exceed \$7 or \$8 million if one ignored the CFI. If one adds CFI, it is over \$70 million that is involved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Well I thank the honourable Minister, Mr. Speaker, but I was under the impression that when the present government came into power in 1969, that the amount of payout was \$13 million on CFI, and that there were provisions made that is anything was wrong with the deal, that it could be cancelled out, so consequently where the figure of \$100,000 comes from — it must have been drawn out of the air through their management, under their jurisdiction, we'll put it this way.

But here again, Mr. Speaker, we find that a government that can criticize can go into the hotel business at \$4.3 million, and consequently, is this going to be a profit making deal? The whole theme across the way seems to be, this is for the people' it's being developed for the people. Well we know who's picking up the losses, and we also know that very few if any of their endeavours have shown a profit. But this "for the people" bit seems to be the big hue and cry. I can't understand why if there is so much money, that a private entrepreneur couldn't have gone into Hecla Island, and possibly put up a hotel.

Getting back to election issues, of which there have been many discussions, Mr. Speaker, Hydro is going to be — (Interjection) — Well certainly, we'll face the election issues, and we know what they're going to be in the rural, and the fellows across the way from the city, will know what they are going to be there. The Hydro definitely is going to be one, and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that when people start getting hit in the pocketbook through demand billing on rates, that possibly there will be nothing greater than a small light bulb burning all summer. They certainly are going to get the message, and we'll certainly be quite willing to stand up on any platform and discuss Hydro. Succession duties — the Honourable Member for St. Matthews got up the other day and said, he didn't believe in incentive, he didn't believe in incentive. How would he know what incentive is? He's never been involved in any risk capital, and many of the opposite fellows across the way never have. What do they know about risk capital? They were born and raised in this province, they were educated by the State, they have never put their neck on the line, they have probably never signed a note. — (Interjection) — I didn't say all' I said the majority over there, and why succession duty should cause such a furor. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. FERGUSON: There you go saying that we are changing the succession duty rate in the Province of Manitoba, and and what was the amount arrived at? It's very small' very negligible. I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the accountants and the lawyers of this province, are picking up at least ten times in fees, as what this province is picking up through succession duties. But it is a real good tax. It's something you've got to do estate planning on, you've got to have it hanging over your head, your going down every year taking a medical to buy insurance to pay your succession duties. It's all a very good thing, and it isn't as though, Mr. Speaker, that every dollar that is in every estate, and every small business, and every farm in this province, has had tax paid on it. It's a very nice way of double taxation or confiscation, whichever way you want to call it.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that those estates in those small businesses were not built up over night. Any small business or any farm — there have been instances whereby there was some inheritance, but the big majority of them have been developed through the effort of the individuals involved, possibly in one, two or three generations, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that they were not built up on the 40 hour week, a 36 hour week, or double time for working on Sundays or holidays. — (Interjection) — You know, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends across the way remind me of the story of the Little Red Hen back in the old primary readers, when it said that the little hen wanted to plant a little plot of wheat, and all of the animals in the barnyard would not participate, but when the wheat was grown the bread was baked, they all stood around like a bunch of jackals, which a lot of our honourable friends across the way remind me of, and demanded their share.

Another nuisance tax is the one that's the Honourable Member for St. Johns' pride and joy, the Mineral Acreage Tax Act. It's not bringing any money into the state or very little. The cost of collection probably is greater than the amount realized but it's a nuisance tax and it is another way of gaining control of the mineral acreage in Manitoba.

This government is very heavily involved in the purchase of land and this is another thing that we're willing to fight election platform on — \$186,000, I believe is the most recent figure arrived at the other day through an Order for Return. I forget who filed it. But here again, a young farmer outside of the government program possibly went to a bank or a credit union or whatever the case may be. He borrowed the money to buy his farm shall we say in 1972 or 1977. Possibly we'd better say 1977 because at that time we had gone through the inflated purchase price of land. But the young fellow that bought back in 1972 is now able at the end of the payout period which is five years — it previously

was five years, it is now one year. There were no capital gains taxed on the purchase price providing he didn't buy it today and sell it tomorrow. I feel that this is a bit unfair. Mind you under the present set-up we did not agree with the MACC in purchasing land and leasing back. Far better that there should have been a subsidized interest rate if we were going to have a program. But our aim would be to get this land back into the hands of the young farmers and through the lease set-up this would be the only way possibly to get back.

The programs of the Minister of Agriculture; he has come up with some very worthwhile programs, but he believes in confrontation with the individuals. And never has there been a faster organizational meeting than when he introduced his compulsory marketing board referendum. We found that overnight the people involved in that industry — the cow-calf operators, the Manitoba Beef Growers Association, and all breeds — formed a united front to combat the Minister of Agriculture. Well has he never heard of sitting down with a group and talking to them? We're all aware of the fact that there is quite a lot wrong with the marketing of cattle, but the Minister took it upon himself to say, "Either you go for compulsion or else you get nothing." Consequently, the vote showed what the general population of Manitoba thinks, 77 to 23. And I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that if and when we do go to the people that I think that will be a very good indication of what the farm vote will be for this present government.

Much is being discussed to do with the supposed adoption of the present government's programs by our side of the fence if we should become government. I'd like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this government has been in power for eight years. And as a socialist government they more or less are more involved in social reform possibly, than a free enterprise government, but there is no government under the sun today, Mr. Speaker, that would not have a social conscience. And where are you going to arrive at the dividing line between where you go overboard to develop a drone society and when you look after the society that are not capable of looking after themselves should enter the picture. And over and above that, Mr. Speaker, a government that over the past eight years has spent somewhere between \$6 and \$7 billion dollars have got to show some results for the amount of money invested.

We're aware of the fact that many of the things in the province have been neglected — the road programs, long-term planning in flood controls — and I think that we're also going to have to start looking at the fact that irrigation is going to be coming to the forefront. It will become more of an agricultural economy that could be dependent on special crops. And I think that the movement will have to be made in conserving our water possibly in areas that have no beneficial value outside of possibly water storage. And there are many of these localities in the province. They could be used and, at not too great a cost, could be developed into storing water which could be used for irrigation and take a considerable amount of risk out of the business of agriculture.

I'd like to mention very briefly, Mr. Speaker, the thing that seems to be foremost in practically every Canadian's mind today and that's national unity. It is something that I guess we were brought face to face with a little quicker than what we really planned on. But here again, I think we can go back to a government in Ottawa that are not accepting the fiscal responsibility. There is deficit financing this year to the tune of \$7 billion, \$7.1 billion. And I think that over the past few years, starting with Mr. Pearson as Prime Minister where he chose to give special status and special benefits to one particular province for one reason: that there was a good solid rock of votes coming out of that province to support a certain party. And following in his footsteps was Mr. Trudeau along the same lines, and I think that we reached a point in Quebec whereby they started to expect possibly a wee bit more than what the rest of the country was willing to give them. I have no hang-up at all on bilingualism in this province, but I am starting to develop a considerable distaste for unilingual bills coming into the Legislature of Quebec. And if the present trend continues, Mr. Speaker, I think that the only hope for the salvation of our country is for the Anglophones to band together.

I wouldn't be surprised if possibly our friend, Mr. Horner, moving across to the Liberal Party might be a trend that, contrary to the beliefs of the Liberal Party, that if Mr. John Turner was to come back into power and tied in with the western provinces; Bennett in B.C.; Lougheed in Alberta; hopefully Culver in Saskatchewan; Lyon in Manitoba; Davis in Ontario; that we could get this country back on a sound actual basis whereby the people are working to produce. Something would have to be developed between the working force and the *entrepreneurs*. But the present setup of our government seems to be to sweep the economic difficulties under the rug and to blissfully go along hoping that the United States will hit the jackpot again and get the economy moving and that we'll be able to follow them on their shirt-tails.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is all I have to say on the Budget Speech at this time. I know that there are many other speakers that want to get their two-cents worth in so with that I'll close. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will take ten or fifteen minutes and put some remarks on the record and perhaps indicate what I feel about the Budget.

I have listened to most of the debates and listened quite carefully and I believe that we had some good speeches from both sides of the House. The Minister this morning was talking about what is socialism and how far can we go and I would like to indicate, perhaps, if the members would look pretty closely, I think that Canada perhaps is one of the most socialist countries in the world in respect to the kind of services that we have; medical services, senior citizens homes and Pharmacare and all the other social programs. And perhaps if the economic basis is there, there is nothing wrong with it but I think that we have to be careful — and the Minister of Health and Social Development has indicated that somewhere along the line we have to be quite careful because we may destroy a good thing that we have.

Now I know that it's easy to say that this government is to blame or this government is to blame, but I can indicate and perhaps indicate quite clearly — I'll try to indicate for the Member for Pembina — it's easy to say that government is foisting many of these programs on us but it's not so. I had a good discussion with a doctor in my constituency just the other night. He says, "Well, do we need all these senior citizens homes or do we need all these extended care homes because it's all lumped with the cost of medical services in this province, and in the country, and this is why we have such a high cost of medical care services." And we had a good discussion and I said to him, "Well, my constituency is probably middle income or middle-high income, at least part of it in Westwood." And I indicated to him I get more calls from those people saying, "I can't get my father or I can't get my mother in a senior citizens home. What's wrong with the government? Why don't they provide more facilities?"

So I say it's not just the government that is foisting programs on us; it's the people. It's us that is demanding many of these services and this is what's happening. It may be good; it may not. In my own opinion, I think it's good as long as there is an economic base to provide these services. But perhaps somewhere along the line if we're running into a situation, it's pretty difficult to have the tax base to do all these services. So I would say some of these programs are not necessarily hoisted by governments but perhaps demanded by the people and it's us — the public — that are responsible.

I wish to make some remarks about the Minister of Finance and his Budget. I believe that I have listened to the other Budgets in this House for many years and, you know, when the Minister brought in the Property Tax Credit Plan and the Cost of Living Credit Plan and one would have said, "Well that's, you know, fairly good programs and may be appealing to many people."

In this instance, today, the present Budget has been indicated and described by the Minister as a "People's Budget." On the opposition's side it has been described as a bad Budget, a cynical Budget and my colleague described it as a "Fool the People Budget." In my own opinion, I would describe it as as it was a pretty cute maneuvering and it was a pretty cute Budget by the Minister of Finance. Because really it doesn't deal with all the realities and all the problems, and I could understand the problem that the Minister of Finance had. You have the limit at perhaps resources. You have some difficulties and where would the government raise the revenue to do the things that have to be done? Perhaps you could have increased the tobacco tax and increased the liquor tax and maybe put some motor gas tax on and get the kind of revenue that was required to deal with the problems that have to be dealt with. But the Minister did not decide to do that and perhaps it's wrong for any Finance Minister to raise taxes during the election year. So what he decided to do is to come almost with a balanced Budget and not deal with many issues. And perhaps if he would have tried to deal with some of the serious problems that we have in this province at the present time, he may have had a deficit of \$40 million to \$50 million. And if he would have come up with a \$40 million or \$50 million deficit, Mr. Speaker, then we on this side, the opposition's side, we would have had a real clout. We could have had something to criticize and say, "Well, the government mismanaged affairs and look, the first time in history we have a \$50 million deficit." And that would have happened because if you combine what his announced program — what he would be introducing to deal with the unemployment situation — and the small deficit then perhaps there would have been a large deficit.

Well the Minister, I'm indicating to the House, brought in a pretty cute Budget. You know it's almost a balanced Budget. There is some fringe reductions — some small reductions for the people — and of course the Tax Credit Plan which totally amounts into quite a few million dollars. But in reality \$25 per home will not cover the cost of increase in utilities or nowhere near. So in that respect I would say that the Minister, as far as from the government point of view, brought in a pretty smart document. And if he deals with the real problems that we have then certainly the deficit will be much larger. I was disappointed that programs were not announced in the Budget. Usually the New Democratic Party talk about, either federally or provincially talk about, three-year programs, five-year programs, what can people expect? And in here the Minister did not give us any kind of a program or course of action that he will undertake. He did announce that the employment program will probably be of a short duration and I'll deal with that in a minute, Mr. Speaker.

We do have a very high rate of unemployment among the sixteen to twenty-four age group and totally the unemployment is very serious. It's quite high, not only in that young age group but now with college graduates and students during the summer holidays are certainly having a real difficult

time finding jobs. I hope that the Minister will act on his Job Creation Program very quickly because again, I indicated to the House the other day, that I am getting calls every day from my constituency. I don't know if the other members are, and I don't know if the government backbenchers are but certainly I'm getting many calls from students who say to me, "Look, I worked last year and I worked the year before, but I can't get a job this year." So I would say that the government has to deal with this issue pretty quickly.

We have the consumer price index that in Winnipeg was rising faster than the other areas. We have a serious drop perhaps in production on construction of housing in the province and, again, I would say to the government this is one area that job creation could have taken place quite extensively in this area because we have the high unemployment.

Now again, I will differ with my own colleague from Fort Rouge, because in the stock of housing in the say \$60,000 to \$70,000 where now an 1,100 square foot home costs \$65,000, which a few years ago was a small home. I think the stock of these homes is sufficient. In fact, there is quite an oversupply right now and the homes are not sold because of price, and it still is a relatively small home. So that it appears to me what we really need, we need either semi-detached or lower cost homes. We need something in the \$45,000, \$40,000, \$39,000 bracket and if we can supply homes in that bracket I think that we would perhaps do is supply the market where the great demand and greater requirement is. But as far as the single detached home in the \$50-\$60,000 bracket there is quite a large supply of stock in the City of Winnipeg right now.

I know that we are still waiting since this session started on the problem with perhaps worsening labour relations in the province and again the government has not dealt with that as yet. We have the fall out of the capital investment in Manitoba and that's statistics from Information Canada. So I'm sure that the government — the Minister indicated to the House that he agrees with the problems that he's confronted with not only here but confronted right across Canada. The Minister of Health indicated this morning the difficulties in financing the health care in the province and the cost of increasing the health care. So we have, perhaps, some serious problems and I believe these problems should have been dealt with in the Budget because that's the mechanism that the Finance Minister has. He did not decide to deal with it. He decided to bring us almost a balanced Budget. In my opinion, it's a very very Conservative Budget. Perhaps to some extent what he did, he disarmed the Official Opposition because the Minister did bring in a very conservative Budget. So from that point of view, I would think that to some extent he disarmed but we still, on this side of the House, have the opportunity to criticize the government for not dealing with the major problems that we have at the present time.

We had the decline and the closing of four mines in northern Manitoba and of course there was, I think, some action by one of the mines and a greater activity in one of the other mines. But, I believe what should happen is we should reassess and review the new legislation that was put on the books, as to how it will affect the mining industry in Manitoba; how it will affect the exploration. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources says it is good legislation, we required it. He may be right, maybe we needed to take more revenue, we deserve to get more revenue than what we had before. But after a couple of years and if all indications are true, that there is almost no exploration going on in the province — exploration is taking place in the other parts of the world and in the Province of Ontario — and if that is correct, then perhaps we should review the legislation and see how it does affect the exploration in this province and see if there are any changes that are required. I think that is one area that we should look into.

There was a pretty large decline in the farm income, even in 1975, I believe 1976, from \$320 million to something like \$217 million, so that must be a concern to the government. And again, as far as the Budget, there was no indication what plan or action government will take if the situation worsens in the province. If we have a drought, that income will probably be a third and it will be a third what it was two years ago. That is again a serious problem.

There is no expansion in the forest industry in the province. There is a decline in the investment capital in the province. It was indicated in the latest statistics, 24 percent decline in investment in the province. So there are some very serious indicators as far as the present time is concerned. And still, in my opinion, these are the areas and these are the problems that the Budget did not deal with and I feel that it should have dealt and people should have known what course of action the government decides to take. And if there was a deficit in the Budget, I would say I would sooner accept a deficit and a government trying to deal with some of the areas and some of the concerns that the people have instead of saying, no, we'll produce a balanced Budget.

The other provinces, the Province of Ontario, have been bringing in for the last several years, Budgets with an extreme large figure of deficits. This would be the start, I don't say that that is good budgeting or a proper finance program but since we have such serious problems in the province at the present time, then I believe the Minister should have taken a course of action that would have been able to deal with these areas. And perhaps the Minister will be dealing with these areas later on

in the session but I think that the mechanism, the tools that he has at his disposal, was the Budget and this is what he should have done, which he did not do.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the members have continually been stating in this House that it is the responsibility and the Federal Government should take the responsibility for the high unemployment right across the country. Well, my point is and my observation is the government front benches cannot have it both ways. When the unemployment is low, say 3 to 4 percent, it appears that every Minister, when they are introducing their Estimates, taking part in the debates in this House, they always don't miss a point of saying, "Well, look what a great job we're doing, the employment is full employment, it's 3 percent or 4 percent." But the minute it gets 6 or 7 percent, or 8 percent, then they say, "Well, there is nothing we can do, it's the Federal Government and it is their responsibility."

Well, I would like to indicate to the members of the House, Mr. Speaker, that the Economic Council of Canada has strongly criticized the provincial governments right across the country and have stated that the provincial governments have the necessary tools to deal with employment and have to start dealing with unemployment in the provinces. In fact, they are stating that they have got the mechanism, they are closer to the scene and they can deal with unemployment to a great extent. This is the Economic Council of Canada, a body of experts, and that's their latest report. Their latest report indicated to the governments or to the provinces that the provincial governments must get involved and must try to deal with unemployment in the provinces respectively, instead of saying that it is strictly up to the Federal Government.

I am concerned when the Minister announced his program that there will be all these temporary jobs created for some \$27 million. I would like to offer my advice to him and to the House. If he will ever have any criticism, he will receive lots of it from many people by saying that he will create temporary jobs for \$27 million or \$30 million. Surely, I think, that what we have to come to grips with, what we have to concern ourselves, is to start creating permanent jobs instead of temporary jobs.

We have presented to the House on several occasions, the way of creating permanent jobs, of on-the-job training, and that has not, up to this point, been accepted, with the exception the other day when even the resolution was voted down in this House by the government side when it was offered some incentive to industry for on-the-job training and that was voted down. And here the Minister, in his Budget, indicates that this is what the government is going to do. So I am glad to here that at least they will be taking some action on the proposals that was presented by our group, at least for the last two or three years, about on-the-job training. —(Interjection)—

Well, the Minister for Corrections says, "Well, well." But that is true, the resolution was voted down and the Budget indicates that this is exactly what the government will do. So I am quite happy that at least the government will be taking some action, Mr. Speaker, in this area.

But I cannot help but be extremely critical of the Minister not dealing with that serious problem of unemployment in his Budget. He did not deal with the problem that the senior citizens have at the present time. He did not deal with what will he do for the small businessman, for the small entrepreneur. So there are many many areas, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister, I think, should have taken action.

I know the Budget isn't an income, an expenses statement for a given period of time. Should the plan of operations of the government in the future, be it for one year or two years or sometimes lack of it, and in my opinion, there was lack of that future plan as far as this budget was concerned. I know we can talk all we want about cutting the expenses in the budget, and it may be desirable, Mr. Speaker, and commendable, but as far as I'm concerned, when we have very serious and critical problems that have to be dealt with, it's pretty difficult to talk about cutting expenses unless we state and indicate where those expenses can be cut, and again I believe it should be related to an overall government plans. You know, we cannot say well we'll reduce this program or we'll not give the government enough money.

The present Budget that was presented by the Finance Minister really was planned operation or plan to deal with the serious problems. It was a Budget that will deal with some minor adjustments, with some benefits to some people, but it still does not deal with very important issues that I talked about, the employment, the senior citizens, and perhaps the farm problem. I think that the Minister did not use the tools that he had at his disposal to deal with these problems.

Now I know there has been considerable debate, Mr. Speaker, in respect to taxation, to succession duties, to estate tax, and I will deal briefly with some of those. I think that I've tried to describe, and given some statistics, given some indications that the economy in Manitoba is not healthy at the present time. I think, and I accept that perhaps we're not like some of the other provinces that have the natural resources. I know that the Minister took great time and pain to say that we're not getting enough money from Ottawa — we're getting less. My member, the colleague for Fort Rouge, indicated to him, and documented which is right at the back of the Budget itself in the statistics, that the government is getting more money this year than they did last year — maybe not in proportion to the expenses, but they're still getting more money, I believe over \$30 million or whatever it is more than they received last year; so to say that they are just not receiving the money

from the Federal Government —(Interjection)— Well they are, because —(Interjection)— The Minister says that if you take inflation factor alone, that may be true, but in dollars and cents, the government is receiving more this year than they received last year. —(Interjection)— Well, I don't think I'm receiving much more than I did last year in dollars and cents really. Perhaps some people are in this province; I don't say that all the people are, the senior citizens and the people on fixed incomes. . . —(Interjection)— myself, yes that's correct, but there's many people that don't, people on the low income scale, and the senior citizens are certainly not receiving, in my opinion, what they should.

We talked about why the new business is not developing in this province, and maybe it's because of the general conditions across the whole country. But I would like to indicate to the Member for St. Johns took I believe some time debating succession duties and estate tax, and maybe we have some reasons why — and let's find out the reasons why some industry is not coming to Manitoba, some is moving out. I would like to indicate to the members of this House, in my own opinion I think that there must be some estate tax and succession duties, but at the same time I feel that we have to live in a world of realism and just see what's happening. I would like to indicate to the members of this House, we can live in isolation, and this is the problem. So when the members say, look we're not going to move on succession duties or estate tax, and I know the Minister has moved and indicated that he will increase some exemptions, but the other exemptions, the inter-spousal arrangements will have to wait until the legislation on family law is passed — Mr. Speaker, the members of this House and the government have to accept the fact that there's many people in this province, small businesses — and they always talk, well there's only two or three estates, but the problem is that people are intelligent, they're smart, they don't wait to die in the province — if they have an estate, they make arrangements or leave the province or move out. I would like to indicate to the member right now how many have left the province — quite a few. All the Member for St. Johns has to do is drive down Inkster Boulevard and just take a look at how many vacant buildings there are, and I'll tell him.

A MEMBER: How many?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well I don't think it's my responsibility to name names.

A MEMBER: Can you give one name?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes I can, and in fact I'll tell him privately. I would say that there's perhaps half a dozen, and many more will, because to them, it's a very important item. —(Interjection)— Well can the member indicate, where is the head office now of BACM? It's not in Manitoba anymore. BACM have set up their office somewhere else. . . —(Interjection)— their head office is not in Manitoba anymore. I'll tell him right now at least three firms, that I'll name — I'll tell him, I won't name them here — will perhaps leave, because in a family operation, the man says look I have a million and a half dollars tied up in this business — it's there in assets, and that's my worth; and I have one son, one child — there's no way I can afford to die in this province. —(Interjection)— That's right. Okay. The member for St. Johns says no, but what would the Member for St. Johns do if he were in that position? Would he say no, I'll make a donation to the government, he'd say, look, if I had an opportunity to move to Alberta and pay no tax, that's what I'm going to do, and I'm sure that every member, almost every member in this House would do. It's as simple as that. I'm not saying that the tax is fair, I'm not saying that it's fair in this country. If there would be the same estate tax and succession duty tax right across the country, I would accept that, but the point is you have to live in a world of realism, this is what every businessman will do.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: If the honourable member agreed to permit a question I would be very interested to know what is his price for staying in Manitoba? How much does he have to have given to him by way of an incentive to keep him here, how much, is a million enough, is a million and a half enough — how much?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Before the honourable gentleman proceeds, I would like to inform the honourable members that we have a visitor in my loge to the right, Mr. Lorne Nystrom, MP for Yorkton-Melville. On behalf of the honourable members, we welcome you here. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. Order please.

MR. PATRICK: The member misses the point. Why did Saskatchewan remove the estate and succession duties, tell me why? Because they didn't want to lost the businesses, in fact, what they want to do is attract some industry, attract business and create some jobs, and probably the government didn't want to do it, same as I would indicate, I don't think it's right, but the thing is we have to live in a world of realism. So it's not one, and I'll tell the member privately the companies that are going to move out. Where are the Winnipeg Supply and Fuel people living now? — In Alberta. Where is BACM? They have moved their offices recently. —(Interjection)— Their workers are here, that's right, but their head offices aren't here anymore.

The problem is you know, the Province of Alberta today will say, look if you come to Alberta, we'll build you a plant at 4 percent interest. That's the government policy, and they have already all kinds of wealth in that province. So this is the difficulty that we're finding ourselves in in a have-not

province. I know, I accept that, and I'm not saying that we have to give it away. But the thing is if you live in the world of realism, and you find out what's going on. Saskatchewan removed it, and Alberta removed it, B.C. removed it, and I understand that it's a better arrangement in Ontario where they have a total forgiveness for small business and farm over a ten-year period. Then Manitoba can't be the only one, and say look we can stay with that type of taxation. Let us see the problem, I'm not saying it's right, but the point is if you take a look at what's happening in the other provinces this is where the business is going. You'll find some of the other large corporations, this is the action that they'll take. So you know, it's easy to say we'll be stubborn, we'll not change, and this is our policy, but in the long run, it's going to hurt, you're going to lose some of the industry that will not develop here.

So, Mr. Speaker, that's one area in taxation, I feel, at least in the interim, until there is some rationalization, perhaps maybe the Federal Government will get back into that field, that there will be the same tax across the country, or there should be some kind of an arrangement between, at least the western provinces, that there is the same tax and then we won't have this problem. So I say that the province perhaps could encourage the Federal Government to get back into that field. And we have to do something because, at the present time, the system is not working.

The other point, the Member for St. Johns would indicate that well, it is not happening. But I am sure that he is still talking to most of his colleagues in the legal profession. I am sure he is talking to the accountants in this province. There aren't that many and he can take a phone and make half-a-dozen or a dozen calls and he will get a pretty good indication.

I have done that. I have called many of the chartered accountants in this city, and I ask what effect does the succession duty have on some of the small businesses in this province or in this city? And invariably, almost every one will say it has. —(Interjection)— Well, not only that. If you get a small contractor that probably built a building 20 years ago, that building today is worth probably \$600,000 or \$800,000.00. It is amortized; it is probably paid. And you know perhaps he is going to pay \$200,000 or \$100,000 tax on that investment, perhaps his life insurance, his home and all his other assets, so it mounts pretty quickly. But he says if I would be somewhere else, it wouldn't cost me any tax.

I mean human nature is what it is. I am sure not only anyone else, but everyone in this House would do the same. If you had an investment or you had so many assets, you would probably say, well, sure, I'll go to Saskatchewan because I won't have to pay giving it to my son or my daughter. That is the course of action, I am sure, that every member will take in this House. It is human nature. So I am saying that we have to look at that realistically, Mr. Speaker.

I have indicated that perhaps we should have some kind of a commission or study made of the mining industry to see if there really is a curtailment in exploration or not, because of the new legislation. And I am not saying that it was all because of new legislation, but I think that we should find out.

I think that we should take a look at . . . In fact I don't like the Manitoba Corporation Capital Tax Act because when the Premier debated it, he said that it won't touch anybody unless it is a million-dollar corporation, in his speech. Maybe the Member for St. Johns didn't say that, but the Premier said that. But I can tell the Member for St. Johns my own small company, Patrick Insurance Services, Ltd., which goes and borrows \$60,000 or \$70,000 from the bank, is forced to pay a hundred and some dollars It is not much, I know, but the point is it is still a tax for the small businesses that have And it is not on the assets, it is on the money that you go to the bank and say: I need operating capital.

So it may be fine for some of the large corporations. It may be fine for the large corporations, but I think it is not in the interest of the small corporations. We have been told, not only by many members in this House, that it is the small corporations, the small entrepreneur that employs the majority of the people in this province, over 60 per cent. So if that is the case, we are making it more difficult.

I know the Minister of Industry and Commerce every day says what job he is going to do for the small business, but really we are not trying to help that small businessman very much by saying to him . . . You know, the rent is pretty high and now on the borrowed capital, you have got to go to the bank and borrow and that is what you are paying, your capital corporation tax. And I think that is unfair and that is an area that the government, I believe, better start looking at because certainly it is one of the other problems that we have, and a hindrance.

Now, how did the Minister and the government deal with the senior citizens? This is supposed to be the government of the people and really I am concerned because let's take a look at the supplements right across Canada, the supplements for the senior citizens. The Premier, not on one occasion, on every occasion in the first two years that he was Premier, used to get up and say, "we may not succeed in making everybody happy, in correcting all wrongs, but one thing we'll accomplish is we will do something for the less fortunate, for the disadvantaged, for the people on low income, for the native people' the ones that haven't got housing, haven't got opportunities to education. We will do something for those people, the senior citizens."

Let's take a look. What is the supplement for the senior citizen per month? It's \$7.85 per month in

this province, \$7.85. It is \$20.00 in Saskatchewan, which is also a not-have province, \$20.00, three times as much, almost. And it is forty-some dollars in Alberta and Ontario, and \$38.00, I believe, in British Columbia, close to \$40.00. —(Interjection)—

Well, this is the latest, it is right now. —(Interjection)— Well, they also have Medicare in all these other provinces so the member cannot say because we are doing things They have Pharmacare, they have home care services, all the other provinces have those things as well. What I am saying is that even the have-not Province of Saskatchewan saw fit to give the senior citizen, who really, because of inflation, is hurting and hurting badly today, but this government that is supposed to be a government of the people, is only giving them a third of what the next have-not province is, which is \$7.85 per month while Saskatchewan is giving \$20.00. —(Interjection)— Yes, it will. That will pay for the increased hydro cost. It will pay for the increased hydro cost. Well, if the Member for Churchill says the \$15.00 will do nothing, can he explain, in the Budget, the Minister — (Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PATRICK: Can the member explain then, on the Manitoba Tax Credit benefits, the Finance Minister takes great pride and took a lot of time in explaining even \$3.00 and \$4.00 increases for the people. He said it was a great benefit and a great thing, \$4.00 per month. For a family that is making \$8.00, in my opinion, that's with three kids, that's almost on the poverty line or perhaps is at the poverty line today with the high cost of living, and the Cost of Living Tax Credit is \$128 for the whole year. So that is how much? A little over \$10.00 a month. So that is a great benefit to those people. So the Finance Minister took a lot of time and said that's a great advantage and a great help and a great assistance for these people. So how can the Member for Churchill say that \$15.00 a month difference would not be a great benefit to senior citizens?

And the reason I am talking about the senior citizens is because I have checked with quite a few, and I would say the ones that have their homes probably paid for are not in too bad a situation. But even they have, before they pay their tax, before they pay their cost of heating and electricity, they are finding it pretty difficult because you know you are looking at \$240.00. It is pretty difficult for anyone to sustain himself on that kind of money. It is very difficult.

And I think in this Budget —(Interjection)— That's right, and that's the reason I am saying that in this Budget, I would have liked to have seen perhaps expanded home care services, which in my opinion is one of the finest programs, and I will give the government credit. But I believe there should have been some supplement, there should have been some supplement for the senior citizens, I mean an increased supplement to what we have at the present time.

There have been government studies done in Saskatchewan, the Federal Government, and every one has indicated — and that was even last year and since last year there was a pretty high inflation, — their studies indicated that these people are in serious trouble, unless they can get out of their homes and get into a senior citizens home where the rent becomes maybe \$50.00 and the cost may be minimized that way. But even then, is that the right thing to do, to say well, because you can't afford to live in your small home . . . and many of the senior citizens are still not living in the large two-storey, \$60,000, \$70,000 homes, I would say. I am talking about the ones that are living in small homes, four-room homes, and so on. And the Budget did not deal with that problem at all and I believe that it should have, Mr. Speaker.

I am concerned about unemployment. I think that the Minister did not deal with this properly from the government point of view. I think he dealt with it quite smart and quite cute but as far as the people are concerned, we are concerned, I think that he should have come out with his program in the Budget and tell us what it is going to cost and what kind of program it is going to be.

The other point that I would like to perhaps just briefly touch on, Mr. Speaker . . . And again the Minister of Industry and Commerce has been in that position now for a few years, and in my opinion I think that the Minister of Industry and Commerce in this province should have been the First Minister. I think that there would be a better rapport with the business community. I believe that there would have been some action and some assistance. It appears that the present Minister doesn't seem to be concerned. In my opinion the too many of the small businesses are disappearing. They are going out of business because they just can't make it. Their costs are too high, and still it is the small , entrepreneur, the small businessman, that in my opinion gives the services, good services, offers the competition. And if the member doesn't believe it, I will tell you right now in St. James Assiniboia, it is a pretty large area, there is probably only one or two service stations that are left that are doing repair work which, at one time, that was the way it was done. Everybody wanted to take their cars to service stations instead of to a large dealership, but there are only one or two left and you have to, even today, make appointments for two weeks before you can get your car in, because you still can get good service at less expense at one of those corner self-operated people that do the mechanical work and also fill your tank and so on. And I think it is unfortunate some of these small businesses are disappearing because they were the ones that offered the competition, gave service, and they are disappearing. So again I am saying to the Minister, why hasn't there been some assistance?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. LES OSLAND: Mr. Speaker, would the member that is speaking place the blame on taxes and that sort of thing, that's driven those small garages with their mechanics out, or would he place it where I believe it rightfully belongs on the companies themselves who set up the self-serve in competition with their own people that were already under lease?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: I would agree with the member, he is correct, that is what has happened. But again, I feel that some of these — I have a case right now, one of the top mechanics probably in the city, he wants to get into business, and I think he would be most successful and probably would employ a few people. But it is pretty difficult for him to get the type of financing. There should be perhaps four percent or five percent financing for this young person to get him established in his business. The Province of Alberta is saying that at four percent we'll build you a plant if you come here and they probably are quite successful now. You know, I believe that we should have some kind of a mechanism to help the small businessman get started at a less interest rate than he can get at the bank or at the present loaning agencies.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's time is up unless we have unanimous consent. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the honourable members present will give consent to the member responding, whether he would care to develop the idea of how much of an incentive a province like Manitoba ought to be trying to give in competition with the wealth of the oil-rich Alberta province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I can answer the honourable member this way. I think that what we can do, it's pretty difficult to compete I'll agree, but what we can do is create a climate that we can attract some people here. — (Interjection) — Well, I just mentioned one way, perhaps Venture Capital that Ontario started, perhaps low interest rates for small businessmen for their capital requirement, that would be another way. I am sure that there are ways. I said the other way was perhaps in the tax field, as much as I feel that there should be some kind of estate and succession duty tax, on the other hand I say you cannot live in isolation, you have to live in a world of realism, and if all the other provinces have done this all we are going to do it lose quite a few — maybe somebody that has got a million dollars, let's say he is relatively well fixed. But to the members, they may say well it's so much money, we don't care about that guy. But the point is that if you don't, he'll leave this province and he may be employing quite a few people. That's the fact.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: If the Member for Pembina refuses permission then, of course, he has control of the meetings. I think we have to be unanimous, so I don't know whether I have the right to ask a question or not.

A MEMBER: Well, you're the boss you know.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank honourable members for this. We are getting close to the lunch hour and I thought it might not hurt for a few minutes.

I am wondering though if the honourable member would care to put some kind of a dollar figure. We have a billion-dollar Budget, how much does he think we ought to put aside or dedicate for the purpose of wooing and winning industry compared with what Alberta could put up with just a piece of its Heritage Fund alone. How much does he think that we ought to set aside?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I think it is a fair question and I don't think it should be too difficult to set aside say five or ten million dollars in a small loans fund for small business or small industry. Because it's the industry that will come here or the industry that will stay here that will offer job opportunities, give you the tax base that you require for education, for schools, for hospitals, for the things that we require. I am not saying that we have to start something large. Surely we can start a small loan agency with a low interest rate, which is repayable. All I am saying is a low interest rate, start with a small figure, and if it is successful in three, four, five years, then that could be expanded. But it is better to try something than do nothing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am glad the last speaker got leave because I have so much to say against the government members opposite that it may take a few days.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WILSON: However, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Budget Speech I would like to take a few moments, quite a few moments, Mr. Speaker, a few serious minutes to re-emphasize that I am sure that I am standing here, when I say as sure as I am standing here, and I feel very confident. I don't sound very enthusiastic right now, but maybe later on I might get worked up to it.

As sure as I am standing here the government over there is going to fall in the next election. — (Interjection) — I'll tell you why in a few minutes. But I have been extremely active since 1969 in doing

all I can to give an added shove to the government, that in my opinion, is tired, inefficient, wasteful, and has run out of ideas, and has run out of good manners in this House.

I disagree with the Minister of Health when he says a few moments ago when he spoke that the Opposition team is not doing all it can to defeat the government. It is true that governments defeat themselves by acting in a high-handed and rude and unparliamentary way, but it is also true that we have a problem and I think that we in the Opposition have got to carry the message to the general public.

In my first election speech in this Assembly I told the members opposite that they would be found out. But because of the large political machine known as the NDP government, it is very seldom a courageous investigative reporter would look behind the slanted and twisted news service releases and seek a non-edited fact, the non-edited facts, and I suggest maybe they should be paid a little bit more because they have got so much money, so much profit, I guess, that they would be rolled back by the AIB, but instead they engage in — one paper says they have 70 percent of the market, the other one proceeds to spend a pail full of money saying that they're my kind of paper. And I think if we could get some half decent salaries for the members of the media that maybe we would get some non-edited facts printed.

I intend to take the few minutes that I have, Mr. Speaker, to attempt to go over the facts once more and close with absolute proof — and I say that to the Member of St. Matthews — absolute proof, that my information comes from their own party convention report of December 2nd. And my opinion stated, again my own personal opinion, because after reading the report and my experiences, they are my own personal observations and I really find it strange the goings-on in the NDP and they seem to remain unreported. — (Interjections) — Well, the news media seems to be more interested in some disenchanted member from Charleswood and giving him headlines than he does about the facts that are going on in that government. I think that my own experiences in two provincial campaigns and certainly the Minister of Corrections knows what I am talking about. Is that the public is not aware of the lengths that the NDP will go to in the name of victory at any price. — (Interjections) — Well, that government over there breaks the law every election and just by the unbelievable thing. All right, here is the proof and it is your own material. "The NDP did not calculate 64 professional organizers in their audited election expenses". And you just have to turn to their report of December 2nd, Page 4, and here may I just skip over, but it says, "Organizational impact . . ." — (Interjections) — And I'm sorry that the federal member from Saskatchewan isn't here because I would love him to hear this. "The NDP", and this is quoting from your own material, "The NDP provided fourteen full-time organizers to our campaign. The B.C. NDP provided eleven. Ontario provided twelve". Well, I wonder what is going to happen this time around if Premier Davis calls an election, that's twelve of those pros that you fellows opposite are going to have to do without. And two other campaign organizers, and hear this, CUPE, United Steel Workers, CFAM and the CLC contributed at least twenty-five organizers and support staff to the election campaign, a total of sixty-four professional organizers, of which that party did not report. They turned around and it says here, "In summary - 58 fulltime organizers were employed during the campaign with the central office paying the salaries of 44." I didn't see that in any report. Living expenses and in-province travel costs were paid in all cases by the Manitoba NDP Party and you guys got the nerve to stand up and complain about the logo in our material, which is a buffalo which is going to help promote this province. This is the kind of thing that really upsets me because, well, I just know that I started to look at this when I noticed a Saskatchewan car in my 1973 campaign and I noticed one again in the by-election and I thought, "Well, I've got to look into this." And luckily the information came forward the other day. So, it seems to me that even though 25 of these union organizers receive large salaries from union dues of members of all political faiths, they seem to think it's all right to take full time off their jobs and get involved in the election, roll their sleeves up and the membership does not have the right to question that and I think it's time that some fairness was put in that a general meeting, whether it's the Tuesday night meeting down at the Labour Temple, that somebody would stand up and say, "Is this fair, is this right, that our union dues are going to be politicized?" — (Interjection) — To the Minister of Tourism, when I worked for the railway, I got my two weeks' salary and I did not get any pay beyond that so if I took over two weeks holiday it was time off without pay and it should stand for everybody in the labour movement. — (Interjection) — Well, all right, here's another example. That centre is paid for union dues from all political parties. Members do not have necessarily have to be involved in a political party and, guess what, they allow election signs of only one party. Sure, you go and ask them, how about letting the Member from Wolseley put up a sign and they say . . .

A MEMBER: Did you ask them?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WILSON: Yes, I did.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WILSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, my comment is that my request was denied and they thought it

was a big joke. Well, I tell you it isn't a big joke. Well, you talk about open government and fair play over there and what I'm trying to tell is I've listened to a lot of nonsense coming from that side and I'm simply telling you that we've got to return fairness to the elections and what we've got to do is force some changes in the Election Act that is going to make it fair and never mind all the goings on. — (Interjection)— Well . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Let's have it.

MR. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, my experience in the last by-election was even the Returning Officer — he won't be back I guess because now he's an Executive Assistant with the government and the Minister of Tourism knows that. He probably hired him because he worked against me and the Minister of Tourism knows what I've got to say about his role as Minister of Tourism. — (Interjection)— Oh he was independent all right. He was real independent, but the NDP sign headquarters was at his house and he held himself out to be independent and many of the people that were enumerators, of course, were related to members of the government so that's no problem, but I just thought I'd put it on the record.— (Interjection)— Well, you know, there's a problem too.

Politics has been taken out of the realm of the ordinary guy being able to afford to run, because what happens is you spot all these infractions and you're fighting a system, you're fighting a machine. So what happens is that you go to a lawyer and he says, "I need \$1,000 retainer." You send Mr. Reeves or whoever, barrels full of infractions and you have to hire a lawyer, pay him a \$1,000 retainer. When are we going to turn to the thing that the government has somebody that examines the infraction, an impartial person, maybe the ombudsman or somebody, who will look at it and say, "Yes, this is a valid claim." And the government pays for the lawyer to investigate it or to bring it forward to have the election declared null and void. — (Interjection)— Well, I don't agree that Legal Aid should be used for political purposes and — (Interjection)— No, I've charged that and I had to prove it in the Estimates. I had to stand up and say that when I was in City Council a member of the Legal Aid had the nerve to write all the councillors demanding that we give the increase to the particular recipients. I voted that way anyway. I didn't need the pressure from one of the heads of the Legal Aid. I didn't need Legal Aid to take me to court because some company attempted to give me a campaign contribution. I didn't need an army of Legal Aid lawyers to be at the trough doing that. — (Interjection)— Well, I just think that your report here speaks for itself. It proves that you have lost the confidence of the people of Manitoba when you have to pay 64 high paid, high priced organizers to come in here and all of these guys from different provinces, what do they know about the needs of . . . be honest, they are here to pick the brains of the average working guy who has got to read what he says and you guys have the nerve to stand up in this coming election and accuse us of a "big lie" strategy. And that's what all these people are doing is coming in here and twisting around things and I think it's time that some measure off fairness and that this kind of huge expenditure, that your government should be held to task for not putting it in and not filing it.

Well, I wanted to get back to the Budget Speech and I did want to comment on something about the people leaving because I know from experience there are a lot of people leaving to Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia. Can you ask yourself why? Why are these people leaving? Well, maybe they are leaving because people — well you call it friendly Manitoba. The Minister of Tourism is setting a poor example for that, but I wonder, if you want to look at the concept, friendly atmosphere, welcome to Manitoba. How can you attribute that kind of feeling, when you have the Member for Radisson, the Member for St. Matthews and the Member for Thompson and the Member for Thompson is a real winner. You should see the stuff he puts in print. He's proud of driving out Inco and Hudson Bay Mining and all the rest of the companies out of the north and he just loves that corporate bum situation that he loves to plaster all over. And now they are going to turn around and dictate up north, the Minister of Consumers Bureau, he's going to dictate up north that the Rentalsman is going to dictate the behaviour of these companies and his own hydro by saying that if some guy comes in drunk and disrupts everybody that 99 working men have to lose their sleep because of some rowdy guy and the company can't do anything because the control is going to be given to the Rentalsman. Some bureaucrat down here in Winnipeg, who is going to also have the right under section 126 to transfer that authority to any kind of a guy holding a grudge or any kind of a redneck or any kind of a type of person that comes along that is going to be anti-business.

Well Well, I think this government is politically absolutely out of their tree. To think that they are going to stick up for one turkey against about 90 or 100 hard working men in that particular bunkhouse or establishment or hotel or apartment or whatever it is, and this is the kind of thing that I think they've absolutely gone off the deep end. I think it's just terrible that they have to do those type of things.

I'm closing down at this particular point and I shall be ready after the lunch hour to come back and give you some real interesting facts about why you fellows are losing your way. Well, that's got to be the height of foolishness for the Minister of Consumers' Bureau to give a Rentalsman, whose already been chastised for delegating authority — (Interjection)— or whatever, he's been criticized. All right

he's been criticized. He's been criticized because he's been delegating authority to a bunch of anti-property management people. He gives it to — I quoted the other day one member of the staff who was 105-115 percent against landlords and against property management people, who is so biased that she can't see beyond the paper that she's reading. That's the thing that I mean about fairness and your government opposite seems to lack that type of fairness and I think the Minister should clarify — (Interjection)— well, he should clarify all of this thing that's come on, as the Member from St. Matthews said, was one of the best Acts in North America and the chickens are coming home to roost.

Well, I'll tell you, people are leaving and I suppose this Sunday you'll all be celebrating. What is this Sunday, members opposite? —(Interjection)— No. It's Worker's Day, May 1st.

A MEMBER: Recognition.

MR. WILSON: Yeah, recognition. I'm sure that some of you will have a motion that we take Monday off so you can celebrate. Well, there's just too many of your socialistic ideas and beyond that coming forward by some of the changes in some of these Bills that are absolutely crazy to give government complete control. —(Interjection)— An open government. Oh, the Minister of Health talks about open government. He's a fine one to talk about open government. I filed an Order for Return that you members, other than the Member for Winnipeg Centre, refused to answer when I wanted to know the names of all your relatives and the salaries that they got that were on staff.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 12:30, the honourable member will have an opportunity to continue for 25 more minutes after the noon hour break. I shall leave the Chair now and reconvene at 2:30 p.m.