

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, April 13, 1978

Time: 8:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: May I direct the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my left where we have 23 cubs from the Second Maples Cub Pack under Akela Vern Barrett. This Cub Pack is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. On behalf of all the members we welcome you here.

The Honourable Member for St. George. ID1BUDGET DEBATE

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could you indicate to me how much time I have remaining, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has ten minutes.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before we broke for the supper hour the Minister without Portfolio and responsible for Housing, I believe, indicated that he was a little bit and even more than a little bit chagrined at my comments that the Conservative Party was in the hip pockets of the insurance industry in this province, Sir, and I indicated to him that I certainly was about to elaborate on my remarks to indicate that several years ago I was in a position that I backed off that comment. But this time I am sticking with it, and even more so to show you that there is such a close relationship between the two, between the honourable members on the opposite side and the insurance industry in this province; it is so close you can barely tell them apart. I am not even sure that you can.

Mr. Speaker, to give you an example: there was a memo written on Great-West Life stationery of the date of April 22nd, 1977, to Mr. Sterling Lyon from a Mr. William R. McCance, Research Co-ordinator, Economic Advisory Committee, where he writes to Mr. Lyon: "Further to conversations I have had with yourself and others we are considering putting together a group of individuals to review the economic environment and the economic impact of our policies." Of "our policies", Mr. Speaker.

Some of the names that have been mentioned to serve on this Board are as follows: Gord Lawson, Chairman; Duff Roblin; Murray Auld; Mac Runciman; John McFarland; Richard Bracken; Hugh Benham; George Richardson; Art Mauro; Sven Sigfusson.

"We would appreciate your comments on the advisability of organizing such a group, and if so, whether or not you had any preferences on the list of proposed Committee men." Signed, Wm. R. McCance, Research Co-ordinator, on Great-West Life stationery.

Not only that, on that same memo, Mr. Speaker, there is a note with some initials here and I won't allege whose they are, but I presume they would be the now Premier, with the note above the initials, "Okay, go ahead. Might want to add McCallum from the U of M, also John McFarland," and initialed with what appears to be an "S", but the memo was written to Mr. Sterling Lyon, and I would like to table this for the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt, there is just no doubt that the relationship of the Conservative Party and the insurance industry are like two peas in the pod. In fact they're so deep in the pockets — the Conservative Party and the insurance industry — I'm afraid that they're so far down that they're in their pants, that's how far they are cooperating with each other. Now, as I've stated, Mr. Speaker, they've gone deeper than that — (Interjection) — in their pants, that is correct. That is correct. Mr. Speaker, who else was on the Task Force Committee from the insurance industry, and when I finished before supper I indicated Mr. Benham and Mr. Thompson, both presidents and investment counsellors of two insurance companies. There was Mr. Roderick B. Penneycook, Vice-president, Great-West Life Assurance Company, Dr. Robert E. Beamish, Vice-president, Great-West Life Assurance Company. These are some of the people with the . . . there's also one more, I am sure, here that headed up the Task Force on, I believe, the Crown Corporations with somebody from . . . I don't have his name right now, but in any event he was with one of the insurance firms in this province.

What I said then, Mr. Speaker, and I do say now, that there is no doubt that the Conservative Party has accommodated a continuous, a continuous barrage, a continuous demonstration, and has allowed it to go on unnoticed to the vast majority of our citizens in this province. The doors are open to those kinds of demonstrations, those demonstrations that are like the lights of the Minister of Highways meeting with the Insurance Bureau of Canada and it bears repeating — the statements made by the Member for Inkster to the insurance industry to indicate to them that if they think that they can come in and sabotage the Public Insurance Corporation in this province, and the scheme and the investment portfolio and all the impact that the insurance system has on our motorists and on all our people in this province, the road is just as short as it is coming from east to Winnipeg as it is going back.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party and this Budget — oh yes, there is another document, Mr. Speaker. There is a document here that was written again by Mr. B. McCance to a Mr. D. A. McCarthy, P.R. Chairman, but this time not on Great-West Life stationery. It was written on an interdepartmental memo. Since when does B. McCance — or I believe the B. McCance of that day — and that memo is

dated 6th of June, 1977, not after October 1977, when he became an employee of this government, but prior to. He used taxpayers' letterhead and paper to write a confidential memo dealing with policy development, about the way to organize the Conservative P.R. campaign, and in suggesting that he wrote, and I will quote from one paragraph on Page 2: "I am suggesting that we set up teams. Karen Webb and Don Leach are already involved in the early stages of the Urban Housing and Parks areas, and that's the kind of grouping we should work for — one writer and one researcher. The writers don't have to be full time, in fact, we'll do a better job of getting the people we need if we can use free lancers on a project basis. That's the way Karen Webb is working with us. Alice Poyser will be willing to do the same. Scott and McCance should supervise and get approval for the approach from SRL. I would assume that that would be our Premier, with those initials.

Mr. Speaker, the point I'm making, I made before, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member's time is up. The Honourable Member's time is up, unless he has consent of the House to continue.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Since this is the first occasion that I have arisen since the session has begun, I would like to perform the duties in congratulating you again on your appointment to your position. I happen to be pretty keenly aware of the difficulties that you face, and the many decisions that fall in your lap, and also I am aware particularly of the difficulties that arise when debate in this Chamber becomes somewhat heated as it did earlier this evening, and how much tact, diplomacy that is necessary in order to cool the House down and bring the debate back to the level that is at least one that one is able to hear. I don't make a promise, Sir, that I am going to ease your difficulties. I don't think that in this Chamber I've been noted for that, but I can assure you that we do have knowledge of the problem that you face, and we do hope that your tact and wisdom will enable you to carry on the business of this Chamber so that we can complete the work that is before us and everyone will have an opportunity to express themselves in whatever way they choose to express themselves.

Sir, I was somewhat intrigued by the comments that were being made by the Member for St. George in his old and un retractable assertion that we are in the hip pockets of the businessmen in this province. —(Interjection)— Well, my honourable friend said the insurance companies, but when he read out a list of names of people who were going to act in Committee, I know some of them — as a matter of fact I think I know of all of them — and I don't think there was one insurance person on that whole list. There were accountants, there were businessmen, there were a variety of occupations involved there, but outside of Mr. McCance himself who is with the Great-West Life, I think it's fair to say that those people came from occupations that are about as varied as you can find in this Chamber.

Aside from that, Sir, I presume that the honourable member was attempting to create the impression that if the government has anything to do with the business community that they're in the pockets of that particular businessman or that group of businessmen. That is rather an interesting proposition particularly in the light of a statement that was made in this Chamber some time ago by the then Minister of Industry of Commerce, the Member for Brandon East. He made a rather interesting statement when he said and this my honourable friend will find in Hansard, "I would like to take this opportunity to point out that we have many very good Manitobans who happen to be businessmen who are assisting us in helping to develop Manitoba, and let me take the opportunity to mention them because it is very seldom that they get mentioned. They are doing this voluntarily." My honourable friends opposite now find that voluntary work on the part of a businessman is some sort of a crime not very far short of capital offense. "They are doing this without pay" — and it might come strange to my honourable friend opposite — "and they are doing this without remuneration." I don't know what the difference is but that's the way my honourable friend from Brandon East phrased it. "They're doing it for the good of Manitoba and in co-operation with the New Democratic government of Manitoba." So my honourable friend now finds that co-operation of businessmen in assisting the government in whatever way they choose to volunteer or whatever way they choose to assist now is not permissible without drawing some conclusions — conclusions, Sir, that are not worthy of my honourable friend.

I suppose at the time the then Minister of Industry and Commerce was aiming those remarks at some of the members of his own backbench who never had a good word to say about any businessman. The Minister at that time even seemed surprised that he could get co-operation from businessmen and I am not surprised; I'm not surprised that the businessmen of this country would even co-operate with my honourable friends opposite, notwithstanding the insults; notwithstanding the difficulties that they made for them as a government; notwithstanding the fact that their one driving ambition seemed to be to drive them out of business. The fact that co-operation from businessmen has been a long-standing feature of the Manitoba scene — we're happy to at least have recognized, even for a very brief moment, that at least the former Minister of Industry and Commerce was able to pay that small and short tribute, which I presume was immediately forgotten by my honourable friends opposite. I doubt very much if they took much stock in it. And judging from the comments that were made by the Member for St. George just a while ago, one couldn't help but draw the conclusion that the help that the business community gave to the previous administration has long been forgotten, and now they revert to their original role of being dedicated to one proposition and one proposition only, and that is taking money from the rich and votes from the poor on the pretext of helping or protecting one from the other. And it's an age-old game of the socialist.

And I suggest that my honourable friends are sitting opposite today because the people of this province recognize that kind of a tactic for what it really was. Well, honourable friends have taken a rather torturous path during the brief few months that this government has been in power. They have continuously attempted to convey to us — and I presume through the medium of the press, to the people of this province — that they know exactly the direction that they were going, but that we don't, that we have no idea of what the people of this province want, or what the people of this province expect from a government. Well, my honourable friend, the Member for Elmwood, who has a capacity to come out with the most appropriate comment from time to time, I think put it very succinctly a couple of years ago when he was sitting over in that seat. During the course of some remarks that I was making about the government attempting to push people around in this province, and that they and they alone seemed to perceive themselves as the leaders of the flock, and that only they knew where they should be going, my honourable friend the Member for Elmwood interjected with his comments when he said, "That's because the people don't know what they want." Well, it's characteristic of the attitude that we see only too well, and that the people of this province perceived during the election in 1977. The attitude that they know all the answers, the attitude that they and they alone can provide the millennium, and they alone know the direction that the country should go, without any regard to what the people of this province may want to do.

I think it was put perhaps as well as I've ever seen it, or ever read it, by Henry Fairlie in his book, *The Kennedy Promise*. Mr. Fairlie was attempting to describe the Kennedy years and their impact, not only in the United States but the world and how they govern and the tactics and the techniques that they used to govern. It is an extremely interesting book and one that I commend to my honourable friends opposite because we see echoes of themselves in that book.

But in one paragraph Mr. Fairlie had this to say, In the total wars of the modern age, we are willing to surrender our individualism for the period of the war because we're persuaded that if there is no victory there is no future. And the danger is that this totalitarian spirit is then carried into peace. If we can perform such miracles in war why cannot we perform them in peace. And such is the plausible cry. If we can build Pluto and Mulberry — and for the benefit of younger members of this Chamber, Pluto and Mulberry were the improvised pipeline and artificial harbour that were constructed for the invasion on D-Day — they say why cannot we build schools and hospitals?

The answer lies and we should be grateful for it and the people themselves who have recovered some of their individualism, that is something that my honourable friends opposite don't want the people to recover. And I seem to perceive that everything that they could possibly do, they did, in order to prevent that kind of individualism. People no longer have a single objective, some want schools, others want automobiles and we have many examples of that just in the last few months. The demonstrations that have been held, the cries for assistance, everybody believing that their priority is the most important one. That's not unusual for a government to be faced with. But even those who want hospitals and schools may want universities and libraries even more. Which of these is the nobler aspiration is a matter of subjective preference and the people cannot with the return of at least a measure of their freedom be confined to any one of them.

In a free society, when it is at peace, a government cannot override the variety of people's choices. It can only marginally influence them. And in that margin the politician works. That really is the role of government.

There are limited resources and in the past 10 or 20 years we've tended to believe that the resources of this country were unlimited. And the reason we tend to believe that is because our governments have taught us to believe that. They've encouraged us to believe that and they should have known better. And we've been able to finance those dreams on the strength of nothing more than sheer inflation and the printing of money; money that is becoming worth less and less every day.

One can only speculate as to how long we can continue to ride the crests of this inflationary mania before the crash finally comes; and come it will. Notwithstanding all of the preaching to the contrary; notwithstanding all of the suggestions from my honourable friends opposite; that we can continue to increase wages; that we can continue to increase expenditures; and that we can continue to go into debt at the rate that we are going without one day facing the consequences.

And I'm going to tell my honourable friends opposite that if there is one group of people in this country that are aware of that, it's the young people because they know that they are the ones that are going to have to pay for it. And if there's one group of people in the western world that are turning their backs on the socialist experiment, it's the young people of this country.

Well, the Member for St. George also took great delight in referring to the incident yesterday, the question of privilege that was raised by the Member for Transcona. The Member for Transcona in his question of privilege stated that the report, or the Rent Review Board, had been censored, and I quote: "And the report had been censored by a political editing job on the technical report." Well, of course, it was hardly a question of privilege but it was a good try. I remember when I was across the way I used to do those things myself and I perhaps can blame myself for the lessons that my honourable friends opposite have learned and the way they practise it. —(Interjection)—

But I want to draw my honourable friends' attention to another document, a document that was tabled in this House a few years ago. It was called "Guidelines for the Seventies", and there was a copy of that original draft . . . —(Interjection)— Well, if my honourable friend will just contain his soul in patience I will come to it. You know, there's nothing more disturbing, that when you're reaching the climax of what I consider to be a pretty good analogy, that somebody interrupts you and beats you to the punch line. That original document was not only censored and edited; it was laundered and it was bleached; it was dry cleaned and wrung out; it was treated with sulphuric acid

and then washed thoroughly in "gramma's lye soap". And then when that document appeared, it created quite a furor in its initial stages and it contained a lot of suggestions. It contained a suggestion that the Co-op Movement was now redundant. It contained a suggestion that the municipal councils should be done away with because they were reactionary. It contained a suggestion that — or recommendation I should say, not a suggestion — it contained a recommendation that all the local businesses should be closed up and replaced by government Crown corporations.

It was a document that my honourable friends, when it was revealed, couldn't face. So they hurriedly did the editing on it — and I'm not critical of that editing — and when the new document was published and tabled in this House there wasn't even one single word mentioned about it. I don't believe it even received any notice in the press because it was such an innocuous document by that time, it had been wrung out so completely and so bereft of all of the original suggestions, that it didn't mean anything. —(Interjection)— On which?

MR. CHERNIACK: The publication?

MR. JORGENSON: Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh, there were? There were not?

MR. JORGENSON: Well, I'll tell you. I'll make a deal with my honourable friends. If they'll take the responsibility for the original document — they accused us of editing the document and then the final one becoming Conservative philosophy, that's the way it was put — that it indicated our philosophy, the final document. I All right, the original of the Guidelines for the Seventies must have contained socialist philosophy, and I'll accept one if my honourable friends will take the other, but they won't do that. They are not prepared to do that. —(Interjections)— Well, that's the one I have just been talking about. And the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs outlined the changes that had been made in that document, and tuere's very little to criticize in the way of so-called changes. Changing the word juicy to something that perhaps was more appropriate for that kind of a document is hardly, in my opinion, a substantial editing job. —(Interjection)— Well, my honourable friend, the Member for St. Johns, says that he is sorry but he can't hear the Member for Lakeside because he's sitting on the other side. Well, I'm glad he's sitting over there because when he sits beside me, he is more trouble to me than he is to you.

But this, Mr. Speaker, has been a rather interesting experience, that we've witnessed in the few months that we have been in the government, and particularly the few weeks that the House has been in session. I find it incredible, day after day, my honouraule friends opposite . . . I always had the impression that the Legislature sat for the purpose of permitting the people of this province the opportunity of questioning the government on its direction, and to ask the government to justify its policy. But what we're finding, Mr. Speaker, is that, day after day, my honourable friends opposite are spending more time attempting to justify the last eight years than they are in questioning the government. Almost every question that is directed, every speech that is made harks back to the eight years that they were in power in an attempt to tell the people of this province that they were wrong, that they were wrong in defeating them. Well I suppose it's a natural reaction on the part of members who get defeated, but it would seem to me that sooner or later my honourable friends are going to accept the role that is theirs at the present time and deal with the business of the House instead of attempting to justify the past eight years because we are facing a different situation. —(Interjection)— Well my honourable friend talks about horror stories. I tell you the worst of the horror stories will be facing this country when inflation and profligate spending catches up to us and my honourable friends, maybe it would be better for them then to look back over the past eight years and rethink what they could have done to prevent it which is something tuat they haven't done up to now.

I found it even interesting to note that. . . I could not help but be reminded of an occasion in 1957 when the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons at that time, Mr. Pearson, suggested in a subamendment, in a confidence motion, that the government of the day should resign and allow the opposition to take over without an election. That suggestion was hinted at by the Member for The Pas just the other day. I find that an intriguing suggestion but one I am afraid we will not follow. I rather suspect that one of the reasons why the Member for Inkster, for example, is so vociferous and I urge him again to pay attention to the injunction that was served upon him by his wife when he is speaking. It is not necessary to become so excited and it is not necessary to shout so loud because we can hear you quite well. Sir, I expect that the reason that the Member for Inkster gets so worked up is because of a statement that he made in 1976 — one that he finds is not being followed as he predicted it would and I am sure he will recall it — when he said that the years that they were in power, we will progress. And in his terms progression means to the left. That's progress. Further and further to the left and. . . See my honourable friends opposite now applaud that statement. One can only conclude from that applause that they are not concerned about how far to the left they go, that the ultimate is the objective. And the ultimate of course is communism and my friend, the Member for Rupertsland seems to take great delight in hearing that. I can only assume that he believes it. And that is progress as far as he is concerned.

And then he went on to say that the years that we are in power that we will just stand still and what is upsetting my honourable friend is that we have not stood still, that we are going the other direction and that really bothers him. —(Interjection)— Well, you see, there is another dichotomy that exists in the attitudes of my honourable friends opposite. There is one group that says. . . among that group

is the Member for Inkster who seems to be charting a different course than the rest of his colleagues when he says that we are doing exactly the same things, that we are still. . . because he wants to believe that, not because it is actually happening but he devoutly wants to believe that we are just standing still while we are the government so that when they take over we will move further to the left again. But that is not what the other meers say. The other members are saying that we are changing the entire course in the direction and that we are going to the right, we are called fascists by the Member for — or Nazis, was it — by the Member for St. Rose and fascists by others.

MR. GREEN: I think he said both.

MR. JORGENSON: So it's rather interesting to note the difference that seems to exist in their minds. I know what is on the mind of my honourable friend for Inkster. He wants to believe it, and when he wants to believe something he will believe it notwithstanding the facts. He has demonstrated that more times than one in this House. Well, the interesting thing about the content of all of the speeches that have been made by my honourable friends opposite is that I have not heard one single word of fear expressed about the results, the devastating results, of inflation — not a single one. There has not been one single word mentioned about the taxpayer, the person that has to foot all these bills. They continue and if one were to compile, I am going to get somebody to do that, even up to the short time that we have been here, to compile the costs of all of the spending that they have wished upon us and upon the taxpayers of this province — (Interjection) — Well, it will come to much more than that. One after the other have urged the government to spend more money on every conceivable thing except highways. And I don't know whether it is because my honourable friend, the Minister of Highways. . .

MR. ENNS: Is such a personable young fellow?

MR. JORGENSON: . . . has done something to offend them. But highways in this province are an important part of the infrastructure of this province, one that — (Interjection) — Well, you see that is the interesting thing about my honourable friend from Inkster. I don't think that there is a country in the world, I don't care what kind of a country it is, that doesn't believe that there are certain things that the government should be doing. One of them is building roads. One of them is building roads. . .

MR. GREEN: That's right. It is a question of how much.

MR. JORGENSON: . . . and streets. And yet to him that is socialism. Well, it's nothing of the sort. The building of highways is a legitimate and I think a proper function of government, doing those things for people that the government can do better. I can tell my honourable friend right now that being in a competitive manufacturing business, or a primary production business, is not a legitimate function of government. And there is where he and I, and perhaps members of this side of the House and members of that side of the House, separate. It has been demonstrated time and time again, and there is a very logical reason, a very logical reason why government in business will not function. I have never heard up until my honourable friends went on that side of the House, I never heard him once, brag about the money that their companies had made. Not once. It was always about the jobs that they created. Well, I am going to tell my honourable friend that if anybody goes into business, any kind of a business, for the purpose of creating jobs then they are doomed to failure.

There is only one purpose for anybody going into business and that is to make money, to make a profit. Yet my honourable friends opposite would deny that to any business. — (Interjection) — My honourable friend, the Member for Ste. Rose says, "Who is opposed to profits?" My goodness. Have I not been hearing the speeches correctly delivered by my honourable friend, and by honourable gentlemen opposite. That has been the theme of their speeches that there is something wrong with the profit motive. They follow that line that is fed to them by their pseudo-intellectuals with bovine submissiveness. . .

MR. ENNS: I could not have said it better myself, Warner.

MR. JORGENSON: . . . without any regard to the facts, and without any regard to the needs of this province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is one that has been spending a great deal of time trying to convince himself that the years that they were in government were the years when there was fiscal responsibility and good management, and he is always comparing that with the years prior to that. Well, he made some reference or other other people made some reference, I think that the Member for Inkster made some reference to anybody that couldn't make a profit in 1971 was an idiot. — (Interjections) — Well, he repeated it this afternoon. I don't want to misquote my honourable friend. Yes, it was a statement that was made by the First Minister and repeated this afternoon by the Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: I merely said he said it.

MR. JORGENSEN: And then he pointed out that in that particular year the government did make a profit and they made profits over a period of years.

Well, the figures which are taken from the Public Accounts indicate that that is a fact. That is the figures of revenue and expenditure and for the year 1970-71 it showed a \$20 million profit or surplus of revenue over expenditure. But the one thing that puzzles me during those same years is the figures that are also contained in the same document, and I presume that my honourable friends will accept that figure that I gave for 1971. I could give them the figures all the years, right from 1965 to 1977, and also I can give them the figures of the increase in the public debt during that same period.

In the year 1971, in spite of the fact that on current account they show a surplus of \$20 million, the increase in the public debt that same year amounted to \$61 million. In 1972 they did a little better, it was only \$2 million.

MR. URUSKI: What is the public debt? How do you determine the public debt? Let's hear your definition of the public debt.

MR. ENNS: Perhaps you can ask Joe Borowski up there, he will tell you what the public debt was.

MR. JORGENSEN: My honourable friend now asks the question, "What is the public debt?"

MR. URUSKI: Yes, how do you interpret it?

MR. JORGENSEN: And we felt all along that they knew what it meant.

MR. URUSKI: How do you interpret the public debt?

MR. JORGENSEN: The following year, 1973, the increase in the public debt was \$78 million, close to \$79 million. 1974 — \$80 million; 1975 — \$248 million more; 1976 — \$293 million more; 1977 — \$267 million more.

MR. ENNS: You know what it means to me, it means an eighty-seven cent Canadian dollar. An eighty-seven cent Canadian dollar.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ENNS: And that dollar will be a peso before you know it. That is what it means to me.

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

MR. GREEN: I just want to make sure that the honourable member and I have the same figures. Are you accumulating or are you saying that this was the increased debt each year?

MR. JORGENSEN: No, this is the debt for each year. Yes, that's right. 1975 — \$248 million; 1976 — \$293 million; and 1977 — \$267 million, making a total over that period from 1969 to 1977, the latest for which we have figures, of over \$1.84 billion.

Now that was the increase in the public debt and I have some difficulty, Sir, in understanding what they mean when they say that they had surpluses in each one of the years. But the figures in the Public Accounts indicate that they had deficits in every one of those years.

Well, the Leader of the Opposition, who is somewhat a master of deception, he says things in such a way, you know, that nobody can quite nail him down. There wasn't a better example of that than in 1972 during his Speech from the Throne, when he referred to the establishment of the Hog Marketing Board the year before, and then referred to the increase in hog prices, as if the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board, and that's what was implied, that the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board could increase the prices of hogs in Omaha, Nebraska; St. Louis; Iowa; and all those other places because they went up all over.

He did the same thing the other day in referring to a statement, or referring to the 1962 dollar devaluation, he mentioned the figure 91 cents, Alvin Hamilton's 91 cents, and he said that is only 3 cents more than it is today. What he failed to mention is that the dollar did not go down to 91 cents at that time, it was pegged at 92 ½. But you see, it was a misleading sort of thing and he does that all the time. He did it again during the course of the election campaign when he was referring to the TED report and the quotation in the TED Report which indicated that, according to him, we had suggested that farms should be reduced. There was nothing of that nature in the TED Report at all. It was a complete fabrication of the content of that report.

Well, and so it goes on. Another instance, the other day he criticized us roundly because we removed the Succession Duty taxes, but during the course of the election campaign. . .

MR. ENNS: What did the Leader of the Opposition say during the course of the election campaign?

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, the Leader of the Opposition during the course of the election campaign said that he was giving serious consideration to removal of the succession duties.

MR. ENNS: It was a noble pursuit during election time.

MR. JORGENSEN: You know, that is the sort of double talk that we get from the Leader of the Opposition. We got it when he was on this side of the House, we are getting it more when he is on that side of the House. Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends want to talk about deception, want to talk about not telling the truth, they want to look to the Leader of the Opposition who is a master of deception and has demonstrated that on more than one occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to listen to the Member for Morris, albeit he is a Minister of the Crown now and the Honourable Minister I should address on that. But he has just done one of his usual jobs of making a jab where there is absolutely, you know, nothing there, create a straw man and then try to knock it down.

TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder if I may interrupt the honourable member and ask leave for the purpose of tabling a document of the Ombudsman. I understand there is some urgency in doing that.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I am only too glad to do that because at news time it said it was tabled and it wasn't.

BUDGET DEBATE (Cont'd.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Yes, and here again is just a small example of the sloppiness of the present administration. The Ombudsman is on "24 Hours" tonight talking about the Ombudsman Report that we haven't even seen. But this is the way the government chooses to operate.

But nevertheless the Premier, in his campaign, said that they were considering — and that happens to be a truthful statement — he was, he was bumping into some opposition, including my own. But, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to see the Member for Lakeside . . . Oh, the Minister of Public Works has left, I'm sorry to see that because when I saw that he was in his seat, I went out to get this horror story but I can't find the quotation that I wanted to get. It is in Volume 5 and somebody removed Volume 5 from it, where Walter Newman way back in 1968 came up with the impression — and I have to paraphrase — that these people were a bunch of crooks. As a result of it, he was shoved to the side as legal counsel for the Fund. But, Mr. Speaker, if anybody in Manitoba wants to read a horror story, they should read this Royal Commission into The Pas complex. I thought we had got by this. The Leader of the Government at the present time, when he was Leader of the Opposition, said that he was going to raise the parliamentary debate and he was going to get out of this who made the biggest mistakes. "Our mistakes aren't as bad as your mistakes," and everything else. But no, they still keep saying that they are going to tell us a horror story.

Well, if anybody wants to read a horror story, they want to read that CFI thing. You open it at any particular page and you will find out just exactly what transpired, how forgetful the First Minister was. He couldn't remember certain trips or involvements with this complex that evolved. And earlier when people were chiding my member for saying that they were in the pocket of the insurance companies, they couldn't even remember getting \$36,000 a year. I don't think I would even forget that.

But in speaking about insurance, when I was a young lad, I asked my grandfather about insurance and said, what do you think about insurance? He said, "It's the biggest ripoff in history." And I said, "Well, don't you believe in it?" He said, "No. If they don't bury me for love, they will for stink."

But this idea of insurance — all insurance is, it's a very simple thing — it's an actual probability that you will live or die, plus an administration cost plus a profit. And when people go around and talk about the Great-West Life Company as if it was the local people down the street, you know, a \$2.3 billion outfit that is owned primarily by CPI and Power Corporation and other people, and where do they get their money from? They get their money from small people who buy insurance policies. They invest their money in this company and the company charges for this investment and invests it wherever they want, not where the people might choose to want, or choose to have their money invested but they have absolutely no control over it. The Member for Inkster with his few shares has absolutely no control over what Great-West Life does with their investment moneys.

But this idea that the larger corporations are friendly and out to serve Manitobans is hogwash. They will serve Manitobans as long as they can make a dollar. And by the way, you never heard me say anything about it being a sin to make a dollar. There is absolutely nothing the matter with making a profit and of course this is one of the problems regardless of what society you have. I personally get sick and tired of left-right, left-right, left-right, left-right, because actually in the final analysis it is what kind of an organization of the systems and institutions can serve the people, not whether it is

"you win or I win" or "you lose or I lose."

But, Mr. Speaker, in this debate so far the Minister without Portfolio, the House Leader, was saying that we are on the defensive of the government. We are not on the defensive of the government. The record speaks for itself. The First Minister, when he was in opposition, said, you know, this program was good, this program was good, hospitalization was good — albeit that they had to be dragged into it kicking and screaming in the 1960s to initiate it.

Mr. Speaker, the big lie that they have been trying to hurl out, the horror stories that they are going to throw out, the idea that there was going to be a \$400 million deficit projected in this Task Force or by Mr. Riley when he was interviewed in Texas or somewhere, you know, I think that the reaction of the Opposition has been most responsible. In the final analysis it boils down to something like \$80 million. One of my constituents asked me, "What is all of this hullabaloo that is going on about this horrendous deficit." I digress, Mr. Speaker. Einstein said if you can't put in simple terms that which you want to say, you don't know what you are talking about and I don't mean by using that that example to equate myself with Einstein by any means. But sigma is equal to MC squared is one of the most simple statements in the world but yet the information that it contains baffled men for centuries.

But, Mr. Speaker, Estimates — these are estimates of how much it is going to cost us to operate the programs that the government wants to implement and how they think that they are going to raise this money and we guessed — that's all it is, it's a guesstimate, people use that term. It's an estimate, it's a guesstimate of how much it is going to cost. Nobody's crystal ball in any endeavour, government, companies or private individuals, is able to ascertain with absolute certainty that which is going to take place economically or fiscally in the next 12 months. So that in a billion dollars, if you are out 1 percent, I think the account ants would all agree that in projections, plus or minus 5 percent is good budgeting. —(Interjection)— Oh, explained in these terms, he said, well, there is really no problems. I said, no, and that they will have the same kind of problems as we had. They will estimate how much it is going to cost — and this is the interesting point — it's the programs, the part of it that they are going to continue that they don't want to continue.

And yet with few exceptions on the other side, they haven't come out and told the people what programs they would initiate. All they are doing is cutting back programs that we started. And what kind of programs are they cutting back, programs which in the final analysis would save them money. The Member for St. George earlier in his remarks, showed them quite simply how they could save money on acute care beds. It's the difference between \$100 a day and \$35 a day in the cost of operating those institutions.

But Mr. Speaker, there has been on television over the past few days, a series of programs — I think there were three of them — on the rising cost of health care. And when you get the economists in it and they're talking about the increase of this and the increase of that, one of the things that they all ignore, is that people are getting health care. I don't know how many people around know that in Manitoba we had one of the highest death rates for young people in the world. In the interlake of this particular province —(Interjection)— the Member for Wolsely chirps, "not true" or something, I don't know, I can't hear him.

MR. WILSON: How come?

MR. BOYCE: How come? Because the people didn't have doctors, as in Snow Lake they won't have a doctor, if you people don't get off your butt and build a hospital there. It was on television tonight, Mr. Speaker. A hospital. They're walking around in the basement of it in rubber boots. It shows the cracks in the plaster. And they're worried that the building won't even stand up. The doctor is leaving. Who would expect people to work in those kind of conditions? But here's a whole community, mining community, that is without health services. There's another doctor going to go up and take a look at it, and I wouldn't be a bit surprised if he just packs his bag and comes home. But yet we can put a couple of hundred men together on a destroyer and we can find a doctor for them.

And once again, the House Leader talks about the causes of inflation. He ignores a couple of areas. Once again, bombs and butter. He said, during the war . . . he was quoting somebody. I'm sorry I missed the name of the person he quoted. I've heard him quote that expression before. But how the people could muster themselves together to address themselves to the common goal of a war. And all controls will be placed on ourselves. But the funny part of it is, just as soon as a war is over, the people who make money on wars still continue to make money because they divert our attention and then they divide us.

He forgets that greed is something which is in all of us. Which one of us doesn't have to learn when they pass the plate that you don't take the biggest piece? There are some people that don't learn that.

I'm glad the Member for Lakeside is back in his seat again, because he stood up briefly the other night and told us his horror stories about if people lend money, you know that's an asset, and I wish he had time to continue, because a number of years ago, I made a bad decision I suppose in a business sense, I co-signed a note for a fellow, and instead of the company going after him and collecting from him — and he's still around, this guy — they phoned me up and said, "You co-signed this note, pay it." And I said, "Well, go after the guy that borrowed the money initially, first, don't deprive him of the opportunity to pay." They sued me. So I had to pay it before they "clommed" on to something. But I was waiting for the member to continue, because his argument was leading to a conclusion which would suggest I had an asset. This piece of paper that I can't do anything with. But he didn't continue. His finances are kind of funny in this sense. If you lend money to somebody, and he can't pay it back, that you've got an asset. This is where your argument was going the other night.

MR. ENNS: Drift that one past me again.

MR. BOYCE: Well, you drifted this one . . .

MR. ENNS: I'm just a little slow tonight, I'm not too swift. I'm just not too swift. Try that again on me, Bud. I just didn't quite catch it.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, perhaps for the record, it should be put on the record that the Minister of Highways, or the Minister of Public Works is saying that he's not too swift. On this, I think we all agree.

MR. ENNS: We're travelling metric now. Everything's a little slower in the whole province.

MR. BOYCE: This is what we all agree, that the Minister is not too swift. —(Interjection)— Well, I wouldn't go as far as that. I disagree. I think he's very bright. But I don't think he's too swift.

To go back just a little bit, the House Leader is beautiful. He takes two entirely different situations and tries to show a parallel. The government tabled the report themselves. They accepted the responsibility for putting on the table, they said, this is a paper that we've asked people to write comments on, we've looked at your suggestions, and we sat down in Cabinet and said, this is what we decided. That's what we did, put it on the table, didn't say anything to try and confuse anybody. But what this government said, they said, "Here's the report". Where is this thing? I must have it. He said, "This is the report of the Rental Review Agency." That's what they said. They didn't say that . . . this government's report. I intend to raise this on the Estimates. I wasn't going to make a big thing out of it, but the Member for Transcona got some more information than I have, but on the front of this thing, what does it say? It says, "The Preliminary Report on the Impact of Rent Controls in the Province of Manitoba. This study was prepared under the direction of Rubin Simkin, Vice-Chairman, Rent Stabilization Board." And then it lists the participants, as if these people accepted the responsibility of what was put in this thing. And it's covered by this letter, an entirely different situation.

If you had put this on the table and said, this is the Minister of Consumer Affairs' opinion, this is the opinion of the government, there wouldn't have been any question at all, but that wasn't what was done. This was put on the table as if it was a report of some professional group, and as was mentioned by the Member for Transcona, I didn't agree with Ruben Bellam's suggestions either, but nevertheless we sent them in here the way they were presented.

But what did he say, Mr. Speaker, he went on and he said this Guidelines for the Seventies was dipped in oil of vitriol and sulphuric acid and everything else, well it's not as bad as you giving a Lydia Pinkham pill to this report, because that's what you did. You took everything out of it which would make it pregnant.

Speaking about such things, I often wonder why the Conservatives were kind of afraid of family law, these changes in family law. The idea that women contribute to the economic well-being of the family unit, and why they would be afraid of the changes we had initiated. But it came out this afternoon. You talk about Freudian slips from the other side. The Minister of Labour saying that nothing was going to be lost in the mines as far as production was concerned, but the Member for St. Matthews, who was giving, I thought, a very good address, but he snuck in this aside sort of thing that private sector wastes money. And all this advertising and all this stuff that was going on, and soap, who needs all this advertising of soap and sanitary napkins and all those other strange things — he doesn't know. I'm sorry to have to use this as a particular example, but he says strange things. He doesn't know anything about the menstrual process. I finally found out, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservative Party are scared of women.

The First Minister — they're great breeders, they want the Domino theory, that they'd all go like this and that's all there is to it. But they don't know that the family unit, that women are equal. You see, they have to have somebody that's not quite as good as they are. They have to have somebody to look down on. It seemed just so strange to me, years ago and today, the greed of people.

You know, this fellow over here, there's not too many members, old Solon over here, one of his famous sayings was, "I have grown old learning many things". Solon. The statue. That's Moses behind you, in case you didn't know.

MR. JORGENSON: What did he say?

MR. BOYCE: What did he say? Which one?

MR. JORGENSON: You get too soon old and too late smart.

MR. BOYCE: I'll put a date on my friend next to you. Was he there, Charlie? Well, he was going back into some of the older expressionists. You younger people don't even remember Baron Munchausen.

MR. ENNS: I flew with him in the last war, him and Big Red. He had a silk scarf.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I was kind of enjoying it. I haven't had a little bit of banter with my friends from Morris and Lakeside for a year or so. But nevertheless, I've grown old learning many things. And I learn that people don't change. That one generation follows another, just as sure as the night follows the day, and each one of them has to go through an exercise. And each one of them has to go through some kind of exorcism, because within all of us, there is a tendency to chase the golden fleece or the brass ring, or something else. And unless we learn to control that, then instead of Armageddon being a theological probability, it is also almost an immediate necessity.

I remember when the Minister of Finance down east said when they removed the 6 percent interest rate and the bank rates. He said, "It may go down". How stupid. "It may go down". The House Leader, when he's talking about the things that cause inflation, what does he talk about? Labour. He doesn't talk about profits going up, he doesn't talk about interest rates going up. You know, 6 percent, 7 percent, 8 percent, 9 percent, 10 percent, 12 percent, 13, 14, you know there were cases in Winnipeg not too many years ago where people were convicted of usury. But this is a term that you don't hear any more. Because it's okay to be greedy if you're lending money. This is one of the things that causes inflation.

\$200 billion a year for armaments, for things to fight, to kill each other. And right down here in the province of Manitoba, the Minister of Industry and Commerce — I'm relying on what? I'm relying on the aerospace industry. What for? F-16s. We want a part of that. That's going to keep our people busy. Would it not be better, Mr. Speaker, if we could address our efforts to building houses for people, roads for people?

You talk about the national debt, or the provincial debt. It just rankles me that the provincial auditor and others keep talking about how much money we owe, and they don't come out and say what we've got for this money that we owe. If it's going to be necessary to account for dollars in this particular way, we own trillions of dollars in assets. The roads system, the telephone system, the school system, the hospital system, and everything that we have purchased with this money. And for people to go around and push silly little cash registers during election campaigns, by telling them we're going broke, how stupid. And I don't think this is why people elected that particular government. A thousand votes either way. One way in a few constituencies changes it. But you have a mandate to govern, there's no denying that. This is your responsibility. But nevertheless, if a person has a mortgage on their house, by your standards, they're broke. If they own their car, they're broke. If they bought a TV set on time, they're broke. How silly. Eventually, the people will learn that that which they're talking about is pure nonsense.

The Budget, Mr. Speaker — it's been said better by others that this non-political document where they are cutting costs — what they are actually doing is transferring payments. Is this present government cutting the amount of money it is costing us to run our universities? No. Instead of paying a bigger share out of general revenue, they are transferring the cost to the students. Instead of paying for bus fares in the City of Winnipeg . . . You know, this is something that, in the past few years that I have been in this House, strikes me as being passing strange.

The Member for Lakeside the other night . . . Somebody made a remark about the farmers and he said, "Look at, you know, all the farmers on the other side of the House." He forgets that there are some people that are engaged in farming over here. But he thinks those of us in the city aren't interested in the problems of the farmers. That's not true. But nevertheless they try to give this impression that we are not in favour of some of the programs that they have put in place in the rural communities.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want the rural members and some of the suburban members to know some of the problems that exist in my particular constituency because there is absolutely nothing in this budget which is of assistance to the people in the core area in the City of Winnipeg. Of all the — shortsighted governments and members thereof that I have ever seen, this is it. Because these people who are so parochial in the interests of the farms forget that the people . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, I thought maybe I was missing something, Mr. Speaker, and I wouldn't like to do that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a dirty trick . . .

MR. JORGENSON: I want to refer my honourable friends to Page 65 of the Ombudsman's Report.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, this is a dirty low-down Morris or Lakeside trick, and I'm sure to this day it was them who sent me that note that my fly was open. And they have done this deliberately to avert my attention. I'll look up Page 65 after the debate is over.

But, anyway, I would like your attention just for a moment though, because I think that you people should be interested in some of the problems in the City of Winnipeg, and the effects of your budget. You people forget that most of the people who move into the city, and especially the core area, are those people who can't make it out in the country. The people who can't make it in other areas, and the people who are either on their way up or their way down.

The Member for Fort Rouge said that the government should look at the possibility of making a cottage factory type of an operation out of the provincial garage. I don't think that that makes sense. But nevertheless one of the things that is of interest — or should be of interest — is that the people in

this downtown area don't own cars. They have to rely on transit. And these are the people, Mr. Speaker, who the Minister of Labour says we can't afford to pay more money. But yet their costs haven't been frozen; their costs go up — 1.1 percent last month.

What is in this budget for housing for the people in my constituency? Zilch, nothing; they are going to cut back on public housing.

You know, the First Minister was talking about Marx. I think Marx is a little out of date. But nevertheless the people who would cause the conditions which gave rise to Marx aren't out of date.

Before the revolution in Cuba . . . I don't know how many people went to Cuba before the revolution or knew what was going on in Cuba before the revolution, but the whole country of Cuba was exploited by a number of companies. The biggest one was United Fruit. And how did they do it? Well, they paid Batista off and Batista . . . Well, the Member for Wolseley doesn't know, you know, anything about history at all. He agrees with the Member for Minnedosa that anybody who went to university and studied a little bit is stupid or something.

But, Mr. Speaker, it seems so evident to a number of people that if some of the things that the people were griping about at the time: that there wasn't any housing; the people didn't have any health care; they didn't have the facilities that they needed. That if they didn't pay attention the people were going to start listening to that fellow who was up in the hills. The situation in Cuba was brought about primarily by Batista capitalism.

Mr. Speaker, I don't like capitalism — state capitalism or private capitalism. It really doesn't make any difference if somebody stands on the back of your neck if their boots are red or black. But nevertheless in this day and age the mixed economy should be something that we strive towards, and strive towards with a sincerity that people realize that when you're talking about private capital, what is private capital? When you talk about taxes, what are taxes?

All taxes are, Mr. Speaker, is us agreeing to muster our resources collectively to do that which we can't do individually. And if we say that we will take a few dollars and put it into an aircraft company . . . And isn't it interesting — in an aircraft company? People forget too soon that Saunders Aircraft — whether it was a good decision or a bad decision on the information which was available as the thing progressed; I to this day don't know. I can honestly say I wish I hadn't been involved in it as a member of government. But nevertheless, whether any other decision could or should have been made as we progressed . . . You know, you take certain people's words for granted, such as the Prime Minister of the country. And isn't it strange that those people who say we should have a mixed economy really don't mean it — including Otto Lang.

When we tried to get a little airline going — a little puddle-jumper in the scheme of things — SkyWest, to go from here to Brandon to Dauphin. Oh no, we can't have that; we can't have that, throw it out! But when PWA is owned by the Alberta Government, the free enterprisers, they kind of turn their back on it. They say they can't merge. That was the restriction that they put on the Alberta Government and their PWA, that they can't merge TransAir now.

The City of Calgary, I believe, paid \$15,000 a bus more to buy buses from General Motors rather than buy buses from Flyer Coach. Why? Because they believe in a mixed economy.

Let me put it this way, Mr. Speaker. Governments really don't move by design; they move by default. And if there was any other way of solving your problem, or anybody else would solve that problem, governments would not act.

One of the lawyers, who I'll not identify too closely in case he just gives the kiss of death, was negotiating with rather a large transaction that I happened to be sitting in on and he came over after the meeting and he said, "I heard you speak once." And he said, "You are the first politician that said in a public speech that you weren't going to give them something." Because somebody in the audience had asked, you know, "What are you going to give us?" And I said, "Politicians really can't give you anything. We take away a dollar and give back out about 85 cents." I think it was Autopac, you know, that came to my mind, relative to that particular conversation.

But what happens is there are problems creep in and there is no instrumentality in the society which musters around it. And some of these things are really insidious. Most of them we don't even see.

There are so many things that a person could take exception to in the Budget Speech. The government's position on the intrusion of the Federal Government into the taxation base of the provinces. It brings to mind that Canada is a group of confederated areas. Manitoba is an entity, and under the BNA Act there are certain things that are reserved to the province and certain things are reserved to the Federal Government. Manitoba — the politicians who were elected at that particular time — chose to join Confederation in the name of and in the interest of all Manitobans. And for those that remember history, we were a little postage stamp down here in the corner, and then it was expanded up to the Northwest Territories. It was still Canada, and Manitoba was given jurisdiction over certain areas.

I have questions about Confederation. I have questions about the nation. But it's almost as if people are afraid to ask a question. They talk about the separation of Quebec. Well, does this include the District of Ungava? The District of Ungava is part of Canada. It had absolutely nothing to do with the British North America Act per se. The District of Ungava was put under the administrative control of Quebec, I think it was in 1921 or something. It wasn't that far ago in history. So if Quebec wants to separate in this economic union — where they want to go out of Canada and all — that wipes out their whole James Bay area. What about the St. Lawrence Seaway? Bilingualism — certainly people should be able to speak all the languages. But there are so many questions go a-begging.

I only have a couple of minutes left, but I wanted to point out one other thing in the Estimates and

the Budget. In choosing to cut back the appropriation of the moneys that they want to put out, you know, for dealing with people with problems relative to alcohol but at the same time expand the police force. This is the kind of government that we have.

I said that in the Senate they have this thing engraved "The nobles must protect the state against the fickleness of the people" — as long as you've got a good, tight police force.

In our community, people really don't know what it is costing us for policing in the Province of Manitoba. They haven't got a clue. Because when you talk about policing, you have to include all the private police. And I'm not too sure just exactly how many there are. But I do know one of the things I have seen lately is in the City of Montreal there are more Rent-A-Cops than there are RCMP, Quebec Provincial Police, and Montreal Police. And these are part of what it costs us to run a police force, because it is included in the costs of the products we buy rather than in the taxes we pay.

Nevertheless, it is a cost to the citizens of the people of the Province of Manitoba. And this I will end on, Mr. Speaker, because this epitomizes the kind of Budget — the kind of government — which we are giving to the people in the province at the present time. They can cut taxes, but they transfer all of these costs to other areas. They don't decrease the costs. They contract out, or co-opt out. They fudge it.

A MEMBER: The shell game.

MR. BOYCE: The shell game is right. Give it to the private sector. I'm going to be very interested to see, during the course of events, just exactly what happens to these so-called private agencies that the government is going to put more and more user fees on.

Well, Mr. Speaker. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Time. The Honourable Meer for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: A very encouraging Budget. I'm very pleased to stand up in the Budget Debate. And to the opposition, it reminds me of a story of the wagon stuck in the mud where it said, "Due to the time of restraint" — I'm talking to the members opposite — "you can help pull." Or, "you can help push; and if you can't do either of these then we would like you to get the heck out of the way because I think Manitoba is on the move."

Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your position because I didn't produce in the produce and as a matter of fact get up and speak in the Throne Speech Debate because I was hoping to do a little bit of homework and hopefully expose the waste and mismanagement of the NDP through Public Accounts. But I have promised a few horror stories and I hope I won't disappoint once the Public Accounts reconvenes. . .

However, I'm not going to follow the example that the Member for Elmwood set, to talk about the entire last eight years because I do only have 40 minutes. However, I would be remiss in the Budget Address if I didn't sort of use my expertise at saving money and sort of place on the record — (Interjection)— Well, you know my municipal name of "thrifty Bob" was lived up to in some areas and I hope if you listen to my suggestions that — I should say you and of course my Leader — that we will possibly save some money in the future.

But before giving a problem-and-solution type of talk it reminds me of some things, but I think we should talk about some of the improvements in Wolseley. I realize that they say that a political promise is one that goes in one year as you're running for office and goes out the other.

But I was pleased to say that in opposition, because I did have the Member for Inkster and the Member for Wellington living in my area, Wolseley did fairly well when I was in opposition. So I think that they must have given a little push.

However, we have in Wolseley, new roads, new street lights, and we have a new Westminster street possibly of a municipal nature; but we have new community clubs and these have all been the things that have happened since I've been in public life. — (Interjection)— Well, we have Wolseley, Broadway Optimist, Laura Secord. . .

MR. GREEN: What about the hydro rates?

MR. WILSON: Well, what about the hydro rates? We'll talk about the new community clubs because they're yelling about them.

But we have — and you'll like this — we have new improved social services; we have Day Care; and we have a new Day Care funding program. . . Well, we have police protection, a per capita grant that the Leader of the Opposition consented to in a similar type of speech last year and of course that's caused a decrease in crime. Of course it took a little bit of very abrupt measures on behalf of both the municipal councillors and myself to see that the Westminster Hotel and others behaved themselves, and the crime decreased in the area. And we did get extra police protection.

But we have — what is the main thing — we have a tremendous area to live in and our property values have gone up, over and above the inflationary expectations and we can only thank the municipal councillors for the bylaw upgrading, and the entire area has certainly been upgraded. — (Interjection)—

Well, we think it's a great urban area; and I think since October 11th, I've possibly played a part as

well as the Member for St. Matthews, and others, in helping save the Misericordia Hospital transfer, which some questionable civil servants had recommended. —(Interjection)— And we tried to pry loose, when the former Member for St. Boniface was there and we hope to be able to in the future, pry loose some of those lottery moneys. And most of all the prying loose of the lottery moneys will be of a great benefit to the community clubs in the area. —(Interjection)—

But, more than ever — something that you could have done — I hope to cause a review of the liquor laws because it seems to me that we want to make Winnipeg — and of course the other smaller towns — some kind of place to be fun again. I think for active people Winnipeg has, in some areas, ceased to be fun and I think it's time for a review of the liquor laws in the province. I think we can have the stand-up bars. I think it's time, they are long overdue; I think the canned sort of mood music and disco music is something that is long overdue and I intend to stand up and fight the Musicians' Union because this is something that has caused other areas of the country to enjoy a boom in visits from other areas.

Well, I would think that these changes alone would bring a new "zing" to the opportunities, not only of the active people but to many organizations. I can think of the large capital investment that will take place, not only in the hotels, but I understand some eastern firms will be coming here if these things come to pass.

I think these fresh new dollars to the province will stop people from leaving Manitoba and I think tourists, once more, have one more reason to come to Manitoba, come to Winnipeg and enjoy the new quality of life. I can think of several examples. I can think of a good one and I think it's the apres-ski atmosphere which I helped — and I'm sorry he's not in his seat, the Member for Ste. Rose — we were able to continue to have the ski-hill improvement in his particular riding, and for that I'm grateful. But I think that the night life, or whatever, is something that is sadly missing.

Well, I'll give you an example. Every weekend bus loads of young people and skiers and athletes leave this city to go to Sugar Hills in Thunder Bay and they go there for the apres-ski as well as the skiing. And this is the type of thing that is taking dollars out of the city and I hope that in the future, with these revised liquor laws, that we can compete in a market. —(Interjection)—

Well, I would like to talk again. I should go to the problems in the past first, since the members are listening opposite, before they leave. But I would like to talk about the incredible waste of tax dollars by the former government and I can think to the tune of \$10.4 million in travel and expenses that members opposite and the government enjoyed. I hope our government can cut that to about \$4 or \$5 million.

I can think of the expansion of Government Air under their reign for — and it was said during the election and certainly I was one that sounded off — that many of these trips were for political purposes, politicized in a sense to such an extent that the man on the street was calling it the "Red Air Force". I don't know the connotation, but that's what they were calling it.

I remember many ministers opposite shouting that they represented the little guy and however Public Accounts proves beyond a doubt that they were the worst spenders.

And I think of the Member for Burrows when I look at the Public Accounts here and it shows that —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: I'd suggest to the honourable member that giving detailed information about one particular member of the Chamber is clearly out of order and is not consistent with the parliamentary practice.

MR. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What I will do is refer anyone to Page 197 and dispense from suggesting that the amount for many members was over \$2,600, and the gentleman in question simply led the "hit parade" in the ministerial expenses.

I can assure you, from the sounding of some discontent civil servants or those willing to please, that I've received a little bit of information and I was hoping the Leader of the Opposition would be here because, if he was truthful — I am sure he is — he would admit that there was some concern expressed by the Provincial Auditor, and others, in the area of ministerial expense accounts.

And I believe that it's been alleged and suggested that several of the members who fought for the so-called little guy in the street, were those who had to be checked regarding high-living expenses.

The Member for Elmwood of course took exception. I was sitting in my seat. He talked about calling me sort of an "out-flanked Liberal", I think were his words. So I thought I would dwell on him for a moment — and I'm not singling him out — but I'm talking about high-living expenses by a department. I think in an Order for Return, No. 19, dated March 2nd, I had attempted to find out the hidden costs of the member's penthouse suite in the Woodsworth Building. And of course it was rumoured that this champion New Democrat was spending tax dollars in a very questionable manner, and so I had filed this Order for Return. Possibly his idol might have been "Bernie Cornfeld" of the IOS. But the civil servants told me about special carpets, special mirrors, special art works, expensive furniture and an executive-type washroom with fancy fixtures.

It has been suggested the cost was over \$40,000.00. However, the Order for Return, which I sought the information, gives the answer as \$2,774.00. So I guess there are ways of putting expenses to other departments, or whatever, but that was the answer I got on the Order for Return.

And while the minister was extremely honest in suggesting the Woodsworth Building — a very questionable building as the Member for Roblin said, "Not entirely square," — cost over \$10 millionn, in my opinion he was sort of playing with the truth a little because of his high-living habits when he refused to give me some of this particular information.

And in addition — and in addition to some of my colleagues — it was after the election, I believe

September 6th, 1977, and the former Minister of Public Works signed for over — according to this information — for over \$47,000; for a total out of a total art budget, of \$169,350; and I suggest that this could have waited till after the election, the purchase of this art. We all know there's a saying that "Art is long and life is short" but one has to establish if the purchase of the so-called art had any marketability, any re-sale value, and I think approximately \$170,000 in a time of restraint is a most questionable purchase. But there's hidden costs to that. There's also the cost of transporting. It has been suggested to me and it's been checked out, that the Minister even had the nerve to appoint an interior design graduate to babysit these paintings, the now famous "Doern" art collection. Her salary, which is listed in Public Accounts as being over \$17,000 is there, and I believe she's still custodian of these particular art works. I think that we should really consider if the guarding of these particular works of art couldn't be done by a security guard, or somebody with lesser qualifications.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, why don't you fire her? You've fired many others. Why don't you fire her?

MR. WILSON: Well, the tragedy to the Member for Burrows is that I was not able to read on the record his expense accounts, but I'm sure he'd be glad to talk to her. —(Interjection)— Well, I can't fire you, can I? I can only hope the public finds out. —(Interjection)—

It is hoped when Public Accounts reconvenes and the government expenditures are examined, that our party can save many future dollars just by supervising spending, avoiding wasted purchases, possibly even tendering out a little more than we have. And we can hire qualified, dedicated people or re-train those existing civil servants, and sort of avoid the pork-barrelling and the relative hiring that went on under the former government.

Because I kind of think that in some of my comments that they will be extremely truthful this evening, and somebody claims that the truth sort of passes through three stages and I know we keep criticizing your past expenditures. But I think first, like the last time I stood up to talk, that the truth is ridiculed. And second, it is opposed; and then finally, at last, third and last, it is regarded as self-evident.

So I think their mistakes of the last four years, that I am particularly familiar with and certainly the four-year mandate that we've been given will bring a lot of things forward.

I'd like to read into the record, some of the highlights of the Budget, as I see them. The cut in sales tax to 2 percent, which in my opinion will really prove a benefit and will increase spending. I see signs of it already. I am out on the street, I can see the new enthusiasm, especially among the young people, and if only for a short term, it will have many positive effects on the economy. I might add that there will be a lot of large automobile purchases and the timing couldn't have been better. I think that the indications are that this will be one of the plus sides of the Budget.

I think the increase to the property tax to pensioners living in their homes, especially some of the ladies who worked on my campaign, from \$475.00 to \$375.00 will, I guarantee, allow many of them to remain in their dwellings.

I think that the increase in tobacco tax by five cents — I'm sorry that I didn't have any input in it because it is far too low in my opinion, it should be 20 cents because we have got to encourage people to slow down on their smoking habits.

The Summer Youth Program, which will mean over 2,000 jobs, I think is a real boon to the economy. One of my later-on suggestions will possibly add to that. I'm pleased to announce that even the backbenchers, our group here, are hoping to hire three students for the summer for helping out in research, so maybe we will have 2,003 new jobs.

I welcome the cut in Legal Aid to \$2.8 million but I can sort of prove and I feel that we didn't go far enough. What ever happened to the dedicated legal profession that used to give free advice in the past? What happened before Legal Aid?

Well, the Consumer's Bureau is another sweetheart. I think that the \$3.5 million is finally a halt and I couldn't agree more with the Task Force Report. I think it is time that government stuck to investigation of complaints and response to enquiries, instead of going to the public on a soap-box type of lecture, telling people they have got to complain; we need more jobs; we're looking for customers; come on in and we'll solve all the problems."

I think that that budget we have just put out, history will prove that we helped a sluggish economy and we will trim down expanding government control, control over our lives, and that especially was evident under the former government.

I really think that civil servants, like the Member for Roblin stated — I think we have proved and will establish that they are no longer the sacred cow and that they have, in their feather bedding, been milking the cow too long and I think in the next four years it is time that they produced. I think that the voters got the message, they felt that they didn't want five men at one shovel, they wanted a shovel for every worker.

Again, it can be proved that you can do things that will improve job improvement by simply getting out and accomplishing some of these things.

However, I really don't feel that the Budget has gone far enough. I'm very concerned that some of the Task Force recommendations . . . I'm going to offer some suggestions. I hope that they are not taken the wrong way.

In the area of tourism, the Task Force Report recommends 20 percent reduction. I really think that tourism involves everybody; that means government, and a reduction of 20 percent in expenditures, hoping that the private sector and industry will pick up the slack, is most questionable. I think it is going to take some time for the private sector to get the message that they have got to become more

involved because government is going to get out. I think that 20 percent is too heavy a whack at this time and I think the recent devaluation of the dollar — we have got to tell our story — I think the devaluation of the dollar has to increase tourism promotion. I think the reduction of the 20 percent by government is a sad day for the economy of Manitoba. The industry is oriented to fresh new dollars coming into the province. The industry is a fantastic job creator and I think it is a fantastic opportunity for us to capitalize if we could rethink our position.

Another questionable recommendation of the Task Force is their attempt to ignore the lucrative Japanese market because the Federal Government stat information is there saying that as many as four to twelve million Japanese will be visiting the North American market. Countless questionnaires that have been put out, signed by visitors, seem to indicate that the Japanese stay an average of 14 days or longer. I might suggest that after one week in British Columbia, these tourists are ripe to be encouraged to come and visit the Manitoba tourism market. —(Interjection)— Well, in particular, they have expressed an interest and I know my colleagues will be there because it has been proven they really enjoy our farm vacation visits.

We should be encouraging one of our major selling items which we have here in Manitoba. We have something to sell. We have got the country life. We have got those different farm animals that people love to take pictures of. I think the government should be pressuring the Federal Government. Well, we all know they have got to come and see Kaiser Resources, after all, they own it. But we all think that the government should be talking to the Federal Government. I certainly think CP Air, because we have got to promote the Manitoba happenings with private brochures printed at cost to the CP Air, and I think they would do it if we sat down and talked with them.

The provincial tourism department, which is basically made up of non-tourism oriented type of people who are civil servants come up through the ranks and are learning slow but sure, but I think they have got to sit down and demand action of Federal input from both Frontier Airlines and Northwest Orient Airlines. Because they have got to bring tourists north. We give them these landing rights and it has got to be a mutual benefit. It will be a benefit to the airlines and to the province. I am completely annoyed with Northwest because they have never advertised Winnipeg in any of their brochures or periodicals and I think that it is time that they had government sit down and talk to them. —(Interjection)— Well, I think that a complete study to guarantee a healthy tourism future should be instituted immediately to help promote our image and improve our image, our attitude, and other tourism-related problems. However, I do think that this study should have some political input. I would be more than happy to share my experiences with this particular study and I would hope the Member for Burrows would indicate he would like to sit on it as well.

I do think consideration for increased productivity, job creation, new revenues, we could do things like start a new live bait industry here where it is so archaic. You know, the fishermen, the sport fishing industry use live minnows in the States; they use them in Ontario. You come to Manitoba, you open up a can and you get frozen minnows. This is one of the reasons for the bad ink for the sports fishermen. I think that we could come up with a sizable small industry in the live bait industry.

I think we should correct a number of problems and I can't think of anything else but the interference that we have between the Federal Government and our fisheries industry. I think we have got to market the rough fish in this province. The former government probably gave the mink industry a push and helped kill it, but I think the rough fish, the mullet and the carp, they can and they should be taken out of the lakes and I can't think of anything better to increase the walleye population than to get rid of these rough fish. I do think that the Canada Works Grant up in Eddystone has proved that the consumer wants these products. They are saleable. I think the white fish roe, or the fish roe out of fish roe, if handled properly is a fantastic market. The Japanese just love it. The American markets love our mullet and carp. It is time that we took this, got it exempt from the Federal Government and let us handle it locally, provincially; we can let Peter Moss and his boys try to sell those fish. They are doing such a terrible job. If they can't sell what they have got now, if they can't sell our pickerel, then let us handle the rough fish. Let us handle the fish roe; we can get on with the job, together with the Inland Fisheries Federation, and start to market some of our product and put people to work. —(Interjection)—

Well, we have got to tell our story; we have got this mullet and carp. I am talking about all of us, the people in the province of Manitoba. We can tell our story because people leaving the province, I think with the budgetary restraints, have got to start carrying a few brochures with them during their winter vacation south, east or west. Well, there is no getting away from it. The modern Canadian cannot be stopped from taking a vacation and I think the people of Manitoba delivered the message when you tried the 2 ½ times 1 stuff on us, because it didn't wash. —(Interjection)—

I think I am going to talk to the member over there because I think he and I agree in some areas on the Whiteshell waters. I think they belong to all Manitobans and I hope this will be recognized by the Tourism Minister. But he is going to, I hope, open up the Whiteshell, unlike what you people did, you parks-oriented people; you just wanted canoes everywhere. I think that we have got to look forward to development proposals so that everybody big and small from the private sector can make available camping sites and well-planned low-cost units for the purchase of the people who live in this province. I think the lawyer who stood up at the University of Winnipeg and said, "They can't do this to our lake," he wasn't speaking for himself. I think he was speaking for those who have had their own way for too long, the idle rich who have really soaked up that lake for too many years without letting us have a foot on the sand. —(Interjection)—

Well, I suggest the day is coming when our party will open up at least two new lakes in the Whiteshell and I think we can improve the quality of life by doing that. I hope the Minister of Tourism

Thursday, April 13, 1978

will again announce his new Lease Program because I think your one-year Lease Program stunk. I think the new leases will encourage lending institutions and help both the family, the guy who wants to build his own cottage, and the small builders to benefit from a Whiteshell Impact Study.

I will be talking about more positive things tomorrow. I did want to say that reducing the Budget to \$25.9 million, down 9.9 percent, is a mistake and I have just got to keep my fingers crossed that the private sector will pick up the slack.

A MEMBER: You don't have much confidence.

MR. WILSON: Well, because there has been too long . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 10:00 p.m., the Member will have 12 minutes the next time we meet.

The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning (Friday).