

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 p.m., Tuesday, April 20, 1976

BUDGET

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak to the Budget Speech and share some of my observations and concerns and possibly go over one or two areas of which I think I may be able to put in some input.

It seemed to me that many of the thoughts expressed before - and I regret that I've come down with the Manitoba spring flu - but that spending must be halted and it seemed to me that in referring to the Budget's page which indicated that we had \$1,176,000,000 as a current expenditure for this year, and looking at some of the key areas of some of them that I share concern in, Health and Social Development is almost \$396,000,000 and Education is \$310,000,000 is an indication to me that certainly the brakes should be put on and I even see where the Consumer Services, in which I share some interest, is now logging ahead at about \$95,000,000. So I think in that particular area we have to give some indication that we are in hard times and certainly should be looking at putting on the brakes.

It seemed that no increase was warranted at this time and from figures established, it's been several different figures, but certainly \$42 million might be not too much of an exaggeration that has been added on to the back of Manitobans basically in taxation this year. So it seems to me that a good deal of money will not be spent but will be transferred and be ready for election goodies and this is in the coming 1977-78 season. I would think by reading past Provincial Auditor reports that if he was to more of a degree unmuzzled he might be able to tell us how we could budget with sincerity so that the people would know the government would be budgeting like somebody in a small business would be, without such huge amounts of money either underspent or overspent. There is just something wrong when those type of things happen, at least the public feels there is something wrong.

I couldn't help but feel that part of this Budget is going to be a holdback in a degree to production. Certainly in the past couple of years the labour-management relations are an indication that some improvement must be made. It would seem to me that workers have to - and this goes for all businesses - have to start making money for their employers because otherwise they're all going to become sort of sandbaggers of the state and you only have to go down Portage Avenue and watch some of those municipal workers with the five men one shovel to know what I mean when I'm talking about sandbaggers of the state. I haven't had the privilege to travel through the rural areas but I'm sure many of them are sleeping under apple trees somewhere in the province. I'm sure they wouldn't consciously want to leave behind for their children the void of the good times that we enjoyed in the '60s and certainly in the '50s.

I can't help but feel that capital investment - now that B.C. is free from socialism and Albertans are smiling, at least they seem to be smiling whenever you watch them on T.V. - that those planes from eastern Canada seem to be carrying investors, they seem to be flying over Winnipeg with their bags of ideas and dollars and investment capital for the private enterprisers seems to be from my talk on the streets, seems to be not as fast as it should be coming. Certainly the sure thing Manitoba, when you consider what's happening in Italy today, this should be a sure bet and I'm surprised that more people aren't fighting to get into the investment opportunities of Manitoba and there could only be one thing wrong: obviously they don't like the government that's in power here. Maybe something will be done to change that.

I like the Tribune article of April 10th in which Vic Grant said, there is no greater spendthrift than government. And even with thrifty Bob on this side of the House they've increased their spending. It seems to me that the media, especially the Free Press, will only mildly cover the legislation and point out these facts. Because Mr. Grant is right on in his comments and I think it is time that the media did their job and pointed out some of the wastes that are going on because certainly we do. I think that the class warfare that this NDP Government seems to encourage - and I agree with

BUDGET

(MR. WILSON cont'd) Mr. Grant's comments when he says everybody is working class and at one time or other most people considered themselves poor.

I welcome the day that television will cover these sittings so that some of the valuable words recorded in Hansard and maybe the less valuable ones will be subject to public judgment and not to some of the coverage that this form of government seems to receive. But going into my envelopes which I have in front of me I don't think that the government - because I want to offer some program suggestions because one can't be critical without offering alternatives - and I would think that --(Interjection)-- Well your member stood up over there and talked about curfews for four hours and when I delivered the Throne Speech about asking for a per capita grant for police protection nobody thought two hoots about it. But in the Budget it came out because they recognized that other levels of government --(Interjection)-- I'm not going to take credit for it because you didn't have to put it in if you didn't want to. But at least I raised it. What I'm trying to say is that other levels of government need some direction and you gave them that direction in the particular Budget Speech and that I'm extremely grateful for.

I think that the government should get out of shaky businesses and the Minister of Mines will probably be following me and I would think that to be a lender of last resort in these hard times is unfair. I think the Manitoba Development Corporation should not be a lender of last resort because when you've got tough times you shouldn't be blowing taxpayers' dollars on shaky businesses. If they can't pass the test of the banking institutes they shouldn't be given an opportunity to set up shop in Manitoba. Send them down to oil rich Alberta for all I care.

I think we also have to slow down in some other areas. You want some suggestions, here's one: I think your plans for this universal Denticare program should wait until 1970 beyond, because if you put all your eggs forward now you're not going to have anything to go to the people with. So I think you should hold up that Denticare program. Well you know what? You people are having trouble hiring the 40 people that you want to send to Regina to do the training so that's how much enthusiasm - the employment offices they can't even get people to go to Regina to take the training course. That's an indication that you can't do it all in one year. So for gosh sakes send 20 people to Regina and delay it a year. All right.

Slow down the massive program and some of you will appreciate this for legal care, or liticare or Legal Aid. I think you're going into civil cases too fast and corporate dealings. The intention of Legal Aid was to help out the unfortunate and give everybody a day in court. It didn't involve two people hammering over the head to make the lawyers rich in civil actions and I think that that could wait because after all that program, all the money comes to General Revenues, it comes into Consolidated Funds from the lawyers' trust accounts and I think there is no duty on you people just because you get the money from the lawyers trust accounts to go out and spend it. Spend it on housing or something worthwhile.

I think the government should, in a sense, wait another year and maybe just halt one of their Public Works programs. Maybe hold the \$6 million or \$10 million Autopac building; maybe hold up the \$7 million employees' garage. Just hold up one of them for a year or two. Even the restaurant downstairs, you know you could keep it closed until next session. What's the big rush of getting it opened? I notice the biggest room has got a blue carpet and the small one a red. You know, save it until next year, we'll take the big room. --(Interjection)-- I think it's time that the MLAs or Ministers started paying for their gasoline. I think the Minister of Tourism should stay out of building cottages in provincial parks, I think that could wait. That's a goody for next year or beyond when times aren't so hard. I think it's terrible when people are having to sell their cottages because they are no longer in that wealthy class but they can't sell them because the government's got them available for free. --(Interjection)-- Well if you want some small ones, I'll give you some.

How about Gimli Park? You've got all those places there and you know what? The people burn the lights all night, they run the water all night, they have five baths a day because all the utilities are paid for for \$135 a month rent. Why don't they have a

BUDGET

(MR. WILSON cont'd) separate meter for their lights? Why don't they have a water meter? Why don't they have the things that would force them to conserve energy instead of leaving the doors open in the wintertime because our good friends in government are going to pay for the heat. I think it's time and I think the Minister of Public Works is a responsible person, I think he'll look into it - at least I hope he will.

The thing I wanted to say at this time is I've tried to learn not to crystal-ball the future and I shouldn't have said that the Minister will start putting meters in Gimli because he may not do it and then I'll be called a liar again. But I have figures here from all sources: \$2.839 billion in government borrowing. Now I printed somewhere that by the time these fellows get kicked out of office, and many of them on the other side say they're going to win next time, that the debt would be \$5 billion, the total borrowing. Again it didn't hit a very good chord and maybe I shouldn't be crystal-balling but a lot of things that I say have turned out to be true.

You know I remember in city council there was an election coming up and Councillor Gee and Bernie Wolfe, they wanted to get this grant through for St. Boniface Hospital. They had to have a 20 percent grant for hospital construction. Well, you know, I had no votes, I only had 490 Roman Catholics in my district so I took a chance. I said that's a provincial responsibility. I said there's an election coming up and I guarantee you that the Minister of Health of the present day, because I can't mention his name, will take over the grants for hospitals. I saved the City of Winnipeg \$720,000; I could have been a councillor for my lifetime and they wouldn't have lost a nickle on me because I know how people think. Well I was waiting for the Minister of Health and I could put his envelope to the end but since he's not here maybe I could be a little softer on him.

Mr. Speaker, I know this north-end hospital was political but I do hope that the Minister puts it to good use and possibly puts it into an area of geriatric with a very small emphasis on surgery or maybe as an emergency ward so that surgery could be done at the Health Sciences Centre where some of the best surgeons in Canada are assimilated.

As I mentioned I was hoping that the ability-to-pay by the tax-poor people of this province who are getting really thumped over the head, is that I feel the universal Denticare program - and I've taken criticism from some of my own members about this. But to me this is a type of fast-moving socialism that's just got to be slowed down. I know you all have ideals and you certainly can call the shots because you're in government but think of the cost. We just can't afford a universal Denticare program. It says here the government was going to start without the Dental Association's aid and again I've seen so many different occupations come under a severe blow because government and them haven't been able to sit down and talk. So I hope the dentists will take heed from one who knows, from one who got wiped out of business to a certain degree by members opposite that they do sit down and discuss with the government and try to fit in somewhere. Even though I know they're training women and dental people to do it when it is the job of dentists.

Now here's a real good one. Again I have to mail to about 25 of my constituents Hansard because the Tribune in their article of April 15th, says that I want to make every welfare recipient take a bus. That wasn't true. I realize the sick and the handicapped. I was talking about the employable and it's there in Hansard. But you know they chop everything down; they've got a limited space and I got real flack from the people. So you know I resent that because I --(Interjection)-- You know the Minister of Health stood up and said that --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order.

MR. WILSON: Well what I'm saying is that I'm glad Hansard prints every word because I said I was supporting the sick and the handicapped and the underprivileged but those people that could work have got to stop burning up gas going picking up their cheques and what have you. They've got to be able to use public transit. That goes for the employees of this government. There should be more emphasis on public transit. This Legislative Building is just a huge parking lot. I was so pleased the other day to walk out there and the only car that had a note on it was mine. I've talked to the Minister of Public Works about that misunderstanding.

BUDGET

(MR. WILSON cont'd)

I did want to get into some of the more important areas and I won't spend too much time on my future projections about government spending. But, you know, two years ago I lodged a campaign against those houses on Balmoral Street and I have been launching a campaign against a number of others in my area. Now the city and province are finally sitting down trying to find out whose jurisdiction it is. I used to get all these letters from the health inspectors. They had patients from Deer Lodge that had been released too soon and they were in these houses. You should see these poor people in there. And you know I couldn't figure it out. Every election it was the only poll I lost until I found out that the NDP were getting 21 mail-in ballots from there. So I am pleased now that I could come to the help of these people because now I'm sure that they'll vote the right way next time.

I am very pleased that the Minister is going to be sitting down and deciding who is going to be in charge of personal care beds and guest homes and nursing homes in the province. Because certainly the city should be supplying the inspectors, certainly Commissioner Henderson should not have to wait to talk to the Tribune before bringing his concerns to the public and certainly the councillors that go to the media with stories about these should not be muzzled. I would think that under the area of the rent control bill coming up - I stood in the beginning of supporting the tenants and was accused of being responsible for the date change but I did feel that the government missed the boat when they could have exempted many people in the Wolseley riding. Maybe I have a selfish reason, but for the whole city for people that run rooming houses with four suites or less that are resident owners. I don't mean slum landlords, I mean the very fibre of our community. Those people take care of their homes. Many of them are new Canadians, are people that don't have a grasp of the language and I'm very much afraid that this huge government is going to really turn these people off. I would rather you exempt them from the bill - I might lose a few votes and rather have them all support me - because I'd like you to consider that for the bill because it's very important that resident landlords be exempted from the bill. They just don't understand it.

I'm very very disappointed in the Consumers Bureau. I had another gentleman, he was talking to me today of how he got fined \$250 by somebody in the Minister of Consumers Bureau - took him to court. His tenant didn't pay his rent and demolished the suite and he decided to throw the tenant out. --(Interjection)-- No, it was at 251 Spence Street and I found out that it was not in my riding but I helped him anyway.

The Budget speech itself leaves a lot to be desired and I think that when you went after the people with campers who can't afford cottages you sort of had the low blow at the little guy. These slide on campers, I think that was a low blow. Many people with station wagons drive old cars. The Minister in charge of Autopac knows that most of the people that buy those \$100 wrecks that he sells, they are usually the big old buicks and oldsmobiles. Really they're for the poor guy that has a large family and I think they've made a mistake in that area.

As mentioned I think that when the government gave us the per capita grant for police protection for the first time, it was an indication that they recognized that crime in the City of Winnipeg has become such a low priority by municipal governments, such a low priority by this government that something had to be done. I welcome that Chief Norm Stewart finally went to the public forum to express that he was 266 policemen short and the government has in their Budget Speech allowed the city to hire 44 new policemen.

I really feel that their massive Legal Aid Program has caused a backlog in the courts. Every free-loading convict pleads not guilty. --(Interjection)-- That's right. They all plead not guilty and they all have a great big trough for all these junior lawyers coming up and I remember two or three years ago the professors were having heart failure. We're graduating so many lawyers, we've got no jobs for them. Now they've got plenty of work. There's no slowdown in Legal Aid. It started out as an election gimmick of \$400,000, now it's over \$2 million. I know very few lawyers, even Councillor Zuken's on the second or third floor but not Legal Aid. It's a store front operation, Portage

BUDGET

(MR. WILSON cont'd) Avenue, right across from Eatons, and all the pamphlets you can read. Now they're opening up all brand new ones. The other one wasn't fancy enough on Isabel, they had to go into one with wall to wall carpeting.

I was telling the Minister of Public Works today how I agreed with many of the statements he made about the country club prisons, the change in the visiting days to four days where at one time you used to have A to N visited Tuesdays and Saturdays, and the N to Zs - now they all can visit four days, so the pushy, the shovy, the nervy people go four days a week to visit. Then they have a social on Sunday, Peter Warren has read out their menu. So I think the country club atmosphere in prisons and certainly it has been indicated in the paper about the Manitoba Youth Centre, people are fighting to get in. You know, people have a way of taking care of their own. --(Interjection)-- Well, I'm serious. You want to check and see how much time all the disbarred lawyers in the last ten years have done. They do a month and then they're transferred out to some program in British Columbia. --(Interjection)-- Yes, at the YMCA, yes. When I was there in Vancouver there were two architects that got over five years in prison and they were getting paid their full fee to design a prison. --(Interjection)--

I'd like to know, it should probably be in Question Period, but I think we still deserve an explanation about where the judge is now? Has he come back to Manitoba? When are we going to hear something more about it? It seems to have been a quiet issue that's disappeared. I'm not going to mention his name. It's been mentioned in the Question Period but I think that we've got to find out all about that. People are inquisitive and they want to know the story. I think that it's time that the facts were put on the table.

I think also this joke that's being perpetrated by members opposite, and there's some certainly big fat fees, I've heard it's in the area totalling over \$1 million, now, altogether since day one, for the legal bill for CFI. The lawyers that have been involved, the lawyers that are over in Europe now on holidays or working, the lawyers that are heading for Europe, the lawyers that are coming back, I don't know how much that's costing but I think the government should stop it.

So, in the area of Public Works, the Minister is one of my favourites in that he does things. He's put lights on the Louis Riel Statue; I'm trying to convince him to fix up the riverbank and maybe he'll put the light meters and the water meters out in the Aspen Park, who knows? I would encourage him to stop building all these statues to his memory and maybe cut out one of those public buildings for two or three years and I would certainly welcome if he was to say that the Autopac building was going to be delayed until at least after the next election to see if we're going to have to build it or not.

One of the sad things about when you support the Arts like I do is that you go to the government with an idea and they only buy half a loaf. I knew the Dunlop Museum and everything was there, all inclusive, for a \$ 150,000 from Canada Permanent Trust. I said there's a lot of Canadiana and there's a lot of artifacts and there's a lot of good things and interesting things and there's some beautiful pictures of the place which are available. --(Interjection)-- Well I'll tell you it was a beautiful place to spend a Sunday afternoon and have a cup of tea. --(Interjection)-- Well it wasn't a historical nightmare. I beg to differ with you and anyone who has attended auction sales over the years would know what I was talking about. For the operators of the riverboats it was a nice stop. Anyway, I went to the government to buy that thing as a historical site. Buy it and run it as a museum. The boats will stop there; people that come up there; we'll have an English Tea Garden. Oh, no. The Minister only buys half a loaf. He declares it a historical site; the trust company goes in, grabs everything, sells it for over \$200,000, after expenses, at the Convention Centre. Many of the things were brought in and even the glass windows were stripped out. So now instead of having a complete museum for \$150,000 with all of the goodies inside which you could have sold for the price of the building, now you've got a building that's been completely stripped by souvenir hunters, antique hunters, people that wanted a piece of the action. I'm afraid that what you've done is you've bought a historical site and what you've done is you're going to have to pay probably very close to a \$100,000 for that property and buildings and you're going

BUDGET

(MR. WILSON cont'd) to have nothing. Now this is the type of thing, I'm saying that just because a person is on this side that you should give some thought once in a while to what he says. I do appreciate the Minister of Tourism declaring it a historical site but I say he missed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member aware that Parks Canada has acquired that property?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Either way it's the taxpayers' dollar and somebody missed out on a good business deal.

Again, the finances of the City of Winnipeg should come under review. Part of it has been. But I say that when you pass on and say to the city, add another five percent on the hotel tax, a ten percent hotel tax is going to turn people right off this city. I don't think anybody is going to stay unless the Great West Life is going to do a great renovation job. But nobody is going to stay at the Marlborough at their prices and pay another ten percent to governments besides. Only Tokyo has a ten percent hotel tax.

I think also that in Education I feel that you should get back up to that 80 percent under the Foundation Program. Never mind cutting out the feeding program for the downtown core and everything. You people from the country were the ones that sent all your problems into the city so we've got to start feeding some of these people and looking after them. Therefore you'd better not start --(Interjection)-- The nutrition program is the only meal that some of those kids get every day and I've been down there to see some of them. Well, you know, I'm very pleased that we're going to have another go-around but one of these days, if these envelopes don't get missing I'm going to give you some real stuff to go on the Manitoba Development Corporation. I don't have a key in my drawer but I'll make sure I take those two out of here.

I did want to criticize - as a layman I think the Community Economic Fund and certainly this Co-operative Fund in which they loan out a million six and the recovery is so poor that either they had no intentions of ever asking for the money back and it was really politicized. Why not give out the funds because this is terrible. When I look at this money going out, taxpayers' dollars --(Interjection)-- I could never figure that one out and what was the name of it? South Indian Lake, where they had \$11,000 for a fence in the middle of nowhere. And \$38,000 for the manager's cottage. You'd think up there that a cottage would only cost --(Interjection)-- Well, who knows.

But with each criticism you must offer a positive point and I wanted to thank the Minister of Urban Affairs for his repairing of the Evanson-Arlington properties and the tot lot. It will do wonders for the city and I'm putting pressure on the councillors now to supply some lighting. Now if the Minister of Health would give the Outreach Programs and the Post-Psychiatric Programs some needed support and leave it to volunteers and never mind giving us all these experts from the United States, these social workers, we could, you know, we don't need civil servants to run our programs, we need the volunteers we've got now. Just give us some money, we'll show you how to run the programs.

You know the Member from St. Matthews, who obviously is worried about me because he runs an article every two weeks in my local newspaper in my area, but these are the kind of disadvantages you're at. You don't have this huge staff to write your material. Even the candidate they had against me who was to take the First Minister's place apparently according to the newspaper, you know, he's all in a quandary. He doesn't know what to do with himself but he sure found his thirty thousand-plus job back pretty fast. What chance does a working man have? What chance does an ordinary guy have to sit in this House when you defeat some guy and he makes more money than you? --(Interjection)-- I don't know if they named a school after him but in my opinion the fellow hasn't proved himself and I criticize the councillors in City Hall. They hadn't even been elected six months and one of them in the Minister of Public Works' riding wanted to name a street after himself.

I have pointed out to the Minister of Health many of the problems that I'm

BUDGET

(MR. WILSON cont'd) having with his government experiments and I'm glad that the Tribune has brought some of them forward. I think more support to Childrens Aid and all the volunteers is the idea --(Interjection)-- Well, you know, it's amazing. When I was fighting this guy at 107 Balmoral he only had one house, now he's got five or six. You know . . . probably quit his job at Deer Lodge, you know. It's big business. I talked about the eight in my area owned by one person. How I found out is I spotted a brand new truck with some bearded wonder driving it and sure enough I followed him and there he was right in one of the MHRC homes paying \$110 per month. But the house is loaded up with \$20 a day per diem children. That is big business. --(Interjections)-- I didn't get anywhere.

I got somewhere with the Minister responsible for Autopac when I said to him, put the cars up for public auction. Let's get the top dollar for them. Let's do this. I did get somewhere and I'm very pleased. But I don't think that people that get full value for their money should be allowed to buy their car back for \$50.00. Once that car is written off and that guy gets his full payment for that car, that car belongs to - when you're government - the State. You have a duty to return all the money to the taxpayers.

I remember bragging about our lottery system when I was on council, how we had - I was in Tourism - how we had 1.6 million fresh dollars coming into the province. Everybody in Canada was buying our lottery tickets. It was fresh money coming in. But all of a sudden the word got out that one of the fellows might have been a Conservative, made \$60,000 as a salesman and somebody on that side got jealous. So he says, we're going to set up a government department. Do you know that these people are all going to be coming for grants now because they used to get money for selling tickets. The solution would have been accountability - would have made these people accountable. Stiffen up the regulations. Not to hire 20, 30, 40 salesmen. Of course you set up an autonomous corporation so they wouldn't get the complete benefits of being civil servants, but many of them that were civil servants and were in the pension plan and stood to gain some of the civil servant benefits have now lost them all because they're now working for this separate organization that's selling the tickets. So the dollar one is a success, but I don't know about the \$3.00 one.

In the area of liquor, I think the accessibility of liquor in the north, we must be losing 200 percent and I'm not interested in these profit figures, I'm talking about in the north. The accessibility of liquor by the north, the availability of it to be brought in and bought by proxy. Why can't I send to the Liquor Commission and have a bottle delivered to my home? Why am I discriminated against? The people in the north can sure have one sent up by proxy pretty fast. The Minister in charge of Renewable Resources, I questioned him on whether government airplanes were taking liquor up there and he felt that they weren't. When I get around to visiting that area I'll find out a little bit more.

Finally, I don't know how much time I've got left. One of them that I had urged the government to get out of, besides all their MDC programs . . .

MR. SCHREYER: . . . on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister state his matter of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: It may be a joking matter to the honourable member but if he is serious in snidely insinuating that government aircraft are being used to take liquor illicitly into any community, the persons responsible will be fired immediately. Let that be clear. If it exists, which I doubt very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: I'm glad the First Minister brought that up, I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Four minutes.

MR. WILSON: I was not casting any shadow on the government aircraft except that it has been reported that aircraft in the north, of which the government has a good number of planes in the north, are taking liquor up into the northern areas. The accessibility of liquor in the north is creating a lot of problems.

Also, Federal programs. You know they start these Make-Work Projects October 1st and some of the people that they've hired as guides and that just drop their

BUDGET

(MR. WILSON cont'd) tools and head into this nice training program, and the people, at the end of the tourist season, they're without proper guides and what-have-you. But anyway, I think that the Mincome Program, which has been kept a secret by the other side and which I think is worth looking into, I did dig into it, and I would support this program if I thought that the government would dismantle all forms of social assistance and go on this Mincome Program. But I know that nobody will dismantle this huge bureaucracy, and I feel that the government, while it's fresh money coming in from Ottawa, there is a certain portion of this being paid for by Manitoba taxpayers, and I think if it's costing a \$1.00 to give away a \$1.00 with no positive results in sight, then I think the government should get out of this program because it's really fooling the public.

I will close with the comment that I feel that the Budget itself is really just lining itself up for next year with a lot of excess revenues which will be there to politicize so many things that I've talked about in the past, and it's a sad day when the taxpayers take second place to vote buying. Thank you.

. . . . continued next page

BUDGET

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that every political person has his discouraged moments when things don't go right or when perhaps he is doing something a lot easier and feels why is he not involved in something else. I think there are various means in which we are sort of reinforced in pursuing the course we are pursuing and in pursuing a particular political position that we happen to take. I suppose that I'm no different than others, that I do have my discouraging moment but I must say, Mr. Speaker, that sitting through legislative debates, sitting through the kind of debate that we've heard recently I am reinforced and convinced that not only am I doing the right thing but I am doing it in pursuance of the political position which I should be taking and which of course I have been convinced about all along.

I find the debate to be an interesting one and I think it particularly was led off in a positive way by the presentation of the Budget and also by the presentation of the Leader of the Opposition who certainly made a philosophical and in many other ways hard hitting attack on the government and of course that is what we expect and that is what we feel is the purpose of us all being here.

I was also very intrigued, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Member for Lakeside, my colleague, who yesterday entered the debate and in doing so, Mr. Speaker, set out some very intriguing rules as to how the debate should be conducted. Mr. Speaker, they went something like this: Now I know in starting that I am going to be castigated by the honourable members who will start referring to things that happened before and I wish we could conduct this debate without referring to what happened before. That was the first rule, Mr. Speaker. The second rule was: I also know in discussing this matter they are going to refer to things that happened in other places and I wish we would stick to the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I think that the honourable member tried to imagine all of the difficulties of his position and then asked us, Mr. Speaker, to conduct the rules of the debate without entering into those difficult areas. Because, Mr. Speaker, he must have an awfully weak position and therefore he would like us to continue on the basis of not discussing what had been done in the past, not discussing what has been done elsewhere. So, Mr. Speaker, he evidently would like us to proceed as follows: We mustn't say anything in answer to any argument about what the Tories did when they were in power. We mustn't say anything, Mr. Speaker, about what the Tories are doing where they are now in power--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Let me suggest that if we're going to have this debate we'll conduct it properly. Those people who have something to say will get an opportunity to say it; except on the point of order otherwise they will keep quiet. That's the rules. That's one of the rules that you have all agreed to, that not the Member for Lakeside nor the Member for Inkster can make. Those are already present and we will use them. The Honourable Minister of Mines--(Interjection)--Carry them out please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, since I always overrun my time I hope that you will take that into account. Mr. Speaker, I will not be deterred. The rules under which the Tories can win or which they think they can win are as follows: Nothing must be said about the Tories about what they did when they were in power, otherwise they will lose. Nothing must be said about the Tories of what they are doing where they are in power or else they will lose. And, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has introduced even a third rule. If that were not enough to help people with a weak position, the Leader of the Opposition has been reported in the paper as saying - and you know, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the newspapers all the time either, but they happen to have said such a wonderful thing that at least I will repeat it so that it should be denied. The third rule of debating with Tories, under which they feel that they will be able to maintain their position, is that we mustn't say anything about what we will do when we are in power. Because if we do, because if we do, because if we do it will be shot full of holes by the government. So, Mr. Speaker, this is the basis upon which this great Tory Party which says that it's going to take power in 18 months . . .

A MEMBER: We will.

BUDGET

MR. GREEN: These are the terms and conditions upon which they are prepared to put their political position before the people. Do not say what we did, do not say what we are now doing and do not say what we are going to do. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know this rather reminds me of the story about the gladiator in old Roman times who happened to be a very good gladiator and he was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition state his point of privilege.

MR. CRAIK: The Minister of Mines and Resources is now switching gears and I know that the rules of the House are such that if you're going to raise a point of privilege you have to do it at the time that the point is made. He's referred to a newspaper report saying that the Leader of the Opposition says you mustn't discuss what you're going to do when you're in power. I would also remind him, Mr. Speaker, that in reading the article I would have raised the same question he has. The article also said . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable member state his matter of privilege but not debate.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is that the Minister knows full well that the article said . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. A difference of opinion is not a matter of privilege. Would the honourable member state his matter of privilege.

MR. CRAIK: . . .our basic party policy has been attributed to the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, the public report on that attributed to a high party source. We also would like to know who the high party source is that keeps telling the newspapers that the Leader said such and such.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: I will correct my remarks. It was not the Leader of the Opposition, it was the Leader of the Conservative Party who was quoted as saying that, not the Leader of the Opposition.

And he was quoted as saying that. And the fact is, Mr. Speaker, he was --(Interjection)--Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: . . .the Leader of the Conservative Party having said that, the Leader of the Conservative Party was not attributed with those comments even in the report, nor was the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Still not a matter of privilege.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, what was said by a high Conservative source who - and I suppose that we should regard high Conservative sources as liars - the high Conservative source quoted the Leader of the Conservative Party as having said we mustn't debate what we will do when we are in power or it will be shot full of holes.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to say that this is rather like the story of the gladiator in Roman times who proved to be a very strong gladiator. He proved, Mr. Speaker, that every time they put him into the den with the lion, that he somehow defeated the lion. They thought that it was due to superior strength or due to brain power so they decided that it's unfair to have this gladiator fight the lions under normal circumstances and that they had to make a special provision for him. So they dug a hole six feet deep and this fellow put him into the hole so that just his head was above the ground, with his arms and all the rest of his body in the hole and then they placed him in the centre of the arena. Then they opened the lion's gate and the lion ran out and the gladiator had no other choice but to, with his teeth, bite the lion where he could bite him. The lion squealed and ran out of the arena. All of the Romans started to yell, "Fight fair you foul gladiator." So what the Member for Lakeside is saying is fight fair. Don't talk about what we did; don't talk about what we are doing and don't talk about what we are going to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: I don't want to interrupt. I promise the Honourable Speaker it'll be my last point of privilege. I have never suggested that we should fight fair. I just wanted--(Interjection)--All I suggested, Mr. Speaker, that I want the battle fought my way.

BUDGET

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, because the honourable member is in such a weak position, because he is in such a weak position and in order so that there will be a fair fight, I can't promise, Mr. Speaker, that I will ignore all of the factors that he spoke about. But I promise to try to stay away from them as much as I can within reasonable bounds. I do reserve the right to leap up with my feet and bite what I can bite but I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to be completely handcuffed. I do recognize the honourable members have a problem; I do recognize that they cannot enter into the debate on any reasonable terms and therefore I'm prepared to accept to some extent what has been suggested. But I'm not willing to completely abandon the debate. Therefore, you know, my honourable member, he will permit me to say - and these are small matters but he has not left me with very much - I mean he said for instance that the sales tax when it was imposed in 1967 yielded \$8 million per point. It yielded \$12 million per point. Rather than \$40 million, it was set up to yield \$60 million. That's only an error of 50 percent. Is it fair to bring that to your attention, that there was that error? Or is that, Mr. Speaker, not fair fighting?

The honourable member said for instance that there was, you know - and this really grieves me because I don't feel that I get the best of the argument even with the correction - that there was \$70 million lost last year in the Manitoba Development Corporation. There was \$20 million lost under the Development Corporation. That doesn't make me feel any better, Mr. Speaker, because I don't feel very good about losing 20. But the honourable member doesn't even feel that it's a fair fight if he says 20. He has to say 70, otherwise it is not fair. Or perhaps the Member for Lakeside will say that this is artistry. This is a bit of painting. This is a bit of embellishment which anybody is entitled to do in debate. Let's at least understand it as that.

Mr. Speaker, what is the Budget all about? What has raised the ire of the opposition who have concentrated their attack as I've tried to ascertain it on really three things: 1) government spending, 2) Manitoba Hydro and the Hydro program, and 3) municipal tax. Those three things have been the bases upon which their attacks have been concentrated. I expect we will also, at what they consider to be appropriate and fair moments to get into things like the Manitoba Development Corporation where the government has had its problems as well, but basically they know that that is not good fighting ground and they have chosen those three areas. Let's see how this Budget reflects those three areas. This has been rather, Mr. Speaker, an unexciting Budget. The Leader of the Opposition has indicated that the government is going to raise \$50 million and he says, that doesn't sound like very much.--(Interjection)--\$39 million, \$49 million? Well, Mr. Speaker, if one can say 40 to mean 60, one can say 50 to mean 49. That's fair. So it's \$49 million, thank you. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has said, that doesn't sound like very much, it sounds very unexciting. But do you realize that that, Sir, is the most money that has been ever levied in taxation by this government? Well what does that mean, Mr. Speaker? What does that really mean? It really means that in all of the seven years that we have presented Budgets that there have been very few Budgets in which substantial taxes have been levied on the people of the Province of Manitoba. There never was a year, Mr. Speaker, when we levied what the equivalent was in 1967, of \$60 million, which was levied as a five percent sales tax by the Conservative administration--(Interjection)--Yes, it's a \$120 million today. No, it's more. The Honourable Member for Lakeside has given us the figures. The same sales tax now raises a \$180 million, that five points of sales tax.--(Interjection)-Right. But the same sales tax if we levied a five percent sales tax today it would raise \$180 million. That's the equivalent of what you people did in 1967.

Now we are raising \$49 million in a year of tremendous inflation. It's less than the five percent sales tax; one third - not a third, not quite a third of what was raised by that government in one year. In those years, Mr. Speaker - and I sometimes find it rather incredible because I frankly do worry about where the money is coming from every time we go into a new program, and in that year we have introduced a universal nursing care program, we are introducing a universal dental care program which is starting off this year. It is to be universal for children between certain ages. Yes, it applies to everybody, it is universal.

BUDGET

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

We went from roughly a Budget of \$1 million per year in Northern Manitoba to a Budget of roughly \$20 million a year in Northern Manitoba. If that bothers some honourable members, let us at least remember that the Member for River Heights said - and you can't say out, out black spot. The Member for River Heights represents over 45 percent of the delegates to the Conservative Convention and the Member for River Heights said: I don't know how many hundreds of millions of dollars you have to spend but whatever it is spend it. Spend it. That was the position taken by the Member for River Heights.

We introduced a \$24 million Cost of Living Tax Credit Program. That is what it expends now. We introduced a Real Property Tax Credit Program which now spends over \$70 million a year, well over \$70 million. I would like to stay with the lower figures rather than with the higher ones. It's now \$90 million. Mr. Speaker, all of this was done without any substantial increases in taxes. Now, Mr. Speaker, this year there is a levy of \$49 million in the Province of Manitoba and I will sort of concede a point to the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Lakeside. I'm prepared to say that all of that taxation or the great part of it will find its way through the economy of the Province of Manitoba and will have to be paid by the great body of people. It won't all work that way but generally taxation, no matter how it is levied, finds its way into the price of consumer goods and all of the people of the province pay and you do not hit the rich much worse than you hit the poor with taxation. There may be some, and I wouldn't ignore it, I wouldn't say that there is no better system of taxation but that by and large I'm willing to concede that point to the members of the opposition because they need some points conceded and they're in very bad trouble and they won't be able to debate with us if we do not give them something. So that point, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to say is a point that is at least worthy of consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the first speech I made in this House when I was in the opposition was a speech relative to the sales tax. I say that the income tax and the sales tax are both, in the last analysis, consumer taxes. I didn't have to hear it from the Member for Sturgeon Creek before I came to that position, so it doesn't change my political position at all. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the object of this political party, regardless of whether it's done through taxation or through other means is still to redistribute income from the wealth produced in the Province of Manitoba. If it is not done through a taxation program then it has to be done through other means.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the \$46 million or the \$49 million has been used, I repeat, to finance the kinds of programs and to bring into balance, or relative balance, operating expenses and operating revenues in the Province of Manitoba with a relatively small tax levy. Now here I'm going to break the rules. I'm going to start playing unfair. What other province, Mr. Speaker, with what other government has been able to operate with less of an increase in taxes than the Province of Manitoba? It's true that we did make an increase and the honourable members say that even that was not necessary. Can the Leader of the Opposition explain, when he has the opportunity to do so, if the \$49 million was not necessary to maintain expenses and revenues in the Province of Manitoba, why did they need two percent of sales tax which is the equivalent alone of \$70 million in the Province of Manitoba, plus an infamous increase in Medicare premiums of \$5 a month to all of the people of the Province of Ontario, to . . . a balance between their revenues and expenditures. Why do they need \$5 per single person, \$10 for a family? Why is it they need a five percent sales tax in the Province of New Brunswick where they have a Progressive Conservative administration? Now I don't want the honourable members to sort of be hurt by that, I'm not even charging them with it. I'm merely asking them if they could explain the reasons why if it is not needed in the Province of Manitoba, why it is needed in those various provinces.

Now the Honourable Member for Lakeside said and he says it's a well known fact I don't know if he used those terms but it was very close. I can paint a little bit? Is that fair? He said it's a well known fact that government is the greatest beneficiary of inflation. Every time somebody says it's a well known fact, Mr. Speaker, it means that he has no way of substantiating it. It means, Mr. Speaker, that there is no way, there

BUDGET

(MR. GREEN cont'd)is no authority, there's no logic, there's no argument that he can present in favour of that position so he says, Mr. Speaker, it is a well known fact.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside state his matter of privilege.

MR. ENNS: The fact is that this was substantiated by Mr. Henny Olford in 1903, in a speech that we have not yet . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That's not a matter of privilege. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we're not supposed to discuss what was said in the past. I thought that was the rules of the debate. I take the honourable member's reference as the same reference that he made when he said that this was said by R. Beaton in the year 1918, etc. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that in introducing this well known fact he assumes that the government taxes increase by virtue of inflation and that government expenses stay the same way.

I did an interesting analysis, Mr. Speaker. I took a figure - I'm sorry I don't have it here before me but I'll give it to the honourable member, I know I had it here when I walked in. It appears to have disappeared. In any event in 1967 when the sales tax was enacted and yielded \$60 million the salaries paid to physicians in the Province of Manitoba were \$22 an hour. Excuse me. The middle salary to physicians was \$21,000 a year, \$21,000. I'm sorry, I had it on paper and I seem to have overlooked it. In any event they were \$21,000 a year which came out roughly to \$11 an hour in 1967. They are now \$42,000 a year which is roughly \$22 an hour based on our rates of pay. Now I use the doctors - which means that the doctors' salaries have doubled. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that everything else, all of the other salaries have grown accordingly and not only have they grown and tripled--(Interjection)--Well the honourable member says "tripled". If he says tripled then he should not be surprised that the government is not a beneficiary of inflation, it is a victim of inflation in the same way--(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, it is a victim of inflation and its increased costs meet its increased revenues and the fact is that I can detail it for you chapter and verse, that the costs to government, taking inflation into consideration, given the increased services, show that there is no benefit to government from inflation. The Honourable Member for Brandon West shows a pained expression. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there are no figures that demonstrate that the governments are beneficiaries from inflation beyond that which they are victims of inflation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is very disturbing to my honourable friends, but I tell them, Mr. Speaker, that the salaries of doctors in the Province of Manitoba - and I use doctors very advisably because, you know, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside came in here last night with the most astonishing figure of all he presented. He said that the doctors in the Province of Manitoba are earning \$9 an hour--(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, \$9.69 per hour.--(Interjection)--The doctors on our payroll, and this is undisputed, are making \$22 an hour. Mr. Speaker, they are making \$22 per hour.--(Interjection)--They are making . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside kindly contain himself. He had his turn.

MR. GREEN: No matter how you cut it the doctors, Mr. Speaker,--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I suggest the Honourable Member . . .

MR. GREEN: No matter how you cut it, Mr. Speaker, if you are going to discuss wages by the hour the doctors working for the public earn \$22 an hour. Now that figure, Mr. Speaker, is not significant in itself. The MMA--(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, I really feel that there is not being given to me any opportunity to deal with my remarks, and I generally do not say this because generally there is good temper. But at the present time it is impossible for me to continue. I've been on my feet almost for the full period of time and I haven't been able to get into the remarks that I wanted to make.

MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate the remarks of the Honourable Minister, but I have asked for order from all sides of the House and apparently it's not forthcoming. There are little caucuses going on behind the Minister's back, around him and the same goes on

BUDGET

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd)in every corner. I would appreciate if all the honourable members would co-operate with the Chair in maintaining decorum and order. I think they are all going to be entitled to debate, those who haven't had a chance yet, and those who have should not monopolize the floor and take time away from others who haven't had a chance yet. Now I appeal to all the honourable members.

I have allowed another extra eight minutes for the extra time that has been taken off because of interruptions. If I get any more interruptions I'll have to add a minute for each time it happens, so the honourable members will have to conduct themselves accordingly.

The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: In 1967 the average doctor's pay here was \$21,834 per annum; \$11.30 per hour, calculated by the hour. The present salary of doctors, average is \$42,300 per annum, calculated hourly, \$22.00 per hour. Now if you calculate by the hour, which doctors now wish to be paid when they are on the golf course, when they are eating lunch, when they are watching television and say that somebody may phone them, and are earning \$9.00 every moment of that time, then we must calculate by the hour. Now Mr. Speaker, the MMA has bargained with the Government of the Province of Manitoba. They don't like it. The MMA has bargained with the Province of Manitoba on the basis that the doctors in public service should be earning as much as they are earning in private practice, and they have said that the doctors in the public service are earning less than they are earning in private practice. So either they are lying when they say that they are making \$9.00 an hour to the Member for Lakeside, or they are lying when they come to us to say that they want to lift the wages of our doctors to the equivalent of what they are making in the private service. Now they can't have it both ways. They can't run around to the public of Manitoba and say they are making \$9.00 an hour, and then come to the government and say we have to pay more than \$22.00 in order to equate them with the private service. And that's the kind of Grandpa Tory snake oil medicine that these itinerant peddlers are trying to sell to the people of Manitoba because they won't talk about what they used to do, they won't talk about what they are doing now, and they won't talk about what they will do in the future. So they're running around the province trying to sell snake oil, and I tell the honourable members that the people of the Province of Manitoba are not going to buy that type of snake oil.

The Honourable Member for Wolseley and the Honourable Member for Lakeside say that putting a hospital into the north end of Winnipeg is the purchase of political support from the people of north Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, I lived in north Winnipeg for 27 years. There was a hospital, the St. Joseph's Hospital, on the corner of Salter and Pritchard. There was a Children's Hospital on the corner of Main Street and Redwood. And those two hospitals closed, and the north end of Winnipeg, which constituted half the population, 250,000 citizens of this province, did not have the kind of hospital facilities that were available to other parts of the city. That when a child hurt himself in north Winnipeg he had to go by traffic either to the General Hospital, and the chances are that the McPhillips Street subway could have been flooded at the time and it was, and they wouldn't fix that either. Because, Mr. Speaker, the fact is, and the north Winnipeggers have been saying this for years and years, that that side of the House, the people who run that party always consider that it is not necessary to do anything in north Winnipeg. I tell the honourable members that we did not have to buy votes in north Winnipeg, that the people in north Winnipeg supported this position when we could give nothing, when we had no power, no influence, or anything. And they didn't go and buy political people in order to get something. They voted on the basis of what they thought was right, and they voted that way whether it was going to be a government or it was not going to be a government. And they did not buy us, and we did not buy them. But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot go to the people of north Winnipeg and say, in order to demonstrate my purity to the Member for Lakeside and the Member for Wolseley, we will deny you a hospital in north Winnipeg so they cannot say that we are trying to support the people of north Winnipeg.

BUDGET

A MEMBER: Don't be an idiot.

MR. GREEN: And the honourable member is laughing. I tell him, Mr. Speaker, that last year I attended a meeting in north Winnipeg, and who was at that meeting. The Leader of the Conservative Party was at that meeting, The Leader of the Conservative Party. Mr. Speaker, last year - we all know who the Leader of the Conservative Party was, and I state for the Member for Lakeside and all the others, that you cannot erase his memory, you cannot erase him from your midst - he attended that meeting in north Winnipeg. And I stood up before those people and I said, "I cannot give privileges to north Winnipeg. If there is need for a hospital in north Winnipeg there will be one. If there is not need for a hospital in north Winnipeg there will not be one." I told them that. The Leader of the Conservative Party got up in north Winnipeg, in my constituency, Lord Selkirk Community Club, invited there by his Tory friends, and he said, "You keep on pressuring your politicians and you'll get your hospital in north Winnipeg. You pressure them and you will get your hospital in north Winnipeg because politicians act under pressure, and you pressure them." And we now, Mr. Speaker, we now get the Conservatives in this House the Leader of - well, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you what I said to the people of north Winnipeg and the people in Lord Selkirk community. I said, "When there is a hospital in north Winnipeg, and I hope there will be one, I cannot promise it, then as sure as God made little apples, the Leader of the Opposition will be saying that you're buying votes in northern Winnipeg." And that is now what the Member for Lakeside says. And that is now what the Member for Wolseley says. And I tell these people that that's what the Leader of the Opposition said, because that is the way he behaved. We never had firmer confirmation of this than the way he spoke this afternoon. He walked into the House earlier in the session and tried to pretend that we had over-spent last year's Budget. So, his mind working - as a matter of fact, readily working that way, he said, "They under-spent last year's Budget so they will have money next year so that they will give goodies at election time."

And the Member for St. Johns very quickly grabbed - I tell you, it's easy to find out why this argument flowed so well from the Member for River Heights. In 1968 the Conservative Party under-spent their Budget by roughly \$42,000,000 - 42 of 350, which is over a tenth - 42 of 398 is still over a tenth. They under-spent the Budget. They announced an election in 1969 and announced that there will be \$5.00 per capita to all of the municipalities in Manitoba. So how did this great logic work itself out in the mind of the Member for River Heights? How did he know it? Because he did it! He did it! They did it! And the Member for Wolseley would behave that way. And the Member for Lakeside would behave that way.--(Interjection)--Pardon? They did it. Well we didn't go back to '66, but I presume, Mr. Speaker, I presume if you go back to - I'm not supposed to - would you please erase the last five minutes from the record? Because it will be too damaging, Mr. Speaker. It will be too damaging to the Conservative Party, who like to fight fair and who do not like to say, and who will only be able to participate in the debate on fair terms and will not be damaged if we do not say what they have done in the past, we do not say what they are doing now, and we do not mention what they will do in the future. That is the only basis upon which they can fight. That will be a fair fight.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we can almost do that and still win, because their position is that weak. But they talk about government spending, and this is really the heart of the issue, that somehow, when the government spends money, it's not productive; and that if the government would stop spending money, inflation would go away, and government spending has gone up by 300 percent between 1968, or '66 to 1976. That's the basis of their position. And everybody listens to this, it sounds good, and nobody pays any attention. What is happening in the private sector, Mr. Speaker? Is spending stable in the private sector? Well I got some of our leading corporations, Mr. Speaker. Holiday Inn in 1968 spent \$14,000,000. This is Canada. Holiday Inn spent \$14 million in '68; 82 million in 1974, an increase of 485 percent in spending. The equivalent public spending increase in the Province of Manitoba was 102 percent. Four times as much--(Interjection)--Pardon me? Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says that the spending

BUDGET

(MR. GREEN cont'd) is okay if it's a profit. I want to tell the honourable member that I consider--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: . . .Mr. Speaker. No, I am talking about Holiday . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: I am talking about Holiday Inn in Canada and the honourable member has one measurement as to whether the spending is justified, did it show a profit? I want you to know that I consider, and I'm willing to go to the people of the Province of Manitoba, that I can have a couple of Holiday Inns less and many more senior citizens homes which do not show a profit. But, Mr. Speaker--(Interjection)-- Yes, let's find some other goodies that make a profit where spending should go, it doesn't matter where because it shows a profit.

Cara Operations Limited, in-flight meals and airport gift and duty free shops. --(Interjections)--No, this is Cara Operations Limited. 1969 - 32 million; 1975 - 76 million, an increase of 138 percent with an equivalent increase in the Province of Manitoba during the same period. Exactly the same. Now, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member for St. James who says, "How much profit did they show?" I want you to know that I consider that the provision of nurses, the provision of medical equipment, the provision of research equipment is more productive, more important to me, and I'm willing to go to the people of the Province of Manitoba and say, rather than the gift stores in the airport, even though they do not show a profit.

The Ford Motor Company of Canada - '69, 1,140 million; '75, 3,950 million, an increase of 245 percent. Equivalent increase in the public sector, equivalent increase in the public sector, 139 percent. And that'll say what they make. Automobiles, they make profits. Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that I consider that the parks that are put up by the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, the schools that are provided by the Minister of Education, the urban services, the housing that is provided by the Minister of Housing Renewal, is as important to me, is as profitable to me and I'm prepared to go to the citizens of the Province of Manitoba and stand those up any time against having more motor cars on the road produced by Ford Motor Company of Canada.

Well, Mr. Speaker, here's a real important one. Agra Industries Limited. They have cheese powders for packaged snack foods and bottling and distribution of Seven-Up, Orange Crush and Hires-Root Beer. Their base period, Mr. Speaker, '68, they spent \$2,600,000; in 1974 they spent \$144,900,000, an increase of 5,500 percent, as against an equivalent public increased spending of 102 percent. Mr. Speaker, I've taken the argument at its worst. I say, Mr. Speaker, that public spending, in my opinion, is not a greater problem in society than private spending is. The question is, what the money is being spent for. And I say, Mr. Speaker, I say that I am quite willing to go to the public of Manitoba and say, "Are the hospitals less valuable than the Pepsi-Cola bottles? Are the parks less valuable than the Cara Shops? Are the housing less valuable than the Holiday Inns?"--(Interjection)--Well I'm glad there's somebody here who has some sense in him - "never" is right. And those people who blame public spending on inflation are selling Grandpa Tory's snake oil, and the people of this province will not buy it.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable members say that the government should only do - and in my opinion the government does nothing, but I use their words because it makes their argument easier - that the government should only do for others what the people cannot do for themselves. And I will accept, Mr. Speaker, that criteria. I say that the people should only do together those things that they can better do together than to try to let it be done individually. Yes! I believe that I am a member of the public. I want to do for myself, I never ask anybody to do for me. But I say that there are things that we can do for ourselves together much better, much more effectively, much less expensively, than trying to do them each individually, and I can prove it to my honourable friends.

The Province of Manitoba last year raised roughly \$700 million in the kind of thing that the honourable members call taxes. The other \$300 million are federal program taxes, but I'm talking about the Provincial Budget. So provincially, Mr. Speaker,

BUDGET

(MR. GREEN cont'd) we have taxed the citizens in our province, if we take a family of five, roughly \$700 per citizen. For a family of five it would be \$3,500 a year, and that's a lot of money. That every citizen in this province has publicly collected from him - a family of five, three children, has collected from him \$3,500. And if he didn't have to pay any taxes, if he was making \$10,000 a year, or \$8,000, he'd make \$11,500. The Member for Wolseley may think that that's intriguing. Wonderful thing. The man suddenly got a raise from \$8,000, no taxes, he's now getting \$11,500. But, Mr. Speaker, what then becomes his expenses? What does he then have to do for himself which he used to do collectively together for himself? Well, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that he will want to do is educate his children, and since I have taken a family of five, I will say that they have three children. The costs for the free enterprise private school in the Province of Manitoba, and I assume that given the fact that it is a free enterprise run by the elite private school that there is no wastage of money, run very efficiently, that there is no people standing in the fields doing nothing or sitting under a banana tree as the Member for Wolseley says. The tuition at that school is \$2,100 per child per year. So he would have to pay, Mr. Speaker, out of this \$3,500 he's got - and he's got three children - he would have to pay \$6,300 a year for the education of those three children. He would have to do that for twelve years. Do you know what the figures are? They are frightening. It's \$75,600 to educate those children so that he could do it for himself rather than do it collectively.--(Interjection)--Well I'm talking about today's figures. Now this is what he is going to get, Mr. Speaker, out of that \$3,500 - I am not including university - \$75,000 to educate three children. Spread it over 30 years if you want to. It still comes out, Mr. Speaker, if you spread it out to 30 years to \$2,500 a year for the education of those children.

What would he do by himself in health care? What can we do together? What can we do for ourselves? The best health plan in the United States, the only one that comes anywhere near approaching the kind of coverage that we have in the Province of Manitoba which we have done for ourselves together, do you know what it costs? Would you like to guess? Eighty-five dollars a month premiums per family; \$1,000 a year for health care alone. That \$3,500 is disappearing pretty quick and we don't even have one inch of road built yet.

Mr. Speaker, supposing that they have a parent, one parent who has to live in a nursing home. Now he's got this \$3,500, got that in his pocket. He doesn't have to give it to that money grubbing government. Going to keep it for himself. Nursing home coverage in Minnesota, \$23 a day, Mr. Speaker. If a man had to stay in a nursing home for two years, and most people would like that they lasted longer, \$16,790 for two years in a nursing home. You know it was the Member for Sturgeon Creek, as rugged a free enterpriser as you can get, and I remember him standing in his seat saying, look, ideology be damned. You've got to do something about taking the cost of nursing home care off of the general public, even the middle income groups, all of the income groups. If anything should be universal it's nursing care. Mr. Speaker, every one of their Grandpa Tory snake oil philosophies breaks down when it starts to hit them in the pocket book. That's what you get for a nursing home.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister's time is up, I'm sorry.

MR. GREEN: I just have a few minutes to go.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the honourable gentleman have leave? The honourable member doesn't have leave.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks. I have other things to say. There will be other opportunities for debate and we will deal with them. In the meantime the other honourable members can continue.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member . . .

MR. ENNS: I appreciate it is by leave. Will the honourable member permit one question?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time has expired and the only way the honourable member can ask a question is by unanimous leave. Does the honourable member have leave? The Honourable Member for St. James.

BUDGET

MR. MINAKER: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I listened with care to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources and I'm somewhat disappointed. I have great respect for the Minister and I think he knows that. But tonight his exuberance was there, his loudness was there but the content wasn't there. I know the Honourable Minister is having trouble in developing oil in our province but now he's out pounding and trying to promote snake oil. Also I can understand possibly some of my colleagues that are in the backbench like myself, trying to promote some kind of segregation between the north and the south but now we have the Honourable Minister, a front bencher, trying to segregate north Winnipeg against the rest of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, we heard the Honourable Minister say that there are certain rules under which the Tories will win and will debate and he doesn't believe what he reads in the papers. I have to concur with the Honourable Minister and I'll comment later on that in my comments, that I don't necessarily believe what I read in papers. It was also quite noticeable for the first I guess 40 minutes - I don't know how long the Minister talked but I think the first 40 minutes of his particular debate was on the defence, which is very different from the Honourable Minister that I know of the two years or the three years that I've sat in the House. Usually he's always been on the offence. But this year he was on the defence.

He also indicated - and I quote the Minister and if I'm wrong in quoting him - he mentioned that it was an unexciting Budget. In fact he didn't mention the Budget for about the first 30 minutes of the speech and contrary to the rules maybe, Mr. Speaker, tonight I'm going to speak on the Budget.

To me the Budget Debate is one of the most important debates that we have in this Legislature and with my experience at city council - I might say in the City of St. James that a former member of this House, Mr. Whiteman was the Finance Minister of our Council and he brought it home to me just how important budgets were not only in operating the city that I represented but also in anything that you operate and are responsible for. So that I intend on speaking on the Budget tonight, not on necessarily snake oils or capital punishment and so forth.

I was very interested in the Honourable Minister's comments that he believed that the average person counted. If I understood him correctly, that's what he said, the average person counted. Yet it was very ironical that he would bring out in his argument, in defence of his government, salaries of doctors - \$21,000 and then \$42,000 a year, they doubled. I don't call that an average income in our province. So tonight, Mr. Speaker, I'll deal with average incomes when I talk about the Budget, not with the upper income as the Honourable Minister seemed to want to single out and point out.

He also seemed to have some question with regards to the accuracy of the honourable colleague from Woodlands with regards to his accuracy. Yet he himself --(Interjection)-- or Lakeside. My apologies to the honourable colleague. I think brought to the attention of the House that in his opinion, the Minister's opinion, my honourable colleague had made an error of some 50 percent. Well I suggest that the Minister himself was in error. He said something, that salaries had doubled and tripled. I heard him say tripled and if I am wrong then when Hansard comes out I'll correct myself, but I heard him say doubled and tripled. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that later on when I'm dealing - and I'll deal with statistics that the government hands out to us - that the Minister . . .

Also, Mr. Speaker, what the Minister said was that the objective of this government was that they would not hit the rich harder than the poor, but the average person contribute. He also talked about the present government had not implanted on the people of Manitoba any great taxation since they've come into government seven years ago. I find that very hard to believe, Mr. Speaker, and I will comment on that as we progress.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier that to me the Budget Debate is the most important debate I think that we deal with during the session that we know we're going to deal with. Also, Mr. Speaker, I have listened for three years to the Budget Debate and I've heard such things as when the Honourable Member from St. Johns was the

BUDGET

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) Minister of Finance and he read such things and I quote: "In June of 1969, the citizens of this province entrusted the New Democratic Party with the responsibility of bringing a new kind of government to Manitoba, a government fully committed to working for real political, social and," I would underline this part, "economic equality for the average wage earner: the old age pensioner, the widow with small children, the local businessman, the farmer and the residents of the north."

Then I listened in 1975 to the First Minister who was then the Minister of Finance and he said, and I quote: "In 1973 I concluded our government's Budget Address for that year with a quotation from Franklin Roosevelt as follows: 'The test of our progress as a society is not in whether we add to the abundance of those who already have much but in whether we provide more for those who have little.'" It's pretty heavy stuff. If this is a fact that the government is striving for, it's pretty hard to debate against.

Then this year, Mr. Speaker, we listened to the Budget and he said and I quote: "In the meantime our administration intends to do all that we can on our own within the limited range of options available to us at the provincial level to make certain that the people of Manitoba are served by a government that places their interests," and I repeat that, "their interests first above all and is committed to seeing that their requirements are met."

Mr. Speaker, I, by profession, like to analyze figures when they're presented to us to see if they meet the general objectives that are put forward in the opening comments of a Budget. I find it very hard to digest the statements that were presented to me in the past three years when I listened to the presentation of the Budget Speech. Because, Mr. Speaker, I know in my household and I'm sure in yours when we have to meet our budget it's the breadwinner that pays for it. If your wife works, she pays for part of it, if you work, you pay for part of it. If there's only one person in the family working then he pays for it. That's really what counts, whether it's a budget for a household or whether it's a budget for the province, it's the people that pay for it that work and earn the money and bring the revenue into the province.

Mr. Speaker, I thought, well let's see if the government is living up to their objectives that they've told me the past three years that I've sat in this House and listened to the Minister of Finance present his Budget. What have they done in the seven years that they've been in power and responsible for operating our province? So I looked at how many people did we have in 1969? Well we had about 979,000. How many people do we have today? We have a little more. Over a million, about a million and twenty one thousand. Five percent increase since the government came into power. That doesn't really have any meaning at this point but the people are there. They've only increased by five percent since this government came into power.

Also what has happened to the labour force, the people who paid for these taxes? I would like to comment at this point, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources has some kind of idea when he pointed to the Minister of Health and he pointed to the Minister of Parks and Recreation that they were paying for the parks, they were paying for the homes. They're not paying for the homes, Mr. Speaker. The taxpayers of Manitoba are paying for the homes. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, about the constituency you represent but I know what the people that I represent are saying: stop spending money. We'd like a little bit of it in our pocket to save for what we want to spend it for. So, Mr. Speaker, what has happened to the workers that pay for all this in Manitoba?

When this government took over there was 373,000 of them or should I say us, because I was working then too. In 1976 there's 427,000 of us working. That's a 15 percent increase since this government took over. But what has this government done in terms of spending since it took over? In 1969 it spent \$398 million. What are we looking at today? I'll subtract the rebates because we keep having that thrown back at us that, well we're giving back \$87½ million for a property tax rebate; we're giving back so many million dollars for a cost-of-living rebate. So let's subtract that \$110½ million and see what they're spending today. They're spending about \$1,066,000,000, an increase of 268 percent since they've taken over. Yet the working force has only increased 15 percent. Who's paying for it? And this government has the audacity to try and imply

BUDGET

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) that taxes have not increased since they've taken over.

Yet if we look at that labour force that pays for these taxes, in 1969 those 373,000 people, if you averaged out on a per worker basis, came forward with \$64 million in income tax, provincial income tax. That's all we'll talk about. In 1976 they're expected to come forward with about \$290 million. That's an increase of 450 percent, 450 percent. The provincial income tax has increased but what has the working force increased in that seven years? Fifteen percent. So let's compare it on a per capita worker basis. I'd like to point out that the figures that I'm using come from this Manitoba Digest of Statistics, they're in there. The January 1976 issue. They also come from your former Budget speeches so if you want them tabled I'll table them but I'd like to get them back.

In 1969 the worker was required on an average basis to provide \$174 per year to the province. Today this government wants \$678 per worker, the average worker. We're talking about what the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was talking about supposedly, the average person that this government is concerned about. An increase of four times on a provincial income tax basis, the average income tax provincially for our workers is increased four times. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister indicated - and this is why I doubt some of the statistics that he was using when he said that salaries had doubled and salaries had tripled - because if I turn to the Manitoba Digest of Statistics and look at what the average weekly earnings, by industry, in Manitoba were, in 1969 in the mining and milling it was \$152 per week, in September of last year it was \$261, an increase of 71 percent, not 100 percent or not 200 percent - Page 38. If we look at manufacturing, it was \$107 a week in 1969, today it's \$190, an increase of 78 percent. And if the honourable members want to go to that book and look at it, they'll find out that the increase in the average income of workers in our province since they have taken office has not doubled or tripled as the Minister of Mines has indicated, it has only doubled in one category, and that is in the construction workers, the rest are less than 80 percent increase. Yet that particular worker, the average worker is expected to put forward 3.9 times or 4 times as much provincial income tax this year as he was in 1969 when this government took over. It's in the books. If the First Minister wants to look, it's right there. He puts it out. His government puts this document out.

Mr. Speaker, what else has this government done to the individual since it's taken over. What other taxes or costs has it imposed on the average worker in Manitoba? And it's the worker that pays for the bills, let's face it. Unfortunately the First Minister wasn't here in my opening remarks - but it's the worker that pays the taxes. Well what was the tobacco tax in 1969? \$8.2 million. What is the tobacco tax they're going to collect today? \$18.5 million. A 2.4 times increase for tobacco tax for the average worker. That's what they're looking at. And what has the sales tax gone up? Again, the working population has only increased 15 percent since this government took office. It's gone up 15 percent. Yet the sales tax that that worker is expected to pay for, to clothe his family and so forth - in 1969 it was estimated at \$60 million, today it's estimated \$190 million or \$189.5 million, a 3.2 increase, Mr. Speaker. That's what this government is doing to the individual on the sales tax picture. --(Interjection)-- Here we go again - Ontario. Mr. Speaker, again I must reiterate that that average worker is looking at an 80 percent increase in salaries since this government took over, yet they want three times or more in sales tax from that individual.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the First Minister likes my next comments, that unfortunately maybe for the First Minister there are people in Manitoba that like to tilt one now and then and sit around the beer parlour and have a few after they've worked hard to pay the taxes and so on. In 1969, the Liquor Control Commission looked at a revenue of some \$27 million. Today what is this government trying to achieve? 67 million, a two and a half times increase. Still ahead of the average income earner, still higher than that 70 percent increase that he's had in his hourly income comparisons. Again from this Manitoba Digest of Statistics that I have to believe is correct, because when I compare them to the Budget Speech, they correlate.

BUDGET

(MR. MINAKER cont'd):

Then what other avenues of taxes has this government gone after, Mr. Speaker? Take a look at Parks and Recreation that the Honourable Minister of Mines pointed to the Minister and said, you know, when they build those parks that's better than a profit. Well no wonder he said that. What was the Parks and Recreation in 1969, the revenue the government expected to get when they took over? \$604,000. Now in our Budget that we're looking at, they're looking for \$2.1 million or 2.2. Three and a half times more fees. Again that hidden tax. And I would suggest to the Honourable First Minister that the parks have not increased their facilities three and a half times. I defy him to tell me that they have.

So what do we have now, Mr. Speaker? We have a government that's working for the average individual as they've stated, yet on one hand the average individual's income is only increased 80 percent. But this government wants something like four times as much provincial income tax from them. They want now, if he smokes - well we better look that one up - now if he happens to smoke they want 2.4 times as much money off him. If he happens to drink, heaven forbid, they want two and a half times as much money off him. If he happens to decide he wants to go out and enjoy some recreation he can expect an increase and we don't know how much. But there it is, Mr. Speaker, that the average individual is being taxed. And it's only natural when a government increases its spending something like 268 percent and the working force only increases by 15 percent, it's obviously that they're going to increase taxes on you and I, or the average individual that happens to have the responsibility of making a living and supporting his family.

And Mr. Speaker, it bears itself out in the particular Budget before us. They have a graph in here, I think it's on Page - well I think everybody else can find it, it's a budgetary current revenues for the fiscal year 1976 and '77. They have a little pie shaped up here, and surprisingly the income tax and succession duty of the total revenue that's going to be collected in our province this year is 35.7 percent.

There's another interesting thing that we have here. The natural resources are going to collect 2.7 percent. And what do we have in the 1969 Budget? The income tax share of the revenue is 28 percent. What's with this government? They're the government that's trying to work for the average individual. In '69 when they took over, the income tax they were collecting from the people of Manitoba represented 28 percent of the source of revenue. And now we've got 35.7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister talks about corporation taxes. The corporation tax in the 1969 estimates was \$29.6 million. The 1976 estimate of revenue from corporations this year is 84.7. Again an increase of 2.9 percent. Let's go after the corporation. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in my view as a layman of how corporations are doing in Manitoba, I would think would be the gross provincial product. I think that would be a fair barometer. It seems to spell itself out in terms of income. And when this government took over in 1969 it was \$3.49 billion. Today, or estimated for 1976, and I'll tell the First Minister that I estimated this. What I did was, I took last year's gross provincial product and I multiplied it by the same increase as it was this year, 10.8 percent. So we're looking at \$7.2 billion thereabouts. Well since they've taken office, this government, it's increased then about 2 times. Yet they want to go after the corporations for 2.9 times as much tax. Now how can I ask the Honourable Minister, Mr. Speaker, does he expect corporations to come into Manitoba to develop and to locate here when the government has this attitude? Let's go after three times what they had seven years ago even though they've only increased the gross provincial product by two times.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to comment on the 2 percent surtax with regards to those particular corporations that might have \$1 million taxable income or more. Why I'd like to comment on it is, I believe, and if I'm wrong I hope the government corrects me on this, that some of these corporations that have this particular situation are ones that export their products. I am thinking of the farm machinery producers like Versatile, and Agro I guess, and Co-op Implements, that they will be faced with a

BUDGET

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) 2 percent surtax. But Mr. Speaker, they're also faced with another surtax at a Federal level. The Anti-Inflation Board has indicated that those particular companies that export their product are limited to the profit that they can use and they will be taxed if they exceed that. So they're hit with a double surtax, Mr. Speaker, and I question whether these companies will want to expand or whether they'll want to even locate here. So I question the Honourable First Minister on whether or not this approach might be a correct one at this time. --(Interjection)--

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

MR. MINAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the First Minister for that embarrassment, that I was not aware of that and I asked for the information and I'm glad he gave it.

Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to talk about the sharing of growth taxes. This government has always stated, and I have known that the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has indicated, that municipalities shouldn't share in the growth taxes because they should be responsible for raising the money that they will spend. Yet, Mr. Speaker, I would point out in 1969 in the Estimates that this government took over for revenue, the national equalization and the shared cost receipts totalled some \$104 million that they received from the Federal Government.

In 1976 the national equalization, the income tax guaranteed revenue and the shared cost receipts will total some \$333 million. Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, are they responsible for raising these taxes? Yet they accept them and I would hope they would accept them. They have tripled. Mr. Speaker, these revenues from the Federal Government - and they come from the people in Manitoba, there's no doubt about it, the taxpayer - have tripled. Yet what we're talking about, Mr. Speaker, is whether it's right for the Provincial Government to say, no, you can't share in the growth taxes because you should be responsible for what you are spending and collect the money for it, when these people, Mr. Speaker, the government will accept \$333 million this year of taxes that they do not collect and are prepared to spend it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's look at the municipality support that this First Minister talks about. In 1969 the unconditional grants were \$7.6 million and the highway maintenance for the urban transit subsidies and so forth represented \$18.2 million and that's \$25.8 million, in 1969. --(Interjection)-- No, we're talking about this government, Mr. Speaker. That represented 6.5 percent of the Budget. Today what are we looking at? The growth tax for corporation and income that will be shared by the municipalities is \$70 $\frac{1}{2}$ million; the assistance program is another 17.2. We're looking at \$34.7 million and let's subtract the Rebate Program. Let's subtract the \$110 $\frac{1}{2}$ million off it. That now represents 3.3 percent of the Budget, Mr. Speaker, half of what they had in 1969. In 1969 it represented 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ percent, today it represents 3.3 percent.

Mr. Speaker, In Education in 1969 it was \$149.5 million, that's 37 $\frac{1}{2}$ percent of the Budget. Today the Colleges and Universities, the Education and the increased assistance announced in the Budget represents \$309.8 million. That's 29 percent. In 1969 it was 37 $\frac{1}{2}$, today it's 29. That's based on subtracting the \$110 $\frac{1}{2}$ million rebate. So you can use it on Education, you can use it on municipalities. A decrease of 30 percent. I'd ask the Honourable Minister where are his priorities? You know why doesn't he live up to what he's saying here, that the average person counts. Where is the money going? We give the rebate back, take it off on three occasions and we're still losing ground since this government took over.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult to agree with some of our colleagues in the House where they say that the Minister is trying to help the small people or the average people or trying to curtail expenses in spending when you see figures like this.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour is 10:00 o'clock. The honourable member will have another twelve minutes next time we get to this debate.

The hour of adjournment having arrived the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Thursday next.