



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

26 Elizabeth II

Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Peter Fox
Speaker



VOL. XXIV No.51A MONDAY, MAY 2, 1977 2:30 p.m.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY of MANITOBA
Monday, May 2, 1977

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports.

RETURN TO ORDER NO. 32

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Agriculture.

HONOURABLE SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Return to Order of the House No. 32.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Continuing Education.

HONOURABLE BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the House on the number of fires in provincial parks.

MR. SPEAKER: Did the Honourable Minister distribute a copy of his report?

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I do not have copies. It's a very brief statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave to proceed without copies? (Agreed)

MR. HANUSCHAK: In the eastern region, in the Whiteshell Provincial Park — this is as of yesterday — there are three fires all under control; two of them are in the vicinity of the Ontario border, 1.5 acres each, and one west of Rennie, five acres. In the western region in the Shilo Military Reserve, 20 square miles, fire stopped on north and east flanks burning approximately 1.5 miles from Bald Head Hills. They predicted a south wind for this afternoon; hopefully it will divert the fire from the park area. It is being fought by parks staff and military personnel.

RETUS TO ORDERS NOS. 28, 31

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Education.

HONOURABLE IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I wish to file an Order for Return to Order No. 28 and an Order for Return to Order No. 31.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Mines.

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I regret the fact that I wasn't here Friday afternoon and I would like — if it is agreeable to honourable members — to have Public Accounts Committee meet tomorrow at ten, which I didn't announce on Friday. On one days notice, I won't hold the meeting unless it's agreeable, but if it is agreeable, we'd like to meet tomorrow at ten. Could you then schedule it, Mr. Clerk, tomorrow from government and forest industry and conservation and recreation groups. I'd like to personally thank them on behalf of all members for these trees which we have in front of us today. Thank you.

RETURN TO ORDER NO. 41

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file a Return to An Order of the House No. 41 dated June 8/76 to the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, reverting briefly to the comments of the Minister of Resources, we are all pleased of course to have the representation of new growth and hope and expectation for the future in the form of the young seedlings that he has presented to all members of the House today and, arising out of that same spirit of hope and renewal and expectation for the future, I have a question for the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister can confirm to the House the statement that he has made outside of the House to the effect that the people of Manitoba will be deprived of the privilege of casting their votes in a provincial general election for a period of two, four or six months, having to do with certain problems that the Premier seems to be concerned about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, Premier (Rossmere): Well, firstly, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that the announcing of a date of an election is a matter of making a statement in the House until and unless it is a case of announcing the issuing of the Writ itself. Point number two is that the

election will be held as it was always contemplated to hold it at the earliest appropriate opportunity and as to what is appropriate is a matter of judgement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Order please. Order please.

MR. LYON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the First Minister confirm that the appropriateness or the inappropriateness of that date which he chooses to keep to himself and to the press, has something to do with the availability of his organizers from outside the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is a subject which is often, I believe, exaggerated. I doubt that there are more than literally a handful or a few numbers of persons. In any case, Mr. Speaker, that too is a matter of judgement. I recall reading something in the papers not too long ago of a reference to some "big blue machine" and that big blue machine, I gather, is their counterpart.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the First Minister. Could the First Minister enlighten the House then as to what accounts for his change of view as between the appropriateness of a June election which he stated to the press about ten days ago and the inappropriateness of which he stated last Friday?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, among other things, Mr. Speaker, the calling of an election in the immediately neighbouring province. That's one factor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. A question to the First Minister arising out of the new hope that he expressed and the fact that the Minister for Renewable Resources gave us these seedlings, can the Minister indicate whether he has received that new hope of honesty from the Leader of the Official Opposition, namely that he was wrong in expressing to this House that Manitoba Hydro wasted some \$605 million of the taxpayers' money?

MR. LYON: On a point of order of which I am sure the Honourable Member for Radisson is fully unaware, the question of a member's honesty or dishonesty or terminology such as he is accustomed to use in this House which is totally inappropriate, I think, Sir, is well aware to you and we on this side of the House as on that side of the House rely upon you, Sir, to question the appropriateness of language used in the House. I suggest that the language used by the Member for Radisson in this connection is, as usual, totally inappropriate but wear in your hands, Sir, with respect to propriety in this House. Insofar as the content of his question is concerned, he can keep asking it until doomsday. We love the extra publicity, particularly on the funds.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, speaking in the same vein as the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, I would quite agree that it is not becoming honourable members to question each other's honesty. It is for that reason, Sir, that when the Chairman and Chief Engineer of Manitoba Hydro has put on the public record on more than one occasion now in the transcript of the Committee on Public Utilities that No. 1, there has been no imposition on engineering determination of political preferences. I don't question his honesty in so doing when he has also stated, as he has on more than one occasion, that in the engineering opinion of Hydro, the course of development of the Nelson River that is being followed is as economic as any alternative. I don't question his honesty but apparently the Leader of the Opposition does under the general premise, as he just finished saying, that any publicity he is quite happy to have.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. On the points of order that were raised, the Chair acknowledges that there was merit, but the Chair is really in the hands of the membership of this Legislative Assembly and the statesmanlike conduct is really a matter for each individual to reflect upon. The Chair cannot control members, except to ask them to maintain a high standard, and I would hope I would get the co-operation of all the members on that.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Attorney-General. Can he confirm reports that were issued again on this weekend's press that the government is planning to present to this House amendments to The Election Act to provide for higher quotas of expenses and other items?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, that would be a matter that would be announced in due course.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, can the Attorney-General indicate if he has received any specific recommendations from The Law Reform Commission, or has the department examined the reports that they have given to come up with a series of proposals on election reform that would be introduced at this session?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Law Reform Commission of Manitoba has issued tentative proposals. They are not final proposals, but tentative proposals for public discussion on a number of proposed reforms to The Election Act. I believe most members have received copies of that report and I believe the deadline for receiving responses to that report has just passed by, I believe this past week, so that would lead to a final report. Insofar as the actual amendments this session to The

Monday, May 2, 1977

Elections Act, that would be a matter that will have to be dealt with and announced in due course, keeping in mind of course the tentative recommendations that were made by the Law Reform Commission.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If the deadline has just passed for these submissions, can we expect any form of final report from the Law Reform Commission before the session ends upon which we might then be able to respond to any possible intentions of the government to make amendments to the Act?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the impression that I have in discussions with the chairman of the Law Reform Commission is that it would be most unlikely that there would be any final recommendations to us within the immediate period of time we are speaking about, within the next month.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister arising out of his comments in response, I take it, to the so-called question by the Honourable Member for Radisson. Having regard to the Premier's previous statements with respect to matters respecting Manitoba Hydro made by persons such as the Honourable Douglas Campbell, former assistant general manager Kris Kristjanson, and Mr. Spafford, is the Premier therefore prepared to withdraw his comments about them, namely that they were dastardly, bastardly, and scurrilous scoundrels? —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister. Order please.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend were to check more closely, he would find that that reference, which I do acknowledge, was made with reference to the Winnipeg Free Press so-called "researched" articles, which I am advised by Manitoba Hydro they did not have one person call by for background material and information —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SCHREYER: Sir, I do not retract that reference.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: The First Minister, then, Mr. Speaker, can we take his comment of this moment as being a retraction of that reference with respect to Mr. Campbell, Mr. Spafford, and Mr. Kristjanson?

MR. SCHREYER: I just finished saying, Sir, that it was with reference to the Winnipeg Free Press and their so-called series of "researched" articles. With respect to Messrs. Campbell, Kristjanson and Spafford, I've already said in the past that the advice that they gave certainly did not and was not accepted by all others of the Board of Manitoba Hydro at that time and that included such people as I have referred to including the late W.J. Parker, Dean Hoogstraten and, in my opinion, Tom Storey, as I recall I believe he was on the board or, if not on the board, he was in the Executive Committee of Hydro at that time. It also refers to Underwood-McLellan and Crippen and the engineering report of Crippen was specifically to the contrary of the point being made by Messrs. Kristjanson and Campbell.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, in light of the Premier's elongation of his reply to a simple question, may I ask him a question now, in the light of the drought conditions that we're presently experiencing and the fact, as admitted by the Minister of Mines the other day — which is in doubt — that there is approximately only four-tenths of a foot more water on Lake Winnipeg than there would have been without control, is the First Minister prepared to —(Interjection)— we're back to an organ grinder situation I see, Mr. Speaker, is the First Minister prepared, is the First Minister —(Interjection)— we have two of them in the House, I see with cups. Is the First Minister prepared now to acknowledge that there was merit in the criticism that was directed to him and Mr. Cass-Beggs and it was not worth \$300 million to preserve four-tenths of a foot on Lake Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before the Honourable First Minister answers, I'm prepared to maintain and try to maintain order, but if members irritate by innuendo and by reference to other individuals, then we are going to have the cross-fire and I would suggest that all honourable members contain themselves and only speak when they have the floor, otherwise it's not fair to this Assembly.

The Honourable First Minister to reply. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I made no admission. I made as a statement of fact that this year the water level would be kept a half foot higher than it would have been. But the regulation scheme, based on history, not based on politics — and I'm sorry I have to explain this to my honourable friend but apparently he won't depart from his position no matter what the facts are — the scientists who prepared the regulation scheme, and you can argue with them if you like, have indicated, based on history, if you have the same historical pattern over the next 80 years that you had over the last, the regulation limit would work between levels of 711 and 715. That is all that was alleged and my honourable friend knows it. If he wants to argue with that, let him argue with the scientists who prepared it. That wasn't an assertion of governmental people, it was an assertion of scientific evidence and this year it happens to result in a half a foot higher.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: A question then, Mr. Speaker, for the Honourable the Minister of Mines and

Resources. Is he prepared to say now that an expenditure of \$300 million, which includes Jenpeg as well as the control works on the top end of Lake Winnipeg, is justified and is viable when the estimates that were made for the viability of that could not exceed \$50 million?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, with regard to my honourable friend's estimate, he is again wrong. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will acknowledge he is wrong . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. GREEN: The honourable member would like to ask the questions and answer them and I say that that position will not find commendation by the people of the province of Manitoba. Neither the question nor the answer. The fact is that the \$50 million estimate did not include the Jenpeg Power Station, that the \$50 million was the estimated cost of Lake Winnipeg Regulation and if one takes, Mr. Speaker, all of the estimates and moves them all forward in accordance with all of the costs that have risen since that date and values money as it was valued at that time, then I say that what happened was what happened throughout this country. It's not that the cost of the article went up, it's that the value of money went down. Furthermore my honourable friend knows that and when he is talking about the \$50 million he is not including Jenpeg.

When he asked me the question as to whether in retrospect it has proved its value, Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting through these committees for eight years. In each case the computer systems have poured out the information under cross-examination by the honourable member and other honourable members — in each case, it has been indicated that the method in which we are proceeding is the most economic method and is as economic as all alternatives have been. That has not been disproven by anybody, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has had four questions on this topic. Unless he is switching the topic, I will recognize another member. —(Interjection)— Order please. Those are the regulations and rules we go by. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on another topic. —(Interjection)— Order please.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I believe I am pursuing my third question for the Minister of Mines. I don't want to be in contravention of your count, Sir, but I believe it is my third question.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is still on the matter of Hydro, it is his fifth question. The Chair takes no responsibility for who answers, only for the questioner. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order, it would seem, Sir, that there would be some difficulty for you if you were to depart from the rule. I suggest that we ought not to become too preoccupied with that inasmuch as my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition can, if he is patient for a minute or two, come back and ask another series of questions after others have had an opportunity, so no one need feel as though they have been deprived.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce responsible for Housing. I have to preface my question, Mr. Speaker — it is to do with the provincial government supplement for the first-time home buyer and the \$500 federal supplement, also for the first-time home buyer. Can the Minister indicate to the House or undertake to give us an answer, why the usage in Manitoba has been so low in percentage as compared to other provinces including the smaller provinces, the Maritimes and Saskatchewan. The usage has been very very low.

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

HONOURABLE LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East): Yes, the honourable member refers to the AHOP, the Assisted HomeOwnership Program for new housing that is now in effect.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, can I clarify; it's the first-time homeowner grant.

MR. EVANS: I believe that's what is referred to as the AHOP program in which the Federal Government provides the initial subsidy payment and the province provides a supplementary payment. At any rate, I too have noticed that there has not been much take-up of that particular program. I think that the reason is that the cost of housing has gone beyond the means of the average people in Manitoba and under The National Housing Act, there are certain restrictions on your ability to obtain a mortgage, you have to be able to repay the mortgage 25 percent of your income. The fact is unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of housing has skyrocketed and I think this is one reason why a lot of people who could take advantage of that program are not doing so because of their particular income situations.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I believe it's a separate grant, not to do with AHOP. My question is that provinces like even the Maritime Provinces picked up something like \$3 million in the First-Time Homeowner Grant while the Province of Manitoba is, picked up around \$1 million. My question what is the reason for it and will the Minister give some consideration to increasing that supplement at the present time. That's on the provincial side.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the honourable member knows of some program I am not

Monday, May 2, 1977

aware of, but the only homeowner grant or subsidy available is the AHOP program, other than grants available for improving and renovating existing housing under the Critical Home Repair Program. So if the honourable member would like to give me more information as to what he is talking about, I am not quite aware of that particular program.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. I am sure that the Minister did not understand my question; perhaps he can take it as notice. I am not talking about the AHOP. I am talking about the \$500 Federal First Homeowner Grant and \$300 Provincial Grant. I will accept the answer that because the costs have probably gone up. My question to the Minister is: will the Minister consider increasing the provincial supplement to the first-time home purchasers at the present time?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, of course, whether we increase or decrease or whenever we change the program, this is in the area of policy, and if there is a policy change, it is announced in the usual way in due course. I am going to take the honourable member's question as notice because I believe the Honourable Member for Assiniboia is talking about AHOP because that is the only program we are involved in in homeowner grants. Well he's shaking his head in a negative way, so we will look into the matter and hopefully come up with a reply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General or the First Minister. It relates to the questions already asked in connection with changes in the Election Act. I wonder if the Attorney-General or the First Minister can confirm the changes in the The Election Act will be brought in which will bring in either partial or whole public financing of elections.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there have been certain possible changes to The Election Act that have been considered. These include some changes as recommended by those who have to work with The Election Act. And also there have been recommendations received from the Law Reform Commission; these have been considered in tandem. It is likely that there will be some changes introduced in the matter specifically of public financing of elections as a matter of direct policy, and when there is any change in that regard, it will be announced in time for the introduction of the measure.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have another question to the First Minister. It relates to the statements made by him recently in connection with Polar Gas and the probable intervention of the Province of Manitoba before the National Energy Board. I wonder if he indicate at the present time whether the government has retained any consultants to assist in the preparation of such an intervention.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Minister that is primarily responsible for this certainly has the matter in hand. There is an understanding that if supplementary consulting advice and information is required, then this will come forward as a request in the usual way in order to be prepared for the inception of the hearings on the Polar Gas application which I still believe to be some time later this fall.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, then either to the First Minister or the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if a projected cost has been determined by either the department or the government as to what the cost would be. And really supplementary to that, whether in fact it would have been cheaper to have made the investment in the first place in the initial studies that were undertaken by Polar Gas.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I am going to read the record of Hansard to see whether I heard my honourable friend correctly, because if he is implying that the taking up of equity stock in the company would somehow predetermine the route that a pipeline would follow, which in the rough order of magnitude costs in the order of \$1.7 to \$2 million a mile, and that therefore every extra mile, suggesting, that much more, if that is what he is of course, reject it out of hand.

A MEMBER: It would be a criminal offence. . .

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. Then I wonder if he can indicate if it cost Polar Gas \$60 million to determine the route line which is not through Manitoba, but only partially through Manitoba, how much does he think it will cost the Province of Manitoba to determine and to prove that it should go through Manitoba?

MR. SCHREYER: That's assuming, Mr. Speaker, that it can be proved. Unlike my honourable friend, I have no sort of magical way of knowing that of two given propositions, that one can be proved in advance and the other disproved. That is precisely what will be systematically analyzed not only by ourselves, but by the National Energy Board, which I do assume, does have the ultimate public interest in mind. My honourable friend can play his local priorities all he likes, he is not going to fool anyone. In the ultimate analysis, there is the public interest that has to be served, and if a case can be made for equating that to the geography of Manitoba even more than is now being suggested, he can rest assured that we will pursue that.

MR. SCHREYER: The Honourable Minister for Public Works.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

HONOURABLE RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could make a "non-political announcement."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed)

MR. DOERN: Tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock, we are going to officially open our solar energy demonstration project on the roof of the Legislative Building, and I wanted to invite any members who were interested to assemble opposite in the old Members' Lounge if they are interested in coming and taking a tour. It is an inaccessible area and has to be conducted tour only so if you are curious to see what solar energy looks like and would like to see this particular project, please meet here tomorrow at ten.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Co-operatives who is responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. With respect to the applications that have been made to CRTC to provide cable vision to areas of the province other than Winnipeg, can the Minister tell the House now how many applications were received and when these will be heard by CRTC?

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

HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure on the exact number of applications from Winnipeg and from outside of the capital; I am not quite sure of the date but it is early in June. I will check on both and answer the honourable member in due course.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, is it the intention of his government to make submissions at that hearing and to make any support or intervention on behalf of any particular applicant?

MR. TOUPIN: No, Mr. Speaker, our submissions are made to the Federal Department of Communications.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I wonder then if the Minister could tell us whether his government has any equity position in any of the applications that are now before CRTC?

MR. TOUPIN: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. I will check and find out. I have, as Minister of Co-operative Development, encouraged local co-operative groups to be formed; we have no financial assistance given to any of them to my knowledge but I will check and return to the honourable member.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could then tell the House how it is that in Manitoba Gazette, the mailing address for WestMan Media Co-operative Ltd. is given as the office of his Deputy Minister?

MR. TOUPIN: It is quite possible, Mr. Speaker. He could be an interested person.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister that was asked sometime ago. Is the First Minister now in a position to advise the House as to the dollar figure for the cost overruns experienced thus far with respect to the installation of the Russian turbines at Jenpeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that when that question was asked, I invited the questioner to pose that at the meeting of the Utilities Committee when the Chairman and the Chief Executive Officer of Hydro would be present to report in detail. However, I would be quite prepared to take that question as notice, provide the information later this week — that would mean, in effect, Wednesday — Thursday and Friday being the Western Premiers' Conference. If not Wednesday, then Monday next.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I wonder if the Minister has yet had an opportunity to ascertain what the intentions of his department are in terms of chemical spraying in the Provincial Parks and can he report to the House at this stage?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is some spraying being done in our parks; malathion in the Whiteshell, and there is a small area in the Spruce Woods wherein there is some evidence of the spruce bud worm, where another chemical, the name of which escapes me at the moment, is being used. In fact, it is the chemical which has been used on a more extensive basis in the Maritimes which met with the disfavour of some, but that chemical that is used in the Spruce Woods is on a very limited basis covering about 500 - 600 acres, and under very controlled conditions.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, in view of that information, can the Minister indicate what kind of instructions the department is issuing to the public that may be planning to visit these parks in terms of restraint of travel in view of the embargo or bans placed upon the use of these chemicals in other areas? Can he indicate what sort of safety instructions and whether in fact there will be a ban on travel

in these parks for a month's period of time until the chemical has dissipated?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Sir, I have indicated to the honourable member the chemical is administered under very controlled conditions and I am not aware that there was any travel within the area where the chemical is being applied.

If there should be any travel, then the public will be warned about it and certainly spraying will not take place at a time when the members of the public are likely to be there.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether the department intends to send out safety instructions to people who may have cottages or may be resident in those areas or surrounding areas, that if there are any children or people who suffer from respiratory diseases, they would then be able to take precautionary action.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I am not aware of the presence of a cottage area anywhere near the vicinity that is being sprayed. Hence, there is no need for the dissemination of that type of information because there is no one in that area to receive it.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister indicate whether he would be prepared to place an embargo on the use of these sprays until such time as the Minister of Mines and Resources has had the opportunity to attend the meeting of Resource Ministers to determine the problems and then determine if there should be more serious and stringent measures applied than the ones presently being applied in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, since the honourable member seems to be pursuing questions that he is now contending are involving more than one department, I would say that he has asked those same questions and has received answers from the Minister of Mines and Resources and from the Minister responsible for the Parks Branch. My honourable friend has this preoccupation; I would suggest that he should pursue it further by means of directing his liberal attention to the appropriate Minister in Ottawa and the senior mandarins in that department in Ottawa who do have, after all, to deal with the acceptability or non acceptability of chemicals, under whatever conditions of controlled use, for all of Canada. Now, if he has that interest, he should get down to it and express it to the authorities in Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has had four questions on this topic. Unless it is a new topic, I will pick another member.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member tell me his point of order.

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, I addressed my question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation; the First Minister interjected and did not answer the question I raised. I would like to know if the Minister of Tourism would like to answer the question I posed to him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member doesn't have a point of order because there are no procedures which indicate a Minister designated by the questioner has to answer. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Continuing Education and relates to some questions he took as notice on Thursday last respecting two appointments to the Board of Governors of Brandon University. Has he been able to determine whether or not these two appointments were valid?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Continuing Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am quite satisfied that the appointments were valid. If there was a technical error insofar as the sequence or the timing of the filing of the Orders-in-Council, I am having that checked out. But there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that the sum total of both Orders-in-Council gives effect to the intent and the wishes of Brandon University, that that which Brandon University wanted done by way of Order-in-Council has, in fact, been done.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the First Minister arises out of the statement about the Prairie Economic Council Meeting of the Premiers. I wonder if he can indicate now whether the question of Quebec and the Language Bill is a matter to be discussed by the Premiers of Western Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, one of the major agenda items has to do with the state of Confederation, Canadian unity. Certainly that would subsume the subject matter my honourable friend is referring to.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister intends to make a statement on behalf of Manitoba at the meeting, and whether that statement will also be made to the Legislature?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend, I believe, is aware that the tradition or past practice of method of operation of the Prairie Premiers' Conference is that it is informal and pursues by way of dialogue and discussion. If we were to commence a procedure whereby there is the depositing of formal position papers in advance, I am afraid that that would be a change in procedure

which I would not want to initiate, certainly not without the concurrence of my colleagues, and accordingly we shan't be proceeding in that fashion at this meeting, and for my part, I would hope never.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder whether the First Minister can indicate whether he will attempt to try and arrive at a consensus with the Premiers, so that in fact there can be a joint statement at this meeting?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, exactly right, Mr. Speaker. That is the point and purpose and hope and objective of these conferences.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance or the First Minister. Some ten days ago we were advised by the Minister of Finance during the delivery of the Budget Speech that there would be a supplementary Estimates or program announced with respect to unemployment in Manitoba, within I believe, and I am subject to correction, within about ten days. Is the Minister in a position to announce if that has been postponed, like the election, because of internal NDP considerations?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let me again suggest: the honourable members wish to have valid procedures, but if they interject with opinions at the end, just like the Honourable Leader of the Opposition did now, we are not going to get proper procedures, so I would ask for co-operation again.

The Honourable First Minister in reply. —(Interjections)— Order please. Order please. Order please. Order please. Order please.

I wanted to indicate that I wasn't raising a point of order, I was only making a suggestion to the members of this House. The honourable member indicates —(Interjections)— Order please. I would like to hear what the honourable member has to say in respect to a point of order.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the point which you have just raised, the gratuitous suggestion about the formation of questions, I suggest, Sir, that we might all, with some benefit to ourselves, gain some understanding of the spirit of the Rules of the House as well as their exact letter if we were to read Hansard questions from Ottawa, Hansard questions from Great Britain, where one finds . Partisan a bit of levity from time to time references from time to time are included in questions that are asked in the House, and it is not the role, with respect, Sir, of the Speaker of any Chamber, not referring to you in particular, Sir, but the Speaker of any Chamber, to become over-concerned about whether or not there are partisan references in questions that are asked. That has been going on in Parliament for 600 years. It will continue to go on long after you and I have left this or other Chambers.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, in attempting to reply to the honourable member's question, he will note that I have not raised any objection as to the mode or style of his question, I have rather come to expect it of him, and answer it by saying that the Minister of Finance made indication at the time of the presentation of the Budget that very soon after the conclusion of the Budget debate, in fact I think he was more specific, had indicated approximately ten days and accordingly we do expect, Mr. Speaker, we do expect to have this tabled, Sir, on Wednesday. That is the target date which I believe is indeed nine or ten days. It therefore, Sir, has nothing to do with internal New Democratic Party considerations. Certainly we are not immune to those problems, but then again, I know that my honourable friend's party has had internal matters having to do with Jack Horner and Ken Wong and others.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Finance Minister and relates to the statement of policy that will be announced in the Supplementary Estimates for Wednesday. I wonder if he can indicate whether his department has made a projection of the number of jobs that must be formed in Manitoba for the next period, for the next period of the next year, and if he has that information, whether he is prepared to furnish the specifics to the Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HONOURABLE SAUL A. MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, the member talks about the number of jobs that must be created. I am not quite sure what he means by that; that can be a very subjective figure. Certainly in working out the program, the departments, all departments of government, have been looking at the number of jobs that will be created. Whether that is going to please the honourable member or not, I am not sure, and therefore beyond that, I can't answer the question.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can inform the House how the government could determine a policy without having some projections of the necessary jobs to be formed in this province?

MR. MILLER: Of course, Mr. Speaker, you can go to zero unemployment, which is of course impossible. That would be a beautiful target. On the other hand, you do aim to lower the unemployment situation, which is really what this is all about, and whether we hit it exactly — and I know the member would like me to stand here and say that there shall be a level of unemployment of 4.91, and then if, by God, I'm out a little, I'll hear about it forever — I am not going to give him numbers to target at.

Monday, May 2, 1977

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Finance Minister can indicate whether the Legislature will be given certain targets for job formation to be made in Manitoba in the coming year?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the Legislature will be given a supplementary supply bill indicating the nature of the program, and I think that should be adequate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANKSY: Mr. Speaker, I just have a matter of privilege, that I don't wish it to be on the record, when the Leader of the Opposition put the three men, namely D. L. Campbell, Mr. Spafford and Kris Kristjanson in the same category. D. L. Campbell, to my knowledge, resigned on the basis that he was following the Tory position that we should flood South Indian Lake to 869, and not any changes that were advocated by the Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Are we on what the Honourable Member for Radisson presumed to call a point of privilege? Because if we are, I would love to speak to the point. —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. LYON: Where are we, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: We are under the Question Period. We have about ten seconds left.

MR. LYON: And what was the status of that utterance that was just made?

MR. SPEAKER: If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition wishes this Chair, he is privileged to have it, then he can adjudicate.

MR. LYON: No, Mr. Speaker, I just wish rulings from the Chair, that's all.

A MEMBER: There is no point of privilege.

MR. LYON: If there was no point of privilege, let him say it.

MR. SPEAKER: I am going to suggest that I am prepared to say whatever the Chair has to say, but I am not prepared to be dictated to by any member of this House what I shall say.
The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, can we proceed to the Orders of the Day?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY — BUDGET DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and further amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, the Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: Grind up that meathead over there, George, baby.

MR. HENDERSON: I had not intended to speak on this Budget debate for many reasons. In fact, when I adjourned it I was adjourning it for one of my members who did want to speak who wasn't here, but there has been so much guff handed out in the last afternoon that I thought that I'd like to comment on some of it, because if I gave up my adjourning it I would have no chance to come in later on.

I would say, in looking at this Budget, that it looks to me like what you could consider an election Budget because it does have no tax increases, and it does have some forms of tax relief for people. But I think, on the other hand, that this Budget could really be misleading because they are going to have a deficit of \$9 million and then their capital borrowing is going to be \$522 million in total. And when you have a capital borrowing of \$522 million in total this is actually \$125 million more than it was in the year 1976.

So on top of that we have the Minister stating that they are going to introduce a very big work program which is going to help an awful lot. I'm wondering, by introducing this does he mean that he is going to actually increase the Budget. Because I always wonder when you put things into capital borrowing, that maybe the books aren't being juggled somewhat and that it really should be going into operating expense. And it does look to me as if the Conservatives — if this is the case — could actually be inheriting a very large debt when they take over.

But one of the things, that is really only a small thing, which does really concern me quite a bit is his comments on removing the sales tax from insulation. Now it's only a small thing and I think it's a very good thing though. It isn't going to create so awful much money but what I was just wondering is why would it not really be on all buildings? Because if it's just going to be on resident buildings I see it as a very very difficult thing to administer. In fact I think it could be considered an administrator's nightmare. And why not give it on all apartment buildings anyway? In fact, if the government is really sincere in its energy programs it would be on commercial buildings, and its talk about conserving energy, it would be on all buildings.

And in fact when you talk about the housing program and you're trying to increase housing and to get more people owning their own places; why shouldn't even this year sales tax be off on all resident buildings? So I just think that this is something that's very small but I think it is really a step in the right direction and it should be a good vote getter for them. But the other thing that I was looking at on it, if

Monday, May 2, 1977

the most that they will be loaning out on the program will be \$1,000, and I imagine there will be many of them much less, I just can't see the point of spreading that over 20 years with such small payments, because the payments are going to be so small and then it's going to linger on so long that it's going to take more and more of a staff to administer it. I'd hate to see this here money that's been saved by not getting a sales tax being used up in just paying out to the administration of salaries.

Another thing I was glad to see was that they had changed their mind and increased the succession duty exemptions because I have felt all along that Manitoba had a very very bad policy considering the way the other provinces were, and even though they say that it only affects two percent of the population, I believe that it is maybe two that they know about; two percent maybe of the people that die. It's affecting them but I think it's affecting many people that they don't know about who are leaving the province. I just wonder when the Minister is commenting probably later if he wouldn't state whether it's two percent of the people that die or two percent of the . . . You know, what does he know about the people that are moving out of the province? What percent are they, or of the companies or corporations that are moving their head offices out of the country? Because I think that you people have finally come to realize that these are important people to this country and by having them move out of the province sooner, and by missing your provincial share of the income tax, that it is really costing you a lot of money not alone to mention anything else.

One thing that I really feel very strongly on this, if you really believe there should be what you could call a "redistribution of wealth", to some extent after death, I think that it should be worked out on the federal level so that all provinces are the same because this is just utter foolishness for one province to be trying to do it on its own and to be losing out in the ways I have pointed out.

Another thing is that we're accused of really going along and taking the side of the NDP. I think that if the members opposite were to look at it the right way, the things that have been happening show that you people realize that the Conservatives were right. Because let's take the succession duty policy, let's take this here removing the sales tax off insulation. These were things that were proposed by the Conservative opposition. And also on your land policy, right from the beginning members on this side said that people should be given the option to be able to buy that at any time after they went into a lease, and, of course it couldn't happen for five years. So now you've changed that lease which just goes to show that really you are beginning to really realize that the Conservatives were right. So I don't see why the members over there are saying that we're agreeing with your side. It seems to me that you've taken some of the things that we have been advocating at different times and you have actually put it into your program.

Another thing that I hear their members commenting on — and they seem to be trying to make a lot of hay on it — is claiming that Ottawa has cut back on a lot of the shared services. Well maybe they have cut back in their shared services the way they were doing them, but in total — the way I size up this Budget — Ottawa is paying more money to Manitoba than it was before. In fact, in 1976 we only got \$230 million back from Ottawa and now we get \$261 million back from Ottawa which is an increase of \$31 million. And not only that, but it's a larger percentage of Manitoba's total Budget than it was before. So I've heard them crying here all the time about what Ottawa was cutting back on and that they weren't helping them. So I think that they have been trying to use Ottawa as a scapegoat and possibly this is what people do when they are in politics. You have to learn how to sort it out but as I look at this and try to sort it out, it looks to me as if the provincial government has been trying to use Ottawa as a whipping boy, as you could say, and that they have been increasing their own Budget so much.

Yes, I see it that the Tories have been right in connection with succession dues and gift taxes, I hope that when we get in that we can remove them altogether. And we were right on the MACC. And I know that we were right in saying, right from the beginning, that government should get out of business. And you people over there have just lost so much money in the different projects that you got into as government that it has created a terrible provincial debt.

During these years since you people have been elected there has been a turnaround in the world situation as far as grain and prices are concerned and there has been inflation. You've taken in more money than you ever dreamed of in income tax from your share of the federal people. You've taken in more in the local sales tax than you ever figured on. You've taken in more in the liquor tax than you ever figured on and you've taken in more in the corporation tax than you ever figured on. And after all of that, you're still in debt you know. So I just wonder if it hadn't been that the economy seemed to turn around in those years of inflation and high price, just where would you people have been if there had been ordinary years. How big would the total debt have been? Our provincial debt is higher now than it ever was and I understand that it's at least three times higher than it was when you people took over. So, you know, in some ways I have to think well, I've got to feel sorry for the Conservative people when they get in with the debt that you people have and the business that you have that they have to try to get out of.

So now I've heard it said that you people are running out of ideas and this sort of thing. Well I think that you're beginning to realize that you just couldn't do all the things that you thought before you

Monday, May 2, 1977

went in. And you're not only like a person that's running out of ideas, to me I'd say that you're like a car that is running out of gas, you know. And not only that but you're running out of road, you know. You've come to the end of the road and the road is the election.

Now we hear the Premier stating that, you know, because of the election in Ontario that they probably won't have their election now; that they'll probably have to leave ours until the fall and then they'll have it then. Well I think that the people of Manitoba are smart enough and they know that the real reason why the Premier doesn't want the election now is that he knows he'll be defeated if he goes to the people now. He knows he'll be defeated if he goes to the people now. So he's got to find some excuse and now he's found Ontario.

Not only that, but if he can postpone it until fall or possibly even later, he's going to use all the government Ministers, all the cars and all our gas which we are supposed to be saving, all the civil servants and all these here NDP organizers from the other provinces — he's going to have them working throughout Manitoba trying to spread their propaganda the way that they want it. So we see that he sees the end of the road and he's trying to keep going and see if he can see an avenue so that he can get a fresh start or something. But I don't think the people of Manitoba are going to be fooled and I think that when this next election comes up that you will see a change in government without a doubt and I think that's what the Premier's afraid of and I think that's why he is delaying the election. If he doesn't think that's the reason he is delaying it, all he has to do is go ahead and call it and he'll see. Thank you.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've already had an opportunity to speak following the Leader of the Opposition, but I want to thank honourable colleagues who have agreed to let me speak ahead of them because frankly, Mr. Speaker, there are notes I have been making off and on on which I wanted to comment. Of course I do believe that the Budget Speech is a good opportunity to exchange opinions but it is notable by the attendance in the House and in the Press Gallery that, although people are speaking I doubt very much that people are listening and I'm not saying that in any accusing sense, it is a fact that people are speaking but the news media and members of the House itself are not evidencing any substantial interest in this Debate. Nevertheless, there are comments I would like to make. I have a sort of a short list of matters I want to deal with and I don't think I'll have time to deal with them all in any event but I certainly want to respond to statements made by the Member for Brandon West and in doing so I want also to make comments of statements made by the Members for Wolseley and Birtle-Russell and Roblin. When I have dealt with that I do wish, Mr. Speaker, to get on the question of CFI. I don't think that I have made any speeches or public statements on the CFI matter since, indeed, it became a subject for review by the commission, but I think that in view of the calls from the other side which refine themselves to one statement — who signed the cheques or you signed the cheques — that it is proper at this time for me to make comment on that. So that is what I propose to embark on, Mr. Speaker, and see how far I get.

So dealing first with the speech by the Member for Brandon West. In his speech he took me to task, along with others, for using language which did not quite suit his ears. Of course, as I read through the speech and notice his general criticism of my own knowledge in the field of finance, I suppose I should recognize that the way he puts it it is clear that he thinks little of my knowledge. He says, "Since the thought of restraining the growth of public spending is apparently foreign to the Member for St. Johns, I suppose it is understandable that he did not recognize it as much." I think probably the word should have been "such." But, Mr. Speaker, throughout his speech he talks about policy and I had claimed that the Leader of the Opposition had presented a speech on the Budget which did not contain policy and I'm afraid I still believe so because throughout the speech made by the Member for Brandon West he is saying, prudent handling of the public's money is policy. He is saying a combined account system is policy. Zero base budgeting is policy. Mr. Speaker, all the policy that he has presumed to tell us about is related to prudent spending. I did receive a note just now, Mr. Speaker, which I think I should put on the record, to the effect that the gallery, the Press Gallery at least is listening even though they are not necessarily in the gallery and I know very well that they do have a speaker in their room and I was sure that someone, at least, from the Press Gallery would have an opportunity to listen should they want to. I don't mean an opportunity, but take advantage of the fact that they have that opportunity accorded to them, something which is, I believe, denied to the caucus rooms and for good reason.

Let me come back, Mr. Speaker, to the speech of the Member for Brandon West. Throughout his speech he is talking as if the policy of the party is prudent management. I don't know which party would reject that as being policy, but if that is all the policy and in reading his speech I consider that is all the policy, then I would consider that the Progressive Conservative Party has shown that it is bankrupt in the sense of having something positive that it would present to the people at the next election. And that is my criticism.

I do believe that, in the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition and by the Member for

Monday, May 2, 1977

Brandon West, that there is a very important distinction between the two parties — the NDP and the Conservatives — and that has to do with the weight being put on progressive taxation. I do believe that the promises being made by the Conservative Party are in the form of being regressive taxation as compared with the policies that we have presented because when one runs through the promises one finds a constant stressing of reduction of taxation and that, I believe, is policy although it is not so stated or that clearly stated.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Brandon West says that there is no question that a small business tax rate is a disincentive and he speaks about that famous 44 percent which the Minister of Mines spoke about and which is really a difference which, in terms of dollars, is not a great deal. But as I recall it the figures he gave us were that with an income of \$100,000 the difference between the Ontario tax and the Manitoba tax in corporate taxation is \$4,000, \$4,000 out of an income of \$100,000 and, Mr. Speaker, neither the Minister of Mines nor I agree that that is by any means a substantial differential. But there is more to it and there is something to read between the lines. The Conservative Party is talking about reduction of taxation, reduction of corporate tax and also reduction of personal income tax. Mr. Speaker, they have not mentioned sales tax and there is no doubt in my mind that they would not reduce sales tax.

Where I feel sure that they would go if they had the power, would be to increase sales taxation. Because, Mr. Speaker, in the sales tax field, the province of Manitoba and the province of Saskatchewan are the lowest. I exclude the province of Alberta which does not have a sales tax but I want to remind honourable members that Saskatchewan and Manitoba have a 5 percent sales tax, Ontario and British Columbia have 7 percent sales tax and all the provinces to the East of Ontario, with the exception of Newfoundland, have an eight percent sales tax and I left out Newfoundland because it has a 10 percent sales tax. Incidentally, the province of Newfoundland, a Conservative province, is now the highest personal income taxing province in Canada. Let us remember that because when the Conservatives go out of this room they are prone to speak of Manitoba as being the highest income taxing province.

Let us remember that Newfoundland is the highest at 58 percent, next to that is Saskatchewan at 58.5 percent, next to that is Manitoba at 56 percent and that leaves out Quebec which has a 72 percent, which would appear to be the highest but there are certain arrangements with the Federal Government whereby there was a transfer of taxation, of tax points so that Quebec would be somewhere close to Manitoba as either third or fourth. Let us remember that and let us remember also that in the corporation capital tax there is a tax there which in Ontario is the highest in Canada. I have said that and I can see a couple of members opposite listening and, of course, I appreciate the fact that they are listening because without them I would not have an audience at all on the other side. —(Interjection)— Yes, the New Democratic Party is well aware of the statements I have to make and I believe concurs with it, but the Honourable Member for Swan River, I do appreciate his comment and the fact that there is no doubt in my mind that he is listening. So I would ask him to pass on the information that I have just given to others of his colleagues. Let us also — and I'm still referring to the Member for Brandon West's speech — comment about the fact that although he states that he is dealing with gross direct and indirect debt when he talks about a figure of \$3,900 he does not have the courtesy of referring to the net direct debt. The reason I call that courtesy is that, in Public Accounts Committee it was made very clear that net debt is the important measurement used by this province for the last twenty and more years. Let us recall that Duff Roblin always referred to Manitoba's net debt and usually net direct debt as being one which is unfunded and always the debate between him and the former Member for Lakeside, Premier Doug Campbell, was always on net debt and it is, to me, a little bit distressing that the Conservative Party now is falling into that trap which Duff Roblin constantly attacked and that is that in the sense of integrity one should speak about net public debt, net unfunded debt and I am quoting, not verbatim but clearly, speeches made by Duff Roblin supported by his Budget Speeches throughout many years.

But let's get back to my comment that I do believe that the Conservative Party should come out from the background and make its statement on sales tax because I do believe that in all their promises about tax reduction they would counter that, if they had the power, with an increase in sales tax. I say that because it is a more regressive form of taxation. It is not a progressive form and they would opt for that, in my belief, because in order to raise the funds that would be needed, they would have to, if reducing taxation, they would have to increase it elsewhere.

This talk about zero budgeting is nonsense, Mr. Speaker, because it is carried on by governments everywhere. The member spoke of incremental budgeting and that does not apply in Manitoba because, in fact, in Manitoba we start and the government before us started always to consider all programs of all departments and measure their relevance to the day, today, at the time they are looking at the budget rather than just follow through from previous years. Relevance is important to be measured and is done and that is under zero budgeting. But, Mr. Speaker, one point of sales tax is worth \$40 million. An increase from 5 to 6 percent in sales tax would net \$40 million which is equivalent to almost six points in personal income taxation. The cost of living tax credit plan, which

they haven't talked about, which I believe they would wipe out, they would eliminate, is a \$25 million item. That is five-eighths of a point of sales tax. I believe that they would bring in sales tax, eliminate a progressive measure such as the cost of living tax credit.

I mention that there is no question at all that the Conservative Party would do away with the Property Tax Credit Plan. The reason I say that is that the former House Leader, the Member for Riel, clearly stated that that was the case and he did it only a year ago and we have not heard the Leader of the Opposition reverse that position or deny it. So we have a right to say that we expect that Conservatives would eliminate the Property Tax Credit Plan. The Member for Riel did say that they would do that as soon as they can switch the money back through the Foundation Program. Let me remind honourable members that to go to the Foundation Program instead of the Property Tax Credit Plan is tremendously regressive because it will reduce the taxation at the school board level which is applied in a manner which applies equally to the large income, the low income, business, industrial and other property taxpayers as compared with the residential taxpayer of low and middle income who are affected by the Property Tax Credit Plan. Let there be no doubt about that, Mr. Speaker, I predict that the Conservative party, if it comes out with a budget, which it has not done, and comes out with a whole statement of how it would proceed, would actually increase sales tax by at least two points and then say, well look 8 points is what is the average across the province. That is what I believe they would do, I believe . . .

MR. JAMES H. BILTON: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes.

MR. BILTON: Would the honourable member tell us how his party eliminated the Medicare premiums, and what area was that charged to?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I am so glad the member gave me the opportunity to speak about something that I really thought he knew, but since he doesn't know I will tell him. I will tell him — and you know, Mr. Speaker, I happen to have, and really it is only a coincidence, it is because I intended to use it in connection with CFI. Honourable members opposite may see a picture of the Member for River Heights, not very recognizable because he was a lot younger when this picture was taken which was prior to March of 1968, and I have this clipping because of statements he made about the MDF. But, by coincidence the headline of that newspaper, March 19, 1968, Winnipeg Tribune, "Weir may take Ottawa to court over Medicare," and it goes on to say that the Premier was shocked, that's Premier Weir was shocked, that he charged that the scheme, the federal scheme, would cost Manitobans at least \$50 million. He said that he is considering seriously taking the Federal Government to court to prevent it from carrying out the Medicare scheme, and he said that Manitoba's position and that of other provinces has been that a national medicare program should be based on need. That's what he said, and that is why he rejected it, and that is the government position, it was the Premier who was speaking. Possibly now that the Member for River Heights has come in I should show him his own picture of some time ago.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am still dealing with Medicare premiums and I am saying that the position of that government was clearly that Medicare should be based on need. So what did they do? When they found that they had to go through with it because if they didn't Manitobans would lose substantial tax moneys, they imposed a premium tax, no moneys to come out of General Revenue. They went further, moneys which had formerly been paid out of General Revenue for the medical needs of indigents now were put into that premium package which they instituted, and they then started to finance the whole Medicare, the provincial share of the Medicare cost on premiums.

The Member for Swan River asked me, almost as if he is my straight man, he puts in my words the question — (Interjection) — well the Member for Swan River is straight, he is straight and he gives me the opportunity to tell him that when we came into government, the first thing we did was to put the cost of the burden of health onto those who are able best to pay, progressive taxation based on ability-to-pay, we eliminated regressive taxation of a premium nature. The Conservative Party screamed — and I am sure the Member for Swan River was one of them — and the Conservative Party, I still contend, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party did not know that they were going to continue this method of financing until their Leader told them that at the time of this last Budget speech. I am sure they didn't know it, but now they know that they agree in that respect with our program of progressive taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Member for Swan River for the opportunity to let me develop that, but I also am aware of the fact that in doing so he is taking away some of my time so I'll come back.

Mr. Speaker, we were talking earlier before I was interrupted, about the net debt *per capita*. I would like to indicate that I have in my hand a page out of a Wood Gundy Financial Statistics 1975 Edition where they show in their estimation, based on their comparative statistics, that the Province of Manitoba has the third lowest debt *per capita*. Do you believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people opposite will repeat this statistical information? Not on your life, Mr. Speaker. Do you believe that they will refrain from continuing this story about gross funded and unfunded debt, without taking into account net debt? Yes, Mr. Speaker, they will continue it. In spite of what we say they will continue it

because it suits them to distort.

Mr. Speaker, talking about distortion, the Budget Speech referred to the fact that between 1969 and 1976 there was an increase in jobs of some 65,000. The Leader of the Opposition said, Oh, no, no, I've got Stats Canada and Stats Canada tell me that there was only an increase of 30,000 jobs. Mr. Speaker, that upset me. If he was speaking from Stats Canada and quoting I had to know because we too were quoting from Stats Canada. What do we find? We find that the increase that we can trace is from June 1969 to March 1977. Why, Mr. Speaker? Why June and March? Why not March and March, or June and June? Well, I think, because it adds up to 30,000 jobs, because that is what it says. But it is absolutely incorrect to compare March employment with June because of the seasonal factors. We know, and I should have thought that the Leader of the Opposition would have known, that March is a low employment month and June is a high employment month, and that is known. Can it be that they made the innocent mistake of comparing two different kinds of months, or can it be a deliberate distortion? I have to leave that question hang there and probably wait for the Member for Brandon West, who believes in gentlemanly debate, to tell us the truth about how this came about. Mr. Speaker, the figure that we used of 65,000 was arrived at by subtracting the average employment level for 1969, which came to 363,000 from the average level for 1976, which came to 428,000.00. That's average, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I want to go on with other matters. The Member for Brandon West referred to the desire to have gentlemanly debate and I concur with that. I do remember when we were on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker, we had not only courteous debate in the main, but we had a very friendly relationship outside of the Chamber with members that were opposite to us. This disappeared the day, and maybe the day or two before, we changed sides of the House. I can tell the Member for Brandon West who wasn't here then, that there was a high degree of respect across the Chamber, and that, Mr. Speaker, that changed, that changed in a radical way. I don't know how it could be turned back. I don't know how scars can be eliminated. I don't know how the Minister of Labour can look across to the labour critic for the Conservative Party remembering the castigating speech that was delivered by the Member for Fort Garry, not against the policies of the Minister of Labour, but against the personality of the Minister of Labour. I don't know if the Minister of Public Works can erase the scars of the various snide remarks that have been passed about his competence across the way.

I don't know whether other members, and there are other members, the Attorney-General was attacked by the Leader of the Opposition near the beginning of this session on the basis that he doesn't have the slightest ability to comprehend his department's work. That kind of a personal attack, how do you easily erase scars?

I would like the Member for Brandon West to know that I have scars just like others and I am sure there are members opposite that have scars, I have scars that date back to Autopac debates. I don't even want to refer to the incidents, but I know of four specific items relating to me personally that left scars, dating back to the Autopac debate, and as recent as a month or two ago. And one of the members opposite I know knows what I am referring to about the most recent scar.

Mr. Speaker, I also am mindful of the fact that I do not recall when we were in opposition that we brought into this Chamber the names of civil servants, of senior civil servants, I do not recall that we referred to them personally or that we attacked their credibility or that we attacked their integrity. But, you know, the names of Cass-Beggs, Tulchinsky, Schulz, Syme. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, I jotted this down on Friday, the names of Parasiuk, Moats, Mackling, Friesen, MacKay, and the Premier's wife, and I don't remember the reference to the Premier's wife but I did write it down here, were all brought into this Chamber for ridicule, for attack, for abuse. It is not easy, Mr. Speaker, to stay away from this kind of approach. I wish it were possible, I would like to try to change and I give honour to those who have been able to stay away from it.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Wolseley, I think it was Friday, it may have been Thursday, spoke and demanded he wanted to know the names of all the relatives of the MLAs on this side, personal attacks on the integrity of individuals. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that at any time that I have been a member of this House, which dates back to 1962, that I mentioned the names of relatives of Progressive Conservatives who were employees of the government, either when I was in opposition nor on this side. And let me tell members, Mr. Speaker, that I could name names of Conservative relatives who are still working for the government, but why should I. As long as their loyalty is there it is evidenced that way, then there should be no question of submitting their names to any form of public ridicule, something which apparently is not beyond the nature of members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to mention some items, I do want to mention the fact that the Member for Wolseley, I am sorry he isn't here, but I did refer earlier to the fact that I intended to. The Member for Wolseley stated, during Estimates Debate, that he was glad that I, that is the Member for St. Johns, agreed with him in criticizing the advertising expenditures of the Department of Consumer Protection. Mr. Speaker, I didn't believe I had done so, so I asked him to give me the quote and he gave me a page number from Hansard. I went back, I looked up the page number, I brought it to him and showed him that I hadn't spoken then, but no, that page number was a speech that he himself had

made where he made that same statement last year. And he said, well here it is I said it last year. So then, I made him find the reference which was for the prior year and I went and dug that out and I brought it to him, Mr. Speaker, and I showed him that I was talking about the advertising money that is being spent across Canada to push consumer goods and I was critical of that.

Mr. Speaker, he shrugged his shoulders so I got up at my seat and I then, on a point of privilege, pointed out the fact that he had distorted my statement very radically, that I pointed it out to him and that he still hadn't backed down, and I then on the record corrected it. Do you know what was his response, Mr. Speaker? He asked for a question and I agreed. He says, does the Minister agree with my comment that the government spends too much money on advertising? Having said on two occasions that I did agree with him, having been proven to him that I didn't do so, he did not have the courtesy or integrity to apologize and withdraw the statement. No, indeed. He then asked me whether I agreed with the statement and that is still on the record, that he has not made the correction.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Birtle-Russell quoted me assaying that — and I quote now — “said to people that you shouldn't own houses, only governments should build houses for you.” Mr. Speaker, I challenged that statement, and the Member for Morris went out and he has a retrieval system that is to be highly respected because within minutes he came back and gave to the Member for Birtle-Russell — I believe it was a photostat of a page from Hansard from back in I think it was 1973, March 1973 — and to justify his statement that I had said that people shouldn't own homes, he quoted me as saying, “There is a great deal of lip service paid in this province by our people on all sides of this House that home ownership is desirable and should be encouraged. So I would like to discuss that for a few minutes because I am not sure that that is right.” Note, Mr. Speaker, I said that I am not sure that it is right that home ownership is desirable and should be encouraged and what does he say? He quotes me as saying that it is not desirable. The Member for Morris quickly brought this quotation to him. Mr. Speaker, I went to the trouble of rereading the entire speech I said then and, Mr. Speaker, I gave the pros and the cons and I even mentioned the important factors of home ownership like tenure, like security, like controlling of costs. I mentioned pros and cons and I concluded my speech — just for the record, let me put the page numbers on the record — from March 8, 1973 Pages 425 and ongoing and then the debate continued on March 21, Page 898. I showed pros and cons of home ownership and then I expressed my regret that members were not prepared to debate the issue at all and indeed they never did. But now they are busy and they have a retrieval system which helps them now to misquote me and I don't mind being misquoted in the House where there is an opportunity to correct it but I do object seriously to the apparent preparedness on the part of members opposite to misquote and continue to misquote.

I must, Mr. Speaker, refer to the Member for Roblin because it was he who made that grand statement. I quote it now from Page 1622 of this year's Hansard. “To think how this government could possibly manage or mismanage their affairs and they know they are mismanaging their domestic affairs because they get the bill every month and they know how much their Hydro bills are. So do the members opposite know. I imagine the Member for St. Matthews, I imagine his bill has gone up the same as mine has, from ten bucks to fifty bucks all in the last year. Sure, I bet you his bill is as high as mine and still rising, and still rising.”

Mr. Speaker, when I was learning something about the practice of cross-examination in court, one of the warnings we had is, don't ask a question unless you are pretty sure you know the answer because you can fall into a trap. Mr. Speaker, I was so sure that hydro rates had not quintupled that I was prepared to walk into a trap and I then asked the Member for Roblin to produce the bills that would justify his statement. Not because he made the statement here, but I do believe that he is making the statement or is likely to make the statement all over Roblin. So I said, “Will you bring your bills in?” His answer was, “I don't see why not.” That was April 6th — it is almost a month. Mr. Speaker, he has not done so. Why? Because he says his accountant has his bills. I wonder what his accountant is doing with the bills for his own home. I am not sure just . . . however, his accountant has the bills.

Mr. Speaker, I predict that he will not bring those bills or, if he does bring the bills and they show that kind of differential, it will be because of a tremendous increase in consumption, not in rates. Now, I'm still prepared to apologize if he produces the bills and shows that they are due to an increase in rates but, Mr. Speaker, I point this out, in reference to the gentlemanly debate which is so desirable in the mind of the Member for Brandon West, that there is danger of distortion.

Now, look at the Member for Pembina who, I believe is a man of integrity, I believe that he would not deliberately say something false but, Mr. Speaker, more than once he has produced from — I guess the same retrieval file system as I have already referred to — he has produced to this House a copy of a first draft prepared by a junior staff person for a policy paper for our government, which draft made certain references to policy and he has quoted it as if it were the government's policy. It was told to him, Mr. Speaker, that that document was a draft which had not been reviewed by anyone except the person who wrote it who was a staff person and that it was not this government's policy and yet, I believe he referred to it more than once. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have to feel that if a man

with the integrity, which I believe he has, of the Member for Pembina, is prepared to repeat what he has been told is not true, then I feel badly about the level to which we have fallen in our debate.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to refer to some items, of the great advertisement which the Conservatives have published and which I believe is the big lie — and I think I've called it that. Mr. Speaker, I call it the big lie because I think that the big lie is based partly on truth and that's what makes it such a big lie. If it were an apparent, obvious lie, then it is of not great consequence, but the big lie is the one we WRE TAUGHT ABOUT AND THAT IS WHERE THERE IS A BASIS OF TRUTH.

Mr. Speaker, when there is reference to the Hydro cost of \$605 million, there is no basis for that, Mr. Speaker, in the minds of any one who is prepared to look honestly at the situation. It is based on a statement made by two non-professional engineers — I believe that Doug Campbell made reference to that, although there is doubt about whether or not he did — but certainly an engineer, one engineer, did come up with some calculation of \$605 million. The basis for the Leader of the Opposition's attack which is mild and repeated by members of his party, is that there was political pressure put on the engineers of Hydro who accepted and bowed to that pressure, and matter how many times they are told it is not true they will continue to repeat it. Mr. Speaker, that is the repetition of the big lie and there are others of the same type.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the Hydro situation only in the sense that when we were dealing with CFI, when we were on the opposition side, we never accused the Conservatives or the government of deliberately doing something false, nor when we dealt with the issue of Manitoba Hydro desire to go in for the high level diversion, never did we question the Conservative government's integrity, or attempting to push a political position. Indeed, what we accused them of doing, and which was apparent, was that they were neglecting to study the environmental impact of their plan. When we went into the election, we went in on the basis of, the Conservatives said, "We will flood Southern Indian Lake at a high level diversion." The Liberals said, "We will not flood it." And we on our side said, "We will study it. We will not commit ourselves either way." One of the first things we did was to go to a highly recommended, highly respected Hydro-electric engineer, Cass-Beggs, we said that we want you to review this with a standpoint of the input of environmental impact. Do we have time for that study? And we engaged him to make that review and he reported to us and said "Yes, you have time to make the study." That is what they call political interference because the study was made and Mr. Bateman and others have made it clear that, as a result of the study, they changed their approach because they were told, "You must study the environmental impact and on that basis we will then proceed to deal with the problem." They had the study, all sorts of studies and they went.

Now, the Conservative Party are prepared to besmirch the names of the engineers, besmirch the names of the Board of Directors, besmirch the name of the government — which is, I suppose, fair game but the others aren't — and they want a Royal Commission. Why do they want a Royal Commission? So that they can besmirch the commission which is exactly what they did with the CFI. We never attacked the integrity of the government in connection with Churchill Forest Industries; we did not attack the principals involved; we did not attack the Board of Directors of the MDC; we did not attack Rex Grose, we attacked the give-aways that the Conservative Government were going to give in CFI. We had no concept of the deliberate thieving, I would say 'planned by the principals of CFI.

But, Mr. Speaker, we appointed a Royal Commission to do it, to study it, what happened? A Royal Commission was appointed headed by the former Chief Justice of Manitoba, Rhodes-Smith, a highly respected individual. What happened? The Conservatives did not like the report; they attempted to besmirch the members of the Royal Commission. It is that kind of an attitude, Mr. Speaker, which is so regrettable.

I want to close, Mr. Speaker, with just one minute, and I will leave my discussion on CFI for a further opportunity. At the nomination of the Member for . — well' now Souris-Lansdowne — the Leader of the Opposition, on April 28, 1977, he talked about, We will bring in prudent management. He talked about — and now I am quoting from the Tribune of April 29th, he is all ready to say, "Well, we're going to inherit a mess so, you know, we are not going to be able to do all the things we promised to do because we will inherit a mess," which is what Bennett has carried out very successfully in BC by raising insurance premiums — quadrupling them, I believe.

But, you know what I like best of all in this — and I want to conclude with it, because the Leader of the Opposition talked about "a note of levity should be permitted" so, I will bring in a note of levity — in fact, I think it is hilarious — and I will then save my remarks about CFI for a future occasion. You know what he said, Mr. Speaker, at his nomination speech? I am quoting from the newspaper report: "Most of all, the Conservatives would try to reward individuals with 'more than their fair share.'" So now we know, the Leader of the Opposition is going to reward individuals with more than their fair share. I must ask, which individuals, because I believe him? . I believe indeed, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition and the Conservative Party, intend to give more than the fair share to certain individuals.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side never promised to give more than the fair share to anyone, because the minute you give more than the fair share that is at somebody's expense and we do not wish to do it

Monday, May 2, 1977

at somebody's expense. When we say the fair share, we say that on the ability-to-pay principle people should contribute on their ability-to-pay and that is how you operate a government that is built for the people. That is not the intent of the Conservatives because I heard — I think it was the Member for Pembina, but someone on that side said — "It was a slip of the tongue". Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the truth. Whether he intended to say it or not I don't know but, Mr. Speaker, he said it — that the Conservatives would try to reward individuals with more than their fair share — and that I believe is the essential difference between that party and ours.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, Mr. Speaker, it is always disarming to follow the Honourable Member for St. Johns in debate in this House because one gets a few thoughts and comments together with respect to subjects before the Members of the Legislature and has some positions that one believes should be put on the record. And then if one finds himself in the position of following the Member for St. Johns in debate, he winds up with an entirely new range of subject matter not related in any way to the kinds of perspectives or arguments that would be desirable in the debate at this point, but simply to deal with the preposterous pratings and prattlings and the preposterous propaganda that is foisted off on members of this Chamber and an unfortunately unwitting public to a certain extent, time and time and time again in this House by that *poseur* from the constituency of St. Johns.

It really is, as I say, disarming and somewhat disturbing, Mr. Speaker, because it detracts from the kinds of objective considerations that all of us on this side would like to bring into debates dealing with such important documents as the Budget. But what we get is a performance straight out of a political circus; straight out of political cartoon; straight off the editorial pages of the best political cartoonist in the country, from the Member for St. Johns time and time and time again. And he distracts us and detracts us because the things he says are so outlandish that we simply can't just let them pass without some reference or without some notice. So I suggest, Sir, that those of us who do find ourselves in this position, and unfortunately it often seems to be me, I must confide in you, Sir; it's somewhat of a disadvantageous position to be in.

I would like to deal objectively with what I think are the failings of this government in the economic and social sphere and I intend to do that. But I simply could not, as a member of a constructive, responsible opposition dealing with the administration that has bungled the economy of this province, allow that kind of smoke screen to be poured out from the volcano from St. Johns, again in debate, in the manner in which he has done it in every major debate in this House as long as I've been a member; be it the Budget Debate, the Debate on the Speech from the Throne, it always serves the Member for St. Johns as an opportunity to engage in his technique of painting the New Democratic Party and his colleagues lily-white, holy, almost sacrosanct. They're always the honest ones. They've never attacked anybody. They've never attacked the integrity of the Conservative Party. No, not much they haven't. Ask the Honourable Member for Lakeside whether the members of the New Democratic Party ever attacked the integrity of him and his colleagues in the administrations of the Honourable Duff Roblin and the Honourable Walter Weir. Ask members who have been in this House. You know, the Member for St. Johns may think he can put that over on the Member for La Verendrye and the Member for Gladstone and the Member for Fort Garry and the Member for Minnedosa because we weren't here. But ask the Member for Roblin; ask the Member for Swan River; ask the Member for River Heights and the Member for Riel, who is in unfortunate health at the present time; and the Member for Lakeside who is out of the House because of some health difficulties; and the Member for Souris-Killarney, the honourable Leader of our party, who were here. They were here when the members opposite — in which I presume the Member for St. Johns was one of the loudest voices — were on the attack against the constructive efforts, the constructive work that was done by the Progressive Conservative administration under Duff Roblin and Walter Weir for nine years in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asked me will I permit a question. I would like to permit a question. He has already put me off-track, I was intending to speak on the Budget, I now have to deal with his propaganda, I wish he'd hold off for just a minute or two and allow me to continue what I'm trying to put together here and then I certainly will welcome a question.

But I say to him: ask those members on this side of the House who suffered the distortions, the exaggerated attacks that the New Democrats and the Liberals put together against the administrations of Duff Roblin and Walter Weir throughout the Hydro development programs of the 1960s — throughout the whole CFI chapter of our history — and you will find a far far different answer, Mr. Speaker, I assure you, than the one that is being foisted off on this House by the holier-than-thou attitude of the Member for St. Johns. So let's just get that straight for a moment here.

The Member for St. Johns always delivers a passionate defence of his party. They have never engaged in any politics. They don't engage in politics. They engage in religion. They operate on the high plane. Everything that comes from the front benches of the NDP is ex-cathedral like a papal edict. They don't deal with the things that ordinary mortal men and women deal with. They don't deal

with political considerations. They don't get down and deal with the kinds of things that really give mankind and civilization and humanity its beauty and its meaning i.e. the warts as well as the attractive side of life. No, they are too far removed from the madding crowd, Mr. Speaker.

We just heard from the Member for St. Johns describing the fact to us that he feels he has got a few scars. He has been in this House for a few years and he has got a few scars. Well, that's unfortunate. I would suggest to him that there are 56 others in this House who have some scars and the entire parade and distinguished company of men and women who have gone through this in every other Legislative Chamber in every other democracy, bears some scars. I hope the Member for St. Johns doesn't feel that he's alone in the fact that he has picked up a couple of scars along the way. Perhaps his religious zeal for the kinds of things that he believes his party is doing have not been sufficient to assuage the pain and the wound of those scars. I would think it would have been, he has such a lofty opinion of what he and his colleagues do.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Johns mentioned the fact that the Conservative Opposition in this House brings the names of civil servants and public servants into debate and this, Sir, has to be one of the most ironic and one of the most unacceptable kinds of arguments that I have ever heard from the Member for St. Johns, or any other member on the government benches. To accuse the Conservative Opposition in this House of bringing names of public and civil servants into debate in this House when, Sir, the whole technique of this government has been to put its civil servants and its public servants up as stationary targets — to put them front and centre — to have them going out formulating policy, to have them going out and making public speeches from Deputy Ministers on down, and then to accuse us of having attacked them or having criticized ' them, or having brought their names into debate in this House, Sir, that has to be the height of hypocrisy, that's just ludicrous.

The reason that the New Democrats, when they were in opposition, didn't drag or didn't bring the names of public servants and civil servants into debates in this House — if they didn't, and I'd have to check the record — but if they didn't, I suggest to you Sir, is because the Progressive Conservative administrations of this province did not use public servants and civil servants as political errand boys. That's the reason. And I say to the Member for St. Johns — and I'm sorry he has left the Chamber — if he and his colleagues want to use the civil service as a political arm; if they want to cynically twist it into a political action group; if they want to pack it with political hats and hangers-on and camp followers and relatives; if they want to use it as a bunch of political errand boys and errand girls; of course those names will be brought into debate in this House. What do they expect? What do they expect? Give the civil service back some of its integrity; some of its pride; some of its sense of professional accomplishment and achievement and opportunity and you'll find that it is not involved at a level of individual members or individual personalities in debate in this House. But it's always going to be dragged in here while Deputy Ministers of the names and the likes of Mr. Jantzen and Mr. Orlikow and there are many many others, are out on the public platforms and the public stages espousing and articulating the policies of this government.

So the Member for St. Johns, I suggest, is using a specious and a totally dishonest argument when he tries to tell the people of Manitoba, through the press gallery in this Chamber, that the Progressive Conservative Opposition has stooped to some kind of nefarious and unattractive practice in asking questions about, and levelling some criticism at particular civil servants. They set it up. They set them up as targets, as stationary targets. They set them up for that kind of criticism. And that goes beyond the realm of pure civil service and public service personnel functioning as government errand boys. It goes into the area of packing with party followers and with relatives. If the Member for St. Johns doesn't like it and doesn't like what we say about it, then let him persuade his colleagues to stop doing it and to give the civil service back the kind of integrity that I refer to and that it had until the 1970s.

So, Mr. Speaker, that preposterous self-righteous kind of personal party worship that the Member for St. Johns indulges in every time he rises to make a major speech in this House simply cannot be left unassailed and unassessed. And I wish to assess it for what it is: a bunch of puffery, poppycock and nonsense. And I think the people of Manitoba recognize that, have come to know that, but I can't allow it to sit like that in this Chamber unchallenged, Sir.

Sir, to get to the main area of my remarks which I would have been at much sooner had I not had to listen to those remarks of the Member for St. Johns. We have come to a position today, Sir, where we address ourselves to the major financial document of this government at a time when the people and the citizenry who make up the fabric of society and the fabric of our economy in this province are afflicted by a certain amount of uncertainty and a certain amount of indecision because of economic factors obtaining not only here but right across the country. And I think that this government, through the First Minister, has taken an unfortunate step in the last few days that will amount to a major disservice to this province, a major disservice to this province, Mr. Speaker, and that step is the cave-in on the matter of a June election. The First Minister's cave-in, as expressed to the Press on Friday and Saturday with respect to a June election. I suggest to you, Sir, that that is a serious problem now for the Province of Manitoba. I believe that it amounts to a complete surrender to narrow partisan considerations and I believe that it betrays the fundamental cynicism of this

Monday, May 2, 1977

administration. They are not concerned with the conditions — social or economic — of the province of Manitoba, they are concerned with themselves, with their own opportunities, and with hanging onto their own jobs.

We have heard for some years now, Sir, the First Minister's Trudeauesque musings about the theological reverence that he has for the four-year election cycle and the almost poetic desirability of June as an election month. He has made such references time and time again, and he has always attempted to construct a posture showing him as a man above the practical considerations that would affect decisions as to when elections must come. The four-year cycle; the June; the early spring; the early summer; the fresh green verdant growing period. These are the times to hold an election. The Minister has made such references, alluded to the subject in terms of that type, time and time again. Well, what a pose that is revealed to be, Mr. Speaker. One doesn't mind posture, certainly one doesn't mind a person taking a position, but I don't think that many of us appreciate synthetic positions or artificial positions, and that is what the First Minister has done in his past references and musings and illusions to the four-year cycle and the June election expected. These are the people across the way who talk about the big lie. Well, I suggest they look at themselves and take a look at the big pose — the big pose — an artificial position that is betrayed by the kind of political cynicism brought to bear in these past few days when pragmatic considerations made them back off, duck, and run away from the election that the people in Manitoba and the economy in Manitoba have been expecting and need. There is a need in this province to clear the air politically, to make the determination as to whether we are going to continue under a socialist administration or return to the incentive society, the incentive-oriented approach that would be practised by the Progressive Conservative Party if it formed government. In the context of that unanswered question, there is considerable indecision and uncertainty throughout the business sector, throughout the economy, as to what steps should be taken, what practices should be engaged in in the months ahead as we attempt to cope with our economic problems. Now we are going to be locked into that undetermined position, and we will mark time in this province for the next several weeks and several months, and there will be no solutions and no determinism brought to bear, while the people wait for the opportunity to make their decision. I don't know what their decision is going to be, but they are anxious to make a decision, to have this thing determined as to whether those who favour the policies of the New Democratic Party are right in doing the best thing for Manitoba, or those who follow the policies of the Progressive Conservative Party are the choice for the province. And as long as that question remains as vivid and as critical as it has been in recent years, in this province, and as it is right now, there will be that uncertainty and there will be that climate of marking time, Sir, until it is answered. So what the First Minister has done by dilly-dallying, by vacillating, and by reversing his field now on the question of an election is a major disservice to the economy of this province and that at a time when all economies, not the least of them our own, are in deep trouble.

The Budget introduced in highly admirable fashion a few days ago in this House by the Finance Minister — and I compliment him on his performance — the Budget was drafted specifically, I presume, to try to cope with some of those economic problems. Now all that goes out the window because we are now frozen in a limbo, in a state of uncertainty as to the political future of this province, and it is not good enough for members opposite to ask why and dismiss it as if it is an unimportant question. The Government House Leader and his colleagues on the other side, Sir, know as well as I do that the political questions that remain to be solved in this province are inextricably related to economic approaches, inextricably related to the questions of the marketplace and the philosophies brought to bear in that arena. So it is not simply some kind of abstract decision. The decision as to whether Manitoba shall be New Democratic or Progressive Conservative, socialist or free enterprise, is a market question, an economic consideration, not just a philosophical one whose ramifications fail to go beyond the confines of a debating society like the Legislature. I suggest that we are now frozen in a very serious state of limbo, much like the Province of Quebec, while those within and without ponder the ultimate political decision which is going to have enormous economic interpretations and ramifications.

Mr. Speaker, there is another aspect to this delay, or apparent delay, in terms of the election call that disturbs me, and that has to do with major legislation that is expected to be before us within the next short while. There are a number of pieces of major, highly controversial legislation in which many many Manitobans, if not all Manitobans, have a great stake. Not the least of them is the bill that will amend The City of Winnipeg Act. I can tell you, Sir, as a representative of a constituency that could be classified as suburban, or almost suburban, as a representative of a constituency that operated as its own municipal being and as its own entity for many many decades, that there is enormous frustration and dissatisfaction among residents in my constituency and others like it with the manner in which the City of Winnipeg is functioning under the existing City of Winnipeg legislation. There is a feeling of complete divorce and separation from the kind of personal, localized representation that used to be available at the local municipal level. There is a feeling of frustration bordering on anger for the breakdown and the deterioration in general services ranging all the way

from snow clearing, snow removal and lane clearing in the wintertime, to garbage pickup and attention to condition of streets and lighting conditions in the summertime. There is a deep concern with the kind of financial burden through taxation that property owners are carrying when they see such an unsatisfactory return and an unsatisfactory performance in the area of local services. They want to see, Sir, some rationalization of the operation of the City of Winnipeg. They want to see some reform that will restore services to an efficient level and that will give them back the feeling that they have got local communication with their local representative, that they can go direct and get something done, that they don't have to go through layer upon layer of bureaucracies starting with their community committee and winding up with the over-layered empire at City Hall and with the individual commissioners and their departments at City Hall. Sir, they have been looking to reform of the City of Winnipeg Act this summer — this summer — as some kind of solution to this besetting problem.

Now I suggest to you that if we do not get a provincial election in June, and it looks as though we are not going to get one, and if we are confronted with this City of Winnipeg legislation in amended form which the government has said they will be bringing it, we are going to be confronted once again with a *fait accompli* in construction of the government and the legislation that runs the City of Winnipeg. We will have legislation introduced by this government, and because of a numerical situation in the House and their position in the House, it will be legislation which will be foisted on us again, the same as the original City of Winnipeg legislation was foisted on us, and the people who want reform — meaningful reform — are still not going to get any satisfaction.

The question of the kinds of reforms necessary to The City of Winnipeg Act could have been — could have been — a worthwhile and thoroughly central issue in a June provincial election. The government could have defined to the people of Manitoba what it envisioned for a reform of the City of Winnipeg structure. The opposition could have defined what it envisioned, and it could have been, Sir, a worthwhile and meaningful public examination and public issue. —(Interjection)— No, that isn't how Metro was created. The Minister of Mines and Resources asked me if that was how Metro was created, and the answer of course is no, Sir. The answer of course is no, but I suggest to the Minister that in retrospect, more and more people are thinking that Metro was not a bad thing, not a bad thing. What we are stuck with here is a city structure and a bureaucracy and an empire that won't work and it was foisted upon us, and we are going to have amendments foisted upon that will again be patterned on the NDP's idea of what the city should be.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: The honourable member is always good enough to ask a question because he likes to participate, and I will ask him if he knows that Metro was not the subject of an election campaign and was not a subject of what he now says should be the determination of The City of Winnipeg Act, and he says it was good.

The reunification of Winnipeg was the subject of a party platform and a debate in an election campaign, was then enacted, and he says it was bad. Why is he suggesting that you should have an election campaign on what the next form should be if he says that the one that was foisted on was good, and the one that was the subject of a campaign was bad?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, what I am concerned with is the results of the things that were done. The concept of the unification of the City of Winnipeg was an election issue, that is correct. That's right. And we did our best to defeat that concept and defeat other concepts advanced by the New Democratic Party and to win the election. We lost.

What I am saying is the result now, five or six years later, we are looking back at legislation that was enacted in this House in 1971, I believe. The results six years later are the results that I have described to the government House Leader — frustration and anger and dissatisfaction — and it could have been a central issue. The reform of the Act could have been a central issue in any forthcoming election, but it won't be now. Now we will get the amended, new, improved, patched-up, tied-together version of what the government would like to see The City of Winnipeg Act be. It will be a band-aid job and we will have to live with it for at least another year before anything can be done to make the City of Winnipeg rational and to make it operational and to give people in the localized suburban and semi-suburban areas the kind of representation that they desire.

So I see that, Sir, as an enormous expense to be related to the delay in a provincial election. I thought that we were going to at least get that question resolved. Now, with the election delayed as it apparently is, we have to continue to live with this monstrosity which has frustrated and angered so many citizens of Winnipeg.

Sir, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs said during his remark on the Budget Debate a few days ago that we have offered no constructive suggestion as to what the government should do, only negative criticisms. Well, that is not true, Mr. Speaker. We have offered this government constructive advice for the past several years: fire up the economy, free up the economy, introduce

Monday, May 2, 1977

measures in the fields of taxation and the fields of incentives that attract individual enterprise and that attract investment and that attract growth and expansion in the private sector and that does create jobs. That is what we have said. This is unattractive to that government. This government doesn't want to listen to that kind of talk. That is capitalist talk; that is business talk; that is vested interest talk. So they don't listen to it, they dismiss it. Then the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs says the Conservatives never offer any suggestions, never offer any alternatives. What he means is he doesn't like our suggestions. He doesn't like our alternatives. And I don't mind them saying that because I don't like his suggestions. But don't tell me that we have not offered any suggestions. We have offered them but they don't like them. We believe the opportunity for profit, for a fair return, is essential if you are going to have a healthy economy and if you are going to create jobs. We are not ashamed of that; we don't regard that as obscene. We don't regard that as something ugly; we don't regard that as something to be ashamed of. We make no bones about it. There has to be profit to provide the incentive. There has to be the incentive to provide the jobs, and they are not going to be done through all the proud protestations of the Minister of Public Works and the public washrooms and the public garages that he is building downtown with public money. That is a stop-gap makeshift measure and he knows it. And until the private sector is free and encouraged and allowed to grow and expand, and investment is interested in coming in or attracted to coming in here, and people are allowed to make a profit, that is classic, that is basic; it is unattractive to socialists but it happens to be basic, classic, productive free enterprise philosophy, and we need it. The province is in trouble and we need it. But because of a doctrine and the philosophy and the dogma of those who occupy the treasury benches today, we can't have that kind of a practical approach. We can't have that kind of a practical approach because all they want is a continual application of their dogmatic, philosophical approach against all the economic industries of North America and the western world today that are calling out, crying out for development and growth of the private sector and for less government involvement, less big government spending, less big government tying up of the individual activities.

Sir, what is wrong with this basic — (Interjection) — The Minister of Public Works says: "Is that why the Republicans got in?" I ask the Minister of Public Works to take a close look at the performance to date of the Democratic so-called President who got in. Mr. Speaker, the basic thing wrong with the Budget

presented in this House a few days ago by the Minister of Finance is that it does not go to the fundamentals of bringing the tax system in Manitoba back into competition with other provinces. It does not do anything to fight inflation; it does nothing to cope with unemployment although we have been told and we are still waiting for the big unemployment program to come. But essentially, Sir, it leaves us where we were, in a dangerously non-competitive position with respect to where the province is in terms of tax system and structure and in terms of economic opportunity. And unless and until we have a Budget that brings us into a position where we are in competition with those other provinces, we are going to continue to be in economic difficulty, and in fact find ourselves in worse economic difficulty. There were \$40 million in new taxes introduced in Manitoba last year in the form of surcharges and other types of tax, Sir; these act as direct disincentives to employment and the private sector growth and development. And that is what we are confronted with.

Sir, if there were any major failing of this government — and there have been several considerable ones — if there were any major failing that could be singled out as the one identifiable area in which their performance has been beyond the dismal and beyond the miserable to the point of disaster, it has been, Sir, in the area of job creation or lack of job creation, as the truth of it has it.

The lesson of the statistics that have been provided by the Bureau of Statistics, Statistics Canada, in recent weeks is very clear, Sir, that job creation in the Province of Manitoba is not anywhere near keeping pace with the growth of our labour force, a 20 percent actual ratio, a 37-½ percent ratio on the seasonally adjusted table, below all the other western provinces, not only including Alberta, but including Saskatchewan and British Columbia, and below the national average; 10,000 new members of the labour force in Manitoba between March 1976 and March 1977 — 2,000 new jobs created, for a ratio of 20 percent. The equivalent ratio in Saskatchewan was 75 percent. They had 24,000 people come into their labour force in that period of time, March 1976 to March 1977 — 18,000 jobs created. Sir, that is a difference of 900 percent: 2,000 here, 18,000 in Saskatchewan. I hardly need to suggest to you that the population differences between Manitoba and Saskatchewan are somewhat at variance with any figure of 900 percent. More alarming than that is the fact that there were 24,000 new members of the labour force in Saskatchewan who came into that force in that year. And we had 10,000 in our province.

Why should there two-and-a-half times as many new members entering the labour force in that province as in ours, Sir? This is a crisis area that commands and requires the most intensive examination by this government, and I assure him that this party in opposition and all Manitobans are waiting with great anxiety the program that was promised a few days ago by the Minister of Finance to combat the unemployment situation and to create jobs. But, Sir, if it is a public works oriented

make-work type of operation limited to a four-month exposure period or application period, it is not going to be anywhere near good enough to deal with the basic problem afflicting our economy; and that is the need for permanent, substantial, creative, productive jobs in the private sector of this economy. And that will only come, Sir, out of the kind of budgetary measures that my leader, my colleagues and I have asked for time and again in question period and in debate in this House, but which have been rejected by the government members opposite as being free-enterprise oriented and as not being acceptable for admission in a socialist liturgy and a socialist philosophy.

If people want to know what the basic objective and the basic economic policy of the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba is, Mr. Speaker, it is to create jobs in this province. That is our basic policy in labour, in economics, in industry, in finance. We are not attempting to cater to or answer to any specific vested interested group. We are attempting to serve and deal with all Manitobans. And the fundamental thing for Manitobans for dignity and for progress and for livelihood is a means of livelihood that is productive and meaningful. If we don't get at that job, at that task, Sir, if we don't answer that challenge, then we are going to have a backwater province here. It is not going to be answered by putting people on the equivalent of the dole and giving them a Public Works' pick and shovel that do a job for three or four months. That is the challenge, number one, pre-eminent, above all else, that faces any government in this province, to create jobs, meaningful jobs in the private sector.

So when our opponents opposite, Mr. Speaker, ask us what are our policies in labour, what are our policies for industry, what are our policies for social development, I suggest to you, Sir, that they can be capsulized in that one fundamental and essential commitment. We can solve a lot of problems in the area of social development, in the area of industry and commerce, in the area of labour, in the area of housing, if we can give people jobs that are productive and permanent, not jobs that just put them on a government payroll for a few weeks, but jobs that produce, jobs that are created out of the private sector. —(Interjection)— I will, but just give me one second.

Mr. Speaker, that is the signal failure of this administration. That is the signal failure of this administration. I don't blame the whole malaise simply on this administration. Certainly, world conditions and national conditions have had a major bearing on the situation in which we find ourselves. Certainly, there have been external factors beyond our direct control. But Sir, a large part of the blame must be borne by this present administration which has been so preoccupied with social tinkering and social rearrangements that it has had no time for, and indeed no interest in the bread and butter issues of society in Manitoba, the bread and butter issues central to the economy: the creation of the jobs that are so necessary and the type of operation that I have referred to.

So, on that note, Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Minister of Finance to improve, expand and amend his Budget and his budgetary message to this House, and his budgetary commitment in the next few weeks to move this government into a position where it aids and assists industry and the private sector and the economy in this province rather than imperilling our economic prospects through the policies and the phoney posture that it has adopted in past years that have killed incentive here and driven investors away and discouraged people from building and expanding in the economic sphere. The result, Sir, is seen on those Statistics Canada figures I referred to. They should be sufficient challenge to keep this government at work 24 hours a day. They should be burning the midnight oil trying to solve the challenge posed in those statistics.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Budget presented by the Honourable Minister of Finance is an excellent one. According to the general opinions expressed in the press and in the other commentaries and also the discussions which I had last week with my constituents, we came to the conclusion that this is a sound, reasonable, fair and sensible Budget. Of course honourable members of the opposition are disappointed because we didn't eliminate succession duties. I read press reports of the Conservative convention, and, Mr. Speaker, I was surprised because the abolition of the income surtax on high incomes and abolition of succession duties were some of the most important items on their agenda.

I am also amazed, Mr. Speaker, that my Conservative friends are always so concerned about that very small minority in the top income bracket. These taxes don't affect more than two percent of the people at most, if so. In the Budget, the exemptions on succession duties were raised to \$250,000.00. Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much whether there is one person or one family with that kind of wealth in my entire constituency. I doubt it very much. So why are the Conservatives always so concerned about this tiny minority of wealthy people? These people are well able to look after themselves.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside — I wish him well — has complained that we on this side never pay attention to the suggestions of the Opposition. He said we never listen to them. Mr. Speaker, he is wrong. We are listening. But we are not hearing any good suggestions being offered so far.

Last spring, May 25 to be exact, we listened to the Honourable Member for Swan River. We listened to him complain that too much government money was being spent on old age pensioners.

Monday, May 2, 1977

He said we should, "Try and curb this expenditure." And I have quoted his actual words. Mr. Speaker, I could never agree with members on the other side that we should curb expenditures on our senior citizens. After all, during their long life of hard work, they more than earn what little they get now. This government has done much for the elderly. The Finance "Our elderly Minister, in his Budget Address said" people and others on low and fixed incomes can now look forward to a future in which their basic needs will be met." And I was glad the Minister added that these people will be able to meet their basic needs with dignity and much deserved respect.

We on this side are never satisfied with what we have accomplished. We believe there is still room for improving the conditions of the senior citizens. Even the Member for Swan River admitted some of the elderly are still living in poor circumstances but he said they are used to living that way. This government is not content to leave any group in society living in poor circumstances, Mr. Speaker. Much has been done, within the power of a provincial government, to improve the lot of the elderly. Still more will be done for them in the future by this government.

Mr. Speaker, I wish all members of this house a long life. I hope all will live long enough to qualify as a senior citizen and enjoy many years of the Golden Age.

A MEMBER: But what if you don't want the Golden Age?

MR. MALINOWSKI: That's your problem.

I know that not all the people who vote Conservative are rich. So all should be interested in having well-established provisions for the elderly.

At their recent convention, Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives said if they ever get into power — which I doubt very much — they will bring Manitoba taxes in line with those of neighboring provinces. They didn't dare say they would raise taxes for the majority of people in Manitoba, but that is exactly what their proposal would mean.

In his Budget speech the Finance Minister repeated a fact which members opposite like to ignore. He said, "No province in Canada, not a single province, has a lower net personal taxes for average and moderate income families than Manitoba." That's what the Minister said. What the Minister said has been demonstrated by independent tax studies and these results were published in both Winnipeg papers and the others across Canada. As far as I know, this fact has never been challenged. So if taxes are lower in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, and higher in all other provinces, what do Manitoba Conservatives mean when they say they will bring Manitoba taxes in line with those of other provinces? It can only mean that they would raise taxes for the majority. If, for example, the Conservatives want to bring Manitoba taxes in line with those of our neighbor, Ontario, they would have to raise taxes here by \$400 for a family of four with an income of \$8,226 a year, Mr. Speaker. And we must not forget, people in Ontario have to pay a seven percent sales tax, and in some other Conservative provinces, the sales tax is as high as ten percent — double that here in Manitoba.

So the Honourable Member for Lakeside wonders why we don't listen to the suggestions of the Opposition. Where would we be if we did? This government introduced Medicare without premiums; the Conservative Opposition opposed it. The government introduced Autopac; the Opposition fought against this with the utmost vigor. The government introduced tax rebates as a means towards greater equality in taxation; Conservatives opposed it.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister in his Budget Address listed many measures adopted by this government and these have been of great benefit to the vast majority of people with a low and average or moderate incomes. Few of these measures received the support of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, obviously many of the things done by this government have been of no direct benefit to people with incomes of \$75,000 to over \$100,000 a year. People in that income range don't have to worry about Medicare premiums. They can afford them whether they are high or low. People in that income range are not going to get excited over saving two or three hundred dollars on their auto insurance. They don't even have to worry about car insurance premium of \$1,446 or \$1,425.00. These were the auto insurance rates in effect in Alberta and Ontario for a 21 year old driver with a Ford Granada 1976 who has had one accident, Mr. Speaker. These facts were brought to light in an article by Nick Hills in the Financial Times. Facts like these will make the average motorist appreciate Manitoba Autopac, Mr. Speaker. But what does the saving of a few hundred or a thousand mean to a man in the top income group — just a bit of petty cash. But to people of average income, all these savings and benefits mean a lot.

We on this side, Mr. Speaker, are often accused by members of the Opposition for fostering envy and hate. This is not true. We are trying to reduce or eliminate envy and hate by bringing about greater justice and greater equality in our society. We are not trying to bring everybody down to the same dead level so as to remove all incentive for the gifted, the talented and the hard workers. But the great curse of our time has been the wide spread between the small minority with wealth far in excess of anything that can be justified on any reasonable grounds while thousands on the other end are barely eking out an existence. Our party has done much to change this and we have a right to be proud of this achievement.

Mr. Speaker, in the Winnipeg papers not so long ago, there was a news item about the chairman of

Monday, May 2, 1977

Inco Limited who retired at 65 with a pension of \$127,000 — that is about \$10,500 a month. This monthly pension income of over \$10,000 a month is more than many heads of families in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, get as an income for a whole year's work. In this same news item, it mentioned that a group of retired Inco workers were protesting against this firm for paying such "immorally small pensions" to the average worker while a top official receives such an outrageously large pension. It mentions an employee who retired with 42 years service with a pension of only \$276 a month, Mr. Speaker. And the Conservatives accuse us of fostering envy and hate.

We, in our party, say the case I have mentioned is an intolerable outrage that can in no way be justified. Our Conservative friends say, "This is fine and dandy." They would justify incomes of a million a year and then plead that the government go easy in taxing such incomes and do away with succession duties.

No matter how I try, I can't understand my Conservative friends. Why are they so worried about high taxes on big incomes? People in those big income brackets should be glad that they are so fortunate as to pay taxes on big incomes. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay as much as possible — even a million dollars a year — I would be glad to do so, but I don't have that kind of an income. People who pay the highest tax on the biggest income are surely much better off than people who pay no tax on incomes that are too small to be taxed. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that 99.99 percent of my constituents would be glad if they were in the highest tax-paying bracket in Canada. Only the Conservatives are worried about the poor people who have to pay too much in taxes on \$100,000 a year income.

There is just one more point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, before I will sit down. Members of the Opposition are always complaining about government waste and extravagance. They have loudly complained about how this government is wasting taxpayers' money. But, in all the time I have been in this House, I have never heard them complain about waste or extravagance of private enterprise. They didn't say a "Boo."

A few days ago, Winnipeg papers published the figures of the salaries top officials in the auto industry are getting now. The President of General Motors had a 70 percent increase, Mr. Speaker. Imagine 70 percent increase. This brings his salary up to \$885,000 a year.

A MEMBER: Not bad for starters.

MR. MALINOWSKI: The President of Ford Motor Company did even better. His salary increase brought his income up to \$970,000 a year. Almost a million, my goodness. A long list of other top executives in the auto industry are getting salaries from \$500,000 to \$860,000 a year.

The newspapers didn't give the salary the President of INCO got before he retired but if he is getting a pension of \$127,000 a year he must have had a salary somewhat in line with that of the top executives of the auto industry. The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the same taxpayers who pay our salaries also have to pay the fat salaries and oversized pensions of those in private industry.

Everyone buying the products of INCO must contribute to the payment of Mr. Edward Grubb's retirement pension of \$127,000.00. Everyone who buys a car must help pay the outrageously large salaries of the top officials of the auto industry. Those shopping at the supermarkets must pay for the waste of millions of dollars in daily full-page newspaper ads.

Members of the opposition would blow their tops if governments paid such fantastically large salaries to the top civil servants. The Leader of the Opposition seems to have a special grudge against civil servants. He thinks there are too many of them. For a while he went about saying he would fire all civil servants appointed since the New Democratic government came to office. Now he says he is going to freeze them. Hoo Hoo. Mr. Speaker, as a clergyman I do not associate firing, you know, with hell-fire but even so, I think freezing sounds a little better than firing. But civil servants who don't like to be fired or frozen will vote naturally NDP.

Mr. Speaker, there is something in the Bible to the effect that "To him who has much more shall be given; and to him who has little, that little shall be taken away." I am not sure if this is a basic Conservative philosophy, Mr. Speaker, but it would seem so judging by their speeches and their attitudes. Especially, Mr. Speaker, at that point I would like to congratulate my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry. He is an expert. He is an excellent speaker. He can speak an hour saying nothing, saying nothing. He is an expert; I don't know how he can do it. If I was to deliver such a sermon in my church, talking to my people for one hour, saying nothing, they would fire me — not freeze me — they would fire me.

So, Mr. Speaker, as for the NDP, our Leader, the First Minister, often quotes the words of a former United States President, Franklin Roosevelt. At the moment, I don't remember the exact words so I will just put it in my own simple words to the effect that: the test of good government is not how much it can add to the wealth of those who already have much, but how much it can improve the lot of those who have little.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a good philosophy for a good government. That is the kind of philosophy that moved me to become a member of this party of which I am very proud. In spite of the newspaper — as you remember, Mr. Speaker, for one weekend I was Conservative and I have lots and lots of trouble with my people; they wouldn't believe what happened. — (Interjection) —

Monday, May 2, 1977

MR. MALINOWSKI: Of course. That is the kind of philosophy, Mr. Speaker, that was evident in that Budget which, as I said from the beginning, was excellent. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would consider calling it 5:30?

MR. SPEAKER: Is that the pleasure of the House? (Agreed). Very well. We will take an evening meal break and the House will reconvene at 8 p.m.