



Second Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

26 Elizabeth II

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



Vol. XXVI No. 6B

2:30 p.m. Thursday, March 23, 1978

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, March 23, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I would like to introduce 35 students of Grade 11 standing from Daniel McIntyre School under the direction of Mr. Rohn. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wellington.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you here today.

At the same time I have been asked to inform the members that on Monday the dining room will be closed at lunch time but will be open for supper in the evening.

The Honourable Minister of Education has 18 minutes left.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. COSENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe when we broke for lunch I had been on the topic of fishing and I hope that I sufficiently motivated all members that they went out and had some good Selkirk whitefish for lunch.

However, I would like to leave that particular aspect for a minute and move to the area of agriculture that was so capably addressed by our Minister of Agriculture this morning. Like some of the members of this Chamber I am very pleased with the fact that I was blessed with the opportunity of being raised on a farm in this province. I think that type of background of being close to nature and the outdoors, working with animals and with the soil, and being very much aware of the weather conditions and the very fact that your whole livelihood may hinge on the varieties of weather does something for an individual. And as I say I know that is a background that I share with many people in this House.

When I speak of agriculture, Mr. Speaker, I think I would be remiss if I did not thank the former Minister of Agriculture for the fact that I'm really here because of some of his efforts. Because I should mention that the move to cram a livestock marketing board down the throats of the farmers in Manitoba caused those gentlemen in my area, who make their living in that manner, to become interested enough in politics and government to get out and work very hard in the previous election. I thank him for getting them that concerned, for that particular factor.

Now, at the same time, I'd like to say that the people in my constituency who make their living through the raising of livestock have told me that they are very pleased that the present Minister of Agriculture is a man who consults, who listens, and who does not shove policy down their throats.

While I'm thanking people of course for making it a little easier for me to get here, I should also thank the former Minister of Highways, who is not sitting in the House at this time. Because I happen to live in an area — particularly on the west side of my constituency — where we had a highway — No. 7 Highway in fact — that has often been referred to as the longest golf course in the world with about 18 holes in every mile, Mr. Speaker. I'll tell you that that is the light side of that highway, that the number of fatalities and the number of crippling accidents that took place on the particular stretch of road from Stonewall into Winnipeg which, as I must mention, has the second-highest traffic density, I understand, of any stretch of road in Manitoba, the number of accidents and injuries that happened on that stretch of road certainly touched all sorts of communities in my constituency and all sorts of people. It was a rare neighbour or relative or friend who was not touched by one of those happenings on that highway, and we waited and waited for something to be done on it. We waited eight years, and finally before the last election, some culverts appeared miraculously, just before the election.

Now I am encouraged and I am optimistic that when our present Minister of Highways tables his estimates that we will find that this government is prepared to pursue a four-lane highway in that particular area and that we will have finally remedied something that affected an awful lot of people in that area. So let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I thank the former Minister of Highways very much, but at the same time I would be much happier if he had taken some positive action rather than waiting until just before the election for the culverts to appear.

I was also rather interested yesterday to hear the Member from Elmwood, my former colleague in the educational business for a few short months, really rising in great indignation at the supposed treatment of the civil servants by this government. I find that indignation a little puzzling, because I am sure if he can think back a few months and a year or two, he will perhaps question some of the policies that his government had at that time regarding the Civil Service. I would mention to him that there were civil servants before this administration took over who were declared redundant, but, however, they weren't laid off. I am informed by some of these people that they were merely shuffled to the corner or moved down to jobs that were less demanding that in no way required their skills, their training or their experience, and as a result many of them quit in disgust. But of course, Mr. Speaker, that didn't appear in the newspapers. I wanted to touch on this topic at this time.

Another aspect of this whole business of government employees, Mr. Speaker, of course, and one that puzzles me a great deal is the matter of contract employees in what seems to me occupying jobs that were permanent in nature, jobs that should have been filled by civil servants, and I found a great number of these people in my own particular department. I find that rather puzzling. Why weren't they civil servants? Why have they been hired for a permanent job on a contract basis? But I haven't read anything about that in the papers either, and this I know has not just occurred in the last few

months, this has taken place before we took over.

I did not intend, Mr. Speaker, in this my initial speech, to touch on education; I understand that that is best handled during the Estimates, and I look forward to that particular debate with some anticipation. I must say, though, that I am very honoured to have received the Education Portfolio. After some 25 years involved in the educational process I can say that I have always been proud of the calling of teacher and at the same time I commend the great legion of teachers in this province who continue to do a good job in spite of some bewilderment that they suffered under the previous government as to what directions they should be going and in spite of the lack of leadership that they found was not there.

Of course, at the same time I'm very proud to be associated with other members of the educational team, namely the trustees of this province and I'm proud to be associated, of course, with the superintendents and lastly, of course, and not least, the parents and students because I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, the young people of this province today are every bit as good as the young people of any other day. In fact, I hold them in very very high esteem and because of that, Mr. Speaker, I feel the responsibility of my job even much heavier than I might under ordinary circumstances. It is a great responsibility and I say to you, and to the other members of this House, that the productivity of education is something that may not be readily available or obvious from a dollar point of view but without a trained, educated, skilled bank of people, the economy of this country would suffer a very very great deal. At the same time, apart from the productivity angle of education, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that our society would be much worse off. We must have people who have been educated, who understand their problems and understand their society and their environment if they are to operate in the very complicated times that we live in today. I think with that type of training, that type of education we put forward and that we will extend and that we will support, that we can end up with a much better society.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I also, like other members of this House, am very pleased to see you occupy the Chair of the Speaker. I must say that I was quite concerned last year during the special session when a statement of the First Minister said that you were going to try to see if you could be impartial and adjust to that job of Speaker. I feel that you did very well. I didn't like that statement at all. It meant that at the special session you could be partial but then you would decide if you could be impartial. I think that you have tried to be impartial and fair to all members, both sides of the House, and I'm sure that you will continue to improve and that you will conduct the affairs of this House very well.

A MEMBER: Improve?

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, yes, there's always room for improvement. Only a few people on the other side think they've achieved everything already and they are right. They're on their way down but you, Sir, I don't think are part of this group and I think that you will improve and I don't think there's anything wrong in wishing someone to keep improving.

I would like to congratulate the Mover and the Seconder. It is an unique occasion to brag a bit about our constituency and it's usually given to two new members. I think that they . . . I congratulate them on the delivery of their speech. I don't say that I agree with everything they have said, but I think that they did quite well.

I must say though, Mr. Speaker, that the congratulation should stop there because I am very disgusted — and that is the word — with some of the actions of this government. I think that they were given all the chances in the world. They had a good majority, fresh new faces, a very, to say the least, a very friendly press, but they have failed miserably. They have failed Sir, because they placed the dollar sign above everything else, above understanding, compassion for people — and yes, I would say honesty also — but there is no compassion at all. Now the corporations are placed before people. People don't count, the corporations do. And then they started to do some of the work with a vengeance and vindictiveness that never was seen before. They talk an awful lot — and that hasn't been challenged enough — they talk about the mandate that they received. I say, Mr. Speaker, that they did not have a mandate for their actions. And if you remember, hardly a year ago, less than a year ago, they said that there was so much mismanagement. They have been telling the people of Manitoba that there was so much mismanagement and that they were going to do away with that and then they could reduce the taxes. And the then Leader of the Opposition sat on that side of the House and he was insulted when he said that it would cancel . . . you would cancel all kinds of programs in the social development and health for instance. And he said, do you think you have a monopoly on goodness, on humanity, on compassion. Most of those programs were started with our previous government and they will all remain. He chastised my leader who, during the campaign, dared warn the senior citizens that they were in for a rough ride with this government. And he said to my leader during the campaign, or about my leader, that he is trying to scare these people.

And what kind of a mandate, what kind of a mandate did they have? They made a pitch, a special pitch on the middle-of-the-road people, on the Liberals, to do away with socialism. They didn't say that they were going to bring fascism. But what are they doing? Is that the mandate to these people — when they told them that none of these programs would be cancelled? But this is what they did, and

Sir, democracy is a joke for them. You know the leader talks as if it was a mistake. It might be a mistake in his eyes and everything should be forgotten about in the last eight years and we had no right to make any legislation. For instance, there was legislation permitting civil servants to participate in partisan politics and the Throne Speech states . . . They stated in the Throne Speech that they will change this. And this is their right, but it is not their right to go with a vengeance, a witch-hunt and fire anybody that dare talk or be loyal to the former administration. That is cruel, Sir, and that is not the mandate that they have received.

MR. CRAIK: We haven't.

MR. DESJARDINS: You know, there was an argument this morning with the Minister that is cancelling the public housing. What did he say? He said to me, "Larry I thought you were a businessman." You know, of course it would be more efficient if we didn't have to pay the labour, and if they could work whenever we tell them to work. Of course it would be, if you didn't have to pay people and then if you give just the large corporations whatever they want. But is that what we want for our people? Is this a government of corporation, by corporation, for corporation? Or is it a government of people? I thought that that's what it is all about.

You know the thing is that you are going to be brave, you're going to have a lot of guts — yes, when you are playing with the lives of other people. But the First Minister made damn sure that he had his own \$3,000 a month before he moved. You know we're talking, so what, somebody will have to suffer.

Let's close our eyes for awhile and just see if we didn't have a job to feed our kids. . . We're not worried. Most of us are not worried, all of us, but what kind of a life would that be? You know you're going to have more people on welfare; you're going to have all kinds of programs which you said that you would increase, improve; you're going to cancel these programs because you're going to have a lot of guts and put people on welfare. Not only civil servants, people in the hospital field, personal care homes, in education. I understand that maybe they'll bring back the school inspectors, I was told. I don't know if that's the case but that will be a joke, that will be money well spent I am sure. .

Now this is the thing that we face and I say, Sir, that this government did not have a mandate for that kind of action. You know, what about the promises? What about the Member for Rhineland — of course he's not here — I don't blame him a damned bit, when he sat there, more personal care beds; we need more personal care beds, what are you doing? No compassion at all, more beds, he said.

And then Day Care. The Premier last year sitting in opposition said, "What have you done? What did this government do for Day Care?" They flail, they abandoned the program and we need more government support for Day Care. What are they going to do now?

And if that's not enough what about the Minister of Health who said, "You have been paying lip service to Day Care. You have underfunded the concept; you have underfunded the program." What is he going to do now? What is he going to do now? Do you know what he's going to do? What they have been doing, what they'll keep on doing, they will say this government left us in a mess. We didn't realize it was that bad. They're not going to compare. We were told this morning they're not looking at other provinces but what have they done here? Well, Sir, don't you think they'd have a little more credibility, those great free enterprisers that know it all; those great administrators. Don't you think there would be more credibility if they hadn't rushed into a special session without knowing anything about their respective departments and reduce taxes? What are they doing now? They are talking about reducing or cancelling the supplement for the elderly. It's only \$70.00 a year, they say, it doesn't mean much.

A MEMBER: What are you talking about?

MR. DESJARDINS: Your man, your people that are dictating to you. This is what they're saying. The ones that are flying a kite for you because you haven't the guts to stand up and say what you're going to do. Your people, they're going to do that and it's only \$70.00.

You know, Mr. Speaker, they did such a great thing, remember, \$70.00 for the people that have nothing else but that pension, that's what the supplement is, no revenue at all but . . . the Saviour to humanity. They have reduced taxes \$101.00 to people in the \$15,000 bracket and that was their first priority. They took it away from those with nothing, to give it to those with \$15,000, that is what they've done.

A MEMBER: It's not \$101.00.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I've even taken their figures of \$101.00. If you use my friend's figure, it's \$53.00 and it's even less. And what other great things they're going to do. They're going to demote the ADM in charge of French education when we are fighting for this unity, we are showing that there are two official languages, and so that's another thing that I should recommend to these people.

If you say who is going to do it? It shows what kind of people you have got on there and I say there is a conflict of interest. There is a conflict of interest. You talk about the people, a one dollar a year man. A one dollar a year man — God, who is paying that? The same people that paid your leader when he was your leader. If that is not conflict of interest tell me when you are going to have a Task Force that is going to look at industry and corporations will it be composed of labour people, of civil servants, of unemployed people. You are doing exactly that because you are getting the people that will profit that have never had to go without food or have had trouble feeding their family. They don't know what

Friday, March 23, 1978

it is. And they are now saying to you, "Be efficient because you have got a mandate to be efficient", and take away the supplement of \$70 to the people that get nothing else. This was your first priority.

You know, we have heard so much. I wonder if we could just go in the back of the hall out there and try to visualize ourselves in a Cabinet meeting. Can you see a big blackboard and a big dollar sign and then they are issued blinkers and cotton, cotton batting, when they are going into Cabinet. Now they start and they decide what they are going to do. Well, they got to cut everything. Isn't it fun to get rid of all the NDPs and I saw this guy talking to this former minister, he's out of a job, we'll kick him out tomorrow. And then we'll see the Minister of Health say, "But Sterling they are people, their programs. What are we going to do?" And Sterling says, "God, you're gullible! What the hell do you think you got the job for. You are the best PR man we had, you are free with words. It doesn't mean anything. Keep on talking about priorities and how much you suffer, how much you are bleeding for those people and we will do nothing. You know that was there to get the liberal-minded people, and you know the suckers bit and we got them. Forget that, forget that — that is the way it is going to be. We told these guys we would get rid of socialism. We didn't tell them that it would be replaced by fascism. We didn't tell them that, but that is what we said."

And then you can see the Attorney-General timidly say, "Yes, you know but Warren and George and I have been promising more help to the municipalities."

"God, you guys, those rookies put me off. You know promises don't mean a thing". And the Attorney-General says, "Well, what about the ladies? You know you put me in a helluva spot with this thing."

"Keep them at home. You are the best breeders. Keep them at home, where they are busy. We don't want them around."

And then, of course, the Minister of Labour, but "Shut up, Norma. You have got that job, if you don't shut up maybe you will be out of Cabinet."

You know that is what you would see. You know I can see that. Then all of a sudden . . .

A MEMBER: You are hitting pretty low, Larry.

MR. DESJARDINS: Very low, but it is the honest truth because that is exactly what is going on.

And then by the way he would say in that Cabinet meeting, "Now for you rookies. This stuff that we are a team, we are working together. You know the guys that have been here before know I never meant that, so don't be gullible. I run the show with the help only of my buddy, the Minister of Finance, and now I must excuse myself because I have been summoned by the corporation who are going to give me my instructions for the next week."

You know we look at this great team in all humility. The Premier was so far behind our leader. Talk about a team, the team approach — he had the greatest team ever.

He has the Minister of Labour, who hates unions, who is trying to get special favours for friends; the Minister of Tourism, who has misled this House, who has no credibility. In fact, in other circles where they can use such words as "liars," this is what they are calling him — who misled the House and there is no credibility at all. He said to my friend from Inkster a while ago when he was asked about Cybershares, about the man that bought it, they promised no competition — I never said that and the guy phoned me back to say he did say it.

I heard this fellow on Tourism, this guy on the radio yesterday, who had said, "I don't deal with ministers, I never dealt with them," and all of a sudden he became an expert. This is what the . . . You know, it says, a document, permission, an agreement. But it is only a working paper, they made a mistake.

In talking about the Whiteshell, this Minister has no idea what is going on. He has no idea about the long-range plans started by the previous administration and the one before that, the Conservatives. He hasn't discussed with anybody, he is given permission in principle to construct these condominiums, but he has got a big ad today — the Whiteshell. He is inviting comments from the people, because we want to know what the people want. —(Interjection)— No, there is nothing about condominiums, that is decided already. —(Interjection)— My friend says that I am hitting pretty low. I don't know if he thinks it is not low when you are dealing with the public. Today's paper, that is not the NDP. Today's paper again or yesterday's paper, the number of administrators openly said they were afraid of political reprisal if they commented on an issue they say is strictly politics, and asked not to be identified, and that is the question of hospitals. You know, this is the kind that they have.

We have the Minister of Agriculture, he has never answered — that's the great team. I am continuing with the great team . . .

And then the one Minister that disappointed me because I thought he was human. It is the Minister in charge of the Task Force. You know he is the one that was fighting with me because he wanted lunch after school, and now he is being made the fall guy by his political enemy No. 1. You know, what better way to get rid of him.

And then the Minister of Health. Well, you know, you play that game. Everybody does when there is a new government — who will be what minister and so on, and I was hoping that the present Minister would get it because I figured that he would be suited, that he was a gentleman, that he would fight for these programs, and so on. But, boy, is he a disappointment! He started his first interview, "I will not be doctrinaire and I will work. I am the Minister for all the province, not only for the Conservatives, for

all those who voted for us and against us." And then disproved that and done everything different. He has talked about priorities. He has been flying kites, that is what he has been doing. He hasn't made one decision. I am told he can't, he has got to ask permission to the Minister of Finance and the Premier before he can make a decision. I've heard that they are all in the same boat.

Now what has he said? We are going to close Seven Oaks. We are going to go ahead with Seven Oaks. We are going to have Misericordia take over. We won't. We are going to pay the doctors. We won't. You know, we will close nursing homes, we won't close nursing homes. We will cut staff at Portage, we won't cut staff at Portage. We will do something for the Fitness Program. We can't do anything, there is a freeze. And we heard so much about what they were going to do, what they were going to do about these — the Fitness Program, because the Minister believes in fitness and believes in all these things and I am very pleased.

But there was a Foundation that is trying it, a group of people, the Grey Nuns, started a Youville Foundation to help these people to work for the well elderly. There was \$100,000 in the Estimates to get them going, something that could save us all kinds of money, and that was taken out — \$100,000.00 for the well elderly. So who is paying lip service now, Mr. Speaker?

As I say, we heard an awful lot about the great team but it's a dictatorship. It's a dictatorship of two: the Premier and the Minister of Finance.

And now, maybe we should look at the leadership that they're getting. Well the red-haired, red-necked leader, whenever he's in trouble he laughs it off. He doesn't answer; he laughs it off. I mean, what kind of statement can he make? He hasn't been in government more than four or five months and where does he start? "I don't care if Price dislikes union or not." And while he was queried about broken promises by the press, he said, "Well, let those who care about such things decide, figure it out." And he said on reform, "The man on the street will not even know that this is going on it will be so smooth." And now what he's saying, he's already starting, he is not saying, "We received a mandate; we have ideas; we'll stand or fall on these ideas." What is he saying? "The private sector is on trial." So if they fail, Mr. Premier will be all right, will not be in any trouble. He can blame the Task Force, he can blame my friend from River Heights — my friend, not his friend — my friend from River Heights, he can blame him, and then he can blame the private sector. Of course, by then you won't be able to blame us or the Federal Government so he'll have to blame somebody else. These are the kind of statements that we hear from him.

Now, you know, if this was going to help the economy, if this was going to help people, but it's not. Now mind you the corporation will make more money. Well why stop there? Bring back slavery. It's going to be a hell of a lot more efficient, Sir, if they bring back slavery. And when they're old or tired or sick, shoot them. Never mind the hospital. Shoot them. Get rid of them. Or sell it. Maybe you can sell it to some provinces that might have less than us. That would be very efficient.

But what about the people? You're going to have so many people directly and indirectly out of work. They can't wait 5 years or 6 years. And you know what they're saying? Well, you've got to keep the people here. They've got to be able to make money and that says it all. You know, that is the No. 1, the *raison d'être* of everything — keep people here. Now if they are not human, if they are not fair with these people, it doesn't matter. The main thing is they've got the money and we need them here at all cost and if somebody must suffer, well it's too bad. We bleed for them, we feel for them but we can't do anything about it as long as we're taken care of. There's nothing that can be done about these people. You're going to have more people on welfare and, boy, be ready to build jails. Be ready to build jails because people who are not eating are not too happy and there will be crime. There will be a lot of crime.

Besides that, what are you doing to the Civil Service? You are turning people against themselves. You have people that are spying and then going out to talk to you. I met on the elevator today somebody that told me, "You know, what am I going to do? This person gets \$50.00 more than me but he's not going to help lift." When they come to me, I'll say, "Go and get him." Now, you know, they're afraid. They're saying, "Well, maybe by the end of the month, maybe by the end of the month we'll know who's going to be next." And what a waste of time. What have the civil servants done the last four months? Nothing, except trying to keep busy and keeping out of the minister's way and maybe a little bit of apple polishing with somebody on the Task Force. That's what they've been doing.

That's it. And especially if they're NDP. Not too long ago the Minister of Finance stood up and said, "Here is somebody that we didn't fire." And I'm not going to comment on the value of the man and what has happened and what he's been accused of since then but Gordie Howe of Civil Service left the province. You remember that? The Gordie Howe civil servant. There were a few that left. There's an executive assistant of a former minister who is now a deputy minister, who was a deputy minister in our government. He wasn't fired. But if the people dare to even talk, they're afraid to talk. I tried to sit with somebody at lunch today, it was pretty tough. I could feel that they weren't very comfortable because they were going to be found out.

I think I covered the expertise of the Task Force. Mind you, the Minister of Education today told us — that's the first new program that was announced — construction of roads in his constituency. You heard him. Two minutes ago. Two minutes ago they announced, or five minutes ago, so this is what happened. A new program that he announced. And the hospitals are going to close, personal care homes. It's going to be easy, the taxes will go down, the service — there won't be any service and you'll have to pay for every service that you get besides that — but they'll be able to say with a straight face that the taxes have gone down. They will have to pay more for insurance; they will have to pay more for health costs, for programs and so on, but that's going to help.

And what about their promises. The senior citizen, they were going to get free glasses, free hearing

aids, that was a commitment. Oh, yes, oh, yes. You, in your program, and I'll bring it tomorrow. I'll bring it tomorrow. You and your leader said during the campaign, "free hearing aids to the senior citizen, free glasses and free dentures," and I'll bring that tomorrow.

And you can understand the Task Force, somebody that's going to help you in administration. But what do those people now, what expertise they have in recommending some of the things on French education, for instance. Is there anybody that even talks French on that Task Force, not one. It's the days of the red neck. It reminds me about 9 years ago when Walter Weir came here and in the leadership convention, again, the then left wing Conservative lions, but the right wing fellow said, "We're spending too much money; Duff is spending too much money, and we're against this thing of national unity. The WASP will rule this country," and so on. You know, the backlash was fantastic. He won every by-election. Two years after he was out kicking manure off the tractor. This is what he was doing.

A MEMBER: Off the wheels.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I don't know, maybe he can kick a little higher than that, I don't know.

So you have a Task Force today. You know, if you'd say to the Task Force, well look at the programs. We said that there was mismanagement. You're our friends, help us, prove the mismanagement. That's not the way it started. These ministers knew nothing about their department but they said you're going to take off \$10 million in health, so much money, \$32 million all together. I asked one of the persons on this Task Force, the health task force say, "God, where do we start? Ten million dollars." No idea at all but, I mean, chop, chop, chop. That's it. You know, it doesn't matter. Priorities don't mean anything. Priorities don't mean anything. What a ridiculous thing, 2.9 for a hospital. Then they said to the St. Boniface, "We just approved a new program. Go ahead, expand your open heart surgery and that team and so on, but do it with that money." You know, with the salaries and so on, how is that possible that you can keep that, not to increase anything at all. You won't be able to do it. To pay for the supplies and so on.

So it's been the most doctrinaire group of people that I've ever seen. You know, sometimes when I sat around there I was a little embarrassed when they talked about the NDP doctrinaire because I knew some that were a bit doctrinaire. But today the talk of the Minister of Health and the Minister of Finance — dollar signs; that's the first thing and the only thing. You've got to get rid of the dollar signs.

A MEMBER: Now they're fanatics.

MR. DESJARDINS: Frantic fanatics. After this there is no doubt that I would never go on this. And there is no doubt at all because I have a little bit of compassion; a little bit compared to these people who don't care about the people suffering, about anything at all but help their friends. — (Interjection)— Yes, privileged classes in society.

Maybe it is time that we talked about the medical profession. Mr. Speaker, I was the worst one for confrontation with the medical profession. I didn't have a contract with them on January 7th, and I was seven days late. Seven days late, and what did they want? No, let's start in 1975. First they asked 53 to 70 percent increase for the government-employed doctors. Then they asked for 51 percent and we gave them from 10 to 39 percent, and we were cheap. We were cheap and you know what else they wanted? No contracting out. The MMA, a free enterprisior, was going to dictate to the government that you don't hire these people because we don't want to. Does that make sense?

You know, I was in confrontation with these people because of that. We had to take an ad in the newspaper to let the public know. Mind you, one of the editorials in the paper thought it was awful. They took the money but they thought it was awful. Two days after it was over. It was over when the people found out what they wanted.

In 1976 I was seven days late for a contract. They wanted to withdraw services, and they wanted a 24 percent increase before the control came in. I instructed the Commission to talk around the 13 and then we ended up with the 9 and they were going to withdraw services.

So therefore on the 9th — two days after their conference — I called a press conference and said, "This is the best we can do." We didn't have a mandate, you know, to cut down. I never should have done that. We were the free spenders. But I said "No, you're going to get this amount."

First of all, there was a control. I couldn't do anything about it, and they were going to withdraw services from the patient. I said "No, you don't. Not from the government because you don't work for the government. If you agree to stay within MMS complete fees, we will pay you and you won't have any bills." And so on. So what are they doing now?

You know the people are afraid. They don't want to talk. They don't want to get mad at the doctor. So they are looking for a means — a certain way, a better way. There are no better ways. You are dealing with dollars of the taxpayers — the public — and you are responsible. You can go with the Commission. The Commission has had no meeting since Christmas. The Manitoba Health Services Commission has had two meetings since this government changed. Now, have you made any offers to the medical profession? No. Oh, the doctors are saying now . . . You know when I talk about privileged groups, the President of the MMA is saying, "Well, we worked so hard for these people." We have given them so much money and what do we get? Nothing! They didn't care about us. You know, that's privilege. And they didn't say what are they doing for Manitoba? You think we're going to help them? No way.

Now, okay, the Minister will stand up and say, "Okay, we're being tough with them, too." I am saying, and this I said repeatedly, that it wasn't a question of doctrinaire or socialism, or anything like that, that it was the same thing across Canada and it's being proven today.

But I am told certain things. Why is it then that doctors are only talking about seat belts now? Why aren't they talking about confrontation? Why aren't they? Nobody's talking to them and this is over three months. Seven days; I was given seven days and then called every name under the sun. But you know this is fine; they're talking about seat belts.

This is not an accusation. I am told and it is being reported to me that many of them will opt out and then that the legislation will be changed to give them an assignment. Well, if that is the case, I serve notice now that I'm going to fight that and fight it all the way, and fight it hard. Because that would kill the plan. That would kill the plan, and how can you give people that are talking about great free enterprise and want to have their cake and eat it too. Because that is exactly what is going to happen. So, don't try to pull anything on this thing. Don't at all, because you're not going to have an easy time on that. And if I have to go all across the province, I will. Because that would be the worst thing that could be done. This was something that was originally in the bill and was taken out by the former Conservative government.

Now, we also heard about contract employees. You know, there is no doubt that some people were on contracts. They shouldn't have been and that should be rectified. If they are needed they should be made a civil servant, and I think it's only fair. I think that that is something that should be stopped. This is something that we recognize we were doing too much of. But don't go all the way on this way, and don't go wild on this thing of contracts because at times you should have people on contracts if you have something specific, some policy, some direction that you are going, you want that expert. But don't — and I say this by experience — place yourself in a position that you will have a high salaried employee who, when that push is finished, you will have to pay and he won't be able to keep his salary.

The Minister of Education said that a while ago. There are people who, when they are not wanted, are sent somewhere else. That's exactly why. They were brought in for certain expertise and when that was no longer needed then there was no need for them. It would have been much better to keep them on contract and inform them, like we did. Don't take credit for reducing the Civil Service when you're talking about the force in the Department of Social Development in the guaranteed income group because those people were there for a certain time, on the understanding that they would go.

Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, I think that this government and the backbenchers . . . Because the backbenchers got up and I remember the last session. There was a terrific speech about what the people wanted in the hospitals, and all these things. Well, you've got to think of that, and I think you need a little bit. I don't say this as an opponent of yours; I say if you want to stay more than four years for one thing . . . And that seems to be the main interest. The Minister of Education thanked the Minister of Agriculture, who he thought was awful, but he thanked him. He was happy that he had been awful. That's what he thinks of the man, because it gave him a chance to be elected.

So, that's Number One. You're elected. So let me appeal to that side of you, that you want to stay here. I think that you should realize that the people won't be pushed around that much, that you're going to have trouble. You can do a good job. You've got a job to do and certainly there are a lot of things that you can correct; there is no doubt about that. But you've got to do away with these blinkers so you won't see suffering, and the cotton in your ears so you won't hear the cries of people who are not too happy.

I think you've got to realize that this is what it's all about. And if it takes a longer time to get the economy rolling . . . Mind you, it's all over the world this thing. It's not only here in Manitoba. You'd think that Manitoba is the worst place in the world. But you've got to realize that you've got to be human, and you've got to think of the people.

In fact, they won't let you forget it. Those days where you could push people around — those days of slavery — are over now. So I would think that you would try to have a little more compassion and insist that your Cabinet might be a little less arrogant and have a little more compassion. And that, I think, will show guts and that certainly will be a good thing for the people of Manitoba.

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

MR. LEN DOMINO: Mr. Speaker, I would first this afternoon like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your appointment and to thank you for all the help and assistance you have offered to me as a new member over the last three or four months. As a new member first coming into this House the rules are strange, the conduct of the House is a little different, and whenever I have had a question I have been able to come to you and you have been of help to me, and you have always offered your time and your assistance and I thank you very much for that.

I would like this afternoon to talk a little bit about election promises. We have heard a lot about election promises from the other side of the House. We haven't heard many facts and figures, all we have heard are a lot of accusations and I've noticed that often in the speeches that were delivered that when the argument was weakest, the volume was loudest and the emotional argument was made. Or slurs and accusations were hurled. Now as a former teacher I have had the privilege and the opportunity to teach young children debating, and I've always noticed that when we start with the Grade Sevens it gets down to Johnny, no, you're ugly, and Mary, no, you're short, you're no good. By the time they are in the Ninth Grade they usually know how to exchange an intelligent discussion.

A MEMBER: Would you say they are about Grade Seven?

MR. DOMINO: Well, I think the House can draw its own conclusions as to the level of debate. I would say at this point it's not just the Opposition, some members of all parties are guilty of it.

But I'd like to talk about election promises and particularly about one promise made by my party, and that was the promise to create jobs. —(Interjection)— I notice that the members of the Opposition are laughing. They should, because they are the ones who created the problem in the first place. —(Interjection)— I see that my remarks that were just made have gone unheeded. I'm trying to make a point here, and what do I get? I get, from the Member for Inkster a speech from his seat. —(Interjection)— That's right, you should be listening.

Now let's quote for a second what the Premier said June 16th, 1977. The then Leader of the Opposition and now Premier of our province issued a press release and this is the commitment he made to the people of Manitoba. He said: "Manitobans have a right to expect a government to provide leadership and to work to assure that every Manitoban may have reasonable hope for secure, permanent and gainful employment, and that is the direction in which we should move." —(Interjection)— Some members yell, where is it? Give us some time, is my answer. Our commitment is clear, the creation of employment, not short-term, meaningless, make-work projects but permanent, productive employment is what our commitment to the people of Manitoba was. —(Interjection)— Another member is yelling and screaming. You will have your turn. I wonder if you didn't make it to the Ninth Grade.

I congratulate the government and the Cabinet, the Premier, on the Throne Speech, I think it was an excellent first step towards keeping that pledge we made to the people of Manitoba. Now the Member for Rossmere, in his speech on Monday, he sounded like we suddenly invented unemployment October 11th. He called our economic theories simplistic. Now if he is trying to pretend that the Progressive Conservative government of this province is responsible for the unemployment we have today then it's his economic theories which are overly simplistic. The facts do not bear him out at all. Let me explain. Let's take a look at the Statistics Canada material. Manitoba's unemployment problem has been growing steadily over the last two years, look, these are seasonally adjusted figures, Stats Canada figures: June 1976, away before the election, 4.5 unemployment; January 1977, 5.1 unemployment; June 1977, 6.1, away before the election. We weren't in power, there was no restraint and there was still unemployment, unemployment was growing. It's not our fault, don't blame us. I notice the Member for Selkirk is smiling, he should be smiling.

If you want to look at the Stats Canada figures, and these are monthly labor force survey data, you can take a look at them and if you take a little bit of time to research something rather than just stand up and pass insults you can make several observations: (1) The Manitoba labor force has grown slower than any Western Canadian province during the last year. Our labor force has grown slower than even Saskatchewan's. (2) Manitoba, over the period, has had the lowest net gain in employment. (3) Manitoba has had the poorest job creation record of any Western province and our job creation record was worse than Canada's as a whole, and therefore we have had a continually increasing unemployment rate over the last two years not created by the Conservative government at all. And the fourth point you can draw from those Stats Canada figures is that the trend is clearly not a one or two-month aberration, it has been there for some time. It is a continuing trend and it started long before the provincial election campaign, and long before the government changed office.

Now the evidence does not support the misinformation and the misrepresentation of the facts that is being spread across this province. It is not fair to say that it is the Progressive Conservative governments fault that we have unemployment. You cannot reasonably expect us to repair in five months, even if you disregard the time lag involved in economic decisions. You can't expect us in five months to undo the damage that was done over eight years, there's no way you can expect that, and if you suggest that to the people of Manitoba you will be hurting your own credibility and I would suggest to Mr. Desjardins, or pardon me, the Member for St. Boniface, who is no longer sitting here to listen to this, that his seat may be in danger next time and that he too will be questioned by the voters, unless of course he changes parties again. He's done that often in the past. But he's running out of parties, my friends.

Let's take a look at why we have this unemployment, okay? Why does Manitoba have such a poor job creation record? Because a poor job creation record last year means unemployment for our young people this year. Let's take a look at what happened under the former ND Party government. I would suggest that the answer is something called The British Disease, or The British Sickness. That's a term used by some economists to describe what happens to an economy, stagnation, inflation and unemployment both at the same time . . . it happens because you allow your non-productive sector of the economy to grow faster than the productive sector of the economy over a long period of time. Finally the burden becomes so heavy you get the classic example like in Great Britain, or Britain, no longer great.

Now when it comes down to matters such as inflation and unemployment, we have to accept the fact that the government is not always the solution, it can be part of the problem. I am suggesting to you that the former government's economic policies created this problem. Now let's look at how they created that problem. Let's look at what all governments, and I'm not putting the blame only on the former provincial government, I would suggest governments of several different colours and stripes across this country at the municipal and national and provincial level. But we are dealing with the provincial government in this House. Let's talk about their record.

Let's look at the provincial debt first off. Our provincial debt March 31st, 1977 stands at \$694,059,000. This figure represents only our nominally self-sustaining debt, that's all we are talking about.

In 1969 the debt was only slightly less than \$150 million, that's \$550 billion, a huge increase in just eight years. It's obvious that what we've been doing in this province is living high off the hog and expecting the young people who are not even born yet to pay for it in years to come.

Let's look at some more statistics. Let's look at some more statistics from Statistics Canada. Let's look at this. If you look at the facts and figures you will notice that in every year — this is Canada now, not just Manitoba — but in every year since 1970 the government's expenditures have grown faster than our gross national product, the British sickness. Okay 1969, the government accounted for 33 percent of our GNP; 1976, 37.2 percent; the British disease. What does the government want us to do? Spend more money.

The Opposition Leader, the Member for Rossmere said that he believed in a mixed economy. Our Throne Speech reaffirmed that we believed in a mixed economy and I'll tell the House right now I believe in a mixed economy. But there must be some problem here, somebody's definitions aren't matching up.

Well, let's take a look first at the definition that was applied to the words "mixed economy" by the members opposite when they were the government.

MR. GREEN: Mixed.

MR. DOMINO: The Member for Rossmere, he believed in a mixed economy. There was a mixed economy when he was the Premier. A mixed economy in which the public sector continually expanded at the expense of the private sector, continually, every year. —(Interjection)— The Member for Inkster says to me, "Terrific" and that's okay because he's a Socialist who does not truly believe in a mixed economy, not if he's a real Socialist.

The former government didn't hide its intentions, they're a matter of record. I want to read a quote to you. This is from a front bencher. The man is not here now. I notice there are very few from the opposition benches listening today. It's unfortunate but let me read a quote. I'm quoting now from the Debates and Proceedings of this House.

A MEMBER: We can't take it, Len.

MR. DOMINO: "Collectively we are going to have to pay a greater share into the public purse because simply this is the one way to improve the quality of life." I notice the Member for Inkster nods his head in approval. That would be a statement he could agree with but . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it should not be on the record that I was nodding my head. I was nodding my head to my learned friend for a moment. I was not listening to my honourable friend.

MR. DOMINO: I was mistaken and I withdraw that comment. I thought that you might be interested in listening to the debate.

MR. GREEN: I was.

MR. DOMINO: But I see that you weren't.

MR. GREEN: I listen more than you do.

MR. DOMINO: Let me repeat that quotation so that we get it. Another member of the former front bench has arrived and I think he should hear it. "Collectively we are going to have to pay a greater share into the public purse because simply this is the one way to improve the quality of life." That wasn't said by the former Member for Crescentwood, the radical. You can find this quote on Page 1283, October 3, 1969, and it was a Member for Brandon East who went on to become our Minister of Finance. Now you wonder why our economy . . . the Minister of Industry and Commerce, pardon me. I didn't have the benefit of being here for the last eight years but as a young person of this province I've suffered some of the consequences of the decisions that were made.

MR. DOMINO: Now let's take a look. The Leader of the Opposition has called our government "dogmatic" and it's been repeated several times today, like a bunch of baying hounds — (Interjection)— they're all agreeing. Dogmatic they're calling us.

It appears to me that if you look at the records the actions of the previous government would fit better with the definition of "dogmatic". They have consistently seen every problem the government is faced with in the same light. Their answer has consistently been the very same, "More money, throw more money at it, we need more government." That is a dogmatic approach and they've had only one approach.

A MEMBER: More control.

MR. DOMINO: It's not only made for a dogmatic and a kind of boring economic policy, but it has also led to a lot of unwise decisions; decisions which created waste, needless waste of our government expenditures, high taxes because we had to pay for the waste; and the high taxes in turn contributed to unemployment; and that's where we're getting around to answering the question we started off with.

Now, let's talk about the Progressive Conservative Party. Let's talk about the government party for awhile, what we believe in and our definition of "mixed income".

Now I'm going to quote and paraphrase from a document issued under the Premier's name just prior to the election campaign and it was a statement of policy. I'm going to paraphrase at some length from it.

"The Progressive Conservative Party believes the development of Canada and Manitoba has been helped by a positive relationship and partnership between government and the private sector. The Progressive Conservative Party has, since Confederation, recognized the task of developing a nation and a community, those tasks are frequently beyond an individual or even a group of individuals and often need government intervention and government assistance."

We accept that fact. But we the P.C.s — unlike the Member for St. Boniface who's once again interrupting, he used to be a former member of that party which barely exists now, the Liberals — we, as the P.C.s have never accepted that Liberal doctrine of laissez-faire, that notion that can so easily become, "Every man for himself and the devil take the hind most," that's never been our position. Neither have we ever accepted the socialist notion that by involving government in everything, you are somehow going to bring control to the people; because the simple fact of the matter is when a government controls everything, the people don't control the government any more.

Our attitudes, and we have a long and honourable history and there are many precedents to show it, our attitudes towards government and towards the mixed economy reflect a variety of our society, the variety of our economy. In some cases we believe that there is no place for government at all except to provide the laws and to ensure order.

And others, governments may provide the guidelines within which citizens compete over and resolve issues on their own. That's the second role for government.

In other cases yet, and we admit this openly and to say different is to distort the facts, in other cases where a public need exists, where private initiative has either been inadequate or failed, or where private initiative would lead to a disproportionate advantage for a few people, we admit there is a need for a public presence and our history has shown that we provide that public presence when it's necessary. Not all the time as a matter of dogma, not every time there's a problem but only when it can't be solved through other methods.

The Conservative record, nationally and provincially, in areas like transportation — we talk now of the CPR, we talk also of several provincial railroads that were built before 1900 in this province, we talk about the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation established by that horrible demon of a man, R. B. Bennett, we talk now of public utilities like the Manitoba Telephone System established by a Conservative Government — we can show and demonstrate that we have a pragmatic, realistic approach to economic problems. I would defy any member of the former front benches to get up and show that his government did that. No. Their answer was always the same. Attack it with government money. Let the government move in. What? We've got a toenail problem — a government moves in. If we get any kind of problem the government moves in.

Our Party is aware of the dangers of a government which is too passive. Well, we're also aware of the dangers of a government that is too aggressive, that controls too much and can become the master, not the servant of the people.

I think our past record shows that we are not a dogmatic party bound to a very tight ideology and I would defy the other members of this House on the other side to justify that statement in terms of their own party. Now allowing our government to grow too fast, as I think I have shown — at least I have offered some evidence — and I would ask that future speakers offer other evidence rather than just getting up and throwing slurs. I think our government has grown too fast and that has resulted in its feeding inflation and it is also creating unemployment, creating higher rates of unemployment. The Leader of the Opposition chooses to believe that Manitoba taxes are lower than other taxes in Canada. He is wrong. He was misinformed when he told the people of Manitoba that during the election campaign. He was misinformed when he said that again on Monday during the Throne Speech.

I would also at this point like to mention something. I am not familiar with the rules exactly but I would suggest that he also misled this House, or at least he misled myself. In the Throne Speech he said something like — if I can quote from the Member for Rossmere's Throne Speech — "We talk about the public services and about task force. Well, may I digress for a moment here to read a page from an Ontario Ministry of Treasury Economic document of last fall. This is issued by the Department of Treasury and Economics and Inter-Government affairs of Ontario." Then he went on to list some very unrealistic facts such as 97 percent of Manitobans are better off under the current Manitoba personal income tax system than under Ontario. . . on and on. He listed these facts. He left me and I think he left the House with the impression that the Ontario government had done some independent research or that the Ontario government had done a study. I asked and it took me three days in the legislative library, three days to find it, but I have it here. You know what it is? It is a newsletter from the Ministry of Treasury and Economic Inter-Government Affairs, rightly so, but it is

just a collection of government news releases which they picked up from across the country and reprinted.

Here we have notes from the province of Manitoba. What he had was one of Saul Miller's — pardon me, former Minister of Finance's government statements which they have reprinted. He led us to believe there was new information. This was the old, inaccurate, Government of Manitoba's study. Now let's talk about how inaccurate that study is and let's have the Minister for St. Johns get up after I am finished and explain where I am wrong. Let's talk about how inaccurate and how cooked those figures were. Let's talk about it. —(Interjection)—

The Member for Logan mentions that I am raising my voice. It's only because the other members won't give me a chance to speak because, as he is doing now, they are speaking from their seats and they are interrupting and being rude. The example of provincial comparisons. . . okay, let's talk about those provincial comparisons which report. . .

MR. CHERNIACK: I am having difficulty hearing the honourable member speak because of all the noise on this side of the House.

MR. DOMINO: Mr. Speaker, I have a distinct impression that the Member for St. John's is not really concerned with what I am saying, he has a large smile on his face now and he thinks it's very funny. I am trying to express an opinion. I am trying to make a point. You will have your chance and I have noticed that you and several others have more than your fair chance to get your points across. I am a backbencher and only speak infrequently. Give me the opportunity to express my point of view — please — without interruptions. We are talking now about those cooked figures. About those figures which suggest Manitoba taxes were lower than other jurisdictions. Let's take a look.

If you take a look at those tax comparisons made by the ND Party and their statisticians, they ignore, they are very selective in what they choose to include or not include. They ignore generally tax credit plans in other provinces and where they do include them, they underrate their effectiveness substantially. The figures that the Member for Rossmere referred to, as they were prepared, in every instance where there was any doubt, they gave the benefit of doubt to the Manitoba situation and discounted the other provincial situation. I will give a few examples. I have much to say and I don't have much time but I will pick at least two or three examples. Let me give the first one: When comparing Manitoba and the Alberta tax structure, no mention was made of the Alberta program such as senior citizens renter grants, the house owners funds, and the educational tax refund. Collectively, this year 1977-78, those programs return to the people of Alberta, \$567 million, about \$300 per Albertan. You compare that, they didn't include that, but you compare that to the Manitoba Property Tax Credit Plan which returned only about \$95 per Manitoban.

Let's take a look at another example. Let's take a look at British Columbia. Now when we are comparing with British Columbia, in the British Columbia comparison there is no recognition at all of the Homeowner Grant which is \$280 per capita for people under 65 and \$430 for those over 65 — no mention of that. Sure Manitoba looks good. Sure when you select the right figures we look great. But when you take an objective view, we don't look good.

Another example. The ND Party comparison assumes across-the-board \$480 for municipal taxes. Now if you take a look at this here report which is the latest report, it is called the McMath Report, the preliminary report of the Commission of Inquiry into Property Tax Assessment by the British Columbia Government, you will notice if you turn to Page 21, you will notice that the McMath Report indicates that Manitoba has the second highest real property tax rate of any province in Canada.

Now it's not fair — \$480 across the board to give it that's a big doubt in favour; that's giving the benefit of the doubt to Manitoba in a substantial way. If you were to calculate the actual figures for property taxes, Manitoba wouldn't look so good any more. It wouldn't look so good at all.

Let's take a look at another example. I've got a whole stack here but I'll stop at one or two more because I have other things to say. The Manitoba tax comparisons are very insistent on including health care premiums in the comparisons. Okay, that's fair enough, but let's include them in a fair way. They don't allow at all for any assistance provided to low income families in other provinces to pay their premiums, and they don't allow for the fact that in some provinces like in Ontario, people over 65 don't pay any premium at all. That's not allowed for. That's distortion of the facts.

Let's take a look at just one more example, again with premiums. It's important. This is probably one of the greatest distortions in the figures. The greatest proportion of premiums paid in some provinces like, again, Ontario, most of the money that comes in from premiums comes in from employer payroll deduction because that's the plan. In Ontario it is mandatory for all enterprises employing 14 people or more to have group plans, so the inclusion of the entire premium as a tax burden is false. If the entire premium is paid by the employer, it should be counted only as a taxable benefit and not as a tax paid by the individual. —(Interjection)— The Member for Inkster will get his opportunity to speak on that later, I'm sure he will. I welcome his remarks. But not now when I'm speaking, please.

The effect of treating the premium in a more accurate way, would be, again, to make Manitoba look not quite so good. Those figures are cooked; the facts of the matter are that we in Manitoba have paid personal and corporate small business taxes which have been substantially higher than other jurisdictions for a number of years. You don't have to believe me. I want to quote again, this time from a former member of this Legislature. I want to quote what he said on February 24, 1976, Page 284.

He said, "We have imposed the highest income tax in the country, and we're proud of the fact."

That's Mr. Walter Johansson, the man that used to sit from the seat I sit from now. And it's no wonder he no longer sits, with a statement like that.

We're looking for ways to reduce taxation, Mr. Speaker, because we want to make Manitoba, once again, competitive. For this, if we can become competitive in terms of the tax burden we place on our small businesses and the tax burden that we place on our individuals, that is the only solution to long-term, permanent, meaningful job creation. The ND Party solution has always been the same. We up the taxes, that creates unemployment, and then we make make-work projects to alleviate the unemployment we have to pay for it with new, higher taxes, you get a vicious circle.

A MEMBER: But they control it.

MR. DOMINO: "They control it," a member from our side suggests. But they can't control the international community; there are many factors you can't control from outside the province. The end result is a poor rate of job creation. A poor rate of job creation reflects itself in insufficient jobs for our young people.

The government has been part of the problem over the last few years. It hasn't been part of the solution like it should have been. Too often during the good years, government has taken the easy way out. It has agreed to more and more spending when it should have been using restraint. Now we're forced to use restraint during some of the harsh years. Not by a matter of choice, but because things have got so bad we have to.

Now, I congratulate the government on its Throne Speech and the efforts it's making to bring more efficiency to the Manitoba government, because every dollar saved by the Manitoba governments, every dollar of more efficiency we can squeeze out of the government is extra benefits to the people of Manitoba, because the Government of Manitoba has no money of its own. All the money we have comes from the Canadian taxpayer. So I congratulate the government. I think the Throne Speech was an excellent Throne Speech. Their efforts to make the Manitoba government more efficient if possible, I applaud, because I want to maintain the level of services. In most cases, I have no quarrel with the level of services. I'd like to provide more services, but I want to make sure that we're not going to destroy the economy by providing those services. I want to be sure there's going to be an economy to create jobs for my children and for the young people I was teaching just a matter of a few months ago.

I want to maintain services, and I want to make government more efficient, and I want to prevent rapid increases in taxation. And I want to if possible, produce a reduction in taxation because that's the only way to long-term job creation.

Let me leave you with some good advice. It's advice which is a little bit late for the members opposite, but I still think it's good advice. I think it's good advice whether you're in opposition or over here. I don't often find myself agreeing with this particular source because the source is the Socialist Prime Minister of Britain, Mr. Callaghan, and I quote from the March 18th edition of the Economist. These are my final remarks. Please listen. If you're concerned about getting re-elected, listen carefully. I only wish the Member for St. Boniface had stayed to listen to my speech.

I quote from the Prime Minister of Great Britain, just last week. "If you want to retain power, you have got to listen to what the people say and to what they want. They want to pay less tax. They are more interested in that than in the government giving away money in other directions." The Prime Minister of Socialist Britain said that last week. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am much more pleased to enter into this Throne Speech debate than I was in entering into the Throne Speech debate in the first Legislative Session that was conducted by the Conservative administration and I say that, Mr. Speaker, because I am very delighted that a greater number of newly elected members to the Legislative Assembly have chosen this second Throne Speech debate at which to make their initial speeches and to give us the pleasure of their remarks. I want to indicate to the member who has just spoken that I enjoyed his speech very much, that for the most part, with a lapse of maybe ten seconds, I listened, and I think that the member will come to appreciate the fact that I probably listen as much as any member in the House to opposite members' speeches. I certainly listen more than does the Member for St. Matthews.

One of the things, if he is giving advice — and I think that advice, I suppose, should be listened to from no matter what source — but when one talks about giving election advice based on the fact that one has won by a margin of just about 100 votes, that one should realize that that advice is, at best, shaky, and that really, it should be listened to, yes, because it's a contribution, but one perhaps would want to have more authoritative propositions upon which to go to the electorate before taking that kind of election advice.

Nevertheless, I want to tell the honourable member that I am pleased to follow him. I thought that he made a creditable contribution to the debate. I think that the facts and figures which he portrayed were interesting; I'm going to deal with some myself, and certainly it's the kind of dialogue that we welcome in this House.

I also want to advise the Speaker that my leader has designated me on this motion to speak on his behalf and therefore I will probably be going somewhat beyond the time limit that is ordinarily allowed.

I welcome, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's remarks. I am not going to comment a great

deal on them, with the exception of one area of it, because I happen to be personally involved in that area, and that is his suggestion that moneys paid by an employer for a health plan are moneys not paid by the taxpayer or, to go one step further, not paid by the employee. If the honourable member was here ten years ago, almost exactly ten years ago, he would have realized what members of the Conservative Party and members of this party and members of the Liberal Party realized at the time, that moneys paid by an employer relative to health premiums for his employee are wages and they are the moneys belonging to the employee.

So firm was that position, even for the Conservatives, that they were urged to accept a Motion from this side of the House, then presented by the New Democratic Party, that when the premiums were removed, the amount that the employer had previously been paying to a health company for his employee was put into the hands of the employee, not the employer. So when the honourable member is making his deductions and talking about every measure of doubt being resolved in favour of what he called the ND Party, I say to him that the PC Party or the PCPrs knew in 1968 that moneys paid by an employer for the health plan of his employees was wages coming out of the hands of the employees, not the employer, and the moneys that are being paid by the employers for the health plan in the Province of Ontario are moneys paid for by the employee. The employer is merely an administrative agent sending that money on to the government and it's the worker who has that money taken out of his pocket. So that's the only point that I make with respect to my honourable friend's remarks.

I also, Mr. Speaker, welcome some of the remarks that have been made by other honourable members. I see some of them are not present and I prefer to deal with them when they do come into the House, particularly my successor, the Minister of Mines and Resources who doesn't happen to be in his seat at this moment.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose that it is normally the case when an opposition member gets up to speak on the Throne Speech Debate that one expects nothing but criticism and generally substantial criticism. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in the words of Brutus, "I come not to," with a bit of a license, a bit of change in the juxtaposition of words, that at this point in my remarks, "I come not to bury the Conservatives but to praise them." The burying, Mr. Speaker, they will be able to do very well by themselves and they are doing a good job of it.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in terms of what I say that I respect about this government. I respect the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this government has adopted a position, has the conviction of that position and for the most part, for the most part, and I think that for any amount that one can expect a government to be able to move in a certain direction, that for the most part, they have followed that position. For that I commend them, Mr. Speaker. I say that they are dead wrong and that that position is not correct and that position will result in a disaster for the economic and social being of the citizens of the Province of Manitoba.

But I do give them the credit for following that position and, Mr. Speaker, if I am wrong, if in a period of two or three years or maybe the Member for St. Matthews wants a little longer than that and we will do our best not to give it to them — that what happens is that suddenly, as a result of the policies of this government, all of the things that they say will happen, will happen and that there is a great increase in productivity in the province of Manitoba, that there is a great increase in employment, that there is a great increase in even the economic indicators that they say are important, then I will say, Mr. Speaker, that I still don't agree with them but I will accept the fact that what they promised was threats. No, because you see, my honourable friend seems to think that if the GNP goes up, if retail sales go up, if the number of investment dollars goes up, if the number of pounds of mineral resources that is taken from the province goes up, then I should be satisfied. But I tell my honourable friend, I have never agreed with that; I have always said that unless, with the increase in the GNP, with the increase in retail sales, with the increase in the amount of investment, unless, Mr. Speaker, there is a corresponding distribution and more equitable distribution to all of the people of the Province of Manitoba, so that some do not work a great deal and get very little, and others do not work very little and get a great deal, that that is not my view of a just and equitable society. But I accept the fact that the Conservatives say that the disparity of income, the differences in wealth, the major differences in wealth, are something that cannot be rectified and if we merely indicate that we have increased the global figures, that that's all that one can expect, and if there are some people who are suffering, we will provide for them, we will be charitable, we will be compassionate and we will see that they do not starve.

Now that's their view, Mr. Speaker, and I say to the Member for Morris, that despite the fact that I disagree that that should be the objective, I will at least agree that that's what they said should happen. If that happens, Mr. Speaker, I will have been wrong about where this government is taking us and they will have been right. —(Interjection)— No, my honourable friend was not listening. My honourable friend was not listening because I said that even if that occurred, that that's not my idea of a just and equitable society. But at least it will be what has been promised.

Now that's not, Mr. Speaker, what's going to occur. What is going to occur as a result of this great doctrinaire capitalist experiment which the Conservative government has decided to suffer the people of Manitoba to bear will be economic stagnation, will be worse social conditions, will be a reduction in the global indicators that they say they are going to improve upon and, ultimately, Mr. Speaker, ultimately what the Member for St. Matthews said will take place. What he said is not necessarily public investment and public involvement but public involvement and public investment

when necessary. The definition of when it is necessary is when you want a pulp mill, you can't get anybody to build it, you can't get the private sector to make any investment, you take public money from my honourable friend and myself and you give it to Alex Kasser and then you let him beat his breast and say, "Look, Ma, I'm a rugged individualist." That's the direction that this government is taking us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the government has indicated over a period of five months that it can take action and it wants to prove to the people of Manitoba that it can take action. It can stop industries which were a failure in private hands which the public worked very hard to make a success, it can stop those things, it can stop programs in Northern Manitoba that were taking people who never had the possibility of entering the mainstream of the Manitoba economy, it can stop legal aid, it can stop day care. It proved, Mr. Speaker, it proved, without any question of a doubt that it is good at stopping things. It is good at doing nothing and I say if that's what you are trying to prove, all right, all ready. You proved it. We believe you. You are good at doing nothing. What we don't know, Mr. Speaker, and what they haven't proved is that they are good at doing anything and that is not what they are trying to prove. So I want to go, Mr. Speaker, and my friend from St. Matthews . . . I'm sorry that I have to be dealing with him. It just fits so well into what I want to say. He made unemployment, he made unemployment one of the major elements of his speech, Mr. Speaker. You know, we looked at this Throne Speech, the honourable member looked at it from the point of view of unemployment. A non-interested or disinterested or by law directed to be disinterested person looked at this Throne Speech, saw what it said about unemployment, and said, spontaneously and illegally, "Oh my God, let us pray."

The Lieutenant-Governor, in reading the Speech, was thrown into a state of such despair, on the basis of what it said about unemployment, Mr. Speaker, that contrary to all parliamentary tradition, he threw caution to the winds and said, "My God, let us pray", because there is nothing in this Throne Speech that is going to deal with the problem of unemployment.

And we all saw it happen. Mr. Speaker, it was there for everybody to see. There for everybody to see. And that's what happened so I'm glad that my honourable friend who can't be any more disinterested than I am, thinks that there is a great deal in that Throne Speech about unemployment, but we've heard it. We've heard it from the highest source in the province who, in the midst of reading this document was driven to say, "Let us pray." And spontaneously. In the course of the remarks. And, Mr. Speaker, that was a most revealing commentary on the Throne Speech.

My friend, the Minister of Mines, is back in the House and I indicated that I was happy to hear new members take the floor and to speak. I did not hear entirely my honourable friend's remarks. As a matter of fact, I was out of the House when he made reference to a feeling on a subject, Mr. Speaker, — and it can only be a feeling — because despite the fact that this may deflate his ego, there is absolutely nothing to it. Until the my honourable friend made the remarks, I had no knowledge that he said anything to the environmental council. To this day, I do not know what he said to the environmental council. Honourable members have all the records. The member, I left him the entire files of our department, every civil servant that was hired or not hired went through those records.

Mr. Speaker, I think that as a Minister, we were entitled to choose amongst three applicants for employment. I never remember the names but it really doesn't matter, he can go back to those records and he will see that over a period of eight years, I probably on not more than two occasions did not take the number one person recommended by the Commission. My learned friend can check those records, he can come into the House and say that I am incorrect. But the fact is, if he did not get employment, Mr. Speaker, he is being a bit, if I may say respectfully, paranoid in attributing some other inadequacy on his part to his political position. To this point, I do not know what he said to the environmental council and do not care and the environmental council knows.

Now Mr. Speaker, there are people who never accept the fact that their own inadequacy is a problem, you know, people who have been discriminated against in one way or another we used to have a joke about it. A fellow was talking to another man and he said, "I-I-I was trying to get a-a-a job as a radio announcer." The other fellow said, "Did you get it?" He said "N-n-n-no." The other fellow said, "Why not?" "B-b-b-because I'm not an Anglo-Saxon." Well, if my honourable friend needs the comfort that he didn't get a job because of his political position, then I leave that with my honourable member because I don't like to remove crutches from people who need them. But I can assure him that he will have to look to his own inadequacy, not to any political positions of his because I did not know that he didn't get a job, I did not know that he applied, and to attribute that to me is wrong which, if the honourable member needs that kind of support for his ego, he can have it. But it just happen.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party in this House has from time to time said that they are fulfilling their mandate and despite what my friend, the Member for St. Boniface, says, they are entitled to make that remark. They did get 49 percent of the vote of the province of Manitoba. They are entitled to say what they think their mandate was. I agree with the Member for St. Boniface that there can be different interpretations as to what their mandate was. And if they choose to say that their mandate was one to do the things that they are now evidencing in doing, well, frankly, I really can't say that they are not entitled to take that position. I happen to think that they are wrong. I agree with the Member for St. Boniface that they are wrong. But I'm rather happy that they are taking that position. Because once and for all, Mr. Speaker, it's going to show that the kind of philosophy which the Conservative Party is determined is going to be foisted on the province of Manitoba is wrong, and that will strengthen, Mr. Speaker, what this party said in the last meeting of this House, and that is that we will start getting that one person in ten saying that's not what I voted for. That's not what I wanted. I

did not expect that there would suddenly be — and there was no election campaign to that effect — the elite of the corporate community coming in with no responsibility whatsoever, with no election mandate whatsoever, and telling the public that they know how to run public business in a way in which they don't know how to run their own business.

Because, Mr. Speaker, the letter to Great-West Life is not just a joke. The expenses of the Great-West Life Assurance Company went up from \$21 million in 1967 to \$58 million in 1976, and those people are coming over here to tell you how to cut your expenses.

Mr. Speaker, if I was left there for one day, I would cut their expenses by \$2 million. I would say that their lawns are too big; their parking lots are too big; their executive offices are too big; the cars they drive are too big; and all at the expense of me, the stockholder.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Honourable Member, the First Minister, whether he received a request from Great-West Life to have a Task Force of public people on Management Committee who know how to cut expenses — I've seen them do it — whether he will lend them to the Great-West Life to help them cut expenses.

A MEMBER: For nothing.

MR. GREEN: Well of course for nothing, it's a reciprocal arrangement. They are entitled to it. If they gave us their help for nothing, surely we will reciprocate in kind. And the Minister said no.

Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting thing. While there was talk about us going in there the stock went up from \$72 to \$82.00. Since the First Minister said, "We won't go in there, the stock went down to \$77.00. Don't you think that we should lend them our assistance in order that the stock should go up?"

Well I am happy, Mr. Speaker, happy because I think that the best way in which the democratic process functions is for directions to be taken, and for people with conviction being prepared to follow those directions and not to turn around and hide every time somebody protests. So I give my honourable friends credit for not changing their minds just because a protest is made. It doesn't mean that the protesters are wrong but sometimes there is the notion. And the Premier of the province put it very well. Are you going to change by the fact that there was a protest group in front of the building and he said "We can't be governed by protest groups."

I want to remind, Mr. Speaker, the members of the opposite side that they asked me in 1971 whether I was going to change my mind because the insurance agents marched on the Legislature, and I said that it would be the worst feature of any government that it starts to be governed by protest groups marching on the Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a group coming on the Legislature not with signs, not with slogans, not en masse. They are coming here very quietly and they are coming here in executive airplanes, and they are staying in the best hotels, and they are now seen by anybody and their signs are not seen by anybody. But, Mr. Speaker, they are here and they are now trying to reverse the process where the people of the province of Manitoba run the most efficient, the least expensive, and the most effective automobile insurance underwriting program in this continent. And they are trying to reverse it, Mr. Speaker.

They are more effective than the picketers; they are more effective than the demonstrators. And the Conservative government which had previously been sound enough to say that they would not really disturb this plan is apparently buoyed by what it thinks is its own success, its own direction, and in the flurry of things, Mr. Speaker, is now talking about what they say "is competition" in the automobile insurance industry which really means, Mr. Speaker, that the private sector gets all the cream, the public gets all the junk and the private sector jokes about how inefficient the public sector is.

Mr. Speaker, I now give notice to those insurance industry people that if I have anything to do with it, and I'm going to try to have something to do with it, if they are thinking of moving into the province of Manitoba to take from the people of this province what we have gained as a result of underwriting our own automobile insurance, Mr. Speaker, then they better doubly estimate their moving expenses because when we come back into power they will be moved out again. And I give them notice, Mr. Speaker, that if they are going to move, then let them know that the highway from Toronto to Winnipeg also is the highway from Winnipeg to Toronto and that we will move them out. They had better make allowances for those double moving expenses because that's the way it is going to be. There is no way, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province who now have the confidence in themselves to know what they can do in terms of underwriting their own automobile insurance, in terms of investing the premium income, in terms of using the interest on the premium income to reduce their rates, are going to let anybody take that away from them any more, Mr. Speaker, than when private industry had that power said that it was going to let it be taken away without a struggle. So let the private insurers take note that there is myself, there are all the people on this side of the House who are going to see to it that their moving expenses are doubled and that they will get nothing for it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a list of what I say are the differences for the directions that this government has taken. I'll try to be as unrepentive as possible but I'm going to read the list and then I'm going to deal with those that I have not yet dealt with in the course of my remarks.

I say number one, Mr. Speaker, the government is misinterpreting the mandate given by the people of Manitoba as giving it authority to indulge in a doctrinaire, ideological, capitalist experiment when all previous attempts to govern in such fashion have led to economic disaster, social dislocation and disparity of income and repression of employees.

Number two, the government is engaged in a scheme to privateer public property without compensation by disposing of enterprises which failed in private hands and had been made viable through public efforts and initiative and competence.

Third, the government has stated its objective of making Manitoba's tax structure competitive with other provinces which would result in an 11 percent sales tax such as is levied in Conservative Newfoundland and the equivalent of a 68 income tax to the average citizen in Ontario and a 7 percent sales tax in Conservative Ontario.

Next that the government is abdicating its responsibility for effective policy and sound administration to private individuals primarily associated with the private corporate sector who have no mandate from or responsibility to the people of Manitoba and who have not shown a measure of competence which exceeds that which has been shown by the public itself.

The next item, Mr. Speaker, the government has issued a declaration of dependence in connection with its resource policy and henceforth will be at the mercy of private mining companies for any activities. As a consequence of this declaration, the public will be forced to pay tribute to these companies in order to maintain exploration and development of our natural resources.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the government seeks to avoid any responsibility for its conduct by continuing falsely to blame its own actions and disabilities on the previous administration.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with the first item, that is this great capitalist experiment. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews talks about the success of this type of government and he mentioned R. B. Bennett and Herbert Hoover. He doesn't mention Herbert Hoover? Mr. Speaker, if you will read Sterling Lyon side by side with Herbert Hoover, you would say Hoover is a raving communist. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, it has never worked. For all those who talk about the British disease, I ask my honourable friend to look at what happened under this great capitalist experiment in 1929, not when a Saunders Aircraft went bad, but when the entire western economy plunged into nothing under this great capitalist experiment and was only rescued, Mr. Speaker, when the public was able to measure its consumption capacity and ability with its productive capacity and ability. And that, Mr. Speaker, has been the problem of this experiment.

There has never been any problem in the western world of the worker efficiency or productive capacity. Canada is probably not operating now at 80 percent of its capacity. So it's not that we are unable to work efficiently or effectively; what we have not learned to do is to do what the Member for Gimli, the Minister of Education, gave us a hint at earlier today. He said that it's good for the economy, Mr. Speaker, it's good for the economy to spend \$9 million a year feeding, clothing, educating, supplying all the amenities of life to — in considerable number — a group of people who produce nothing which anybody else in society can use, on the basis that this is a necessary military expenditure and helped the economy of Gimli. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's the case, why could you not spend the same \$9 million a year to develop aeroplanes even if they are not viable, and I'm not suggesting that that be done. But on the basis of what the Minister of Education said, we would not be poorer. We would have everything that you had under the military expenditure plus aeroplanes. If you didn't like the aeroplanes, you could shoot them down. And it wouldn't make any difference, would it?

The Honourable Member for St. Matthews is laughing. Do you know that your well-being and my well-being and the well-being of all of North America depended for a period of 10 years on our society producing \$30 billion a year in goods which were aimed for nothing but destruction and that your well-being was provided by that kind of expenditure. So I tell the honourable member that the difficulty is that we have not educated ourselves on how to consume and that that is our problem, not the fact that the workers are inefficient or that we cannot produce.

Mr. Speaker, what has the Minister of Tourism done? The Minister of Tourism is so embarrassed by the fact that after we reversed the policies of the Manitoba Development Corporation from what they were under capitalist administrations, namely that you give money only to save failing industries or only when no bank or financial institution would do it, that when we reversed that in 1973, we turned the situation around so that by the time he had to pick up the first statement from the Manitoba Development Corporation — and that's the luck of the draw, Mr. Chairman, I sat with those statements for four years and it's going to be the Minister of Tourism who lays on the table a statement for the Manitoba Development Corporation for the fiscal year ending 1977 showing a \$4,800,000 profit — it will be laid on the table by the Minister of Tourism and he will be exceedingly embarrassed by it.

He will try to explain that it doesn't really mean a profit at all, it merely means recovery of previous losses and a change in the books such as was recommended by the Auditor, but he will not be able to avoid, Mr. Speaker is that by and large, the public sector industries that he is disposing of were all failures in the private sector, that the public sector worked for them, made them a success, and now they are saleable.

He got \$347,000 for Dormond Industries. Is there a businessman in the House? The company made \$39,000 last year, paying all expenses, managerial salaries and everything else, so that it is a company that is on its way up and made 10 percent on the amount that he has sold it for — (Interjection) — certainly, that can be done. After the public, starting at the bottom of the hill, struggled through adversity, through the kind of a criticism that you do not hear now against any of the public companies, all of the criticism intended to destroy these companies and in the face of that crawled up the hill with it for the Minister, when it got to the hill, to take the wagon and say, "It now belongs to the private sector."

Well, maybe you people feel cheerful about having your property privateered and given to

somebody who did not work for it, but I don't feel particularly cheerful about it, and the fact is, it is an embarrassment to the Minister of Tourism. It's an embarrassment to the Minister of Tourism, Mr. Speaker, that Flyer in 1977, but perhaps that was not appreciated when I asked the question yesterday. I'm not talking about 1976. For the year ended December 31st, 1977 Flyer Industries showed a profit. Flyer Industries have shown a profit for the last three years running. Flyer Industries was not a public corporation, Flyer Industries was a private corporation which was in trouble and came to the government that the Member for St. Matthews says, "not necessarily public investment, but public investment when necessary," and the public took the firm, yes, and had some problems with it, you know, but the problems were not bigger than those that were held by Flexible-Rohr in San Diego but in the last three years it has shown a profit.

Tantalum Mining, which was a disaster in the private sector, 25 percent of it was taken over for the public, it has run on its cash flow every year and has shown a profit.

McKenzie Seeds, which was losing money prior to this government taking over and did lose some after that, has now shown a profit for the last two years after paying enormous sums of interest. If that company was capitalized, like CFI is capitalized, like our friendly auditor who makes money by the stroke of a pen by writing off debt and creating share capital, if that was done with McKenzie Seeds it would show a profit of over half a million dollars, showed a profit.

Cybershare, which went broke, run by the private sector, whom my honourable friends think is the fountain of all wisdom and efficiency, went broke. The public went in and operated it, yes, with some difficulty, and eventually showed a profit.

And these are all investments which couldn't be touched by the private sector, and I ask my friend, the Member from Minnedosa, if a bank was prohibited by law as the Conservatives prohibited the MDC from taking anything except impossible situations, would it show black figures? And he said, no way. And that was the law. The law was that the MDC could not take an investment unless it was refused by everybody in the private sector. And despite those hadihandicaps, I tell the Member for St. Matthews that he and the collective citizenry of this province have much more competence and ability than he gives them credit for because it showed profit under public investment. This is a terrible — there's very little left on the MDC statement which is not a problem. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, there is very little left that is a problem. Flyer remains a problem, but with patience and effort it will work and a break from our Canadian buyers whom we have to pay enormous amounts for oil too, Flyer would be a viable industry in this province. But there is nothing left, and my honourable friend, the Minister of Tourism, is embarrassed to come to the people of Manitoba and say that the enterprises which you have conducted and engaged in over the past five or six years, you have done well with. You have done well with them when nobody else could do well, and they are a profit-making institution. He is embarrassed to say that, so what does he do, Mr. Speaker? He starts selling them off and getting rid of them so that they will not form a blemish on this government, that is, that they're operating something that shows a profit.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I charge that they are engaged for that reason in a practice of privateering public property without compensation, and that the public will look at what is being done, and one of those ten people is going to change their minds from the way in which they registered their approval in 1977.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Finance has told us, he's given us fair warning, Mr. Speaker, don't say that he didn't tell you it was going to be done, that he's going to make us competitive tax-wise with other provinces. That means, Mr. Speaker, in Conservative Newfoundland they have an 11 percent sales tax, and I assume being competitive is to put us at 11 percent. But if Newfoundland is too far, oh well, the member for St. Matthews shakes his head, not nods his head, shakes his head, that is a remote example. I don't know why it's a remote example. It's a Tory Government. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, Alberta is the largest taxing province in Canada. It collects more taxes than any other province in Canada, spends more money per capita than any other province in Canada. What the honourable member is saying is that he wants to ignore the oil revenue. Mr. Speaker, since when are taxes wonderful because they come from the oil industry. I thought my learned friend, my honourable friend, is opposed to taxes. The Province of Alberta is the largest taxing province in Canada. It collects more money in taxation than any other province, and, Mr. Speaker, spends more money per capita, not for the amount it collects, on civil servants than any other province in Canada. If you want to go to Alberta as an example of an efficient administration, not more money per tax dollar it collects — more money per capita than any other province in Canada.

But let's go, Mr. Speaker, to our sister province of Ontario, which we are going to be competitive with. We are going to jump into line with Ontario. First of all, we have to increase our sales tax to 7 percent. Then, Mr. Speaker, we have to increase the income tax for a person in the \$10,000 category to 68 percent. —(Interjection)— I will give it to you, I will absolutely give it to you. The income tax now collected in Ontario for a person earning \$10,000 is \$586.80, that is at 43 percent. Mr. Davis, in order to save these people from income tax, has charged them a Medical Care premium of an additional \$144.00 because Mr. Davis is very clever. He says, "If I charge it to you in income tax it's going to hit 58 percent. So to save you this income tax I'm going to give you a Medicare premium. You should feel cheerful. A Medicare premium of \$144.00 over \$586.80 is an increase of 25 percent in the tax, which means that you go from 43, plus 25 percent, is 68 percent. So that man is being charged what in Manitoba would be a 68 percent income tax. There's the source, Mr. Member for St. Matthews, and

you can check the source, and if I'm wrong, I will be happy to be corrected.

But Mr. Speaker, to go further, the honourable member says we should climb into bed with Ontario and get in line with them, so we should take our, what we are now paying by general revenues, and add it as a premium, charge premiums. Well, Mr. Speaker, and I tell my honourable member that the source is a calculation, but he can calculate it if he wants. The Province of Ontario with 7.6 million people raises \$1.120 million in premiums to cover 34 percent of Medicare programs. If we, with 1.1 million people, raised the same amount in premiums, our income tax would be reduced to 32 percent, and theirs is 43. So if we are to get into competition to be as good as Ontario we will have a 32 percent income tax and the Medicare premium. But Mr. Speaker, a Medicare premium, I don't know about my honourable friend's constituency, but my constituency, a Medicare premium will hurt the residents far more than the income tax that they are now paying. Because the income tax, and I just read you what would be paid by a \$10,000 income earner, the income tax goes up in a graduated fashion. The minute your premium has exactly the reverse effect, for a person making \$57,000 it's only a 3 percent increase of his income tax, not a 25 percent increase of his income tax, only a 3 percent increase of his income tax and for one making \$144.00, only a 4 percent increase.

Mr. Speaker, the first figure I gave, 25 percent, that may be 25 percent of the tax, rather than a 25 percent increase in the tax, which would bring it into the category of 55 percent. I'm not exactly sure on that figure.

But, nevertheless, the position that I'm putting, and that is that the premium has a worse effect than an increase in income tax on lower income groups, is so obvious that a government was defeated on it, and then acknowledged after this government was defeated. The Member for St. Matthews maybe doesn't know historically that an election was fought in 1969 on exactly that issue, and that a government was defeated on it, and after the government was defeated, I saw successive former ministers get up and stand up in this House, one in this Chair, the Member for River Heights — "I was against premiums," the Member for Lakeside, — "I was against premiums." You couldn't find a former Tory who was in favor of premiums, just as you couldn't find anybody in Germany who knew about the camps. You couldn't find a Tory who was in favour of premiums for that reason. So if we are to be competitive with Ontario — I understand that they are paying something in the neighborhood of \$500.00 in premiums.

A MEMBER: \$520.00.

MR. GREEN: \$520.00 in premiums! Do you know what that amounts to in sales tax? It means that a person would have to spend \$10,000 in sales tax expenditures on taxable goods. Do you know how much a person has to have to spend \$10,000 on taxable goods a year? I'll give you a fast figure — at least \$25,000 — because his rent doesn't count, his food doesn't count, his heating doesn't count, his taxes doesn't count, so a person who spends \$10,000 a year would be paying a five percent sales tax. Just think how \$500.00 affects them who are under ten thousand. So when you are dealing with those figures that you gave to show how wonderful things are in Ontario — (Interjection) — I'll tell you what, Mr. Speaker, you read my figures and deal with them. I'll think about whether I'm going to deal with your figures. I didn't, you know, come here to deal with your figures, and the honourable member maybe flatters himself that I was going to take the floor today to talk about his figures. I took the floor today to talk about my figures, and you can look at them.

105 -106

Now Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member will then say . . . — (Interjection) — that's good . . . that's clever . . . that I accept as clever.

Now Mr. Speaker, what is the next area of activity that the Conservative government is going to lead us to — competing — that they are going to privateer public property. They are going to make us competitive with Ontario in taxes. They are going to, Mr. Speaker, give us a Task Force. I have already dealt with that. We have a minister back in the House that says that the way of preserving our ecology and conservation in terms of the lake is to permit more fishing and to eliminate the practise of fishing licenses.

Well Mr. Speaker, I don't claim to be infallible as a minister. I guess I'm like the Minister of Tourism who said that I make mistakes. But I was told, and I asked the honourable member — this is not a political question, it doesn't have to do with New Democratic Party philosophy — I was told by every biologist, by every organization of fishermen, by anybody who knows anything about conservation, that the reason that we have not been able to maintain fish stock in Lake Winnipeg — and it went down terribly between the years 1958 to the Roblin administration 1968, that Mr. Molgat brought into this House — remember the list of poundage, from five million down to virtually nothing — I was told, and I want you to tell me that these people are nuts.

I was told by the fishermen themselves, the organization, I was told by the biologists, I was told by the conservationists that no government as yet had the guts to regulate quotas on that lake, to preserve it for the fishermen who are now fishing, and the generations of the future, and to see to it that the fishermen who are genuinely fishermen are able to make a living by limiting licenses to people who show that they are genuinely fishermen. That's what we did. It has nothing to do with the New Democratic Party — I didn't hear it at a New Democratic Party convention or anybody. I accept full responsibility for it.

But I want the Honourable Member to produce any authority other than a man who says I want to fish as much as I can, get as much fish as I can, make as much money as I can, and not worry about anybody afterwards . . .

MR. GREEN: Get anybody to adopt that. You say that the Minister for Northern Affairs is going to bring in that type of policy. Mr. Speaker, to this point I have more respect for the Minister of Northern Affairs, I don't believe that he is going to do that. I believe that once the bullet is bent that they will be able to hold the line — that they will be able to make perhaps make modifications, although I don't think that that's necessary. But to do what my Honourable honourable friend says, is there a Conservative who believes it?

MR. GREEN: That somebody should say that you should tell a person engaged in it — that to find out how much wood somebody should cut or how much timber somebody should take, you should let the person going into the forest take as much as he can. He's the one who knows, not the people who are there to conserve it.

Well, I remember the Member for River Heights said when I was Minister of Resources, I had those resources in trust for this generation and future generations. I asked the Honourable Member to regard those resources as a trust and not to say that there is going to be unlimited right to supply an unlimited number of licenses.

Now I have dealt, Mr. Speaker, with the question of this Task Force and the so-called efficiency people who are going to come in and tell the public how to run their affairs. I say Mr. Speaker, that with respect to all of the economic programs and particularly with respect to the mining programs, that what the government has done, Mr. Speaker, is to issue a declaration of dependence and to say to the mining firms that there it is — it's all yours. Please explore and develop, and the industry will say that they will explore and develop, and then when there is no public capacity left, they will come back to the Minister — and I tell him and I ask him to see whether I am not being prophetic — they will come back and they'll say, "Well, you know, times are tough, the metal markets are rough, we are getting a good deal here in New Caledonia, and unless you people can match it, you are going to have to accept a diminution of activity." And what's the Minister going to say? Is he going to say, "Oh no, we stand firm." Is he going to say to the people and the Minister of Northern Affairs community, "It doesn't matter if INCO doesn't do anything, we are not going to come up." Nonsense, Mr. Speaker, he's going to come up, and do you know why, Mr. Speaker, he's got no alternative. He's got no alternative. He has not left himself an alternative.

There was a e. movie, Mr. Speaker, with Danny Kaye it was called "Me and the Colonel", and one of the delightful parts of the movie is that Danny Kaye in describing his philosophy said that there should always be two alternatives, that one can either do one thing or another thing. And what we said in the mineral resource development is that we will make it so that we can move with the industry and we think that they will do it; or we can move without the industry. But there must be two alternatives, because with one alternative I am at the mercy of the industry.

You know there is a Yiddish expression Mr. Speaker, seeing that you are in the Chair *McCanasoy*, *McCanasoy*. (?) They both mean the same thing. You can do it this way, you can do it this way — but they are different things, because you have to have an alternative and the Minister . . .

MR. MINAKER: We say *comme ci, comme ca*.

MR. GREEN: No, you know what the Minister in this government is saying, they say *McCanasoy* period. That there is only one way, and that one way puts me into the hands and under the control of the private mining industry. Well let's, Mr. Speaker, look at what is being undone. Look at what is being undone. The Manitoba Government set up a Manitoba mineral resources company which explored with everybody else, and had much the same results as everybody else; found some interesting anomalies, found some mineralized zones, but did not - in the same way as the private sector - did not find something that they could today identify as a mine. In the mining companies they don't look upon that as a failure — if they did there would be no mining companies.

Then the government of Manitoba said, that because we believe there is a role for the private sector and we are willing to be involved in that role on our land, which is what any private company says and does say and does — we are willing to have another company come in and we want to be a partner. And you know what the private mining companies who do that say? They say "We are going to take a free ride." The public of this province never said we'll take a free ride, they said, "On our property which we are in control of, when we go partners we'll pay fifty percent of the cost."

You know the industry never ever said this was unfair. They said, "Well, we don't really like you as a partner, but if we are to have you, it's fair." And may I say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Wingate, the President of the International Nickel Company, said to me that, although that used to be our style — this was back in 1970 — so long as they put up their share of the money, we now do not see anything terribly wrong with having a public partner. And the public went into the field, Mr. Speaker, with at least 30 private companies to reach a level of mineral exploration that was the highest it ever was in the Province of Manitoba. And each of those programs with a private company, so that if the members are terribly doctrinairily sure that the public can't do it, let me console him, it wasn't the public that was doing it — we were partners with your genius friends the private sector.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, last year it was reported in the papers — the Member for Lakeside, I never did it — was saying that there was a major fine, and I don't know whether it was true or not, but what I do know is that the Minister is going to be very embarrassed if there is a major fine, and he is going to want to get rid of it as quickly as possible because he will not let it be ever known that the public of this province was capable of doing anything. And he is going to put the people of this

province with respect to their resources in a way that no private developer owning land would do. Mr. Speaker, it is of course, contrary to my philosophy which doesn't bother my honourable friends.

It is not effective, which we could argue about, but most of all, and something which should concern them, it is unbusinesslike. It is the last thing any businessman would do, but it is what's been done by my honourable friend.

Now Mr. Speaker, the fact is that this administration is going ahead with what I think are reprehensible programs, with what I think will ultimately prove to be to the benefit of the political party that I represent, because it will be a test of the true effectiveness of the different ways of doing it — choose our way, I believe, and you know, for those who say that the people have spoken, let me remind them that it is not a rule that when the people have spoken they are mute thereafter. They continue to speak and you do not know what they will say, and we are in this room fighting one another in a philosophical way for the minds of those people, and the people will speak again.

And what is the answer to all of these problems? There are two answers that are brought up by the Conservative administration, Mr. Speaker. One is, "Oh yes, but all of those deficits are forcing us to do what we did, and anything that is wrong in the Province of Manitoba you look to the deficits." I was on a program with the Minister of Finance who wasn't here, and he was asked why he wasn't doing something and he said, "We have this terrible deficit." Well the member for Ste. Rose described that deficit. The deficit on operations that the honourable gentleman did not know about and which came about not through any mismanagement, which exists throughout this country, is roughly \$100 million. Mr. Speaker, that's a lot of money, but it's nine to ten million dollars a year. It doesn't mean the end of the Province of Manitoba.

Nine to ten million dollars a year — they have already increased taxes by that amount if they were talking about having to take care of the deficit. The two percent on Motor Vehicle Tax will give you about eight million, and you've increased that, so how long can you use this excuse about a deficit?

And then Mr. Speaker, they talk about it as if a deficit on one year's operation — and some people are worried, yes, \$125 million — it's a lot of money, but we brought in seven virtually balanced budgets before we brought in a deficit budget of \$25 million. Now if my honourable friends say they don't know how to govern because there was a deficit and that their hands are tied and they are unable to do anything, I suggest to them, Mr. Speaker, instead of getting into Great West Life from across the street let them get the advisers from Ontario because they know how to govern and they've had deficits, Mr. Speaker. My honourable friend says, the Minister of Health, that there were leaking taps — that money was leaking from all the taps in the Province of Manitoba. If it was leaking taps, Mr. Speaker, in the Province of Manitoba, it was wide open flood gates in the Province of Ontario.

And I'll show you — if you guys want to hear about deficits and recurring deficits and the government not able to blame them on the previous administration, well I'm going to give them to you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to put them on the record — years in a row. 1977 to 1978 — \$1.5 billion, and that's more than ten times our deficit with eight times or nine times the number of people. But it doesn't stop there — that's one year. Our's was for one year. Let the member for St. Matthews listen to what are our deficits by Tory businesslike governments who are not complaining that they now don't know how to govern. 1976 — \$1.2 billion, 1975 — \$1.4 billion, 1974 — one-half a billion, 1973 \$380 million, 1972 — \$366 million, 1971 — \$625 million, — (Interjection) — yes. 1970 — \$136 million — one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight — (Interjection) — Oh you know, the honourable member was lecturing to me, Mr. Speaker, that he didn't want me to speak when he was speaking.

Apparently you can get a rise out of him too. I don't mind it — have fun — be my guest, but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, three deficits in a row which exceed our Budget — \$1.5 \$1.5 billion, \$1.2 billion, \$1.4 billion — and they have the nerve to blame every problem on the fact that there was a deficit. Not every problem — they have another another technique. I sent my friend, the Minister of Finance, a note — in a bantering style I will admit, but sometimes it is good to have some humour in politics — about Greb Shoes leaving the province. My friend has no sense of humour. He said, "What about the hydro rates?"

Mr. Speaker, there is a delightful record by Peter Sellers about some British politician addressing a crowd. He was talking about various things, and he would talk about for a few minutes — Mr. Sellers can do it, I can't, can't — about the glory of the British Empire. There would be a voice from the back of the crowd, "What about the workers?" And he talked for a few more minutes about Britain's balance of trade and in the middle of his remarks somebody would say, "What about the workers?" Well, Mr. Speaker, with Mr. Craik, when I tell the Minister of Mines that he is hurting our integrity with the International Joint Commission, the Minister of Finance says, "What about the hydro rates?" When I say to the Minister of Highways that he has increased taxes by two cents, the Minister of Finance says, "What about the hydro rates?" When I say the Attorney-General is emasculating? — that's a good word — the family law, the Minister of Finance says, "What about the hydro rates?" When I say that the Minister of Labour is what she is, the Minister of Finance says, "What about the hydro rates?"

MR. ENNS: What about the hydro rates?"

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, when I say that the Minister of Urban Affairs is killing our housing program, the First Minister says, "We are the best breeders in the province of Manitoba." That's what he says. He has a different song.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is fair political argument, and I hope that we can indulge in it in a manner which permits us to be as we always have been, each other's respecters and friends and colleagues

Friday, March 23, 1978

but let us not mistake the fact that there are strong, probably irreconcilable ideological differences, between the members on this side of the House and the members on that side of the House.

My Honourable friend the First Minister has walked in and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I did express in what he might think is a backhanded way, my admiration to the First Minister. I have said that his government has had the courage of behaving by and large, I would have to say as much as any government would, in accordance with his convictions, in accordance with what he says is his mandate which I disagree with, and I say for that I respect him. I also said that he is dead wrong and he would expect that from me and I know he will not take it in any adverse way.

But those are the things that the Honourable Members opposite are going to have to deal with. You can get away with this - what about the hydro rates - for so long. You are making, in my opinion, no distance whatsoever on these so-called deficits. The province of Manitoba, for the last eight years, was governed with as much fiscal, I should say with more fiscal responsibility, than all of the other provinces in the country - you can go by the records alone - and ultimately, you are going to have to deal with your position. And I say to my honourable friends, it is not the private sector that is on trial, it is the First Minister that is on trial.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. GREEN: And I know that that is the way he would want it, and that is the way we want it, Mr. Speaker, and I am quite satisfied. As a matter of fact, from time to time, I get a little bit shaky about whether I am right or wrong, but when I hear my honourable friends, I am convinced, and they restore me and I am sure to some extent, I restore them. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with our Rule 35, subsection 2, at thirty minutes before the closing hour, on the fifth of the eight days, we should deal with the sub-amendment. Now, is it the wish of the House that the sub-amendment moved by the Member for Fort Rouge and seconded by the Member for St. Boniface should be read in its entirety?

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. GREEN: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition and the sub-amendment moved by the Member for Fort Rouge, we are dealing with the sub-amendment only. All those in favor of the sub-amendment please rise.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: *Messrs. Schreyer, Green, Cherniack, Pawley, Miller, Desjardins, Uruski, Bostrom, Fox, McBryde, Doern, Boyce, Hanuschak, Axworthy, Adam, Walding, Barrow, Parasiuk, Jenkins, Cowan, Malinowski.*

NAYS: *Messrs. Lyon, Enns, Jorgenson, McGill, Craik, Sherman, Spivak, Mercier, Einarson, Ferguson, Johnston, Cosens, Banman, MacMaster, Ransom, McGregor, Blake, Gourlay, McKenzie, Brown, Minaker, Domino, Driedger, Orchard, Anderson, Hyde, Galbraith, Wilson, Steen, Kovnats and Mrs. Price.*

MR. CLERK: Yeas 21, Nays 31.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost. On the proposed motion of the the Honourable Minister without Portfolio. **MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if, because it is a long weekend, that we could call it 5:30. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister without Portfolio, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone that debate be adjourned. Is that agreed? The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways that the House adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.