

**THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY of MANITOBA**  
**Wednesday, April 27, 1977**

---

**TIME: 2:30 p.m.**

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan):** Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 37 students, Grade 4 standing, of the Ramah Hebrew School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. L. Dyck. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River Heights.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, we welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**HONOURABLE PETER BURTONIAK (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the Taxicab Board today revoked an exemption of wheelchair transportation vehicles from licensing and regulation under the Taxicab Act. The exemption order under the Taxicab Board was made back in 1967.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Does the Honourable Minister have copies for the members? Thank you.

**MR. BURTONIAK:** The Board has determined that that action is necessary to ensure the safe and efficient transportation of handicapped people who are confined to wheelchairs.

The Taxicab Board members have participated in meetings with the City of Winnipeg respecting the development of public transportation for wheelchair persons and now consider it important to provide for effective control over the operation of private wheelchair van operations.

The Taxicab Board will be arranging a meeting with representatives of the handicapped people and of those who are currently involved in this specialized transportation field, to discuss proposals for new regulations to ensure safe and reasonable operation. Details of the meeting and place and time will be announced very shortly by the Chairman of the Board.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. STERLING LYON (Souris-Killarney):** Well, Mr. Speaker, it will require a few moments to digest what the Minister . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. If the honourable member wishes to read it he is welcome to. — (Interjection)— Order please. I suggested I would give the honourable member time to read it.

**MR. LYON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It would appear, Mr. Speaker, from the announcement that the Minister has just made, that an exemption which heretofore existed is now being revoked with respect to wheelchair transportation vehicles. It is difficult, from the Minister's brief four paragraph announcement, to make a determination as to whether this, or how this can prove to be beneficial to this group of disabled citizens about whom, of course, we all share concern. We would wish to take the matter under advisement and consider it, and perhaps discuss with the persons concerned the validity or otherwise of the order that has been made, and perhaps have discussions later on with the Minister after we have ascertained that kind of information.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion.

**INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN, Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Springfield)** introduced **Bill (No. 67) The Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act.** (Recommended by the Administrator of the Government of Manitoba) . . . . .

**MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson)** introduced **Bill (No. 71) An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Society of Industrial Accountants of Manitoba.**

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister in his capacity as Minister in charge of Manitoba Hydro, but in his absence I would direct it to the House Leader. Can the Minister confirm that the Member for St. Johns was stating government policy on Monday last when he made the statement that the removal of sales tax from all Hydro bills to Manitoba consumers would be a disincentive to energy conservation in Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Mines.

**HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, whether or not it is government policy, I

want to advise the honourable member that just as is the case in his own group that expressions of opinion by various members are comments as to how they feel about various questions and that government policy are pronouncements and legislation and other pronouncements of the Minister.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. LYON:** I wish to thank the Honourable the Minister of Mines, Mr. Speaker, for his comment. That being the case, can the Minister of Mines advise why the 5 percent sales tax is not being removed from Hydro bills as a measure of saving for the people of Manitoba at these times of extra high Hydro costs.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, the principles and other matters reflecting the Budget are embraced in the Budget Address.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable the Minister of Labour, and I would ask him whether he had any opportunity to participate in consultations with the Federal Government, the Federal Minister of Manpower, prior to the new regulations announced today by the Minister of Manpower with respect to unemployment qualification periods based as they are on regional differences across the country?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Labour.

**HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY (Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, may I first of all indicate to my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, I have been too busy today to read newspapers and secondly, if there are any statements in the papers I will be reading them but I am of the opinion that they wouldn't be law in any case until they are passed by the Parliament of Canada.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Minister's assurance. I would ask him if he would, in line with that, just give the House additional insurance that he will be following up with interest and hopefully making representations to the position taken by the Federal Government that because of relatively low unemployment in the Prairies, even though it's historically high . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member is debating the question. Will he ask it?

**MR. SHERMAN:** I will, Sir, but the Minister has advised the House that he is not acquainted with the situation so I was trying to establish the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** It's contrary to our rules to refer to newspaper items.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Can the Minister assure the House that, because of the Federal Government position which is based on varying rates of unemployment, that the unemployment situation in Manitoba and on the Prairies is historically high even though it may be low in comparison to the rest of the country and that therefore the kinds of strictures announced by the Federal Government would appear on first reflection to be weighted unfairly.

**MR. PAULLEY:** I do want to indicate to my honourable friend that, as has been my policy and the policy of this government to keep itself abreast of what is happening right across Canada in respect of unemployment, that I have had some discussions with the Minister of Manpower as to the effect of the application of unemployment insurance benefits, etc. in relation to being prejudicial in some instances, to an area such as Manitoba, who enjoys a relatively low unemployment rate. I assure my honourable friend in the House that we will be pursuing with a great deal of interest this avenue of endeavour.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

**MR. EDWARD MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Continuing Education, and relates to the appointment of members of the Board of Governors of Brandon University by this government, and specifically, Mr. Speaker, to Order-in-Council No. 342 of the 30th of March, 1977. I would ask the Minister if he can tell the House, why of these six appointments, two were made in direct contravention of the regulations respecting appointments by the government to the Board of Governors of Brandon University?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Continuing Education.

**HONOURABLE BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows):** Mr. Speaker, there was no appointment made to the Board of Governors of any University in contravention of any regulations.

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister. Is it not true that the regulations require that after two consecutive terms as members of the Board of Governors, that a third term may not be undertaken until a lapse of three years has occurred?

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** I believe if the Honourable Member for Brandon West will do some further research, he will find that that requirement was amended by the body having had the power to make it in the first place.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I'd like to ask if he has had the opportunity to check into whether his department is using the chemical malathion to spray in the Whiteshell Park area?

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

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** I will check. I haven't the information at the moment, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister then take as further investigation, if the department is planning to use an additional chemical called phenatrothion, which has been recently banned in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and P.E.I. Prince Edward Island, because of its linkage to the Rhye's syndrome which has a fifty percent mortality rate with children. Can he indicate whether the department is planning to use that chemical in the Spruce Woods Provincial Park or any other Provincial Parks this spring and summer?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HONOURABLE SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I think it would be worthwhile to remind the Member for Fort Rouge that the regulations governing the distribution sale of pesticides and herbicides comes under federal jurisdiction.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Considering the irrelevancy of the remark of the Minister of Agriculture, I am asking. . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** . . . if the Provincial Government. . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Let me suggest to the honourable member, if we're going to stay within the rules of the questions, that superfluous remarks are not necessary. If he wishes to place a question, make it strict and terse. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I would then like to ask the Minister responsible.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition raise a point of order?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, just a clarification on a point of order. Can we have your assurance, Sir, that that same injunction that you have just announced applies also to the answers that are given to questions?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then I would like to ask the Minister. . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister raises. . .

**MR. PAULLEY:** On a point of privilege which I think supersedes a point of order such as raised by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, I think that it is my privilege as a Member of this House to object to any aspersion being cast on the presiding officer of this Assembly even though he attempts to cloak it in the terminology of a point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. Final question.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, if I might be allowed to return to the question then to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Can he answer whether in fact his department is planning to use this particular chemical, which has already recently been banned in the Province of Nova Scotia and P.E.I. because of its linkage with a serious syndrome that affects children and has a 50 percent mortality rate. Is the Provincial Government using that chemical or not? That's what I would like to know.

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

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Chairman, as I had indicated to the honourable member when I had taken his first question as notice, I will check upon whether or not that particular chemical is being used by my department. I will also check what other chemicals are used. I will also give a list of those which we do not wish to use for whatever reasons, but I also want to assure the honourable member that it's not the intention of my department to violate any legislation of regulations governing the use of pesticides.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. Order please.

**MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Attorney-General. In light of the statement he made the other day regarding a 30-day period for an inquest under the Fatality Inquiries Act — and I realize that if there's a possibility of criminal charges the inquest has to be delayed — is the Attorney-General contemplating the laying of any criminal charges with respect to the recent fire in Portage?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I believe it was yesterday or the day before yesterday, we are awaiting the Fire Commissioner's report and the report from police officers investigating the tragic fire in Portage. Once we've obtained that information then we'll know what are the appropriate steps. Thereafter we'll have an opportunity to read the report. Up until that time one cannot contemplate anything.

**MR. GRAHAM:** Mr. Speaker, I have a second question for the Honourable Attorney-General. It deals with the possibility of a strike with the employees of the Manitoba Liquor Commission, which I understand is under his jurisdiction. Can the Minister indicate whether the initial position taken by the negotiating team of staying within the guidelines of the Anti-Inflation Board and then reversing that position and negotiating as though the Anti-Inflation Board does not exist, has that firm's unswerving position been changed at all in the recent days?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which is being handled through negotiations at the

present time. The only change in the original position is that there were two items which it was felt were included under the original AIB order that, in fact, were not included, and which provided some greater flexibility insofar as the continuance of the negotiations. After that clarification, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am aware negotiations are continuing in good faith between the parties, with both parties of course being aware of the existence of the guidelines.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. DAVID BLAKE:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister responsible for Renewable Resources. I wonder if he might inform the House the qualifications and the information relating to the deer hunting season that he announced outside the House recently.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Renewable Resources.

**HONOURABLE HARVEY BOSTROM (Rupertsland):** Mr. Speaker, the full details of the announcement has gone off via the news service. All of the details with respect to the areas that will be allowed for hunting, and the qualifications and licensing and so on will be coming out in detailed information as the seasons are announced via the regular brochures that come out from the department.

Mr. Speaker, just to conclude, no other seasons have been announced to my knowledge by way of Ministerial Statement in this House. I made a statement to the press on this particular item because it was rather unique in the sense that we haven't had a season for a couple of years.

**MR. BLAKE:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The fact that it was rather unique and we haven't had a season for some years, I thought that it might have been announced in the House, but I realize it's the Minister's privilege to announce it. I wonder if he might inform the House what input the Wildlife Associations have had in the setting of the regulations for the upcoming deer season.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated during the Estimates debate, I have operated with an open-door policy with respect to all groups in Manitoba that wish to make their comment on any aspect of our administration in this department and the Wildlife Federation is no exception here. I did ask them if they would like to be involved in the discussion of the details of this season and the various options that we were looking at. They did indicate that they would and in fact came in and discussed it with me personally and in fact commented that they were generally in agreement with the decision that we were making.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson.

**MR. SHAFRANKSY:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General indicate whether it was proper for the judge to order the use of police officers to serve an injunction in the picket line at Griffin?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Asking for legal opinion.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

**MR. STEVE PATRICK:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. In view of the statements in a news release this morning by the Manitoba Mental Health Association about the bed spaces and the critical situation in Manitoba at the present time, can the Minister indicate to the House what is the present rate of beds available for psychiatric patients in Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Health.

**HONOURABLE LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, no, off hand I couldn't give this information. I think that we had a thorough discussion on that and some of the problems brought out by the Association. I think that I recognized that during the Estimates and I think all the answers should be found in Hansard during the debate . . . .

**MR. PATRICK:** A supplementary. Has the Minister met recently with the Association and in the statements by the Association that were released this morning, is it true that the mental health services are not available in Winnipeg or in rural Manitoba as well?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** No, I don't think that. I haven't seen the statement that my honourable friend is referring to. I would like to see it before commenting on it. As far as discussion with them, staff have had many meetings with them to look at this situation.

**MR. PATRICK:** Can the Minister agree that there are only 66 workers available in the province in this area?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I am not going to agree to anything. At this time my honourable friend has probably a statement in front of him that I haven't seen and I don't think it would be proper for me to discuss something that I haven't seen.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

**MR. HENRY J. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. I would like to ask him, now that the beef vote is over a month since it was held, I would like to ask the Minister if any discussion between the directors of the Manitoba Beef Growers Association, together with the directors of the Cow-Calf Producers, have had any correspondence with him or have they had any request to meet with the Minister in regard to some of the problems they consider still serious

in the beef industry?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Agriculture.

**MR. USKIW:** No, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there has been any request to my office.

**MR. EINARSON:** I would like to ask the Minister then, should there be a request, is the Minister prepared to meet with those . . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Hypothetical.

The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Honourable Minister of Highways. Under the new \$82,471,000 under Capital Requirements of the government, an item appears of \$20,573,000.00. I wonder, could the Minister advise the House how much of that money they allocated to the Department of Highways, how much to the Department of Northern Affairs, how much to the Department of Tourism, and how much . . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order for Return.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson.

**MR. SHAFRANKSY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I have a question for the First Minister in his capacity as Minister reporting for Manitoba Hydro. In view of the charges by the Leader of the Official Opposition very recently that Dr. Cass-Beggs was used in a political manner by this government to influence the Board of Manitoba Hydro, can he indicate whether Dr. Jack Hoogstraten, the former Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, whether he can be influenced politically, whether in fact his integrity has not been challenged by the Leader of the Official Opposition?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, Premier (Rossmere):** Mr. Speaker, . . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Morris state his point of order.

**MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would be interested in knowing how you could rule the question of the Member for Fort Rouge out of order and not that one.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister. —(Interjections)— The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated in the past to the honourable member, I would invite him to read the transcripts of the hearing of the meetings of the Public Utilities Committee. When the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, in response to a question posed by the Minister of Mines and Resources, and in response to a question asked by me this year, two questions in two successive years as to whether or not there was any political interference or imposition on engineering analysis and recommendations, the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, who is also the Chief Engineer, indicated that there was none. And accordingly I would invite my honourable friend to read the transcripts once again.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. BLAKE:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable First Minister. I wonder if he could confirm to the House that the polls in Radisson constituency are so bad that the member has to keep asking these idiotic statements pending the upcoming election?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know anything about polls. Democracy will continue with or without polls, but I must say at the same time that there is nothing idiotic in asserting that in two successive years the Chief Engineer of Hydro has confirmed that there has been no "political imposition" on engineering analysis and recommendations. And if there is anything idiotic, it is in my honourable friends repeatedly trying to assert otherwise.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin. —(Interjections)— Order please. Order please. Order please. I wonder if the honourable gentlemen would cool off a little? Order please. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, —(Interjections)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the member to apologize for calling me a liar. From his chair he just yelled across the House that we were God-damned, bloody liars. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that that demands an apology in this House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson.

**MR. SHAFRANKSY:** Mr. Speaker, I apologize for the use of the words "bloody liars," but the fact is that they are strangers to the truth. —(Interjections)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**A MEMBER:** He gets the headlines again!

**MR. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the First Minister. I wonder, can the First Minister advise the House if the reason that he put the Member for Radisson as Chairman is to muzzle him? And I ask a second question: Can the First Minister assure the House the Member for Radisson can read? **MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, assuming that that question is in order, I would simply reply that

the selection of the Chairman of a committee follows a rather democratic process, and as such one does not have to engage in manipulation behind the scenes, such as I understand some erstwhile Conservative candidates or potential candidates have not been able to find in their own party. But apart from that, Mr. Speaker, I would say to my honourable friend, the Member for Roblin, that the Member for Radisson has at least an appreciation of the evolution of the decision-making with respect to the development of the Nelson River which is what my honourable friend, the Member for Roblin, apparently seems to be ignorant of altogether.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry. Order, please. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. It relates to the members of a particular union in the construction industry in Manitoba. I would like to ask the Minister of Labour if he can advise the House under what authority the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the federal Department of Manpower can threaten Manitoba tradesmen or craftsmen with suspension of their unemployment insurance benefits if they refuse to take . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. You're asking for a legal interpretation.

**MR. SHERMAN:** No, I'm not, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Yes you are. Would the honourable member rephrase.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I'm asking if the Minister can cite the authority, Sir. I'd like to repeat my question and rephrase it, perhaps, if that's necessary. I'm asking the Minister if he can advise the House what are the terms and the rights that the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the federal Department of Manpower have that permit them to threaten Manitoba tradesmen with suspension of their unemployment insurance benefits if they won't take jobs outside the province; not in the north but outside the province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. PAULLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I think that we should recognize that the Honourable the Member for Fort Garry has a legitimate question albeit a question that really should be directed towards the federal authority. And I hope we don't go through another Donnybrook of impertinent interruptions such as we have thus far this afternoon which I think is abhorable and unbecoming the conduct of this House. But I would say to my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, I do appreciate the fact that he has raised a very interesting point. I do indicate that it is under the purview of the federal authority in the first instance but if he would be kind enough to give me the particulars of which I am not aware, I would be prepared, as the Minister of Labour in Manitoba, to make representations to Ottawa to see that any injustice is overcome.

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

**MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister for Health. With respect to changes in the Canada Pension Plan which are being considered by Parliament Ottawa at the present time, is it a fact that all provinces are consulted and have to give agreement before changes are made?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Health.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** No, Mr. Speaker. There should be consultation with the provinces. There has been over the last two or three years. We're having a conference of the provincial Health Ministers on June 22-23 but they certainly have a right to bring in their own bills, which is their prerogative.

**MR. G. E. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, another question to the same Minister. Since Ontario is opposing the change which would allow the spouse who drops out of the work force for up to seven years to not include those no or low income years in calculating the Canada Pension, is Manitoba taking the position that they agree with the proposal or are they siding with Ontario in opposing that particular proposal?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, maybe there is something that Ontario knows that we haven't . . . We don't know the implication and everything. We haven't taken a firm position for or against the Federal Government on that.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways. I wonder if he could give us a breakdown of that item \$20.573 million which appears in the New Capital for the Budget Debate?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Highways.

**MR. BURTNIAK:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I would be able to give that breakdown at the appropriate time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Attorney-General. Is it the usual practice of the courts in Manitoba to use police departments for the verbal issuance of Injunction Orders?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, the question assumes that the police were used in the service of an Injunction Order. It is my advice that they were not involved in the service of the Injunction Order. I am in the process of obtaining further clarification in view of the news stories of this morning but I am informed they were not involved in the service of court documents.

**MR. JENKINS:** A supplementary question then, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney-General. Is the Injunction that was ordered this morning against picketing or is it an injunction against obstruction?

**MR. PAWLEY:** The Injunction was obtained civilly as it was a private matter but it is my understanding that the Injunction involves only that pertaining to impeding and obstructing and does not involve an Injunction against picketing or communicating of information, only against impeding or obstructing, which in fact, Mr. Speaker, is the law up to the present time. The Injunction simply is confirming what I think we all understood the law to be up until this point.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, for the further information of the Honourable Member for Roblin, his question with respect to a breakout of the Capital Funds requested in one given item will be before the House at the time of the submission for Capital Supply authority and at the time of the treating of the Capital Supply Bill, so that in both cases really there are two opportunities for getting that information outside of this context itself.

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

**MR. G. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Honourable the Minister for Health and it is with respect to the proposed changes in the Canada Pension Plan. Does his government agree with the change that will allow for a credit splitting of the CPP in the event of a marriage breakup? In other words, both parties in the marriage have a right to a part of the pension that was earned by the one party in the marriage.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Health.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I think that it would be more prudent to look into the matter and answer my honourable friend at a subsequent date.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister in charge of Telephones. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House when the directive was given by Manitoba Telephones to their operators not to leave call-back numbers when there is a collect call being made from Manitoba or from an area in Manitoba. They refuse now to leave a call-back number with the person they are calling.

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

**MR. TOUPIN:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure. I'll take the question as notice and get back to the honourable member.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. BOB BANMAN:** Further to that same Minister, I wonder if the Minister could also advise the members of the Legislature when constituents call them collect and the members are in the House, whether there can be any arrangements made that the operators can get the name and phone number so that we can call our constituents back?

**MR. TOUPIN:** Well again, Mr. Speaker, it's not a problem that I have whether I'm in the House or in my office or at home. But if there is a desire of a constituent of ours wanting to leave a name and message without having to pay the toll charge, that is something that can be looked into.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY — BUDGET DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Finance and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and the amendment to that by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

**MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have to confess that the speech I am going to make today is probably one that will be purely off the cuff. The figures that I had worked out using the figures of the Budget, mysteriously disappeared from my desk sometime between last night and today.

**A MEMBER:** They're in my pocket.

**MR. GRAHAM:** So I will have to go without those figures, Mr. Speaker. So I apologize to some degree for that.

It's a pleasure for me, Mr. Speaker, to take part in this debate at this time for several reasons. First of all, I think that it's fairly important for as many members as desire and as possible to put forward in this type of debate their own particular ideas and to enforce the position of their particular political party. I've noticed that the Member for St. Matthews put forward a very forceful argument the other day as well as the Member for Ste. Rose and the Member for Selkirk, the Honourable Attorney-General. I was rather impressed, Mr. Speaker, with the remarks of the Honourable Attorney-General

because unlike the Member for Lakeside who last evening put forward a very strong case for the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources as being the logical and the only contender for the leadership of the New Democratic Party in opposition after the next election, I suspect that the Honourable Attorney-General was also likewise trying to put forward his own particular case, and I suggest, Sir, that he should be considered. I hope that the New Democratic Party does give consideration to maybe several potential leaders of their political party after the next election.

The Attorney-General, though, finds himself in a rather precarious position in this particular election. Because No. 1, he is somewhat like the First Minister, he's not too sure whether his seat is entirely safe or not; and yet he realizes that if he is going to be considered as a potential leader he will have to spend a great deal of time touring the Province of Manitoba acting as one who has the aspirations to leadership. So he's at a cross-roads there, he has to make sure that he is elected in his own constituency, and yet he has to at the same time, show to the people of Manitoba that he has some qualifications that should be considered if and when he decides to throw his hat in for the leadership of his political party.

So in that respect and because I have probably a rather fairly close association with the Attorney-General in that I think I understand him and I understand his political aspirations, there is the deeper one though, Mr. Speaker, and that is that in that understanding you also begin to get an understanding of the philosophy, the political philosophy of the individual. I think that therein lies the real problem that the Attorney-General would have if he was aspiring to the leadership of the New Democratic Party and that is his own personal philosophical beliefs. I would say that if he was entirely honest with the people of Manitoba and told them his own personal beliefs and his political aspirations in that respect, then I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, that probably the Member for Lakeside was correct, that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources will be the next leader of the New Democratic Party.

I think that if his personal and philosophical beliefs became widely known, his chances of leading the New Democratic Party would be very slight.

**A MEMBER:** A nice guy.

**MR. GRAHAM:** However, Mr. Speaker, he's a real nice guy and I wish him well in his endeavours and time alone will tell how successful he will be.

Mr. Speaker, my intention in getting into this debate was not to deal, as most members on the other side have done, not to deal in the past and to put forward rather fallacious arguments, I intend to deal more with what is in front of us.

Sir, it has always been my concern ever since I've been involved in the political field to be more concerned about tomorrow than yesterday, because after all tomorrow is the most important day in our life. It is the policies and the programs that are adopted today that will affect tomorrow. When I look at this Budget that has been brought down by this government in which the Minister of Finance has indicated no significant tax changes, I have to then look at some of the secondary aspects of that Budget which in my estimation give you a true indication of the intent and the real philosophy of this government.

I would have to say, Sir, that the real philosophy of this government can be likened to that of a bloodsucker.

**A MEMBER:** Going through the back door.

**MR. GRAHAM:** They want to derive from the citizenry of Manitoba more and more dollars in as painless a manner as possible. Just like the bloodsucker extracts the blood from its host without creating too much pain.

This government when you look at their detailed estimates of revenue for the coming year, then you can get some idea of what I am trying to bring forward, Sir, and that is the little points, the little insignificant points but I think they are important. I had gone to considerable detail, Sir, to work it all out in percentage figures, but unfortunately those figures disappeared out of my desk last night.

For instance' under the Attorney-General's department itself, in the field of fines and costs this government intends, in the coming year, to extract some 25 to 30 percent more money out of the people of Manitoba than they did last year, in the field of fines and costs. That, Sir, indicates to me the punitive philosophy of this government.

This would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, to give you a rather deeper insight into what the real philosophy of this government is and that is to take by whatever means possible, in little amounts here, in larger amounts there, but in any manner possible, to take just a little bit more from the individual in Manitoba's society.

Again in the Attorney-General's Department, the next one is under County Court Fees and this would appear in the field of fees to be roughly a 30 to 35 percent increase, a one year increase, somewhere in that neighbourhood. I had the exact figures worked out at one time. It goes from 462 to 683 ½. Now I would say that that is getting up in the 40 percent class of increase in County Court fees.

**A MEMBER:** Increased usage.

**MR. GRAHAM:** It may be increased usage and if it is then it indicates that the people of Manitoba



have not been living up to the laws or it indicates that because we have more laws passed and the punitive action of the government has demanded and put forward a tighter rein on the people of Manitoba and are trying to control people more and more all the time.

So this again is an indication, Sir, of what the philosophy of this government is, to take by whatever means possible, in little amounts or large amounts, in as painless a manner as possible. This is done not through passing laws, but it is done by regulation. The increase in fees is done by regulation, never approved in this Legislature other than we have, I believe, a report — I think it was tabled here very early in the session — of the number of regulations that have been approved during the past year.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the third item, and this is just the Attorney-General's section, because it is the first one in the — no, it is not the first one, the first one is Agriculture. They only have one item in here and this again is in the area of fees, where they have gone from 301 to 447 which again would indicate a 40 percent increase, roughly. So it does give you a rather consistent, constant picture of what this government intends to do.

This, Mr. Speaker, is somewhat ironic because we find that one arm of government is asking its employees to live within the guidelines of the Anti-inflation Board and to abide by the spirit of the anti-inflation legislation and yet they themselves, knowing full well that they are exempt from the Anti-inflation Board guidelines and controls, are adopting a much different pattern. I would think that any wage earner who showed that in the past year he had a 30 or 40 or 50 percent increase in wages, and if he was one of a large group of employees of a particular company, that would very quickly be rolled back by the Anti-inflation Board.

But here we find that the Anti-inflation Board has no authority. Government is fully aware of that and yet they have no hesitation whatsoever, quite nonchalantly they say — Okay we'll increase fees 30, 40, 50 percent; by the bloodsucker technique we will extract from the individual in Manitoba just a few extra pennies or dollars so that the wheels of government will be well oiled and the revenue of this province will increase to meet, or to come close to meeting their program for expenditure.

We find, Mr. Speaker, even in the field of say the Public Trustee . . . Now I would suspect the Public Trustee, who is supposed to act on behalf of people who are unable to look after their own affairs for some reason or another, but even in that field the increase is something like 40 to 45 percent. So it shows you, Mr. Speaker, the bloodsucker philosophy of this government. It is relatively painless because the person is not able to look after his own affairs, the Public Trustee will do it for him but his estate will be paying more to this government.

Surprisingly though, Mr. Speaker, we find in the Attorney-General's Department that there is one area where they expect no increase in revenue and that is in the field of Legal Aid where they had 750,000 last year and they expect 750,000 this year. I think the Minister explained that to us earlier because he came back from Ottawa and said he was very unsatisfied that he was unable to get any more from Ottawa with respect to Legal Aid.

But, Mr. Speaker, at the same time, in one field in which there is I would suspect, and past history has shown there has been a very dramatic increase, and that's the field of the expected revenue of the Liquor Control Commission. — (Interjections) — Mr. Speaker, before everybody goes off on a tangent here, I want to point out that here the government expects no increase, no increase. They expect \$67 million revenue in the year ending March 31st just past and they expect to receive \$68 million a year from now.

Now, if the increases of the past years, if that growth rate continues and I know in some years we have seen an increase from year to year as much as \$12-\$15 million from one year to the next, but here we only expect one million this year. We find . . .

**A MEMBER:** The moderation program, it's getting revenue.

**MR. GRAHAM:** It could be that the moderation program is working. It also could mean that this government has already bled from the taxpayer as much money as they can hopefully expect to extract and there isn't enough money left for that particular aspect. That is a possibility. There is also the second possibility that we may indeed end up with the Winnipeg Jets playing in the National Hockey League next year. It's a possibility, but if the Manitoba Liquor Commission, which has a complete monopoly but still does a lot of advertising, if they continue to pay part of the cost of the broadcasts of those Winnipeg Jets games, if it's in the National Hockey League, that advertising dollar may go up considerably, the cost of it. So it may be the dramatic increase in cost of the advertising campaign of the Liquor Control Commission.

So, Mr. Speaker, I've just dealt with the Attorney-General's department to show you what this bloodsucker philosophy of this government is. We get into the field of the Co-operative Development for instance, we find they expect a decrease in revenue there. So the Co-op program does not expect to have that much increased revenue for the province of Manitoba.

We find in the field of Licenses, under Consumer Corporate and Internal Services, that we are looking well in excess of fifty percent increase in licensing. These things, Mr. Speaker, are all consistent. They are not constant because they fluctuate greatly. I believe there's one in here which

indicates about a 270 percent increase, if I can find it. Under Municipal Affairs, the fees that they expect to raise this year under Municipal Affairs indicate a 270 percent increase. Two hundred and seventy percent increase under Municipal Affairs. And I would like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs, what is the dramatic service that he is going to provide for the municipalities that will cost them 270 times as much this year, a 270 percent increase over last year's services. He just lists it simply as fees, but it does indicate a very substantial amount.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I could go through this thing for a great deal — but the whole thing, Mr. Speaker, is that it is relatively consistent. They don't have to have a substantial change in the Budget, in changing their personal income tax, their corporate tax, their retail sales tax, or anything else. But through the small insidious, bloodsucker type fees and licenses, they are extracting more and more taxpayer dollars and the wheels of this government will, hopefully, get sufficient lubrication to keep them turning.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that it should be the intention of any government to gouge in a manner such as this. I know, Sir, that when government changes, I think you will see a government that listens to people, and you'll see a government that will do for people in a humane manner the things that people cannot do for themselves and that society may very well of necessity have to do. But they will try to encourage in our community an atmosphere which will give the individual a desire to succeed himself, which will re-instil in people a desire to further their own goal and will not, as this government has done in the past, stifle individual initiative and create a crowd at the public trough.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the comments that I wish to make at this time and I look forward with interest to the comments of others in this Debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Municipal Affairs.

**HONOURABLE BILLIE URUSKI (St. George):** Mr. Speaker, initially I had not intended to take part in this Debate. However, I certainly welcome the opportunity to take part in the Budget Debate this session as, in all likelihood, this will be the last Budget that this government will bring in. It may very well not, but it could likely be the last Budget this government brings in prior to the provincial election and I would like to give some of my views with respect to the Budget and to general comments that have been made by members of the Opposition with respect to the conduct of the affairs of this province by the New Democratic Party Government.

I want to maybe take a lesson from the Member for Lakeside. During his Debates, he likes to trot out a New Democratic Party Convention booklet, wave it around and throw out some of the resolutions that the Party discusses, that are brought forth at our Convention. Frankly, I had the opportunity of viewing last night the policy papers of the Annual Meeting of the Conservative Party that was held in the City, the Leader of the Opposition said, "While these are policy" . . . — (Interjection)— it was the end of March, the end of March; in fact, just a month ago — (Interjection)— yes, March 31st, April 1st and 2nd, where the Leader of the Opposition said, "Of course, these policy programs are not the last word, but they are working papers put forward for discussion purposes only." They have done some work on their policies as to what they intend to put forward. Mr. Speaker, I reviewed them and looked through some of their statements, and I want to go into some of them. They one issue, the home owner in Manitoba. They talk about the program of the introduction of a system of tax credits for home owners to make improvements and renovations to their dwellings — the intention would be to compensate the increased assessment and thereby realty taxes which the improvements create.

Mr. Speaker, they now talk about tax credits. Would you believe that the Tory Party is in effect saying that they want to introduce a tax credit program. But you know, what is the record of the Conservative Party in this House, going back to 1969 when the change in government took place? They have consistently voted against tax credit programs. In fact, in thLAST SESSION THE THEN House Leader of the Party who — I want to say I'm sorry that he is not in the House and suffered a severe heart attack and I hope he is getting better. I think anyone who goes through such an experience and is able to pull through it is a fortunate individual indeed and I'm certainly pleased to hear that he is on the way to recovery. But he, in the last session and, of course, prior to the by-election in SourisKillarney, made statements in this House saying that the first priority of the Conservative Party would be to get rid of the Property Tax Credit Program because it is — (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa says he didn't say that and I am misquoting him. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe I have some documents here which were, if not from Hansard then they were in the . . . Craik saves Conservatives" and here I will read back to the honourable member — this was in the Tribune of May 4, 1976: "Craik states Conservatives would end tax rebates." Now, you know, the Tribune, although I don't hold that high regard for some of the statements made, I believe they are as fair as one could expect the media to be. But in this case here, Mr. Speaker, it was not the statement of the reporter, it was an actual quote of the Member for Riel: "Craik describes this as," and she quotes, "a very cheap vote buying technique and said getting rid of it would be our prime objective." That is a statement of the Member for Riel on behalf of the Conservative Party. The Member from Minnedosa says it's not true. Now I would want him to get up in

this House and say, "Look, the honourable member was misquoted and that's not what he was saying," and deny all that. And they voted totally and — (Interjection)— That's right. Your leader went out on the hustings following a couple of months after the session, after that statement was made, after that statement was made, Mr. Speaker, several months later and in fact reversed the position of the Conservative Party. He went on the hustings and said, "Look we we will not do away with the Tax Credit Program because it's a good program." Maybe he didn't say it's a good program' but "we will not do away with it," in any event. Why? —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, the heckling of the Member for Lakeside, regardless of what happens, it portrays the sheer desire, and I really can't blame them, the sheer desire to govern this province in the next number of years, because I believe it will be their last chance, because I believe that if the Leader of the Opposition and his group do not succeed, that will be the end of the Conservative Party for another ten years, because I venture to say that the Leader of the Opposition is here for only one thing. He entered the federal race in Winnipeg South Centre for one thing, to get into federal politics. He moved in, lost, and he moved out. He's been watching the scene very well. Here he saw an opportunity coming — that there could be — knocked off his partner in the leadership race, and moved in for the kill to see whether or not he could become the next Premier of this province.

I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, our leader will be around I hope even longer than he has indicated, even as long as he indicated, for the entire term of the next election' because he will be around for the next election, and he has made that. . . Schreyer to serve a full term. You don't even have to. . . — (Interjection)— even longer, longer than the next term. I would hope frankly, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier' my leader, will be here a long time, longer than the time that he has already indicated that he is prepared to. . . —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation that the whole debate in this House is, in fact, a debate about integrity, honesty, and posture, public posture, exercise and programs of the government in question — the integrity of the government in question. That is what all this debate is about. I'm not ashamed to say that the Premier of this province is probably the most, in the terms of public office, the most appealing individual that there is anywhere, not only here in this province but right across this country, and there is no doubt about it. Even the three members here — their cohorts in Ottawa are wanting to try and entice the Premier to the Federal Government. Frankly, the Liberals got to the Tories. They didn't get to the Socialists.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this debate is going to go on, and I think it's a healthy debate, and the honourable members opposite talk about socialism and being stifling. The Leader of the Opposition talks about people being stifled, and we have to get rid of these socialists and what is. . . What are we really talking about, Mr. Speaker? What in effect has happened in these last eight years? What are we talking about socialism? Are we talking about the people of Manitoba for example, getting together through their elected representatives, and operating their own insurance company as Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's what they call socialism' that's what it is, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the people of Manitoba have benefited by —if that's what they want to call it — by socialism, by being able, through their elected representatives, to gain more economic independence by banding together and forming and operating their own insurance company, and investing all the excess funds of their investment income, into hospitals, and schools, and municipal debentures in this province. If that is socialism' Mr. Speaker, I support it. I have been part of it, and I believe that the people of Manitoba support it.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has consistently, until this last session, said that he wants a freedom of choice, and they would do away with the insurance company, the Public Insurance Corporation. They would throw it open, and in fact, I believe they would do it. But seeing the errors of it, he even goes to schools and says that he will not do away with Autopac, and that we really can't do away with it. Do you want me to tell you why, Mr. Speaker? What is really behind it? He is really saying to the insurance companies, look fellows, we know you support us, we know you support us, please keep quiet until we get into office. Please keep quiet.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, it is worth the insurance companies of this province' over the last five years, at least \$160 million in revenues. What can that mean to the war chest of the Tory Party? Heck, even 1 percent of that amount of money, that the companies have lost alone by not being in business, that is only the difference between the premiums they collected and would have charged the motorists of Manitoba, and what the motorists paid — \$167 million. That's virtually two years of premiums to the average motorist, Mr. Speaker. That is what is at stake. No wonder he goes around and says, look we're not going to touch the corporation now, because you know, it really can't be undone. Well the fact of the matter is, it can easily be undone.

The fact of the matter is, the B.C. Government walked in, and they virtually tripled the premiums to most motorists, they quadrupled the premiums to young drivers, just changed the entire philosophy of the corporation, and could have it undone. But you know, that wasn't even enough for the companies. That wasn't even enough for the companies of the private sector in B.C., because they still . . . That wasn't enough for them, to even triple the premiums in that province to lure them back

into the insurance business, because they were leery, because they know that it is only a matter of time, when a government that intends to take a share of the economic development of a province will come in and operate the corporation and provide insurance coverage at the lowest possible cost to the motorists of that province.

So that is why he now has reverted his position with respect to the Insurance Corporation of this province. He wants things to be very quiet, because if he can gain enough support other ways, then he will do the bidding of the insurance companies after the next election, because that it is the scheme. It is to get into office, and then you can do what you want.

Mr. Speaker, they talk about, in their policies, about the renting in this province. They talk about continuing to provide subsidized government rental housing as it is needed, but to institute plans for the purchase of these units, by residents' through a progressive system of subsidized rental, leading to real cost rental with the option of a lease purchase agreement. Mr. Speaker, they're prepared to do that in housing, and I don't argue with that. I don't think that's such a bad policy, but let them not be as hypocritical as they have been against the Land Lease Program this government instituted several years ago, because that is the very policy that they are talking about in their program for rent subsidizing and lease purchase agreements with respect to housing. Let them not be hypocritical about a stance that they have taken on the Farm Lease Program, as it relates to the Rental Program, as being able to offer a purchase for the renter in this province. They have consistently argued that the Land Lease Program is to the detriment, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, it has brought young people back to the farms. And in fact, in my own constituency, Mr. Speaker' although I have to say some people have taken advantage of it, but the programs of this government over the last eight years, have stemmed, at least in part . . . I have to realize that the depopulation of rural areas will continue, and it will fluctuate, but in my area, in the years 1969 to 1974, there was a net increase in population where, over the last number of years, in my area, in my own constituency, there had been a progressive decline.

So, while I can say that — and I'll be quite honest — an impact of government programming had an impact to stemming the tide of rural depopulation, but yet, I am not as foolish to say that we can stem it completely, but the programs and policies of this government over the last eight years have really stemmed, or at least slowed rural decline. And I know it has been a positive effect in my own area because, just simply even by the voters' list, there was an increase of 400 voters from the 1969 election to the 1973 election, and that is an amount of roughly 8,000 voters, which is a sizeable increase just in terms of voters. So there was a net increase in population.

What impact has this government had in rural areas over the last eight years, the areas that I represent, Mr. Speaker? What really has happened over the last eight years? It started with a program that was criticized and kicked around as the san-can program. The Member for Lakeside liked to josh about it, but you know, Mr. Speaker, about 6,000 families . . . This is the arrogance that is portrayed, although joshingly and nicely, by members opposite, as if in jest, but the fact of the matter is that that portrays the type of reflection that honourable members opposite have on, whether they be mundane, common sense, down-to-earth programs like the Rural Water Services Program which brought water service to many homes in the farm areas. It was criticized and joshed about as the san-can program by members opposite. That was just one of them. These sewer and water programs for the communities, many of them have taken advantage of it.

And the greatest impact of all on which the Tory opposition is talking about, saying that we should sell off or get rid of some of the housing stock to encourage development by private enterprise of specific purpose, reasonable accommodation for senior citizens, family rental units. They intend to, at least they haven't clearly stated but it appears that they intend to allow the private sector to start building the units for senior citizens rather than operating as a public. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, the private sector now builds the homes. Mr. Speaker, the private sector does now build the units. Are they saying that they will allow the private sector to take over the running of the senior citizens' homes? Will they now say that they will sell off the public investment and the investment into homes in this province for elderly and for low-income families, that they will sell it off to the private sector? If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, they really reflect some of the statements — you know I don't know which to choose from, whether it's the Liberals or the Tories — about the selling off of profitable investment of this province to the private sector. If that is their policy, I think they should come out and say it. But I think the greatest impact in rural Manitoba for the elderly and the low-income people has been the millions of dollars of investment in housing stock in this province.

Mr. Speaker, there was not one unit of housing in my constituency prior to 1969 for our elderly and infirm, not one unit, not one unit of public housing before 1969. And they cannot say on the other side that there was not money available to do those kinds of programs. But you know, Mr. Speaker, they are very cute in their statements: we have to cut down on spending. What does that really mean? Does that mean the end of the programs of investment into housing which have been invested over the last

seven years; that is an investment for the future? The housing stock, we know now, that the values of it have increased substantially over the last seven years, the values of that housing stock and that investment that has been made. But there was not one unit in my area.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to have been part of a government, an interventionist government that has been able to say, "Look, there are things to be done and we have to go ahead and do them." And in eight years it has not been . . . We have made mistakes, there is no doubt about it. I think there is no doubt about it that we can be criticized for making mistakes in areas such as that, but it hasn't been, Mr. Speaker, without trying and attempting.

I go down the list of programs and I will want to go down the list of programs in the last eight years. That list, Mr. Speaker, would match any previous administration over the last two to three decades of expansion in programs in this province. Without a batting of an eye, it will match any of the records of the previous administrations for the last — not the Conservative years — the last two or three decades, and the most fundamental of all is the housing program in this province in the rural areas which assists the elderly to remain, live out there twilight years in their own communities without having to move out.

Coupled with the housing has been the expansion in the health care field in the building of personal care homes, nursing home care into the communities which have hospitals in the area. Mr. Speaker, there was one unit and I have to give credit to the Sisters of St. Benedict who, for many years, operated the St. Benedict's Manor in Arborg, which, as a result of the 1974 floods forced the closure of that home and the senior citizens, the infirm patients had to be moved first to the Deer Lodge Hospital for an interim measure, and then to the CFS Gimli Base and they are there now. I would hope that by this summer that project, the rebuilding of that home in Arborg, will be complete and the two homes that are scheduled for Ashern and Eriksdale, adjacent to their will also be well this year to complement those units in that area.

Additionally the dental care program which has begun, one of the pilot areas was the Interlake region. Although I realize that we are not able to expand the program as quickly as we would have hoped, we know the program is on its way and will be continued. And I really, I believe, as an MLA and as a colleague in Cabinet, owe my colleagues a debt of gratitude and I would congratulate them. The honourable members josh if there are congratulations given to colleagues, but, Mr. Speaker, the continued move by my colleagues, and specifically I mentioned the programs in the Department of Health, have made a tremendous impact on the standard of living in the area which I represent.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party is going to continue and want to form the next government. They have principles. They have stated in their principle, and I have to take this in to look at it and challenge that statement: "To re-establish the merit principle in hiring and promotion with the Manitoba Public Service so as to eliminate the patronage practices of the past eight years." Mr. Speaker, what the Sam Hill are they talking about? What are they talking about? I want them to put on the record, to state categorically and give me instances of cases where civil servants were hired through the Civil Service Commission in normal applications that there was in effect political interference.

I want them to give me instances because, Mr. Speaker, when they were in government, and we are in government, we of course hire people that reflect the policy position of this government in key areas of policy that this government undertakes and I can't see the Conservatives or any government, whether it be Liberals or Conservatives, not hiring those types of people in key areas when they are in government. But to suggest that every position within the Civil Service is dealt with with other than merit to the principle, Mr. Speaker, is a total condemnation on the Conservative Party and their attitude toward government when they were in office because if they are saying that the system has changed somewhat, then they are really saying that they tinkered with the entire system when they were in government because nothing has changed. There have been streamlining procedures, but the principles in the administration of the Act have not changed and I challenge the Conservative Party to put on the record what they are really talking about. If they are talking about Ministerial appointments and the like are somehow different than they did when they were in office, that is a bunch of nonsense, Mr. Speaker. I don't deny them the right, but I don't want them to try and misinterpret those two areas, Ministerial appointments, which are made by Order-in-Council, and of a policy nature. I would expect you when you will be in government, that you will appoint people who are of a policy nature.

**A MEMBER:** Oh, come on.

**MR. URUSKI:** And if you tell me that you did not, then you are a bunch of hypocrites. You are worse hypocrites than your policy says you are, because that is in effect what you are trying to lead people to believe. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Conservative Party to put on the record exactly what they are talking about. If they are saying that the administration of the Act has changed, I want them to put that on the record.

Mr. Speaker, there are other areas. There are other areas and they talk about the incentive, we have to provide incentive and we have to provide to the private sector and to individuals — who are

they talking about? They have a list of lowering personal income taxes as it becomes financially possible to levels comparable with those in neighbouring provinces, "as it becomes." But who will a lowering of personal income tax assist, Mr. Speaker? Who will it assist? It won't assist the fellow who is making \$8,000, \$10,000, \$15,000, it will assist him maybe to the tune of \$100 if there is a drastic decrease. It will assist the fellow in the \$30,000, \$40,000, \$50,000 income bracket. But what is the net effect, Mr. Speaker? What is the net effect?

You know, Mr. Speaker, if in fact, if we reduce the income tax or we reduce the Property Tax Credit Program in this province, as stated by the Minister of Finance, we could, if we did away with it, we could reduce our income tax to the lowest anywhere in the country. If that is what they are talking about, they could easily accomplish that, Mr. Speaker. They could easily accomplish what they are talking about. They are talking about abolish the income surtax. Again, who are they talking about? The high income brackets. To remove succession duties and gift taxes, who are they talking about? The individuals who have estates in excess of a quarter-of-a-million dollars? Who are they talking about? Is this the group that they are really talking about? Who are you representing, Mr. Speaker? Who are you trying to represent? By your policies it is only evident you are only representing one group. Mr. Speaker, that is perfectly legitimate, but do not try and indicate that you are representing the average worker in this province. Mr. Speaker, the average person in this province, you are not representing him. How can you say that you will, when you effect a lowering in the income tax, that you will benefit to any great degree the person on a middle or modest income as in comparison to a person who is in the upper income bracket. Who benefits by that? Who benefited by the shift in Medicare premiums from the flat poll tax to the ability-to-pay principle on income tax? Certainly it wasn't the individual that was making \$30,000, \$40,000 a year? We realize that, that it wasn't he who benefited, because if we paid, if we charged the flat premium tax as they put it on when they were in office, we would have been able to keep our income tax rates low.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, they talk about the lowering of taxes for everyone and still continuing to do the programs and the suggestions that when they are in office, they will be able to do all these things. But, Mr. Speaker, don't let it fool anybody, because there is always a Catch-22 and even in their policies, they are at least admitting, and they say taxation in Manitoba, to proceed with tax reductions only as it becomes financially feasible as a result of savings in the operation of government and through growth in the economy. That is the key to their entire policy on taxation.

So, Mr. Speaker, while they are saying we can have great savings, they have yet to come out with alternatives as to which programs they would cut and do away with. They, even in their policy programs, said that we will increase, we want an extra board and commission dealing with energy to review the energy program; to continue to bring in another board into existence but yet they intend to make savings. They have yet to come up with concrete alternatives as to which programs they intend to cut, do away with. They don't have a policy, Mr. Speaker, they like everything that this government has done. Although they abhor the socialist group on this side they will go out to the public and say all those socialist programs are good, we will retain them, but get rid of the socialists' Mr. Speaker, just for the sake of gaining power in this province. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

**MR. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to hear the comments from the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I should like to take a few minutes of the time of this House to express some thoughts that I have on this Budget speech.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs thought he should like to take a lesson from the comments he indicated that he heard from my colleague, the Member for Lakeside. But you know, Mr. Speaker, some of the comments that I've heard from honourable gentlemen opposite, I don't think I'd like to take a lesson from anything that I've heard yet. So I want to say Mr. Speaker, that it sounds as though this is an election Budget speech.

I know, Mr. Speaker, through the question period these days, when we pose questions from this side of the House, honourable gentlemen opposite seem to have some questions they want to refer back to us. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that's as I have never experienced in this House before and I think that the Minister of Mines and Resources — and here I've said this before — is the one who I have the greatest respect for because I think he is one who is about as close to the truth, if one can use that terminology in this House, by saying that he is concerned of what is going to happen and the kind of battle he's going to have to wage in the next provincial election.

It apparently appears obvious, Mr. Speaker, from the attitude and the things that are coming from honourable gentlemen on the other side, it's obvious that they have the election jitters already. They have the election jitters already, Mr. Speaker.

But you know, Sir, I being a farmer, am concerned about our agricultural industry in this province. And you know, Sir, right today we look ahead and while we have no control — or any government has any control — of the Almighty above as to whether we are going to get rain in the next week, two weeks or two months, we do face a very serious situation. And you know, Mr. Speaker, I don't see in this Budget where this government has made any reservations for the catastrophe that could happen

in this province should our agricultural industry be faced probably — and I don't want to sound like a pessimist, Mr. Speaker, — but could possibly be one of the worst droughts that this province has ever seen, even worse than in the Thirties, and I can barely remember that.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we had — if I may just give a few figures — in 1976 our total farm expenses were \$649.5 million and in 1974 our net high income was around \$426 million; and I use those figures because according to the Budget, if I understand it or the predictions that this government was making, they estimate our income to be down from \$426 million in 1974 to about \$342 million in 1977. Mr. Speaker, this is a real concern.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs was talking about the municipal taxes and I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that in 1974 the taxes combined for the agricultural industry in the Province of Manitoba in 1974 was \$21 million. That has increased in the past year to \$31 million, an increase of about 50 percent. And you know, Mr. Speaker, there is so much discussion and they taught it, I suppose rightfully so as far as they are concerned, about the great things that the Property Credit Tax Plan are doing and the income tax assistance that is granted, they have increased that by \$25.00, and compare that increase with the increase in the property tax that farmers face in this province, is a drop in the bucket. —(Interjection)— I want to say, we have a 50 percent increase and I think the property credit tax in this past year is an increase of about eight percent if you calculate it out.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the Property Credit Tax Plan — and I'll say you can go to any town in the Province of Manitoba and it will also apply to a number of homeowners in the City of Winnipeg and all cities across this province — where their total taxes may be \$250, but the maximum goes a little higher than that. I've heard where some people when they've gone to pay their taxes — it didn't reach the maximum amount that they were allowed — so they asked the secretary if they would be receiving a cheque from the government for the difference. Of course, the secretary at the local level or the municipal level, says "No." But when that person files his income tax return he will then receive the difference between what his total taxes are, education and property, and up to the maximum amount that is allowed. So, Mr. Speaker, somebody has to pay that. Somebody has to pay that.

So there are many, I say, farmers who are business people, and you can go into any town in rural Manitoba, any any Main Street, all businesses are subject to that higher cost in taxes, because so many people — and I can understand, Mr. Speaker, where many people and particularly senior citizens shouldn't be asked to pay our educational taxes having reached retirement and have probably fulfilled their obligation of educating their children.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, it goes farther than that. Their municipal taxes are also taken care of. Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentlemen were talking and they've been goading over the Property Credit Tax Plan that they have brought in . . .

**A MEMBER:** They don't believe in any constructive criticism.

**MR. EINARSON:** . . . all I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is I just want to be fair with everyone. I believe in assisting those who can't help themselves. —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please.

**MR. EINARSON:** But you know, Mr. Speaker, they've gone they have no so far for those who are allowed to be eliminated' responsibility whatsoever and there are thousands of them across the province. But somebody has to pick up that tab. This is where I am saying, this is one of the items in our high costs in the agricultural industry.

There are a number of things that I think this government over the years have allowed to go undone, and I can think of our Department of Mines and Resources for one example. When we were government we established a policy of water control throughout this province, but in the last number of years not a thing has been done. I can think of a time when we were faced with the kind of doubt that we are faced with' I believe it would have been much better possibly if the government, instead of putting \$40 million into trying to make planes, if they had used half of that and split it up and probably dealt with some of the problems of damming our rivers and our lakes to create a water conservation program.

I am given to understand, Mr. Speaker, that a group from the southern part of the province here have recently met with the Minister of Mines and Resources, want to discuss with him now because it's an urgent situation and I understand, Mr. Speaker, again as in the past years, he has turned them down flat; has no intentions of doing anything insofar as water conservation in the central southern part of the province is concerned. I would say, Mr. Speaker, it affects all areas right from Winnipeg south to the border and all the way west to the western boundary of Manitoba-Saskatchewan.

I can think, Mr. Speaker, of the Tourism and Recreation Department, the amount of moneys that they've spent on a hotel — what is it, \$4 million, Mr. Speaker? — in a resort area. I have no objections to spending a certain amount of money insofar as our tourism is concerned, but I think, Mr. Speaker, and here I am talking about priorities — and when government established priorities as to where the money is going to be spent — and we all know that our tax dollars are limited in numbers and therefore we have to be concerned as to how that money is spent.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in the area of Public Works, and here again I think of the slogans that this government has started and is building up, it seems to me the momentum is getting greater day by day. They refer to my leader and to my colleagues as the "big liar" no matter what it is that we say. I think, Mr. Speaker, that . . . —(Interjection)— Oh well, now the Minister of Health is saying from his seat that he's accusing his own colleagues of not giving the truth. Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe we are getting the facts now, are they admitting the kind of questioning that the Member for Radisson is bringing out, that he's probably embarking upon a course that is not in an honourable fashion if they want to use that term, that the sort of attitude that this government is taking, accusing us of whatever we say, it's just not true?

Mr. Speaker, I think that when we go to the people in this province we will have our policies, we will have our figures and our facts to tell our story.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, I would suggest insofar as the agriculture industry is concerned and as far as this Budget is concerned, we can look forward to a very insignificant kind of assistance that will be forthcoming from this government should we have a serious drought. The Minister of Agriculture, if he was in his seat today, would say, well, we have a Crop Insurance Program. That is quite right but it doesn't go anywhere near covering the kind of costs that farmers face today with the increased inputs that are required to carry out a farming operation. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Resources says, "We don't like welfare." Of course we don't like welfare. We certainly don't. We are prepared to stand on our own two feet in every way possible.

Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to the Minister of Mines and Resources and his department. For instance, we will get back to water control again and what it is doing in our lakes and so on. Out in my constituency there is a government park there and revenue comes to the government from that park. We have quite a fishing attraction in that part of Manitoba. The government collects revenue through the selling of licences in order that people can come there to fish and they come from all parts of Manitoba, they come from other provinces in this country, they come from the United States and elsewhere to spend money there. Mr. Speaker, when we ask the Minister what they are prepared to do in some small way to give some assistance in that particular area, he says well, it is up to the municipalities.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the Minister that the revenues they collect that pertain to our tourist industry, that just a small part of it would be, and I think justifiably so, returned back to the people in the community from where this money was collected.

**MR. GREEN:** I would ask the honourable member if it is the policy of his government that revenue collected from the sale of licences will go back to the communities where the licences are sold and used? Is that going to be the policy of the Conservative Party when they are in power?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

**MR. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, I didn't stand up here to reply to the Budget Speech to announce the policies of the Conservative Party. That is not my job, Mr. Speaker. I am here for the purpose of creating a kind of criticism I would hope is of a constructive nature. All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is I am expressing a point of view. While the Minister of Mines and Resources never has agreed with my points of view, nevertheless, I believe, on behalf of all those people that I represent . . . —(Interjections)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. EINARSON:** . . . who spend a lot of time collecting revenue for this Provincial Government, that in the overall picture they collect X number of dollars and I believe that just a portion of it, or a fair share of it should be used to promote our lakes and so on, because that is what they are used for. I don't think that is being socialistically minded, Mr. Speaker, no way. I don't think so. Mr. Speaker, I spent four years on the government side and there was a certain amount of money that was being allocated to, say Rock Lake back in 1969. But where did it go, Mr. Speaker? Where did it go, Mr. Speaker? I suggest to you I think they must have put it in Hecla Island. I think they put it in Hecla Island, Mr. Speaker. They have done absolutely nothing.

I will follow through with a comment that their First Minister made prior to the last election, that any constituency that doesn't vote NDP, we will pretty well forget about them. This has been obvious and I can so indicate, on many occasions, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjections)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Does the Honourable Minister of Mines have a point of order?

**MR. GREEN:** On a point of privilege I want to know when and where the First Minister made a statement that any constituency that does not vote NDP can forget about it? —(Interjections)—

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to use the expressions that have been used. No such statement was ever made.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

**MR. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, you know the Minister of Mines and Resources is very technical and he wants me to quote verbatim exactly what the Minister said, the First Minister. This Minister of



Mines and Resources is very capable of standing up and twisting words around.

But what I said now, while I didn't use the exact words the First Minister used just prior to the election of 1973, a few days before, what I said, the message was exactly the same and the intent was the same. There was no difference, Mr. Speaker. You can go out into Birtle-Russell constituency and ask the people there what interpretation they got from the First Minister as far this was concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Tourism . . . I am given to understand now one of the municipalities in this province made application for some funds to develop grass greens on their golf course, lottery funds that were used for recreational purposes throughout the province. I don't have a copy of the letter, Mr. Speaker, but I am given to understand that the Minister of Tourism wrote back and replied after they had had their application on his desk for some weeks, that they are not sure that this lottery money is going to be used for recreational purposes this coming year, through the Tourism. I just merely place this, Mr. Speaker, for the record because we are going to deal with the Minister's Estimates on Tourism very shortly.

Mr. Speaker, here again I am wondering, if that is going to be the policy of this government then I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, they are going to decide where those funds are going to go. That is to say, perhaps we in the southern part of the province can write off any hopes. —(Interjection)— I don't know. No. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health asked me if that has been the case. No, that has not been the case but I am saying and I am registering now, that from a letter that they received from this Minister of Tourism, there is a possibility that that may not be the case for the coming year. Mr. Speaker, I just register that so that we are prepared for the Minister of Tourism and Recreation in his Estimates on that one item.

Another thing I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about moneys that are being allocated through the Budget for various things — and I don't want to sound so parochial — but we have an historical church in the community from where I came, the Minister of Tourism — and he is sitting in his seat right now — indicated there would be \$10,000 allocated for that church. Mr. Speaker, today not one dollar has been spent on that church, not one dollar. And the ex-Minister of Tourism knows exactly what I am talking about. —(Interjections)— It is called Grund Church.

I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, when they allocate funds and they are not spent, what happens to them? What happens to them, Mr. Speaker? I would hope that the ex-Minister of Tourism would will talk to the Minister of Tourism and give him the answer because I am going to question him on that when we deal with our Tourism Estimates.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**MR. TOUPIN:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is making reference to a commitment made by a previous Minister of the Crown and I quite recall the commitment. Would the honourable member not agree that in regard to the Facility Grants that he is talking about, whether they are used in the fiscal year mentioned or not, they are still held in trust and committed?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

**MR. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, the funds may be held in trust but that is not doing the community any good. When the government took over that facility they had an obligation and so many years have gone by and nothing has been done. Finally last year, when they said they were being allocated \$10,000 and still nothing is being done — that is my point, Mr. Speaker. People are losing hope and faith, they don't trust this government any more. They say there is \$10,000 being allocated but if nothing is done it doesn't mean a thing. This is the point I want to make, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it has been mentioned by the Minister of Municipal Affairs that we have been criticizing Autopac in this way, that we would not do away with it. Mr. Speaker, I see the Minister of Health — and I don't think this has ever been said before — and they talk about Autopac and that is fine, and what it has done for the people of this province in reducing their rates. But you know, if it hadn't of been for the Minister of Health they would never have had Autopac in Manitoba. I want to also add, God bless his soul, a colleague that used to be within our party was also part of it. But between those two people and the Minister of Health, had he not crossed the floor of the House — and I wonder if the people of Manitoba realize that, that we would never have had Autopac in the province of Manitoba because they required him in order to have a majority vote. So I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I don't blame the Minister of Mines and Resources or the First Minister or anybody; I hold the Minister of Health responsible for Autopac coming into the province of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, you know we talk and we debate about these various matters and the government having gone so far and spent so many millions of dollars in buildings, in changing the whole establishment insofar as administration is concerned, this is a tremendous undertaking. And you know when one government goes out and another administration comes in with a different political view I think it would be naive on our part to say that we're going to throw out Autopac because you just can't do it. Mr. Speaker, you just can't do it overnight. All I say and my colleagues have said we'd like to give those private insurance companies that are still left in Manitoba — if there will be any — an opportunity to offer their services and to compete. Is there anything wrong with that?

I think, Mr. Speaker, as far as Autopac is concerned, this is one thing, I think, that has to be repeated and made abundantly clear — and made abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker — that we want to allow private insurance companies to compete with our Crown corporation. I think, Mr. Speaker, that should be fair comment.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to hear the chatter on the other side of the House — and I see the Member for St. Matthews is in his seat.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. EINARSON:** He was talking about succession duties. He talked about gift taxes, how it affected the people of his constituency and compared it with the farmers of the province and probably segments of our society. And if I understood him correctly — I don't have Hansard before me — but if I understood him correctly, Mr. Speaker, he was saying that the people of his constituency, if we were to relieve people of succession duties and gift taxes, that would be a tremendous burden on the people that he represents in St. Matthews. The hard work from those people that he represents. Mr. Speaker, I take nothing from the people of the constituency of St. Matthews. If they worked hard and have been able to accumulate from their own business that they may operate, there's nothing wrong with that. But to pit the people from his constituency, say, as against mine, that's the thing I take issue with, Mr. Speaker, and that's what he was trying to do. That's the thing, Mr. Speaker, that he was trying to do. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of attitude and the kind of game that this government is going to play come the next provincial election. Mark my word on that. This is what their plans are. They are going to try to divide our city folks from the country.

All I say, Mr. Speaker, is thank goodness that beef vote went the way it did because if the Minister of Agriculture had had 77 percent in favour for his own policy, then I would suggest' Mr. Speaker, to the people opposite they couldn't get out of this place quick enough to go to the people. I say that's how important that vote was to them. Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, it went the other way.

Mr. Speaker, I've rambled a little bit here but probably I should have mentioned this when I was dealing with agriculture. But to make some final remarks insofar as this Budget is concerned and as it affects our farm people, the policies within the Department of Agriculture, many farmers have been concerned about it.

One of the areas I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, is our beef promotion program that was started back in 1975. Commendable to the Minister as it was at that time but the objection that I posed, Mr. Speaker, was that he was drawing up a five-year plan; a five-year plan and the first year was a carrot to lock them in for five years. You know, that was fine. And the Minister said that if you wanted to go into the plan and if you decided that in the second or third year you wanted to opt out they would have to pay back the grants that were made to that individual farmer plus 9 percent interest.

Now in this session we are faced with the coming up of an election. We have legislation before us, Mr. Speaker, and the legislation is complementary to the program that the Federal Government has now brought in. I think what I must say is that this government is caught in a bind. The Minister of Agriculture is now saying to those farmers who got into his program two years ago, if they want to opt out of that and join the federal program, they are not obligated to pay back that money.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell this government that I think the Minister of Mines and Resources should go out to the country and talk to some of those farmers who did not go into that program. I'll tell you right now, Mr. Speaker, they are very very unhappy because they felt that this government was not being honest with them. If the Minister of Agriculture could say that now, on behalf of his colleagues, why couldn't he say that same thing two years ago? — (Interjection) — Ah, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Resources said there was no federal program.

You know Saskatchewan had that same program, Alberta had that same program but they did not choose to establish a five-year plan. And there's a big difference, Mr. Speaker. Because this Minister of Agriculture, he thought that in the third year he was going to start to get his money back. Unfortunately, the market has not come up and he has been caught in a bind.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to register the discontent and the unhappiness of many many farmers while in the Land Lease Program. They have been involved in the buying of farm land to the tune of about \$17 million.

Here is another area; I think that if they had put that money to uses of developing our water resources, conservation of our water and damming our rivers and lakes, I think that as we are faced with a drought situation now, it probably wouldn't have been quite so bad.

Mr. Speaker, those are two things in the agricultural industry that I think that this government have done themselves a disservice by suddenly changing their plans just before an election. Mr. Speaker, having made these few comments and registering these complaints, some of them we'll be dealing with in the Estimates as they come ahead, but I, for one, am concerned that this government has done nothing in that Budget to alleviate the possibility of some very serious problems that could be forthcoming because they have not calculated the loss in revenue to the Treasury this coming year. The difficulty lies in the government that is going to succeed is taking over the reins of a bad

situation. I don't underestimate, Mr. Speaker, the real problems that will be encountered in days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the government did not see fit to put some provisions into making some reservations insofar as funds are concerned for the possibility of a serious drought situation which in turn could reduce tremendously the moneys that are going to be coming to the Treasury and some of the things they say that they are going to do, we're not sure whether we're going to be in a much worse deficit position that what they are indicating. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**MR. TOUPIN:** Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate my colleague, the Member for Seven Oaks, the Honourable Minister of Finance, for the presentation of his Budget. I believe that this proves without any doubt that in a year of constraint, and a year that can be considered, surely is being considered by the member that has just spoken as possibly a year that could be somewhat dangerous to farmers because of possible drought, that we are presenting what can be considered as a balanced Budget in regard to major programs that have been initiated over the last eight years.

I would like to pose a question, Mr. Speaker, in regard to Manitobans, a question to Manitobans pertaining to the Winnipeg Free Press. I was fortunate enough to hear the major part of the speech made by my colleague from Ste. Rose du Lac, and the speech made on the Budget Debate by the Honourable Member for Lakeside. Unfortunately, the Winnipeg Free Press found it appropriate to have a lovely picture that dated maybe seven or eight years ago of the Honourable Member for Lakeside indicating that the member had made a significant contribution to the debate in the House. I didn't see anything from the comments made by the Member for Ste. Rose. I'm wondering, you know, how free the Free Press really is in regards to informing the population of Manitoba of what is happening by means of this House.

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, definitely wanted to leave the impression with the people of Manitoba that we, as a party in government, are wanting to take from the rich to give more to the poor. That was certainly a strong point in his contribution to the Budget Debate.

I would not deny, Mr. Speaker, that the type of taxation that we've initiated over the last eight years has, in our opinion, been more equitable for all, including the poor. But if we allowed the Conservatives, Mr. Speaker, to become again the government after the next election it would not be that the administration of that day would allow funds from the rich to be given to the poor but taxes from the poor going to the rich. That's what happened prior to 1969. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition did not say that, but the mode of taxation, Mr. Speaker — and I hope I don't get to talk as loud as I did last time — but the mode of taxation that we saw in this province, Mr. Speaker, prior to 1969 caused exactly that.

Now is the Winnipeg Free Press telling the people of Manitoba that? I haven't read it although it has been said by members of this House before. That's exactly what will happen if the Conservatives — and/or the Liberals — are allowed to form the next administration in this province, is that we would take from the poor and give to those more fortunate financially. That's exactly what happened prior to 1969.

The personal taxes in this province, Mr. Speaker, yes, are higher than they were in 1969. But if we look, the personal income tax and corporate tax are higher now than they were in 1969. But they always leave aside the other taxes that were paid and payable by everyone, no matter what their income.

Again, we talk often — and the Member for Sturgeon Creek doesn't like us to go back in history, but we have to, Mr. Speaker. We have to remind Manitobans that if they allow the Conservatives to get back in office, they will have the same type of treatment. They will cause, if not a medical premium, a deterrent fee, to be installed that will cause those less fortunate to be able to pay negative taxes when they can ill-afford to pay any taxes. That is exactly what will happen.

What will the Conservative Party, God forbid, once they become the administration of this province again, do with the \$100 million that they will do away with in regard to the tax rebate plan? What will they do with \$100 million, Mr. Speaker? Have they told us? Mr. Speaker, they are on record as saying they will abolish what we consider to be a refund to those being charged sometimes higher taxes that they can ill-afford to pay on the municipal level, pertaining mainly to school taxes, that they would do away with that. The Conservative Party is on record. But what would they do with the \$100 million in question? Would they give that — (Interjections) — Mr. Speaker, I am having more trouble with my colleagues on this side of the House than I am with the opposite side.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. TOUPIN:** Who needs enemies, Mr. Speaker?

My question, Mr. Speaker, to you and to Manitobans is, what would the Conservatives do with \$100 million that is now being rebated to Manitobans whom we consider to be in need? Have they told us that? Have they told us what they would do with this \$100 million? What would they do with the millions of dollars that would actually be an additional revenue to some people pertaining to the reduction of the personal income tax and the corporation tax?

Mr. Speaker, those are a lot of questions that the people of Manitoba should be asking, what I consider to be renegades that want to get back in government, want to serve the people of Manitoba. I sometimes wonder whose freedom of choice are they talking about? Is it the freedom of choice of a few, or is it the freedom of choice of the majority? I believe that is a question that must be asked when we talk of philosophy, when we talk of delivery of service.

We have laid on the record of this House many times, Mr. Speaker, what has been accomplished since 1969. We indicated prior to the election of 1969 what we felt had to be done. It is done. Things that we talked about on the platform in 1969, 1973, are done.

I can recall — and I have lived in this province since 1934 — I can recall for a period of eleven years the Conservatives were promising to build a road. And I can remember pegs going up at every election on the road. I don't know if they used the same pegs, but there were pegs being put on that road every election, Mr. Speaker, and the road was not resurfaced until 1970. Why? 1970. We didn't promise it in the election of 1969, because I was the MLA for the area. We didn't promise a road, but the road was redone, reconstructed, and paved. The pegs were transferred to Lakeside, I suppose. — (Interjections) —

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. TOUPIN:** Mr. Speaker, I would not want to leave on the record that I am intending to congratulate only the Minister of Finance for his Budget speech. I would like to congratulate the organization that has put out a slip-in, I guess they call it, a paper, I believe it was in the Winnipeg Tribune, a supplement from the Salvation Army. I think it is well presented, very well done, and I would like to congratulate the Salvation Army for the work done over the years. I was honoured to be able to work with them for approximately four-and-a-half years when I was in Health and Social Development, and in my humble opinion they are really wanting to help those most in need, and it is not always easy. But there are certain figures here that are being quoted by the writer that I think are very significant and should be considered. I quote on Page 5 of the given pamphlet, "The poorest 20 percent of Canadians share only 4.4 percent of Canada's money income. The wealthiest, 20 percent of Canadians share 42.2 percent."

Now that is staggering. And it is quoted here, Mr. Speaker, that "Despite," — and they are not necessarily talking here of Manitoba, "Despite government efforts to redistribute wealth more equitably, the family income of the poorest 20 percent of Canadians fell by seven percent only between 1969 and 1974." Now is that applicable across Canada? I would be led to believe that it is, based on this data. It would be worse, certainly, in some provinces where they have decided by policy of government to have more negative taxes than others. I consider the personal and corporate tax as being the most progressive way of taxing people because it is based on the ability of people of paying taxes.

More negative, but less negative than the Medicare premium, is the sales tax. I find the Medicare premium as being one of the most negative taxes that could be. I think this is an article that Manitobans should consider, especially at a time when an election is pending, whether it be in the next few months or in the next year or so. I think it is very important that Manitobans have the type of administration in government that will reflect a more equitable way of taxing people and in offering the type of services that are needed by people in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I am very tempted to enumerate again, because sometimes we have to kick people in the behind more often than others for them to understand who is actually being kicked and who is kicking. I think that is the case in regard to some of the members of the opposition, pertaining to what was attempted to be accomplished in the last eight years.

I would like, apart from the content of the Budget Debate, Mr. Speaker, to talk a bit of my own constituency in this debate. I represent what I consider to be a constituency which is average in this province, and even above average financially, in regard to some of the problems and some of the needs that are expressed to me and expressed to other levels of government. In the last few months, Mr. Speaker, there has been an accrued interest in agonizing declarations made by constituents of mine in the Springfield-Transcona School Division. I am not intending by means of this House or publicly outside of this House to blame the teachers, blame the trustees or blame the employees of the school division itself, but I am wanting to impress upon those given certain responsibility in the Springfield-Transcona School Division that there has to be, in my humble opinion, a closer relationship between parents and teachers in the Transcona-Springfield School Division. And here I include certainly the school trustees and the parents. I am not in a position to judge what is happening and the reasons why it is happening or not happening pertaining to the level of education and the quality of education in Springfield itself, but I am wanting a better forum of communication, if possible, between the trustees, the teachers and the parents concerned. I have had representation mainly from the Anola-Vivian area of my constituency, although I have talked with a lot of people in Oakbank-Dugald. I have not discussed the problem with parents and teachers in Transcona itself, but I have in my own constituency. And if there is a recommendation that I could make, it would be for the school trustees, the teachers and the parents to reactivate what was once known as being quite

acceptable in a time where I served as a school trustee for a period of approximately ten years, to have the Home and School Association work much closer together. This is obviously not happening to the degree that the parents are finding it desirable in the Anola area.

I don't see this, Mr. Speaker, as a problem that relates to the Department of Education. I see it as a problem that has to be looked at and hopefully solved by the local authorities, being the trustees of the Transcona-Springfield School Division.

I have had several meetings with parents with children involved because I do speak at a lot of schools, and here again I say that I am not wanting to express any criticism on the part of those elected at the school board level or those that are given appointments to teach our children in Transcona-Springfield, but only that a closer liaison should exist between those two levels. — (Interjections)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. TOUPIN:** Mr. Speaker, we are often told, but I guess we don't often realize, that one day we will be accountable not only for the words that we have expressed, but for the silence that we have actually caused to happen within ourselves. And that is very important to realize for members of the House that have difficulty in keeping silent and what they think of others when they are silent. And that is something that I or they can't judge. That is something that is being judged by stronger powers than we represent in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reflect more closely on some of the programs that are reflected within the Budget before us. We have been criticised for presenting a budget that is not considered to be dealing with some of the possible problems that we face today, one being drought, as expressed by the Member for Birtle-Russell. Drought is something that we can't predict, no more so than we can predict, say, a flood for next spring, and is something that would have to be dealt with on an emergency basis. And the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, who sat in the previous administration while they were in government, well knows that. And if he doesn't want to put it on the record, he knows that back in the 1950s, back in 1969 when we did experience, and 1966 when we experienced floods in the province of Manitoba, that his government of the day dealt with the problem not by forecasting within a predicted budget but by dealing with a Special Warrant and having it shared with the other level of government. So we can't include within the Budget, Mr. Speaker, what we don't really know will happen. I was sitting in my yard this morning at six o'clock admiring nature and a few drops of rain fell down.

**A MEMBER:** Before you went to bed.

**MR. TOUPIN:** No. You know, who can tell if we're going to get precipitation in the next few months that will be beneficial for farmers. So what I'm really telling the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell is that problem, if it occurs, will have to be dealt with by government by means of a Special Warrant, a special bill that will raise funds in this House.

The Minister of Finance indicated that, in regard to an additional program dealing with unemployment, that this would be brought forward later on and he made a commitment in regard to job creation and that will be announced by the Minister of Finance. It is a problem not necessarily caused by Manitoba alone but is reflected all across Canada and the United States. It's caused in part by — not that I want to criticize or pass blame to the Federal Government — but by measures that they have taken in the last few months, they've caused this province to lose approximately \$10 million in revenue and that's created some problems for this province and we've told them that. They haven't rectified it. We're hoping that that level of government that can deal with approximately a million unemployed in Canada, will come forward very shortly with a program to stimulate employment in Canada. That has to be done by what we figure to be a level of government more capable than we are. We're willing to take our responsibilities — I believe that we have over the years — but we feel and we've said this on and on, that the Federal Government should not cause unemployment but should take ways and means of launching into the economy the funds that are needed for individuals to become more productive.

I'd like to make reference to a pamphlet that was sent to me in the last few days by a Member of Parliament, the Honourable David Orlikow, MP for Winnipeg North, and he quotes some of the unemployment problems in Canada and some of the possible solutions that should be initiated by the Federal Government. The only reason, Mr. Speaker, that I discuss this in this House is that whatever is done or not done by the Federal Government has a definite reflection on what has to be done or not done by this level of government here. Mr. Orlikow, and I quote, indicates, "I believe that in order to deal with the problems we face of an increasing cost of living and uncontrollably high rate of unemployment, the Budget should have, first of all, cut personal income tax for people in the lower and middle income brackets. Unemployment is caused by the fact that people simply cannot afford to purchase the goods produced by Canadian companies and a tax cut to the people in the lower and middle income brackets would have provided them with money to purchase the things they need." Now he's talking of an incentive to people, not necessarily to businesses but to people that will cause businesses to flourish.

Secondly, Mr. Orlikow indicates, "The Federal Government should provide for real direct job creation. A hundred million, which the Minister of Finance in Ottawa proposed for job creation, will at best create 50,000 jobs, when there is approximately a million unemployed in Canada. While the Minister could find only \$100,000,000 for job creation, he cut corporation taxes by \$1.1 billion and \$100,000,000 for direct job creation." He indicates here that since Mr. Trudeau became Prime Minister we have already cut corporation taxes by \$6 billion and during this period unemployment has almost doubled in Canada.

According to most, incentives to corporations will not persuade them to expand their production and hire more people. Canadian factories are only working at 80 percent capacity. They have not been able to keep their plants working at full capacity so that they will not likely expand their capacity because of incentives. He says, "I believe that the billion dollars concession given to corporations should have been allocated to public housing and home insulation, to mention just a few.

In 1971-72 when the rate of unemployment was one-third less than it is now, the Federal Government allocated \$500'000,000 to a capital works program under which municipalities were able to expand sewer and water facilities, build recreational centres, improve hospitals and senior citizens housing. Today he indicates there is nothing for capital works in the Budget. He says that during the 1974 election campaign promises were made by the Prime Minister that a Liberal government would give to the provinces and municipalities \$290 million to improve and expand urban transit systems. The government has reneged on these promises completely. There is nothing in the Budget to meet these needs even though the government preaches about the necessity to conserve energy.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to indicate the lack of action by the Federal Government that will necessitate action to be taken by this level of government that we at this time can ill afford but obviously this will have to be done pertaining to the number and the percentage of unemployed people that we have in this province. We feel that full employment is needed in regard to, first of all, have people that are able and willing to work have the pride and incentive to do so, that we should offer them as many options as possible. We should, on the other hand, for those that can't work because of ill health, supply them with the basic needs and development needed to live as decent human beings.

I would like to make a correction Mr. Speaker. A while ago I mentioned the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell and it should have been the Honourable Member for Rock Lake. I'm sorry to the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be able to have a reflection, apart from criticism, knowing that criticism is one of the responsibilities of the Members of the Opposition. I would like the members of the Opposition, if possible, add another part of their responsibility in presenting constructive suggestions pertaining to what would happen pertaining to their alternative, if there is a change to their strategy as it would be in the future as we've experienced in the past. Up till now I've heard a lot of criticism, which I say is a responsibility of the Opposition, constructive criticism, but I haven't heard any constructive strategies for the future as an alternative. We talk about alleged problems pertaining to allocation of construction works on Hydro being excessive, we hear from the opposition in regard to problems that they see in the housing stock in the province of Manitoba, in measures that are contemplated by some of our Crown corporations, one being the Manitoba Telephone System, but yet we don't hear from them constructive suggestions of what could be done. And I see that as being a responsibility of the opposition party. I see our responsibility as attempting to govern the province to the best of our ability, and whenever possible to take advantage of, first of all, constructive criticism, and secondly, to try and take advantage of recommendations that are made from members of the opposition, and from the people of Manitoba. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that we've heard a lot of negative criticism, we've heard some constructive criticism, but very few constructive alternatives that are presented to us, that could be considered for implementation.

So this is an invitation to certainly the Conservative Party, I can't indicate that criticism to the members of the Liberal Party, because in regards to the problem of housing in this province, we've had suggestions made by the Liberal Party, by the spokesman of the Liberal Party pertaining to Housing, that in my humble opinion can certainly be considered in regards to augmenting the stock of housing, enabling us to rectify some of the problems that we have pertaining to those less able to satisfy their needs in the low and middle income brackets. That's a responsibility not only of MHRC like I indicated on the Budget debate, but a responsibility of the three sectors in society in regards to construction of adequate housing, being the public, the private, and the co-operative sector. And not only in regards to construction of new housing, but the rehabilitation of the existing stock itself, and hopefully that all three of us can address ourselves to this ongoing problem. Causing a home, causing an apartment block to be demolished, when there is an assurance that it could be renovated and brought up to standards acceptable to the Fire Commissioner and those intending to lease, I believe should be allowed to happen, based on incentives, not necessarily to the owners, but on incentives to those that are intending to make use of these facilities.

That, Mr. Speaker, . . . has been the motto, and I hope I won't have to translate that word, has

been the motto of this government in the last eight years in regards to helping those that are mostly in need in this province although I don't believe, and if you look at the tables presented in the budget, I could quote them, if you compare all taxes in this province with other provinces in Canada, say anything below \$50'000 and less, we don't compare that badly. For those making more than \$50,000 net revenue a year in the Province of Manitoba, as compared to say Ontario, they may have a slight advantage in having the type of administration as they have in Ontario — not that much, but a slight advantage. But anything below \$50,000 in net revenue, taking all taxes into consideration, if I made that type of salary, I'd still want to stay at home, in the Province of Manitoba. If I made, Mr. Speaker, that much more, and I did meet over the weekend a friend of mine that makes much more, he's considered to be a millionaire and he knows that in Manitoba he's paying much more taxes. The only real complaint that he had in regards to our philosophy in taxing people was based on the succession duty itself. So I talked about the revision to succession duty in the Province of Manitoba, and how this would be applicable to his spouse and children, and I can't say that he was totally satisfied, because unfortunately a lot of people that do have in society, want more. And if we recognize that, I think we have to respect it, but not necessarily, agree. We're friends, we're not necessarily buddies in regards to our basic philosophy. I hope that I never become so wanting that I'm not willing to share the additional revenue that I may be blessed with in the future.

I happen to believe, Mr. Speaker, again when I talk about some basic responsibilities that I've had in life, I was involved by choice in a movement that resembled a lot our philosophy in regards to sharing with other people being the co-operative movement. I received a lot through the co-operative movement, namely the Credit Union movement, and I felt that the day that I had a few dollars of my own, they helped me start in life, but the day that I had a few dollars of my own, that I'd attempt to help others that didn't have. And that's to some degree happening today, and I think anyone that is able to contribute more to society, because of his ability, whether they be physical or mental, that that person should be able to one day have the type of sharing, sharing of responsibilities, sharing of revenue with those less fortunate, for whatever reason.

Well unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I hear the Member for Radisson ask if members on the other side of the House would do that. I don't have to pose myself that question, Mr. Speaker, because I know that they didn't and I know that they haven't expressed a desire to do differently. I know that. The only thing that I do know, Mr. Speaker, is based on the history, history of at least 11 years that I can recall vividly, and based on a philosophy that is right close to ours, being Ontario, and another philosophy which is not too far away, being Alberta. And I know what type of say, programs, what type of taxes that would be implemented if they ever became again the government. Even though, Mr. Speaker, that they've said that if they became the government, that Autopac, you know, is not too bad, you know we may even decide to keep it. They even say that Medicare, Medicare that they're going to keep that, and I believe, and I hope they correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe that they said that if they became the government again, the people of Manitoba allowed them to become government again, that they wouldn't even have Medicare premiums. I believe they said that. I believe they said that they wouldn't have Medicare premiums.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member has five minutes.

**MR. TOUPIN:** Today, Mr. Speaker, Medicare premiums are worth I'd say roughly, \$90 million, about \$90 million at the rate that they had it, which was. . . —(Interjection)— no, it was more than that. I'd say \$90 million. Mr. Speaker, back in 1969, back in 1969, they had \$17.00 a month, \$204.00 a year per family. Now you take that at the rate, you know that would pay today, I'd say roughly \$90 million — I may be off. Now you know, that's a lot of money, but they say, Mr. Speaker, that they wouldn't impose Medicare premiums, but how about a deterrent fee, what are they going to do with that? They've expressed views on that in the past, but they haven't lately. Would they cause a person, because he or she is ill for a longer period of time in an acute hospital bed to pay a deterrent after a period of days, or would they charge that person board and room? Now you know, they haven't said that, but if they're going to allow the personal income tax and the corporation tax to be lowered, which I'd say they are more or less committed to, they'll have to get the funds someplace. I say, Mr. Speaker, that they'll do what they did before. They won't do what we are being accused by the Leader of the Opposition of doing, in taking from the rich and giving to the poor. They're going to take from the poor to give to the rich like they did, Mr. Speaker, prior to 1969, and we can prove that — that's on the record.

Why would they change, Mr. Speaker. I say that they will not change because that is their basic philosophy, it has been, it is in Ontario, and it is in Alberta. I say that the personal income tax that we have in the Province of Manitoba today, the corporation tax that we have today, is based on the ability of the individual citizen to pay that tax, and that's the way it should be. That's the way it should be. —(Interjection)— That's very significant of the Conservatives, if they can't make points in regards to their own strategy, in regards to their own philosophy, they become personal. The Honourable Member for Brandon said, "we wouldn't take from Girl Guides" — that's all they can do. That's all I got from the opposition member in my own constituency in 1973. I don't bother, Mr. Speaker, dealing

**Wednesday, April 27, 1977**

---

with personalities. I want to deal with what their philosophy is, and what the people of Manitoba can expect. in 1973. I don't bother, Mr. Speaker, dealing with personalities. I want to deal with what their philosophy is and what the people of Manitoba can expect. Again, I say, God forbid they again become the government of this province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that the debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House adjourned until 2:30 p.m. Thursday.