

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8 p.m. Thursday, April 22, 1976

BUDGET DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I had taken the adjournment before the supper hour and I just wanted to add my comments to the Budget Debate.

Before touching on the Budget items that I wish to comment on, I want to comment briefly on the remarks of the Honourable the Attorney-General before we adjourned, whereby he was quoting from newspaper articles. I found it rather amusing because we hear so often from that side they don't believe anything that's in the newspaper anyways, so I found it a little odd that he was taking that particular opportunity to quote us. He was suggesting, and we get the comment from that side many times of using scare tactics, or whatever they accuse us of, and I don't think there is any more scare tactic has been used than what the Honourable the Attorney-General was trying to infer in his remarks that the Conservative Party was going to abolish medicare. I think that that's absolute nonsense and it certainly should be stated as such because when they start believing all the items that are in the newspapers it will become some source of comfort to the newspapers at least.

I would also like to comment again on the item appearing recently attributed to the Premier, whereby he made the remark that he would strive to see income levels brought in line, whereby the boss would make no more than 2-1/2 times the lowest paid employee. I would find that very hard to support, Mr. Speaker. I think if that is gaining some popularity in the Scandinavian countries, that's fine and good; if somebody wants to live that way they can join those countries and achieve that goal or that aim of social justice, whatever it is that the Premier is trying to get at, but if . . .

A MEMBER: Permit a question?

MR. BLAKE: When I'm finished, certainly. If that is the aim of this particular government, I think that should be spelled out, and I think they should spell out some other points of interest also in comments like that. If it happens to be a chap who is in business and has invested all of his resources in that particular business hoping to make a fairly good profit or a fairly good return on his investment, if he should happen to fall on bad years and go into bankruptcy, I wonder if the lowest paid employees on his staff might share the losses of his company as well as picking up some of the results of his efforts profit-wise. I would find that very very hard to support, Mr. Speaker. If that's the aim of this particular government, I think they should spell it out a little louder and a little clearer so that the people will just know exactly what we're heading for with an NDP administration for an additional term of office in the Province of Manitoba.

I would like to comment also on the statements that have been made about us following the spending habits of other Tory governments in other provinces, or not following the spending habits of other Tory governments. I think we're concerned with Manitoba on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, and certainly we're concerned with the rest of Canada, but we're mainly concerned with the problems of Manitoba. I don't particularly have that great a concern of what the Tories in the other provinces are doing. I haven't had time to associate with them. I don't know if I were in Nova Scotia or Ontario whether I would be a Tory, or, God forbid, I may be a Liberal if I were living in those provinces, I don't know. But I'm living in Manitoba and I'm a Conservative and I'm concerned with what the Conservatives do and what we do in Manitoba, and I'm not really concerned with what happens in India or Portugal, or wherever it is that the Attorney-General was comparing us with just before the supper hour, because we're not following the leads of other countries, hopefully, or with other governments, we're concerned with Manitoba. We do get concerned with this province when we find that there is maybe more out-migration than there is increase in our population, and when we look at some of the figures without the government capital spending, I'm afraid that this province would be fairly well stagnant and if they weren't hiring continually more and more civil servants we may have a greater unemployment problem also.

BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. BLAKE cont'd)

The big concern I think with more and more people all the time, Mr. Speaker, is with too much government at all levels and we hear of the share of taxes that this government is giving back to the municipalities, and that's all fine they certainly need the money, and if they're giving them these taxes to operate on, that's all well and good, but at the same time they're giving them this money to operate on they've cut their authority down over the years to the point where the municipal bodies can't really do too much without coming back to the government and saying is it all right to do it? I just think an awful lot of people are becoming frustrated at the local government level and hopefully there will be some move to rectify this and give the local bodies the authority that they require to work out some of their problems. It's been a tendency over the past few years I think to try and spend our way into prosperity. I don't want to get into quotations of famous economists and what not - I leave that to the Minister of Mines because he does it so capably - but I think there is a tendency and a growing tendency I think more and more to resurrect old Adam Smith maybe and just take another look at him, maybe all of the philosophies and economic theories he had weren't all that bad --(Interjection)-- Only parts of him unfortunately. He maybe should be dusted off, and maybe all governments can take a look at some of his philosophies and with some of the other new innovations that have come up with other economists over they years hopefully get a policy that is going to give us a better way of life which I think we want for all Manitobans.

But one of the big things I think, Mr. Speaker, in government spending is to put maybe some more priorities on what we're spending money for, particularly one item that comes to my mind in the Province of Manitoba is highways. The highway's budget hasn't gone up that much. If we're going to tax people, if we're going to take another \$40 or \$50 million from people that maybe we don't really need, there's an area there that people are maybe saying, if you're going to tax us let's have some more highways, or let's have some more improvements in the roads that we've got. I don't really think that's the case today. I think your highway system is falling into some sort of dis-repair. I know the Member for Arthur strongly states that in his questions very often, and it's becoming pretty evident with a lot of the rural people that we meet and talk to in our rounds around the constituency.

When we speak of government spending and ways to curtail it; what would we do if we were in government, Mr. Speaker? I think there are many many things that we would do and we would do differently, and I interjected once this afternoon that we would cut a lot of the fat from government and there are many ways. The Minister of Health has stated that he thinks probably there is areas where it could be cut. Maybe they have too many employees, maybe they have too many cars, and he's not all that much against deterreny of some type of conversations I've had with him. Much as it may be great election stuff to say that we're going to bring in a deterrent fee, and we're going to bring back hospital premiums, but I don't think in this day and age that that's going to bother us too much, Mr. Speaker. One example comes to mind on a highway that I travel every week going home to my constituency - and we'll be questioning the Minister on that when we get into his Estimates - is on Highway No. 4 they were going to build three bridges this past winter, or replace three bridges. They built the small detour around the area, which is only two or three hundred yards, but they got one bridge built in January. Consequently with the spring run-off they've had to tear down all of those by-passes that have been built to let six or eight or ten feet of water through, which was a complete and absolute waste of money. Now, I don't know what the cost was - we'll find that out when we get into the Minister's Estimates but it's things like that that I think the average taxpayer, who drives up and down the road and sees something like that, and it makes him pretty darn furious, because his municipal taxes keep going up, and the government keeps taking a further bite out of it, and it's pretty annoying to him.

But, Mr. Speaker, on the question of the Budget that we've heard many many speeches on and certainly some excellent contributions. I didn't find the Budget all that exciting. A billion and a hundred and seventy-six million dollars is going to be spent, which is probably up 15 or 16 percent. I don't really call that holding the line. We

BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) have some capital spending to come in yet, then it may even increase to roughly 18 percent. They're planning for a deficit of around 13 million or better. But, Mr. Speaker, that depends on probably to a great extent on the tax sharing setup from Ottawa under the Revenue Guarantee Act and there has been some speculation that this could be considerably less than has been projected or has been expected.

Now, if this should come up 50 million, or whatever figure you want to take out of the air, if it should come up that much less than is anticipated, the province could be in for a pretty large deficit, and it probably could point to some serious trouble in their future plans. Because all this Budget did in the new taxes that they brought out was scrape little areas together. Their getting a little bit of money here, and a little bit of money there, and gathering it up from all little nooks and crannies wherever they can stand another little bit of tax. The philosophy, Mr. Speaker, of soaking the rich, and the ability-to-pay principle, soak those who have the ability to pay, is all well and good to a point - I think everyone has the ability to pay a little bit more if they have to, there is no question about that - but there has to be a good and valid reason on why you're asking them to pay more. And it's been stated here many many times of the Budget, the last time the Conservatives were in government and what it is today, and it's gone up four or five times, and are you getting four or five times as many services? I don't know. Under the previous Conservative administration with the \$350 million Budget or \$360 million, whatever it was, they were building a \$60 or \$70 million flood-way; they were building a \$40 million diversion, that has been proven to be worth every dollar they've spent on it. They did all this on a 300 and some odd million dollar budget, plus building roads, hospitals and schools.

These things, Mr. Speaker, are the questions that are going to have to be answered. Are we getting that much more value for our tax dollar today than we were then? Deficit financing was pretty popular at all government levels a few year ago, but I think that theory has kind of been blown out the window, that people have got to start taking another look and start preaching restraint. We're hearing it more and more all the time. I think Ontario is certainly taking a look at restraint and our sister province to the west, Saskatchewan, is certainly starting to preach restraint. And I think that theme is becoming more and more popular because it's been amply demonstrated, Mr. Speaker, those that provide the largest percent of the taxes, those earning less than \$15,000 are providing two thirds of the tax base. And this is extremely important. These are the people who are being taxed, and taxed and taxed, and they're being asked to pay little bits more here and little bits more there.

I think, being a rural representative, the earnings in rural areas are probably somewhat lower than in the city. Their entertainment is naturally lower, but their motor vehicle is very important to them because they travel to shop, and they travel to the neighbouring communities that are a larger size. And we get onto the small amount that's being raised on registration of weighted vehicles. Trucks are certainly popular in the rural areas - there's another ten percent going on them. These costs are all funnelling back down to that middle-income earner that's carrying the major portion of the tax load already. And certainly the small man that has a family of several children, a station wagon is one of the most convenient methods of running his family around and he's going to be asked to pay another \$50.00 or \$75.00 to register that vehicle that he may have saved and saved for the last few years to buy. He'll pay another \$50.00 or \$75.00 on a station wagon probably - I don't know what the weights are going to be. But that's pretty important to him, Mr. Speaker, because I have some of my neighbours that are earning \$10,000, \$12,000 a year, and they find that they have to budget very closely even to meet their insurance premiums, that those on that side of the House would have us believe are so drastically low that they are practically giving them insurance for nothing. But all of these things just add one more little tax to the small wage earner, who is already, as I say, carrying the major portion of the tax load.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. BLAKE: These are the people, Mr. Speaker, that enjoy a bottle of beer. They'll be watching the hockey game tonight with a dozen pints probably, and a neighbour

BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) in, and you're going to get another few cents from them on this. To many people this is their entertainment. They take their wife or their girl friend and they go up to the local public house on Saturday night and they sit and spend a few dollars. This is their entertainment. Now you're going to have to hook them for another nickel a drink, or whatever, and it's not that much. You're not going to stop them from drinking. We all know that tobacco and liquor are bad for us, but that's beside the point. People are going to continue to do it, and you're getting at the smaller man. The fellow that's making \$20,000 or \$30,000 a year or the wealthy businessman can afford it. You're not going to hit him another ten cents a drink. You'll catch the little guy, the same as the bingo games and the lottery games get them. --(Interjection)-- They're the ones they're after.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. BLAKE: Soaking the rich, Mr. Speaker, is just not going to wash all that well. It might look good, but it's really not covering the problem. The little man is paying the bill and he's not getting any municipal tax relief. Inflation is catching him. The cost of living is up again another 10 percent. His hydro costs are up, and he's starting to find now that keeping his house this year is costing him probably several hundred dollars more than it cost him a couple of years ago, with his municipal tax increase, his hydro rates, his 10 or 20 percent in the last couple of years for his groceries, and various other costs. The cost of operating his small home is going up and up every year and he's not getting that much value from his tax dollar to really make him that enthusiastic.

I think another area that should be commented on, Mr. Speaker, in the Budget is the corporate tax increase which now federal-provincial accounts for about 51 percent, and I'm certainly not holding a torch for the corporations but I certainly think they have to be treated fairly, and I'll refer probably to the mining companies that our friends from the north, Thompson and Flin Flon, continue to bad mouth every time they get a chance to speak. I think those companies deserve a little better than that and possibly they should have been contributing a little more of their tax dollar over the years. I think there was certainly a simple formula to do that, to accomplish that end, without killing the goose that laid the golden egg, so to speak. And that's what I think is happening because we hear indications coming from them that exploration will probably cease, especially some of the exploration that's been carried on a 50-50 basis, because apparently the 50 percent share that the government's supposed to be paying, they haven't been paying their bills. At least that's the last report that I heard on the radio from one of the mining companies in the north.

But I think they're prepared to pay a fair share of the tax load. There's no question about it that there has to be an incentive to develop those mines because mining is a gamble and it takes large risks of money, and I think the mining industry in spite of the things that they haven't done right or the things that we want to criticize them for, they have done an awful lot to develop our north. I think they deserve some credit where credit is due and not continual criticism such as we hear so often when members opposite are so gleefully or so ready to pounce on a corporation because they've made a profit. Well we all know what happens when companies don't make a profit. They're not around and there's no jobs so the incentive to develop and provide jobs has got to be there and it's got to be there through profit, the old carrot method. This government, Mr. Speaker, not only do they take away the carrot, they don't even give them the stick. So the healthy climate for growth and development has got to be one of the responsibilities of government. It doesn't seem to be so now. There are so many jitters around with what's happened in Saskatchewan with the potash industry that I don't think, until that climate is improved, I don't think we're going to see much development in the mining industry in Manitoba. I think it's so important because I feel there's a tremendous wealth in the north and it's got to be developed and I don't think the government is capable of doing it, whether they do it by themselves or whether they do it on a 50-50 basis or just how they do it. I don't think governments are capable of developing it.

Mr. Speaker, the healthy climate that I mentioned earlier is completely

BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) necessary. In order to see our north grow and prosper, in the other sections of the province there has to be a confidence restored in the people that they're happy to do business here and they'll only do that when they know that they can get a just return. There's an article in yesterday's paper that the personal savings at Canadian chartered banks have doubled since 1970 to \$33.2 billion. Now, Mr. Speaker, that augers well for the thrift and the attitude of the Canadian depositor and it shows that he has a little nest egg put away. But Mr. Speaker, these are the funds that have helped develop the country, be it in small business, be it in mining, whether they're buying shares or whether they're lending money to a neighbour to develop a small manufacturing plant or whatever. These are the dollars that built this country up to now and will continue to build it and continue to make it grow and prosper.

Now they're not going to take that money and invest it unless they can get a fair return on the risk that they're taking. If they can leave it sitting in the bank or a trust company or credit union at 10 percent, or even in government bonds at 10 percent or 9-3/4, they're not going to take that money and lend it to the three young men in town that want to build a small manufacturing plant or whatever. But if the right climate is created and they can see that they can make 15 percent possibly with some good fortune on their investment, they're likely to take a bit of a gamble where they're running the risk of losing the whole works but they're running the risk of making a little better interest than they can get by leaving it sit gathering interest in a depository or a safe bond investment. There's no question about it in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that they will not invest in the housing industry or the manufacturing industry in any way shape or form unless they can be reasonably sure of a good return.

That can only be created by government because that's what makes things tick in the country, Mr. Speaker, and people want to go where the action is. If there's lots of development and lots of movement and lots of chance for investment and a chance of good return on their investment, that's where people are going to go to invest their money and take part in and enjoy some of that particular growth. Lots of jobs for young people, Mr. Speaker, and that's one of the concerns we hear so much about today that we've got to have jobs for the young people.

So the old theme that was handed down in the Budget of soaking the rich just isn't going to work forever, Mr. Speaker. There's only so much that you can take and if you took all the money from the so-called rich people in Manitoba you wouldn't have enough to last this government too long. But, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned some of the areas that concern me when people see money being wasted or frittered away, or they accuse government of it, and these are the things that I think the government has to take steps to rectify if they want to maintain the confidence of the people.

I want to get parochial for a moment before I finish my remarks, Mr. Speaker. An example of that happened in my constituency. We have an elderly persons' home in Minnedosa, a six-storey high rise, which is pretty big stuff for a small country town. That was built in 1972, Mr. Speaker, at a cost of \$643,530, and I believe there's some cents on there, I'm not sure. Federal funds, 7-1/2 percent interest, which sounds like a pretty good deal. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose had the honour of coming down and cutting the ribbon at that fine edifice.

MR. ENNS: Mind you, not as good as the old member, but a fine member.

MR. BLAKE: I noticed he didn't give the Federal Government too much credit for all the money they put up there but the Manitoba Government got the credit for instituting it. --(Interjection)-- That's right. But, Mr. Speaker, what I want to say is that particular building, there's 56 suites in it. The contractor that built it is now out of business, the stone mason who did all the masonry work is now out of business. Every time it rains the rain pours in those suites and the elderly couples and the single elderly people living in there are just having a terrible time. They mop up five to six pails of water off the floors, they have to roll up their rugs and it's ruining the drapes, it's ruining the walls. --(Interjection)-- We all know on a stone building like that, Mr. Speaker, in the climate that we have in Manitoba that it won't be very long before that water gets in behind the masonry work and it will freeze in

BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) November, or December and in a few years that building is going to crumble and be a complete wreck. I don't know how long the suites inside, the painting and what-not, the tiling on the floor, how long it's going to stand up under what's going on right now. My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that the architect that designed it - and this isn't the only one that they're having trouble with. I phoned the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation Monday when I came in after inspecting these suites on Sunday and I was just surprised at the trouble. They were phoning me last week and telling me that water was coming in and I thought there was some small amount of water running in their window or something and it just amazed me, the amount of water that's pouring in there. I phoned Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation and they tell me that's not the only one, there's one at 185 Smith Street - I wrote an address down somewhere - there's two or three in Winnipeg where they're having the same problem.

Now what I want to know, Mr. Speaker, is did the same architect them because the one out in our area, the architect must have been out to lunch when he designed the plumbing set-up because he has all the pipes on the outside of a concrete wall in the basement. When they back-filled it they broke some of the pipes, then they had to jack hammer a hole in the concrete wall to get at the pipes to fix them. When they got that done they sealed it up again with concrete instead of having some way to get at the pipe. The last one, the building manager said just bolt a plywood sheet over it because we might have to get in there again. This particular problem has been looked at, Mr. Speaker. It's required now to get another stone mason to drill drain holes in all of these concrete blocks to allow the water to drain out and they have to be very careful that they don't hit the flashing that's there. If they drill a hole through the flashing they've got a bigger problem.

Now there was a government inspector on that building, Mr. Speaker. There has been no water-proofing put on there; there was no coatings of water proofing or anything put on there. These repairs are going to cost in the neighbourhood \$15,000, that's the figure I got from Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation today, Mr. Speaker. Now God knows how much the repairs are going to cost on the ones in Winnipeg here because they've got to be an awful lot bigger than ours. These are the things that the little taxpayer sees going on and unfortunately he doesn't see enough of it. These things are going on without the taxpayer knowing it. I think it's a responsibility the government has to face up to and with all the song and dance we hear about the massive elderly persons' housing and all that that's going on and we know it's necessary, but let's not waste the money on it. Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation put out the contracts, Mr. Speaker. I think they accept proposals. I think that's what they call it now; they don't call for bids or tenders, they call it accepting a proposal. When they get a proposal for a building like this they have to have an inspector on the job and I just don't know what he was doing why the silicone treatments haven't been put on two years ago because the building was built in 1972 and it's now 1975. --(Interjection)-- A fellow named Radford from Neepawa or somewhere. The stone mason, where he came from I don't know but it wasn't the same one that did the buildings here in Winnipeg. They both took their training at the same trade school by the look of it, Mr. Speaker.

Apart from the damage done to the suites or the floor coverings or the personal belongings of the people in those suites, Mr. Speaker, the worry and the consternation of the elderly people is what concerns me. They moved into those little suites and they're very very happy. The accommodation is necessary we know and they are happy to have it but when you undertake a \$650,000 building like that surely it's worth the extra few thousand dollars or whatever is required to make sure that it's constructed properly because this is a real bad situation. The frustration and the worry that these people are going through not knowing if it's going to rain tonight, whether to roll all the carpets up before they go to bed or to pull the bed away from the wall in case it rains during the night. I mean that's a pretty tough thing to live with, you know. Just imagine yourself getting ready for bed and saying now I wonder if

BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) I should move the bed over in case it's going to come through the roof tonight or should I sleep in the kitchen, that's the only dry place in the house. --(Interjection)-- The candles I think will keep going. But, Mr. Speaker, those conditions exist not only in my constituency but in the others.

These are some of the problems with big government and big brother trying to take care of everyone from the cradle to the grave. There are many many things, Mr. Speaker, that I think the people still like to do for themselves. They still feel that they can manage their affairs and they can handle their money better than the government has and the more money that the government can leave in their pockets the more money that they are going to have to do all the things that they want to do and not have to accept everything down the road like a herd of sheep where everybody gets handed out the same ration. If the little fellow that's sweeping floors in the plan knows that he's always going to make only 2-1/2 times less than the boss makes, that's a pretty nice feeling to have, because if the boss is going to make \$50,000 a year he knows he's going to go up accordingly. That's fine and dandy to bring him up but don't stop the fellow on top from trying to make an extra dollar, Mr. Speaker. I think that incentive and the desire to get ahead is one of the greatest things that we've had going in this country and I don't want to see it slowed down because we've built a pretty good condition of living up till now and we know there are social responsibilities at all levels that have to be lived up to. I think everyone in this province is prepared to carry their fair share and do their bit but they don't want to be over-taxed and be continually loading it on that fellow that's earning between \$10,000 and \$15,000 because he's the fellow that's carrying the major portion of the load. I know he enjoys his tax credit when he sees it on his Return, but when he sits down and calculates it all out and figures how much tax he's paying - don't try and scare him and say that we're going to slap a Medicare premium back on him, that we're opposed to Medicare because, Mr. Speaker, he's not going to buy that. He knows what his taxes are now and what it's costing to run our hospitals and if we're going to start reducing medical service or hospital service in the rural areas it's not going to be very acceptable, if they suspect that there's more money being spent on the facilities in here than in the rural areas. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. Johns): The honourable member agreed to answer a question at conclusion. May I ask him whether he believes that the present income disparity is just right and if not would he suggest how he would improve it? What would be right as income disparity?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I mentioned incentives before and I think that's the greatest thing to encourage the fellow that is maybe not earning quite as much now to earn a little bit more. Everyone has the opportunity of getting to the top and I think everyone should aspire to increase their level of income. How I might set down a formula for the Minister to attain the level, I don't know.

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

MR. TOUPIN: The Honourable Member wanted to speak?

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the Honourable Member from Lakeside would join the Honourable Member from St. Johns and get outside. The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I would actually like the Honourable Member from Lakeside to speak because I want to comment in regards to the remarks that he left with us on the Budget debate.

I feel a bit perplexed especially when I see in the House today the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek and the Honourable Member for Wolseley, and looking back at the comments they made in previous debates during this session indicating to us, from this side of the House, that was elected to form a government and attempt to administer the affairs of this province, their indication to us that we should not talk about what happened in the past; we should not attempt to relate on an ongoing basis

BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) things that we feel were done to the benefit to the majority and this province; we should not mention things that have happened in all provinces in Canada because it doesn't seem fair to compare Ontario with Manitoba, it doesn't seem fair to compare Saskatchewan with British Columbia. We're supposed to talk about the future.

Now if we attempt to relate the splitting up of the pie as we have it now in the Budget Debate, that is something that we can talk about. We can relate the messes that were left with us by the Honourable Member for St. James in regards to the comparison between 1969 and 1976 on the percentage of the pie that is left for Education, that is left for all services that were desired by people and compare that between 1969 and 1976. What do we have and for what reason? If we listen to the Honourable Member, especially for Wolseley, when he tells me that he doesn't believe that we should build log cabins in provincial parks, that this is excessive expenditure that is being had through the Department of Parks, I can inform the honourable member from one side of his mouth he says that and then from the other side he's pleading for additional revenue for services that he believes to be adequate and desired by people in his own constituency. Well, Mr. Speaker, we just can't have it both ways.

If we talk about additional services whether it's recommended by members of the opposition or recommended by people that have elected us on this side of the House, we have to raise additional revenue. If we look at the Budget as we have it before us and the additional revenue sought here for 1976-1977, it comes out to less than one percent of the sales tax, less than one percent of the sales tax. Here I know the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek will criticize me for relating back just a few years to indicate that five percent of sales tax didn't seem too much a few years ago, but if we had decided to go to what I consider to be a more negative tax than personal and corporate tax, and had added one percent on the sales tax that would have brought us in excess of 60 million additional dollars. That would have been enough to fill all of the needs that we felt as a government were needed and required by the citizens of this province.

Now would the honourable member criticize his own party for raising five percent sales tax back in the latter part of 1960? Would he criticize his party - who by the way he endorsed the philosophy of his party, I know that because I've heard him talk and he is a Conservative. He surely isn't a Progressive Conservative, he's a Conservative and he relates that philosophy - would he endorse a lower personal and/or corporate tax as we have it now? Now these are the things that we can discuss.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa, who just sat down indicated that we, because of our philosophy, have an attempt to tax the rich more than we do the poor. Now if we base our taxation methods on the personal and the corporate tax, I don't believe that we are taxing the rich more than we are the poor, we're taxing individuals on the ability-to-pay. But obviously - and that is if you make \$50,000 a year you're taxed on that ability-to-pay, if you make \$5,000 a year you have the same percentage of personal and/or corporate tax if both are applicable. So, you know, what is the point of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa?

I'll tell you what his point is in the few minutes that I have before me. I believe the Honourable Member for Minnedosa believes and I'm sure, based again on history - how else can you plan effectively in the future than to base your thoughts on the past and attempt to not re-do the same mistakes of the past and plan effectively and long into the future. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa, the Honourable Member for Wolseley, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, and I'm sure if elected that their leader, Mr. Lyon, would lower the personal and corporate tax, would lower the personal and corporate tax. To them that would be a progressive move towards charging people on the ability-to-pay: taxing less those that are at the higher brackets in society and taxing more those that are earning less in society. Now you'll ask, Mr. Speaker, how will that be taxing those making less in society? Because history again, and forgive me - the Honourable Member for Lakeside, forgive me for making

BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) reference --(Interjection)-- Forgive me for making reference to the past, but the Honourable Member for Lakeside who was a Minister in the Roblin Government was actually part of causing a Medicare and hospital premium. Now, by that fact, if the corporate and personal tax were lowered . . .

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

MR. ENNS: Well I don't mind him attributing certain causes to me but if he wants to be specific then I was part of the administration that introduced Medicare into this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I would leave it up to you to decide if the Honourable Member for Lakeside has a point of privilege. Obviously he has, since he got up and said his short piece. He can accept or attempt to accept the credit of bringing Medicare and bringing hospital insurance in this province but it was certainly not his government that actually indicated to the public of Canada that Medicare and hospital insurance was desired by the population. Yes, they did bring in 1969 Medicare and hospital coverage insurance. But what they did, Mr. Speaker, at the same time - and that was a foul ball and we can't blame them for that - but just prior to the election of 1969 they tabbed on to the people of this province, whether they were poor, whether they were working poor or rich or wealthy, \$17.00 a month per family, \$204.00 a year. Here's one reason, Mr. Speaker, that they could and would in the future be able to lower the personal and corporate tax, because they would take whatever part is missing in the personal and corporate revenue and place it on a very negative tax. They would place it on the Medicare and hospital premium tax that could raise I would say today approximately \$17.00 a month per family, \$204.00 a year, well over a \$100 million, well over a \$100 million in revenue.

Here I'm subject to correction but when we abolished the premium, first of all we took it in two stages. We abolished 50 percent and when the latter part was totally abolished it represented then approximately \$58 million of revenue, meaning that we had to raise \$58 million additional taxes to pay for that service. Some honourable members of the House, Mr. Speaker, would indicate, well who is paying for this service now? I'm paying for this service now; you're paying for this service now but we're paying based on the ability-to-pay and that's a big difference. That's the difference between you and I. Not between you and I, Mr. Speaker, but between the Official Opposition and the present government, is that they would base it - no matter the revenue of the individual family, they would base it on a per month charge for everyone, same amount. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows that if we went back to a premium tax even of \$17.00 a month - not \$27.00, not \$35.00, not \$50.00 a day - \$17.00 per month per family per year that that would bring in approximately \$100 million. Now what would the honourable member do with that \$100 million? Well, I still wonder. Because he indicated, Mr. Speaker, while he was speaking in this House on the Budget Debate, and he said that he wanted to be sincere with us and he wanted to put forward propositions because he doesn't only want to criticize this government, he wants to tell us what he would do - not what he did from 1959 to 1969 but what he would do as a Cabinet Minister if elected to the government of this province in 1987.

Now what he would do, Mr. Speaker - and that we will find within Hansard - he would cut down on automobiles. He said that. He would cut down on automobiles in this province. Now what would he do as a Minister? I can remember visiting the honourable member when he was a Minister. I remember visiting him when he was the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. He doesn't remember. I remember visiting him when he was Minister of Agriculture and what was he driving? Was he driving a Volvo? Was he driving a Volkswagen? What kind of vehicle was he driving? Was he cutting back on civil servants that had automobiles then that made over 6,000 miles per year for government service? Did he cut back on those? No way. No way. He didn't cut back then and he wouldn't cut back in the future because I'll tell you the

BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) reason why. Because it's not financially feasible to cut back on civil servants that need their cars to travel on government business over a certain number of miles per year. The honourable member knows that. Would he prefer paying 15, 18 cents per mile for an individual that owns and operates his own car instead of supplying a car? No he wouldn't. Not if the individual is actually including a percentage of miles per year that is in excess of a certain amount. So that's wiped out, Mr. Speaker. As soon as he becomes again a responsible person attempting to control the purses of this province, he would fall back on that. He would say, "Well, I'm sorry. I said I would do that back in April, 1976. We're now in 1987. I thought I could do it. Times have changed. I won't be able to do it."

What would he say again in 1987, you know - how shall we say it - if God allows him to live that long. He will have to step back on his second more or less commitment or at least advice that he gave us the other day pertaining to abolishing the MDC and I would ask the honourable member to correct me if I'm wrong but I distinctly heard him say that he would abolish the MDC. He feels, Mr. Speaker, that the time is now right to do away with what he started. What he started he now wants to do away with it. What would he do in 1987 if it's ever allowed by the people of Manitoba to let him again govern? Would he abolish the MDC? I don't believe he would. I don't believe he would, for the simple reason by 1987 times will have changed as they have from 1969 to 1976 and unfortunately I can't accuse the honourable member but he hasn't kept abreast of these changes enough. I think he should sit down with the Honourable Mines Minister, the Minister of Industry and Commerce and catch up. Please do. We'll set aside at least an hour and try at least to bring you up-to-date to the circumstances as we live them today. Now even if he didn't accept our advice, Mr. Speaker - and I'm sure that the Mines Minister and the Minister of Industry and Commerce could at least relate facts that he does not now know, if he did still accept to do what he indicates he would do, what would that cause, Mr. Speaker? What would that cause if we said today as a government that the MDC is no longer existing and we leave it all to private enterprise? What would happen?

MR. ENNS: We'd stop subsidizing buses for the people in San Francisco and call all the loans.

MR. TOUPIN: I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, what would happen. There would be literally hundreds if not thousands of requests by individuals, directly or indirectly through the bank - and I'm not saying credit unions, I do say the bank - to subsidize directly or indirectly through grants, individuals by means through the bank - that is through the banks or trust companies - but the honourable member doesn't feel that that's wrong. We're still using public funds by the millions, by the millions. All we have to do is look at the record, look at CFI, look at all things that have happened in the past. We'd go back, Mr. Speaker, to that good old free enterprise system. We'd help people by giving them credit and supplementing the financial needs of the banking system. That's what the honourable member is advocating. That's what he's advocating. We can't say that he's even used what I consider to be the best vehicle to help people to help themselves, being the co-operative movement. He would not use that because he hasn't used it. Why would he change now?

The honourable member is a bit over 30 and I don't think that he's able to change that well. That's why I'm a bit sympathetic to him. It's difficult to change once you reach 39 and the honourable member is a Conservative and I'm sorry to say probably will die a Conservative. That I feel sorry for because he doesn't seem to be able to sit down with common sense people and discuss the changes of time, the changes of time, Mr. Speaker. If there's any problem with Conservatives it's that they're so dead set in their ways that they just look at their own belly button and don't get back enough to look at all the elephants. And that's the problem that they have. They just look at themselves, they don't seem to see what people around them are desirous to obtain for themselves by means of services. --(Interjection)--

Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to see these types of Conservatives in the House. At least we don't have the type of Conservatives that vacillate on policy. We know

BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) they're Conservatives. We know where they stand pertaining to financial issues. We know equally what they would do if they would become government. Now because we have what I believe to be smart people in this Province of Manitoba, they will recognize what the Honourable Mines Minister indicated as being snake oil. Snake oil from Swan River. Snake oil from Lakeside. From Wolseley. They'll recognize that, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: Grandpa Tory's snake oil.

MR. TOUPIN: I say, Mr. Speaker, that the undivided earnings caused by grants made under the old system to the banking system would not be made to credit unions for the simple reason that it hasn't happened in the future. Let me finish by saying --(Interjection)-- Yes, in a few minutes. It wouldn't happen because it hasn't happened in the past, Mr. Speaker. Look at the record. Is it possible - I see the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek has left the House and he would fault me for looking at the past. But look at The Public Schools Act prior to 1969; look at The Municipal Act prior to 1969; look at The Manitoba Health Services Commission Act that was actually created by the Conservative Party. Mr. Speaker, what provision did those Acts make? Mr. Speaker, I would especially like the Honourable Member for Swan River to listen to this. It made it completely unlawful for a municipality, a school board, hospitals, the Health Services Commission, the Liquor Control Commission to do business with credit unions. Did the Honourable Member for Swan River, who was the Speaker at the time, know that? Since they are entranced in their ideas of being Conservatives and wanting to stick to that so-called free enterprise system, why would they go back and change their minds pertaining to the philosophy they had then? I don't see it. It would be different if the Honourable Member for Lakeside were 29 but being over 39 he would not change. He's a Conservative, he'll pass away as a good Conservative as people say it. Unfortunately we know what happened in the past. I think we can predict quite easily what will happen in the future under a Conservative Government.

Now, can we look at another point that the Honourable Member for Lakeside made. He said - and please correct me if I'm wrong - he said that he would abolish the Farm Credit Corporation.

A MEMBER: I didn't hear him say that.

MR. TOUPIN: Well I have it as a note.

A MEMBER: Where?

MR. TOUPIN: In any case let's put it this way. He indicates from his chair, Mr. Speaker, that he would not abolish it. But we can go back to history and say that even though it started under the administration of the previous government that he would not use it to the same degree. --(Interjection)-- He would not use it in the same way as we do, he would use it in a way that I depict him of using the MDC. Now I don't think the honourable member would deny that. He would use the Farm Credit Corporation as he would use the MDC if he decided to keep the MDC.

He would not allow funds to come directly to the Farm Credit Corporation to help farmers; he would channel whatever funds he could from the private sector and since we have to forget about credit unions, because they have - they'd use the banks, they'd use the trust companies and they would subsidize the banks and they'd subsidize trust companies because that's what they did. Why would they change that? --(Interjection)-- Well that is the major difference, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member for Lakeside indicates from his seat that he would attempt to subsidize individuals but the amount of individuals that he would attempt to subsidize would be a handful of elite that he has.

What we're doing through the Farm Credit Corporation, Mr. Speaker, is helping farmers, helping literally thousands of farmers directly but not indirectly through the banks and even the credit unions. Now the honourable members doesn't endorse that. He doesn't feel that that's correct. He would use a different formula. Well I'm sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, that I don't intend to change, being about the same age as the Honourable Member for Lakeside. I don't intend to change my

BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) philosophy to accept his but I would only ask, since I cannot articulate as well as my colleague the Minister for Mines and Natural Resources, that he should accept to sit down with my colleague and listen for at least one-half of an hour, just to attempt to understand. It could be longer, but at least if he could give my colleague a half an hour to attempt to understand the differences, the major differences of philosophy and the reason why things are happening. I think if that happened, if he really had an open mind, that he'd probably just take a great big jump over to this side. That really scares, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Swan River because you know he happens to be just a few years older and he'd be harder to change.

A MEMBER: You can't teach an old dog new tricks.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the comments made by the Honourable Member for Wolseley were very difficult to distinguish in regards to what I considered or tried to assess his priorities even in regards to the Budget itself. They were conflicting and unfortunately we haven't got Hansard, we haven't got his comments on Hansard yet. But he was contradictory in the sense that he was seeking additional services and yet asking for cut-backs into additional funds being raised by different methods of taxes that we have before us. I have to say again to the Honourable Member for Wolseley that he's now in the Provincial Legislature; he has to take responsibility for raising taxes on the provincial level. He has to equally share some of those taxes with the municipality that he sat with for a certain time. He has to recognize that you can't have it both ways. You can't say cut back on taxes and increase services. You can't tell people in the City of Winnipeg or the Municipality of Springfield, yes, you have discretion, you have autonomy, you are elected by the local people to render certain services and yet you don't have to take political responsibility. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, that cannot be had, that cannot be had.

You can't become a member of this Legislative Assembly, expect to become part of a government and attempt to govern without expecting the fiscal responsibility at all levels. I respect the fiscal responsibilities of the Federal Government as I respect the right, not only the right but the obligation of municipal councils and now more and more Local Government Districts and Indian Bands to raise the level of taxation that they need to render the services that people seek in their given municipalities. That is their right and obligation as an elected politician at that level. If they can't do that they should not attempt, as cowards, to translate that responsibility, pass the buck, to another level of government. I will never accept that.

A MEMBER: Never?

MR. TOUPIN: No. I say I would never accept that responsibility unless we as members of this Legislative Assembly decide to no longer delegate under statutes responsibilities to another level of government. Once we do that, amend The Municipal Act and take back certain responsibilities, they have a delegated responsibility by statutes, by regulations that they must honour and that's their obligation as elected politicians. I hope the honourable member when he goes back to city council, because I would attempt to predict that at the next election he's going to have some difficulty on the provincial level, that he keep that in mind because that's very important, very important.

Mr. Speaker, I do have comments to make on what my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, gave to this House. I would rather wait a few minutes because I'd like him to be in the House while I make them.

MR. ENNS: Can I ask my question while you're waiting.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, please do.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, my question to the honourable member who seems again preoccupied with the subject of oil of a certain description. Would he not at least concede that ever since the Honourable Minister of Mines introduced that subject matter into this Chamber a few days ago, that whether it's Arctic Oil or Mid East Oil or Syncrude Oil or the Alberta Tar Sands, the concern that we all have about that

BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) commodity, that perhaps even snake oil could become a valuable commodity in this province.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: It depends, Mr. Speaker, how fluid the members of the Opposition are. We can't really judge that by the size of the individual in question and by the tone of speeches that are made. I think the surface is one thing, the inner feeling of an individual is another. We should always attempt to understand and at least respect if we don't accept. Now that's a point that I feel is true of any member of any political party. We should not be deceived by the surface appearance of an individual but attempt to go deeper and find out what the inner feelings are in regards to our counterparts in this House.

A MEMBER: Transcendental meditation.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, right. That's what I used to call it.

A MEMBER: That's when they look at their belly buttons.

MR. TOUPIN: Pardon? --(Interjection)-- No I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should attempt to indicate to the Conservative members of this House the possibility of withdrawing themselves slightly, especially when they consider that a provincial election is around the corner, at the furthest a year and a half away, that they would like to go back, especially now that they've elected themselves a new leader, and attempt to change their philosophy. I for one would not want them to take a different direction. I'm happy to see them painted in that corner. I'm sure that the people of Manitoba will appreciate the fact that they have painted themselves in that corner and they'll be in a better position to choose between what I consider to be a right-wing Conservative party and a middle of the road Social Democratic party.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a few brief comments about the remarks made by my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, and I wanted him to be in the House while I did. I don't happen to agree with the comments made by the Honourable Minister pertaining to capital punishment because of personal experiences that I've had in life generally before entering politics, during the years that I worked in the co-operative movement and equally while sitting in this House. Either directly while serving in Health and Social Development, being responsible for Corrections, for those serving two years or less on the provincial level, and having had deep concern and implication with individual sentences for crimes that were considered to be punishable by capital punishment and then finding out by the process that we've decided for ourselves in this country, being a process of court and judgment that in so many cases across this country it had been found over a period of years that individuals that had been sentenced, and wrongly sentenced, if they would have been hung or allowed to receive capital punishment certainly I don't believe that that would have been acceptable even to the Honourable Minister of Public Works.

I would like to cite one example. While I attended university my professor - well let's put it this way - became ill, had a tumour in his head, went home killed his wife and three daughters. Now there was nothing apparent on the surface that the individual had premeditated those murders. He was brought into the hospital, he was operated on and he didn't remember absolutely anything of what had happened the previous day. Now what would have happened if he hadn't been actually reviewed by medical experts pertaining to his physical malaise pertaining to what happened. There was nothing on the exterior that indicated that the individual was mentally disturbed; there was nothing that indicated that he was physically deformed for whatever reason. But once the operation took place the man wept for weeks and weeks on end. Now that happens in a lot of cases pertaining to individuals that are either suffering a physical or mental say behaviour.

I believe that they must be treated first of all. There must be a serious attempt by society - and I do say governments because governments do have responsibility to give treatment to individuals in need whether they be ill physically or mentally - and if it is completely impossible under a reasonable amount of time

BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) to cure a given individual I don't even believe that capital punishment is the answer. I don't happen to believe that the life, as an example, of a police officer, the life of any person walking the street is worth more than one another. I believe that life, whether it be in the soul of the Member for Swan River or in the soul of the Member for Springfield, is the same life. It's the same life and I don't believe that men on this earth have the right to take that life away. I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that men give themselves by a democratic process the right to treat individuals that are suffering. That doesn't mean, Mr. Speaker, that we should not have different levels of care like we have for physical ailments, that we shouldn't have acute care, personal care services, senior citizens care, home care and so on. The same as in our institutions for those that are sentenced by the courts, there should be different levels of care to protect society. On the second point you'd be able to treat more effectively those individuals that are doing things that are completely contrary to the general acceptance of society. So I believe that's a right that should be expected of people democratically elected and should actually be performed by all levels of government. We should not attempt to again - and I go back to the comments made by the Member for Wolseley - attempt to pass the buck at a different level of government. We should stand together; we should exchange our views, attempt to use the force of one another to cope with these problems.

I didn't get the chance to speak, Mr. Speaker, on the resolution brought in by my honourable friend but I feel that I may have another opportunity to do so. I've received notice from you that I only have approximately one minute of time, I should have three minutes. So I'd like to pursue points pertaining to the comments made by my colleague the Minister of Public Works.

A MEMBER: His last word was hang them.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member seems to like to talk from his own seat. I guess that's because he got up in this debate already and attempted to make his contribution. --(Interjection)-- Well I wouldn't say it failed. I'm no judge of whether my other colleague felt his comments were good or bad. But it's not a Cabinet switch. I think it's good for a party to have a divergence of opinion pertaining to things that deal with conscience and things that actually should be decided, actually should be decided by a group of individuals for the betterment of society. I would like the Honourable Minister of Public Works possibly to cross the floor - and I'm only talking about the aisle, I'm not talking about crossing . . . but crossing the aisle to our colleague the Minister of Corrections and Rehabilitation, to receive some wisdom from our colleague, the Honourable Minister responsible for Corrections in the Province of Manitoba. I'm quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that allowing some of his precious time that he'll learn to appreciate what individuals are suffering from and what can be done to eventually cure them. Before we have attempted everything in our possibility in that regard I don't believe that we, even as democratically elected as we are, should take the life of an individual. That I'm very firm on.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Would you entertain a question, my colleague? Would you explain your theory of capital punishment to the widows and children of the policemen who were so brutally murdered in Moncton and Calgary? Would you know that?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister has one minute in which to reply.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, again the only way I believe that I could explain my basic philosophy in that regard would be to indicate that I don't find that more acceptable than having a policeman being very brutal and massacre another person. I don't believe that one has more right than the other. I believe that if there is a sick police officer, if there is a sick individual that is being hindered by a malady in society, that we have to attempt to treat the malady and not destroy it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Question? The Honourable Member for Thompson.

BUDGET

MR. KEN DILLEN (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, it's always interesting to enter into the Budget Debate but it's usually more advantageous to enter it after a member of the opposition has spoken. It seems to me that the opposition has obviously ran out of anything to talk about. If they are going to collapse in just a few short days, what are they going to do in an election campaign? You know if they haven't got what it takes to carry on a Budget Debate in this House for the length of time that it is generally required . . .

A MEMBER: May as well go home.

MR. DILLEN: If they ever have any hope of getting around a northern constituency I can tell you that they are going to be in tremendous trouble. Because the first time they have to walk any distance, if they can't sustain themselves in the House for any length of time, what are they going to on the hustings?

I followed with great interest the presentation made by the Member for Minnedosa and I can understand the position that he's in. You know that the Royal Bank of Canada obviously has him like a puppet on a string in the House. You know I'm sure that his association in Flin Flon also puts him in a very good position, having been a manager of the Royal Bank, had a close association also with the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company. So between the two of them they are very capable at pulling his strings.

You know they talk about mining development. There's just an absolute blindness on the part of members opposite about the direction in which investment in the mining industry is taking. I tried in this House to convince them, to try to enlighten them about what mining companies are doing. But they just absolutely refuse to open their ears or to allow any kind of thought to penetrate into their heads about mining investments. You know, I just picked up a paper, and I'm sure they are going to regard it as being wild eyed radicalism, some kind of a radical newspaper calling on all people in Canada to rise up in opposition to a decision by the Falcon Bridge Nickel Company who are planning an investment of some \$350 million in Chile. You know, that is a recent announcement, and it's not the Waffle Party that puts together this information asking people to support their position in opposition to that investment until full and complete human rights have been returned to Chile. No, it is the Council of Churches of Canada, The Canadian Council of Churches who are asking the people of Canada, who through their tax dollars are supporting the export organizations, who are placing part of at least of the money into that investment. And I can give you horror stories of the kinds of torture and indiscriminate murder that is going on in that country since the Allende government took over. Don't talk about anything outside of Manitoba that's who won, you know, because Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting doesn't want you to talk about anything outside of Manitoba. I don't know from where they're pulling your strings . . . But that is the history of the development of the mining industry. They don't give a hoot about Manitobans and their investment in Manitoba. They're almost portraying themselves as the nice guys, and if you take the position of International Nickel Company at the moment in regard to the decision by Anti-Inflation Board to rollback the settlement in Thompson, they are saying, we are nice guys, we supported you before the Anti-Inflation Board so that we could pay you the money we wanted to pay you but the Anti-Inflation Board would not allow us to do it. Nice guys. But they fail to recognize that these same nice guys when the workers went out on strike one year ago, had the opportunity without the interference of the Anti-Inflation Board to pay the kind of wages that the people required at that time. But no, all of a sudden they are nice guys.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the member for yielding for question. Would he not confirm that the company are meeting with the Anti-Inflation Board officials to have them reconsider their decision on the rolling back of those wages?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. DILLEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is true, that the company is meeting along with representatives of the Unions before the Anti-Inflation Board. I don't know if they're meeting the Board, but they are I am sure meeting officials of that Board. But, you know, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa asked a question and then he immediately leaves the room, which is an indication to me that he doesn't want to hear the

BUDGET

(MR. DILLEN cont'd)answer. He doesn't really want to know. But I, for the records, will answer the question so that he can read it when Hansard comes out.

When you look at who are the people who make up this Anti-Inflation Board, you will find that they are the same people who are described in Peter Neuman's book called The Canadian Establishment. And the Canadian establishment are the ones who are determining what the wage rates are going to be paid to the workers in this country. And in whose interest are they acting? Can you honestly tell me that this Canadian establishment is going to be operating in the interest of the working people of this country? I can tell you that they are not, that they are going to be acting in the interest of the circle of friends that they have. And it is very strange, that while a historic relationship has existed between Sudbury and Thompson for a number of years, that all of sudden, even though there are provisions in the guidelines of the Anti-Inflation Program for using that provision on historic relationships, that this historic relationship did not apply any more, even though it has for a number of years. But then when you really start to scratch the surface and try to figure out why this has occurred, what has happened? You will find that there has also been a historic relationship between Thompson and all of the other mines operating in northern Manitoba, Sherritt-Gordon, Hudson Bay and Falcon Bridge. This same historic relationship has been in effect for as long as those mines have been in operation also, but more pronounced in the last couple of years, in the last couple of sets of negotiations. So that while International Nickel is trying to portray themselves as the nice guys in putting forward their position, I am sure that the Canadian establishment of whom Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting are a part of, of whom Sherritt-Gordon is also a part of, have made their inroads through the senate or through the cabinet or through the back bench of the Liberal Party, or whatever process that is used. And I'm not sure of what process we're talking about now, because there are so many avenues that have come to light in the last couple of weeks in the press.--(Interjection)-- About the avenues that are being used for the distortion of justice in this country. Sky Shops is a typical example, where, you know, friends are rewarding the friends. It doesn't surprise me that there is now a denial of the historic relationship because the same circle of friends will be ensuring that this historic relationship will not exist between all of the other mines in northern Manitoba either. But when you examine very closely the mining industry, while they are still trying to portray themselves as friends, let us not forget that those same friends of the working people, similar to the friends of the working people that we have over on the opposite side of the House in the Conservative Party, who while in opposition are great friends of the working people, but while in government forget their same friends. Anyway, one must remember --(Interjection)-- where were, where were you when the working people needed you? --(Interjections)-- Where were you when the working people needed you? Where was this government, this Conservative Government when the working people needed them? Their crys fell on deaf ears.

I can remember coming before a committee in the Legislature during the Conservative administration in this Legislative Building. I might just as well have saved my breath. We were asking for reforms and safety in the mines, and we were told that, production before safety. Kill them, kill the men, you know Mr. Speaker, these same friends of the mining industry who are professing to be the friends today, let us not forget that these are the same friends who as a result of the operations in Sudbury have the highest level of cancer by population of any area in the world, the highest level of chest and heart conditions of any area of the world. You know, that must say something about the friends of the working people. You know, how they can come forward today and say, we are your friends, we are trying to help you achieve what you are after. And these are the same friends that are polluting an entire countryside in northern Manitoba, making a wasteland and devastating the timber for miles around. Those are the kinds of friends that we have. And in addition to that, they have some of the most deplorable working conditions that exist anywhere in this province, where men are subjected to gases and dusts beyond the tolerance level at any given time of the day. You know, how they can come forward today and say, we are trying to help you, we wanted

BUDGET

(MR. DILLEN cont'd)to give you the money, but the Anti-Inflation Board would not allow us, is to me the height of hypocrisy, when they had that opportunity to give the kind of money that was needed to keep pace with the cost of living in northern Manitoba last year when the workers went on strike and there was no Anti-Inflation Board.

But what of the Torys, what of the Torys in the last Federal election? Who planted the seed of the creation of some form of control against working people when they first started their campaign? And these people on the opposite side of the House were assisting in that campaign as well, and in support of the kinds of controls that they were advocating at that time. When the program was first introduced by the Leader of the Conservative opposition in Ottawa, it was called a wage and price control. Well I imagine then that when the popularity of that program didn't take off as anticipated, that it was changed a little bit, to then be called a selective wage and price control. And that was about halfway through the campaign. And then when that ceased to catch fire and improve the lot of the Conservative Party, they changed it to a 90-day freeze. But under any administration, it amounted to the same thing. And then to have the Liberals not a year later introduce the same program that the Conservatives started out with at the commencement of that campaign. --(Interjection)-- You know, what is the difference about the application of specific time limits, because I can tell you if it was the largest union in the province that was negotiating, the specific time limits would apply to them at that particular time. But of course, the so-called friends of the working people on the Conservative side of the House would have us believe that they are going to be the Messiah to lead the working people out of the wilderness. --(Interjection)-- I'm sure you wouldn't recognize him if you saw him.

But I want to go on a little bit in the description of northern Manitoba and how it applies. You know, that in 1968 when I went to northern Manitoba, I answered an ad in the paper and was hired by a mining company. When I saw that ad, I thought well, if there is the number of people that are unemployed today, and it was higher at that time than it is now, I said to myself, why do they have to advertise? Why is it necessary to advertise to work in a mine? You know that at that time, the wages were as good as could be expected anywhere in the province. It didn't take me long, once I got to the mine site, to figure out why the necessity for advertising. You know, at that time there was a Tory administration, and it wasn't unusual - you know, they talk about the ineffectiveness of the provincial housing program, Mr. Speaker - in 1968 it was not unusual for somebody who wanted to move his family to Thompson to place himself about 200 on a waiting list for housing and could expect to wait from 6 months to a year to obtain accommodation. --(Interjection)-- That is the truth. And many of the workers at that time were living in tents. It wasn't unusual, because of the lack of accommodation and because of a lack of a willingness on a part of the government at that time to spend any money in northern Manitoba, to have basements entirely divided off by wire run from wall to wall and blankets hung over the wire, and that was the sleeping accommodation for the work force in basements of existing houses. And not only that, it wasn't unusual to have two or three people sleeping in the same beds, but working on different shifts. --(Interjection)-- You find it funny. You know, by the way that the Member for Wolseley is laughing about the conditions that I'm describing now, we could only expect that if the people of this province to ever have the misfortune of having this government put back in power, that we could expect the same conditions again, because he finds it amusing. It is not much wonder that people simply said that they have had enough, because those were the living conditions that I'm describing as accurately as possible.

And my first experience of going on the job, let me just describe this to you if I may. I walked down to the bus from the bunkhouse and I walked to the back of the bus. I asked the driver, "Is this the INCO bus" and he said, "Yes." So I went in and sat down and he said, "Hey, come back here, fella." He said, "You've gotta have a ticket," and I said, "Well I'm going to work for INCO." He said, "Well you've got to have a ticket." The ticket was I believe 35 cents at that time, and I didn't have a ticket. He told me to walk, my first day in Thompson, he told me to walk four miles to work. Fortunately, a friend gave me a ticket and I was able to take the bus to work. Then they take you into a little room, it's called orientation, and they go on to describe all of

BUDGET

(MR. DILLEN cont'd)things that could happen to you if you weren't careful. You know, that this rock could fall on you, this machine could kill you, that one will crush you, this one will break your arm, that one will break your leg, wear you safety glasses because you'll lose your eyesight, and always wear your hard hat and make sure you've hard-toed boots. Well, they insisted that I have all of the safety equipment, and little did I know, when I had it given to me that they were going to turn around on my first pay cheque and recover all of the money back in one swoop, and that my first pay cheque which I hoped to have a little bit of spending money to buy tobacco, ended up to be nothing because I had to pay for the safety equipment. --(Interjection)-- Now the Member for Swan River finds this amusing. You know, it's not much wonder, Mr. Speaker, that I find it hard to accept that these are friends who are trying to help the workers in northern Manitoba achieve their just settlement of their collective agreement. Well, it wasn't long after that we went underground, and they told me to shovel the ditch for draining the water towards the shaft. I was working like a fool, and I thought I was working fast, but before I had gone very far, the shift boss came to me and said, "When I started working in this mine five years ago," he said, "I started on the shovel just like you," But he said, "The first day I started here, I could go all the way from here to the door, which was about a 100 yards away, cleaning out the ditch, and if you expect to ever get into production and into a production stope, that you'd better work a little harder than that." Of course, I was not on the bonus system and the production stope then entitles you to a bonus. So that was the carrot that was hung out immediately in front of my nose, that there was a possibility that I was going to make some bonus. So I commenced to shovel like an idiot rather than a fool, and I shovelled all the way to where he had pointed to . . .

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): And you're still shovelling tonight.

MR. DILLEN: You know, it's too bad that people on this side of the House don't recognize what work is all about. I'm sure that if the members on the other side had to put in a day's work that we would be attending more funerals. Anyway, I had the carrot out in front of my nose and I fell immediately into the trap of massive production. The next job I had, the following day, was shovelling a rock pile on the side of the drift into a Grandy Car. And I was shovelling I thought as fast as I was expected to. The foreman came along and said, "When I first started in this mine, in order to get to get to be a shift boss," he said, "I used to shovel two of them cars every day." No, I'm sorry, "Before dinner," he said, "I'd have two of those cars filled." By this time I had maybe just the bottom covered. So I said, "Well if that's what a guy has to do to get into this bonus system, that's what I'm going to do," so that was how I started the whole process in the mines.

And that was the same system that existed 30 years ago, it's the same system that existed 70 years ago, and it's the same system that exists right today. The same system of trying to use the incentive system as the unseen supervisor in order to obtain maximum production from the worker by using the incentive bonus system. And if there is anything that has contributed more to the deaths and the disabling injuries and the injuries that have occurred underground, it has been as a result of that bonus system, because in order to maximize bonus, one will take unnecessary chances. They will drill into a boot leg they will stretch out the rock bolting, will commence drilling before the rock bolting has been completed, a number of things that all contribute to death and injury in the mines. And yet if you talk to a miner about the possibility of increasing the hourly rate and eliminating the bonus system, the old traditional, rugged, free-enterprise, individualistic attitude comes out, and that he will have no part of the elimination of the bonus system.

Mr. Speaker, the mining industry today has become larger, the amount of ore being removed is in much greater volume, more heavier equipment is being used underground than has ever been used before, and right to this day there isn't a proper lighting system underground. In spite of all the massive technological improvements that have occurred in the mining industry, one is still dependent upon the traditional lamp that is mounted on the hard hat. But those are the kinds of things that are happening, and the

BUDGET

(MR. DILLEN cont'd) possibilities of injury in that occupation are increasing more and more every day. And to this extent, I don't believe that the concept of Workers Compensation has kept pace with that kind of change.

But you know, the mining industry today is trying to portray that they are the friends of those workers, but where were they, those great friends of the working people in Thompson, when they didn't have any place to live? You know, when the town was placed in a dictatorial system under the Local Government District administrator, who at that time, not only was he collecting wages from the International Nickel Company, but he was also collecting wages from the Manitoba Government, and he had complete and total control of the town. And while they're talking on this side of the House about improving the political climate for the expansion of small and family businesses in northern Manitoba, let me tell you that prior to 1969, unless you had the sanction of the Nickel Company and the Local Government District administrator for the establishment of any kind of business in Thompson, you were denied; and that there was more denial of the free rights of an individual to establish any kind of business that he wanted to go into under the more favourable political climate that these people on the Conservative side of the House had prior to 1969. If you wanted to start a dry cleaning business, you had to go cap in hand to International Nickel in order to get their sanction to establish a business, that is not the case today. The banks the same way. Anybody that went into the community, and as a matter of fact I don't believe that in the initial stages of the development of Thompson that the Royal Bank of Canada had the sanction of International Nickel. --(Interjection)-- Nothing is free.

But where were they when those conditions were existent in northern Manitoba? Where were the proponents of the small businessman at that time? They were completely blind. And how did we come to establish local government in Thompson, how was that accomplished? What was the process? How many people have had to sleep on the front steps of this Legislature in order to obtain Local Government Districts in northern Manitoba since 1969? How many?

MR. BILTON: Dear old Joe. Dear old Joe.

MR. DILLEN: Not one. Not one. As a matter of fact it has been the policy of this government, a continuing policy for the development of local government since that time. But Joe Borowski, in order to establish local government in northern Manitoba, in the City of Thompson, to break the back of the dictatorial kind of administration that existed at that time, with the full support, the full support of the Conservative administration, in order to break the back of that kind of a system had to come down to this Legislative Building and sleep on the steps in protest of the kind of system that Conservatives allowed to continue. And they're trying to tell us now, they're trying to tell us now that they have changed their spots, they're trying to out-socialist the socialists, you know. You know, they're trying now to say that they've somehow changed their spots. The Conservatives on this side of the House are trying to convince the people of northern Manitoba that they have changed their spots, that they are now the saviour of the working man. That is what I get from the people who speak over here, you know, the Member for . . . --(Interjection)-- Yes. Well, the Member for Minnedosa is saying that that is the traditional position of the Conservative party, that they are in support of the working man. But you know that --(Interjection)-- But where were they? Where were they when we needed you. Where were you? Where were you? Where were you when the working man wanted to have this dictatorial system removed? The working people of northern Manitoba are not going to be taken in by that kind of tomfoolery, that kind of utter nonsense, that somehow the Conservatives have changed their spots. And to give you an example of just how they view the mentality of the people of northern Manitoba; in the last election they staked all of their claims on their ability to distribute hot dogs. They were going up and down the streets delivering hot dogs to the people along the street. And the Liberals are no better. They were giving out bubble gum. The Liberals were giving bubble gum in northern Manitoba. And it wouldn't be so bad if the Conservatives were giving away their money, as the Member for Wolseley is saying but that they were given the product from one of the meat packers in Winnipeg, given to them for distribution.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is up. If the Honourable Minister will take the adjournment I'll call it 10 o'clock. The Honourable Minister of Corrections.

The hour of adjournment having arrived, I am now adjourning the House and the House stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. (Friday)