

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, February 13, 1967.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading & Receiving Petitions

MR. CLERK: The Petition of the Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Before we proceed I wonder if I may direct the attention of the members to the gallery. On my left there are 45 students of Grade 4 and 5 standing from the Harrow School. These students are under the direction of Miss Wright and Miss Lambert. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer. Thirty-eight students are also there, of Grade 8 standing. These students are under the direction of Miss Dawson and they are from the River Heights School. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I think the House would like me to report that this morning a meeting was held between the executive committee of the Winnipeg General Hospital and the Manitoba Hospital Services Commission at which time they had a very fruitful and illuminating review of the problem of hospital financing that concerns both of them. I can say that as a result of this meeting the Hospital Commission and the Executive Board of the Winnipeg General Hospital will meet again in an effort to find a solution to the problem which will be entirely in the public interest.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. In view of the fact that an advertisement was published in last Saturday's papers calling for applicants for the summer training plan for high school teachers, is this not indicative of a lack of interest among our students in teaching as a career, and is it not indicative of a shortage of teachers for the coming year?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): I would like to take that question as notice and look into it further if I can. It's our attempt to recruit candidates for teacher training, as you know.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question - two questions in fact, to my honourable friend the Minister of Water Control and Conservation. 1. What is the likelihood of a flood this spring? About this time of the year we do have the forecasts nearly daily; and then 2. What, if any, asset or value will the floodway be in event of a flood this year? I noticed a recent article, from the Department no doubt, indicating that it could be of partial use in the event of a flood by knocking out certain approaches and one thing and another, so I wonder if my honourable friend would care to comment on both the questions.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Highways)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, on the first question, the Flood Forecasting Committee meets approximately about this week and we have no report as yet. As soon as their first report is available I'll provide it to the House. As far as the use of the floodway is concerned, it is expected to be able to be provided for partial use if that is necessary. It's hoped that it won't be necessary for the simple reason that there is an area of the floodway that is anticipated using for one of the events of the Pan Am games, which would prove difficult if it becomes necessary to use the floodway for its intended purpose in the spring, but a very large percentage of the flows that could normally be anticipated for the floodway to handle should be able to be used next spring if it is necessary.

MR. SHOEMAKER: A subsequent question; next spring - you mean this spring? If it could be -- would you care to elaborate on what would be necessary, what immediate steps would have to be taken in order for it to be of partial use?

MR. WEIR: Well Mr. Speaker, we will be into estimates by this time and able to discuss it more fully, I would think, if it's desired, but it's the elimination of some of the plugs;

(MR. WEIR, cont'd) . . . . there are two or three plugs within the floodway that would need to be removed and there is still -- I believe it's one contract that has quite a good bit of work to be done with it to get the full excavation of the floodway out, and this can be done, Mr. Speaker, next spring with the normal notice and will require moving considerably less dirt than we had to move last year in the same period of time for much longer distances to provide dikes and so on.

MR. SHOEMAKER: . . . a subsequent question. Am I allowed two? This has to do with the Pam Am games. My honourable friend suggested that they were going to be used for the Pam Am games and this is the first I've heard of it. Would you care to elaborate on that? What do they intend to use them for?

MR. SPEAKER: . . . . are you content with that? The Minister has indicated that his estimates will be up shortly and possibly the matter could be pursued from there? Is that satisfactory to the honourable member?

MR. SHOEMAKER: . . . Pan Am games, I don't think that we would be able to get the information I am seeking from him on his estimates perhaps. His answer in respect to the last question was not satisfactory but I will attempt to get the answer at a later date perhaps.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, my question has to do with the question of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. At what elevation, that is, what water height would it be anticipated that the floodway would be used this spring if necessary?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice. Normal flood levels, I would anticipate, but I don't have it at my finger tips.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. In view of a change in policy regarding trainable and educable retardates and the responsibility going to the school boards, can the Minister tell me whether he has any information or whether information has been disseminated so that the parents of these students know what is going to happen to their children next fall? There appears to be some confusion.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which is before our school divisions now. I could table a letter sent to the school divisions last December explaining the regulations which were promulgated with respect to handicapped children and transportation within city limits and so on which is a new departure in policy, as you know, and these regulations are in force. With the new foundation program being contemplated I think this would be of tremendous assistance, further assistance, to the divisions in organizing such classes. At the moment, it is understood Winnipeg is proceeding in the matter with respect to accommodation and I have had discussions with the staff in the last week, and we will probably be having the Metro divisions in to outline further what we think are possibilities. In the meantime, they are exploring accommodation.

MR. DOERN: . . . as a supplementary question? Is the onus on the dissemination of this information on the school boards and divisions or is the department itself going to advertise and inform the public?

MR. JOHNSON: This is a division responsibility, in respect to their particular policy within their division. However, we are trying to be as helpful as possible and, as a matter of fact, I could table this afternoon or send around a few copies to each group in the House this afternoon, the letter we wrote to all the divisions last December which I think will cover most of the points that have been raised.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Welfare. I have a clipping in my hand; it's February 2nd out of the Free Press, regarding wheel chairs by taxis set for March 1st. It refers to a firm called Handicapped Services Limited; so my question is: will this firm be receiving any form of government subsidy either by special fare or by a lump sum grant? And the second question is: if this is so, was the same opportunity offered to all taxicab companies?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, again this year I would like to, in the name of Mr. Hebert and the Societé de St. Jean Baptiste I would like to extend to you, Sir, and to all the Members of this House the invitation to the annual Pea Soup Night to be held in St. Boniface. I would like to inform the Clerk of the House also, that he and his

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) . . . assistant and also the Sergeant-at-Arms and his staff - adult staff that is - as well as all the members of the Press are invited. I would ask also the Ministers if as usual they would inform their Deputy Ministers and heads of their Department. This year the Pea Soup Night will be held in the gym of St. Boniface College on Wednesday, March 15, starting at 8 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, I wonder if I could ask a question of the Honourable the Minister of Education. I would like to know if it is his intention to introduce this bill on French as a teaching language and have this bill distributed to the members, before the next recess of this House which is to start on February 27th.

MR. JOHNSON: I'll do my best, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. The reply with regard to the education for the retardates, I am wondering whether the Minister could tell us whether the Department is considering spearheading a movement within Greater Winnipeg for a Metropolitan school board to take over and look after all education for all these handicapped special problems.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I can inform the House, as my honourable friend may know, that last summer the Metropolitan boards visited me - this fall, I should say - with respect to education of the handicapped and other special education needs, and we discussed the various alternatives before us, just what form this should take, and we are still pursuing this. At one time we thought possibly --we discussed regionalizing Winnipeg for this purpose but it is apparent that there are certain categories of handicapped, for example, within the Metro area that probably involve all divisions, and whether probably in this field we can come together on some mutual understanding to start with and just see where we can go from there. There are ramifications to this but certainly, as I indicated to the Member from Elmwood, the Department have been having discussions within the department to probably having the Metro boards in to discuss some of these matters in the immediate future.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders I would like to table a Return to an Order of the House No. 33.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to say that I was asked privately the other day about a certain important event that many of the members of the House will be attending later this week. The question arose as to what sort of dress would be appropriate for this occasion and I felt that the members of the House who will be attending would like to know that the Northern Manitoba Trappers Festival is quite an informal affair and my only advice would be that you dress warmly. Many of the events that take place will be taken outdoors and this time of year it's not uncommon for temperatures to go down to 30 below or colder. However, I know that they're enjoying some of the same mild weather that we are at the present time. The dress of the local people will mainly be parkas and mukluks and fur ties and dress of that kind, and if any of you don't have this kind of equipment I think that there'll be suitable opportunities for you to procure the same up there at a nominal price and be assured of the highest quality workmanship available in any part of this country. There are certain indoor events for which casual dress is also recommended and I think really that's about all I have to say on the question.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Some two months ago the Honourable Minister attended a meeting in the Petersfield area relating to the flood problems of that area and there was a brief presented to him at that particular meeting. I was wondering whether or not the Minister might inform the House whether or not there is any action or consideration to the brief.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I feel that we have just recently talked about this subject at some length during the course of my estimates. I think the Member from Brokenhead knows the position of the government on this question, that we're awaiting further developments with respect to agreements to be soon negotiated and signed before the government can announce any new problems or any new actions on these matters.

MR. USKIW: . . . a supplementary question. In the brief they asked for removal of a government-owned road, an abandoned road which apparently was aggravating the situation for them in the area, and I was just wondering in this connection whether there is anything being considered.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of course could answer the question but I'm wondering if that isn't in the field of anticipation of possible government policy in view of what the Minister has had to say.

MR. PAULLEY . . . the Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: Beg pardon?

MR. PAULLEY: . . . perhaps not up to the Minister to indicate . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe I have something to say in the matter too. I may be wrong but I believe it to be out of order at this stage.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the reason I asked the question is I had a number of calls from the area asking whether or not there is something going to be done, or at least that they would like to know from the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe we've discussed the matter. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Has he or his department made any decision with respect to the releasing for sale across the border of Manitou wheat yet?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, this subject is still under very active consideration by the department. I may report to the House that we are gratified with the amount of movement that is taking place to Saskatchewan of some of our Manitou wheat. To date no firm decision has been made.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. This question arises from an article which appeared in the Winnipeg Tribune on Saturday, February 11th, by Duart Farquharson entitled "Provinces, Municipalities Asleep at Housing Switch." I wish to know, Mr. Speaker, whether it is correct that Manitoba law at present prevents any public housing project which does not emanate from urban renewal. This was a statement made in this story and if it is correct, Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable the First Minister be good enough to inform the House whether the government is contemplating, is giving consideration to the presentation of any legislation to change this particular situation.

And a supplementary question to that, arising from a statement made by federal minister Nicholson, in which he states that "at the moment most of the provinces do not have the establishments necessary to put our offer of loan assistance," - meaning under CMHC - "to anything like full use." I also wish to know, Mr. Speaker, whether this is a correct account of the situation as it exists in Manitoba?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I can take no responsibility for any statement made in the newspapers or by a federal cabinet minister. I think that if my honourable friend wishes to pursue this subject he will have ample opportunity when the estimates of the Department of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs are before us, and I repeat the announcement that I made a few days ago, that we are expecting a visit from federal authorities at which time we may have some suggestions to offer as to how we may be able to improve the situation generally.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Developments and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): In replying to what the Honourable First Minister -- or adding to what the Honourable First Minister has said, I understand that all MLAs have been invited by CMHC to a meeting and the date was announced jointly, or will be announced jointly today by myself and the Honourable Mr. Nicholson, that he will be in Winnipeg here on March 6th, and if you have not received your invitation to this meeting I'm sure that CMHC will have it in the mail to you.

MR. PAULLEY: Is this not anticipation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to speak on a point of privilege. In the final edition of Saturday's Free Press of February 11, 1967, there is this statement and I quote: "When Mr. Cowan finished, Mr. Paulley immediately rose to protest this intrusion into the budget debate. The same thing had occurred last year and a subsequent note of regret had been sent by Mr. Cowan to Saul Cherniack, NDP St. John's, who is the NDP spokesman on the budget." Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the NDP didn't say that and it isn't a fact that I sent a note to the Honourable Member for St. John's; and I didn't realize that the NDP objected to me speaking after the Leader of the Opposition until the Leader of the NDP got on his feet on Friday. Furthermore,

(MR. COWAN, cont'd) . . . . last year he berated us for being quiet after the Honourable Member for St. John's spoke.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. On February 7th he said in reply to an earlier question from me, "Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. George was good enough to remind me yesterday of a question he had asked some weeks ago concerning I believe a report or statistics from the Probation Branch with respect to their activities in the department. I can tell my honourable friend that there is no requirement, no statutory requirement for such a report and such a report is not prepared."

In today's Free Press there is a full story outlining all the statistics of -- I would say . . . ."The provincial government report so closely guarded that apparently even the Minister in charge is unaware of it, showed that in 1965 there were 2,720 cases of juvenile delinquency handled by the Winnipeg Juvenile and Family Court." And the story goes on to outline all the details of this report which I was led to believe didn't exist. Now if the Minister didn't know about it, perhaps he should -- maybe in view of the fact that the press has now been furnished with this information, maybe he'd like the House to have it now.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): I haven't seen the news article to which my honourable friend refers. If I said, "No report is prepared," I was deficient in not adding the word "No public report" at that time. But then of course even that isn't accurate today because obviously it is public, so it's the old story - there's nothing secret in government.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, on another matter, I believe this question should be directed to the Attorney-General. Does the government or the Attorney-General permit wire-tapping under certain circumstances?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that question has been asked before and answered, but however, if the Minister cares to deal with it it's quite all right as far as I'm concerned.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the question was asked by the Leader of the Opposition before and the answer then, as now, is no. There is a statutory prohibition against it. I made inquiries to determine from the question asked by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition of anything to the knowledge of the department that was going on in this field and they reported negatively to me. It's contrary to the law and there is no permission expressed or implied from this department to permit that kind of activity to take place.

MR. GUTTORMSON: If anyone wished, say, the Police Department or any other person wished to have a phone wire tapped, would they have to obtain permission or could permission be granted under any circumstances?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, that is a legal question and I couldn't answer it just as I stand at my place, my desk, but my recollection is that it is prohibited under the telephone legislation, the Manitoba Telephone Act. That's only my recollection.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Subsequently, therefore I can assume then that if anyone is doing this that they're acting against the law.

MR. LYON: Well my honourable friend had better consult his own solicitor before he makes a legal assumption.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Education. I am presently in receipt of a statement of equalized assessment for 1967 and I notice that in most rural municipalities the assessment is up about 50 percent. Now what effect will this have on the 9 mill or 33 mill that has been established for educational purposes on real property? I don't expect a full answer but the formula that I would like to be able to work out is something like this: You would take the '67 figure over the last one times nine. Am I correct in my formula?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, it's fully explained in the White Paper. I'd be happy to go over it with my honourable friend again if he wishes.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Privately.

MR. JOHNSON: Privately, if I could; and try and point out to him that it's 9 and 33 . . . equalized. While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 27 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. This includes, may I add, only the full time researchers. Most people in the Department of Education are engaged in some form of **daily research**. Oh Mr. Speaker, while I'm . . . take this opportunity to ask the Clerk this afternoon **later on** to pass out a speaker's kit, you'd call it, for distribution to all the members. This contains

(MR. JOHNSON, cont'd) . . . . the list of the educational benefits of the single district division as compiled by the publicity committee. I placed myself in the hands of the groups, representatives of the Teachers Society, Manitoba Association of School Trustees and departmental officials under Mr. S. Smith as Chairman, to develop a brochure, and this is the brochure which is handed out to those going to speak at these meetings and certain of the material is going to be distributed actively in the next few weeks in addition to radio and television spots; and in there also I've asked the department to summarize the meetings that have been held to date, the projected meetings which will be held from now until March 8th. In the list they will see departmental speakers, or where the committee have asked an outside speaker to come in these are listed, and while not many government people are listed in this particular sheet I hope to have a detailed list of government speakers in the very near future, so I'll ask that this material be distributed during the afternoon.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a subsequent question to the Attorney-General regarding the report of the probation office. Will he be making copies available to the members of the House in view of the fact that obviously some of the information is now public?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of what's in the newspaper that is of so much interest to my honourable friends but when I do become aware of it I'll find out what the report is about and my honourable friends-- I think as I said to my honourable friend from St. George, I'll be happy to give them all the statistics and information and help that I can when the estimates are before the House.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I gather then that if you're going to give us all -- that you won't mind giving us the report then.

MR. LYON: . . . what report my honourable friend is talking about yet. When I find out I'll let him know.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I believe the question should go to the Minister of Public Works. If possibly the question period seems rather lengthy I wonder if it would be in order to ask the Minister to again have the clocks synchronized in this building. They seem to be out between three and five minutes. We could save a few minutes.

MR. McLEAN: I'll do my best.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the table of the House the Annual Report for 1966 of the Department of Labour.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, before embarking on the voyage that I have before me I would like to confirm the statement made by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that I never did receive a note or any other form of communication from him when he spoke before I did last year on this budget address. I did, in fact, receive a communication - telephonic - from one of the prominent members of the front bench of the government apologizing for what had been done.

Mr. Speaker, it may appear unseemly to some to hear me commence this contribution on behalf of the New Democratic Party to the debate on the budget by using a text, "Love thy Neighbour." This certainly is no surprise to a New Democrat. The principle of Love thy Neighbour has been well established by society and given meaning by many religions throughout the millennia. In the eighth century B.C. it was stated by the prophet Isaiah "and show mercy and compassion every man to his brother." One often hears about "Confucius say." Well Confucius did say. On being asked what was one word which could serve as a rule of practice for all of one's life, he said, "Is reciprocity not such a word; do not to others what you do not want done to yourself. This is what the word means. If you act thus in public or private life there can be no ill will."

Hillel, who was a leading teacher of the Hebrews in the century before Christ, was once accosted by a heathen who indicated he was prepared to accept the Hebrew faith, but being busy could only tarry as long as he could stand on one leg to learn about that faith. And he, undaunted, said that he could base the religion on "Daalecho Sumi L'chavrecho Loi Saaveed" -- "Do not do unto others what you would not have them do unto you." And this, he emphasized,

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . . was the true religion; all the rest was merely commentary.

And Jesus and his disciple Paul also used the expression which is quoted in the revised standard version of the Bible as "Whatever you wish that men would do to you, you do so to them for this is the law of the prophets."

In the nineteenth century a French politician and historian named Louis Jean Joseph Charles Blanc coined the expression "A chacun selon ses besoins; De chacun selon ses faculte." To each according to his needs; from each according to his ability. This really is the essence of the religious tenets and the social aspirations shared as common ambition by people everywhere.

When members of this House react to the term "socialist" in manifest fear and obvious contempt, it underlines no wrong on our part, but rather emphasizes complete lack of knowledge of the social and religious aspirations of the vast majority of people. G.D.H. Cole, a recognized English authority on economics and socialism has pointed out as follows:

"Socialism in effect does not consist in the establishment of public ownership of industry, though, of course, it involved this. It is quite possible for a wide range of industries and services to be publicly owned in a community which remains fundamentally capitalist in its structure and outlook. The essence of socialism is to be found, not in a particular way of organizing the conduct of industry, but in a particular relationship among men. Socialization is a means and not an end -- a means towards the realization of the ideal of human equality which lies at the basis of the Socialist movement.

Equality, of course, may mean very different things. It need not mean that all men ought to be equal in the sense of the possession of equal attainments, capacities and qualities. It should mean to reduce existing inequalities of capacity and service by the removal of those disabilities which at present prevent the great mass of men from making the most of capacities which they do possess. Socialism stands for a system which will as far as possible enable every man to develop to the fullest extent whatever of virtue there is in him. This implies both an educational system freely open to all in accordance with their ability to profit by it, and a greatly improved physical environment destined to prevent disease, under-nourishment, and the stifling of valuable human qualities through crowded and oppressive surroundings."

And so, Mr. Speaker, it is no presumption to relate these social goals with the Golden Rule.

We believe, therefore, that the function of government is to ensure this very expression, and that when government forgets its role, then it departs from this principle which members of all parties have accepted in their own religious lives, and which are too often forgotten in both commercial and political life. It has been said that "We have committed the Golden Rule to memory; let us now commit it to life." We commend the Minister, therefore, for the following statement in his budget address:

"The real concern of government is the well-being of people. This involves implementation of progressive social and economic measures, including education, health, welfare and related services. It involves programs aimed at encouraging communities in which rising generations and plan their careers and live their lives in security and confidence and with opportunity to find the kind of work near at hand they would like to do."

Well government's recognition of the responsibility for its citizens has been winning greater acceptance year by year, so that today Government occupies fields formerly claimed by philanthropists and the Lords of the manor, by providing for the health needs of the community, by providing for the material needs of those who are unable to support themselves, and latterly by providing the educational requirements of all. It is not surprising either that it has assumed the responsibility to protect those who were so often cruelly exploited, by guaranteeing minimal: in wages, standards of work, standards of living accommodation, and of subsistence and even providing protection from actions of the state. So what may sometimes be disdainfully referred to as "creeping socialism" is really a recognition of the basic responsibility of people collectively to ensure the maximum opportunity for individual achievement.

To accomplish these purposes it has become necessary for government to arrange for the equitable distribution of the fruits of production by the adjustment of incomes, and it is government which provides the machinery by which such adjustment takes place. In the early days taxation was required by the King and the Nobles to provide for their own welfare and to provide the necessary powers to maintain control. In order to accomplish this, the Nobles waged wars, and having won, were then able to oppress the conquered and to obtain tax

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . . resources from them. Subsequently, it became necessary to tax the very people over whom they ruled. This taxation, again, was not done for the purpose of providing any service to such people but rather for the selfish purposes of the ruling classes. As the recognition for providing for the material needs of the people grew, adjustment became not just a matter of the oppressed contributing their resources through the Government for the oppressors, but became more a matter of adjusting income by taxing in accordance with ability to pay in order to provide for the recognized needs of all the people. Taxation then came to accomplish several purposes. It raised the necessary monies from those who had the ability to contribute, and through the machinery of government provided the means for meeting the requirements of all: the haves and the have nots alike. As society became more sophisticated, taxes helped create checks and balances for the maintenance of a stable economy. Fiscal Policy (properly applied) could stem inflation or prevent serious depressions by levelling some of the peaks and valleys of otherwise unchecked economic development. But there have been problems. Imbalances have been created through special concessions and through the efforts to gain particular advantages by municipalities or provinces; sometimes in order to better compete in the open market. This very technique has now been proposed for Alberta, which has indicated that it is prepared to give up its estate taxes in order to induce wealthy people to settle there. And the logical answer was given by Quebec, which indicated that it too would give up estate taxes in order to keep its present wealth and to entice new wealth to settle in that province. The result may well be that all other provinces will fall into line, and one of the well known forms of progressive taxation will have been lost merely by the desire to compete by offering a minimum price. Taxation is then not always the answer to orderliness and progress. If taxes are, as the Encyclopedia Britannica defines: "compulsory government levies on private units imposed for general public purposes, not as a direct charge for special services rendered," then they should be understood for what they are, collected without apology and applied with prudence.

Taxes can properly best be understood by their type or their effective rate structure and classified as progressive, proportional or regressive. And the distinction really depends upon the ratio of tax liability to net income (or net worth). If the ratio rises as income rises - i.e. if the tax takes a greater percentage of a person's income, the larger that income is - the tax is progressive. And if the ratio is constant the tax is then proportional. And if it declines as income rises, the tax is regressive. The terms are applied to particular taxes and to tax systems as a whole. Among specific taxes, personal net income, net worth, death and gift taxes tend to be more progressive. And most sales and excise taxes are levied at the proportional rates but can be shown (as I expect we will do) to be regressive in effect. And in assessing the taxation policies of this government, and considering a taxation policy that would be best for the people in Manitoba, we must consider both long range and short term objectives. In the long range, recognition of society's as well as the individual's rights and needs, demand taxation policies whose progressive features encourage the principle "from each in accordance with his ability." The short range point of view must never detract from this, even if immediate considerations of the province to strengthen its economic base, and to keep it a good place in which to live, seem to dictate otherwise. We cannot allow ourselves to be fooled by shadows. Our purposes must be more substantive. We want to provide a good atmosphere for living so that people will fulfill their lives in a positive and satisfying manner, rather than to continue to run away to other climes - warmer economically, physically and spiritually, and we want to attract others to come and share our benefits.

The success of our Party can be measured, Mr. Speaker, very often by the obvious recognition of our policies by the other political parties. It is true that we have not yet attained the recognition in this province of either forming the Government or the Official Opposition. To the extent that this is a defeat, we pride ourselves in our attainments (attested to by a society which increasingly accepts our philosophy.) We consider this educational process the first step to something better and we adopt Abraham Lincoln's view "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it." So we shall continue to press for all-party acceptance of our programs of education, of health and welfare, of protection for the consumer and the inalienable rights of the individual. We shall continue, therefore, either to take others to task for their failures or help broaden their attainments by demanding what in the final analysis are the needs and demands of the voters they need to maintain their jealously guarded power.

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . .

Though the report of the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future points out that the province's tax structure is not a deterrent to industrial location, it warns against increased taxes since the province must provide every possible incentive to prospects in order to overcome the problems of lack of locational attraction, of the lack of ancillary services, and the vested attitudes and the institutional sclerosis which abound in this traditionally orientated economy. The incompatibility of these institutions and attitudes has been too little understood by this government, despite its boasts to the contrary. They still use such come-ons as low wage scales, expend undue effort in search for unskilled or semi-skilled labour for certain secondary and primary industries, which may be better served by the development of more sophisticated techniques and improved equipment as well as skilled labour which in the meantime is being drained away by attraction elsewhere. Low wages certainly are not the answer. The Financial Times of Canada, which is dated January 18, 1967, in its economic forecast and survey of industry in Manitoba, though it speaks of our buoyant economy bringing growth goals within reach, confirms that low wages contribute to the "brain drain". It says, "Manitoba has one of the lowest wage rates in Canada," and it finds that all is not rosy in this province. I want to suggest that better schools, more attractive housing for example, could mean better wages, better standards of living, and provide further motivation to capital and labour alike. Our neighbour to the south brags of the highest wages but it also brags of the lowest wage per produced unit; and with that kind of accomplishment there would be both people and money to make this province a better place to live.

Well what kind of economy do we have? Well if we were to take the Honourable Minister at face value it is probably the most buoyant provincial economy in the country - but is it, Mr. Speaker? It is an interesting feature of Budget statements made by Provincial Treasurers of the moment, that the immediately preceding year has always shown tremendous economic development. In the latest statement, which was presented to us last week, we find that the record of economic development claimed for 1966 was supposed to be the best in the history of the province, and we are then given statistics showing increases in various fields. In the 1966 budget statement, a change was made in the manner of reflecting economic development and as a result, significant adverse factors were not readily apparent. Now, with all the resources of research available to the government, we find that this year there has again been a change in the manner of presentation, where in statistics are given that are not fully comparable with the statistics which were given in previous years' budget addresses. Again significance for the change is not apparent. I challenge the Provincial Treasurer to give us the full picture so that we can see a comparison between apples and apples, and not apples and oranges. For example, when in the budget address we find the Provincial Treasurer giving us figures showing increases in production value and in gross income and in various manufacturing shipments, etc., we find percentages ranging from 6% to 9%; but nowhere do we find an acknowledgment of an increase in consumer price index.

In looking at the Labour Gazette issue for last December, 1966, we find that the consumer price index shows an increase from 1964 of 135.4 to 1965 of 138.7 and to October of 1966 of 145.3. In the span from October 1965 to October 1966, there has been an increase every month rising from 139.3 to 145.3 (which is a 6 point increase in one year) and this of course is the Canadian Consumer price index, and just to ease matters a little bit one should indicate that in the table which deals with certain regional cities, we find that Winnipeg shows an increase from September 1965 of 135.3 to September 1966 of 140.5, which is a 5.2 point increase. To the extent that this is lower than the national figure, I would indicate to you that the same issue of the Labour Gazette shows an average hourly earning in Manitoba considerably lower than most of the other provinces. The average for April 1966 of \$1.89 per hour is higher than Nova Scotia of \$1.84, and is higher than New Brunswick of \$1.87, but it is lower than all of the other provinces except Prince Edward Island, which is not reported and we don't know. The province to the east of us has an average hourly earning of \$2.36; the province to the west of us has an average hourly earning of \$2.25, and I remind you that Manitoba has an average hourly earning of \$1.89 as reported in April of 1966. The average hourly earning in Manitoba in April 1965, a year earlier, was \$1.82, which shows a 7-cents change per hour in that year. When one takes these statistics into consideration and relates them to the narcissistic outlook shown in the budget statement of this year, one reflects that unrelated statistics are only used to prove a point in the eyes of the person giving the statistic, rather than to stand up to public scrutiny. If we would apply 1965 dollar figures to the 1966

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . . figures and relate them to the Consumer Price Index, is it not possible that we will find that we have been running hard in order to stand still and not fall behind? Are these increases noted by the Provincial Treasurer only the result of the inflated dollar and the natural increase?

What is more disturbing is that, as I mentioned earlier, last year we found that mineral production showed an increase in growth between 1965 and 1966; this year, to our great disappointment, we are informed in the current budget address that mineral production last year did not reach the high levels originally anticipated. The reason given for that is the shortage of labour at critical stages of production. We heard of this a few years ago when the difficulties in San Antonio Mines were revealed to us. At that time we were informed that miners' wages were at a very low level compared with mines elsewhere and that as a result production was suffering. We argued then that something drastic had to be done about providing sufficient miners, and now we find that what is being done is that our Minister of Industry and Commerce has been shipped out to Europe to attempt to recruit miners. Apparently his recruiting efforts have been so poorly met that he has had to complain bitterly about the educational qualifications adopted by the Federal Government as far as immigration is concerned, and despite what we knew years ago a report in the January 1967 issue of "Trade and Commerce" confirms our worst fears, when it indicates that the average weekly wage in the mining industry is the lowest of any of the four western provinces as compiled for June 1966. Of even greater significance and concern is the fact that the same report indicates that Manitoba wages in every one of the major economic areas are the lowest in the West.

The Canada Yearbook reports that the value of mineral production in 1963 in Manitoba was \$169 million, and in 1964 it was \$175 million. We find that in the 1966 budget speech, the 1965 mineral production was expected to reach \$182 million and on the basis of this \$7 million increase in each of the preceding years we would have a right to expect that the 1966 would have been \$189 million; 1967 should be \$196 million. But this year's budget speech states that there will be no increase but that it will remain at the same level as 1965. In the light of all the exploration, in the light of the mines that have been announced at Soab and Fox and elsewhere, and in the light of the fact that Manitoba's natural resources in the north hold the key for the economic future of this province, we feel that this is an emergency problem with which the government is not adequately coping. Oh yes, we hear about the schools that are being opened; we know about our immigration battle with the Federal Government; we know about the efforts that we are supposedly making amongst residents of northern Manitoba; but the fact is that along with training programs must go an up-grading of living conditions and an up-grading of the material benefits for the workers we so badly need. But we do find in the same budget report that residential housing was down 8% from 1965 and the blame is against Federal policies to restrain price increases. Well, it's true that there have been difficulties in this respect along with the short money situation. On the other hand, though, we hear that after the Federal Minister - we spoke of it today - Mr. Nicholson announced that vast sums of Central Mortgage and Housing monies were available, our own Premier, the former provincial treasurer, announced in this House that the government is not satisfied with the arrangements proposed for urban renewal and new housing, and so is not taking advantage of the proposals. Is he biting off Manitoba's nose in order to spite a Liberal's face? As has already been pointed out by the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition it was certainly heartening to note the resolution of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, a member of the Conservative caucus, complaining of the maintenance of an 11% sales tax on building materials. It appeared that the powers-that-be on his side of the House failed to inform him that this - his own government - was bringing in a 5% sales tax on building materials which would have all the adverse effects that apparently gave the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne cause for concern. Well now we have a 16% sales tax.

Well Mr. Speaker, coming back to the question of mineral production, we find that out of a total of even the stagnant amount of \$182 million, the expected revenue from this to the coffers of Manitoba will be in the neighborhood of, not quite, \$5 million. We have maintained all along, and we still maintain, that the return to the people of Manitoba for the depletion of their natural resources for the benefit of private enterprise, much of which is centered outside of Manitoba, and indeed outside of Canada, is complete inadequate. We maintain that these companies come into the areas where they find the ore and that they should be satisfied to pay a proper rental and, indeed, a proper share of the benefits, to the people who provide the minerals per se and the ground within which they are contained. The return of 2-1/2% is completely

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . . inadequate, and I suggest that it is not enough to encourage private enterprise to exploit our natural resources if the only result from that is to provide jobs for people in those areas. The basic philosophy of the New Democratic Party is that we must exploit natural resources for public enrichment and to add creatively to the human resources of the province. Certainly it is a major criticism against this Government that it found it necessary to take money out of the pockets of people who live and work here, in a regressive form of taxation, instead of making sure that no excess profits accrue to shareholders of the companies which exploit our natural resources. And I must not overlook this opportunity to indicate that in many cases we don't even know who or where these companies or shareholders really are. I refer, of course, to the exploiters of the Forest Industry of this province, and rather than belabour the entire matter of the Churchill Forest Products, which we have repeatedly debated, I will only make passing reference to it. In the eyes of the free wheeling, free enterpriser's approach, the deal made by the Province of Manitoba may have been a good one; but in the eyes of the people of Manitoba, this cannot possibly be considered so simply. The resources of Manitoba, both natural and financial, having been put up by the province in outright expenditure and loan, are the very nub of the financial commitment necessary to develop the forest products industry. Our contention has been all along that no matter how good the management is on the part of the government in this respect, its basic principle is completely false, in putting up these monies and making important commitments on behalf of the taxpayer. It would have been far more prudent to have made sure that an equitable share of the benefits derived therefrom would have come back to the people in the same manner they will do for the unknown and unlocated shareholders that will now benefit, if it is a successful operation. If, however, it is not a successful operation then obviously the loss will be borne by the people of Manitoba who have been compelled to participate in a development program committed to the principle of helping those who have, at the expense of those who have not. This is a broad, general, damaging statement, but I believe that it is supported on the basis of the general principles enunciated by this Government in the past. As a matter of fact, those devotees of Readers Digest will have seen the January issue which condensed a Time article on Canada. When it speaks of Manitoba, it refers to it as "the only relatively 'have not' province in the West." It has certainly not been a question of love thy next door neighbour here in the province of Manitoba, but rather love thy neighbour, stranger though he be, even if he live on the other side of the world. It is certainly not a question of "from each according to his ability" but it seems to be the other way around when it comes to the question of the development of our natural resources.

This in our opinion exemplifies the unimaginative static approach to economic planning in which this government has been indulging during its tenure of office. The suggested progress and the questionable reasonableness of statistics to prove the march to progress and economic viability, and the rationalization of obvious and impossible-to-hide failings through the "cry-baby" techniques of blaming the bullying federal government for its parsimony and its lack of sensitivity, underscore once again the lack of understanding, foresight and of good old Capitalist entrepreneurship which they so loudly proclaim to all and sundry. The Provincial Treasurer attacks the Government of Canada. The Leader of the Official Opposition defends the Government of Canada, but he holds back a little to protect the right of the Provincial Leader who wishes to disagree with national policies. Only a few years ago, in the days of Dief, we found Duff making the speeches now being made by the Provincial Liberal Leader who at that time was able to call down a plague on both the Federal and Provincial Houses. Well, Mr. Speaker, while TweedleDuff and TweedleGil are battling, let us consider what kind of an economy do we have after all? May we suggest, rather than the gay rosy one pictured by the Provincial Treasurer, that it is one filled rather with potentials for robust health, despite all the natural limitations and pitfalls. It is one, however, beset by enough tribulations, without those imposed by false tax ideas and questionable economic practices.

Let us then consider taxes since this is really a basic and understandably crucial concern of all of us. The government has stated in its budget statements that it has considered all the tax fields open to it but it chose to apply the sales tax. Let us review just what this sales tax will mean to people of Manitoba. I have referred previously to the classification of sales tax as being a proportional tax with the danger of being regressive, and I note that the Government has made a point of indicating that when sound exemptions are provided it is not regressive and can fall with reasonable equity on all. Well this is wishful thinking on the part

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd.) . . . . of the government and it even rises to the occasion by quoting John F. Due when he states as quoted by the Minister, that when food is exempt the regressiveness is largely eliminated, so that Mr. Speaker, it's only a question of degree. The government has reached the stage of saying that as long as we do not tax the poor quite as hard as we tax the medium income people, then it is all right. I say that our poor cannot be taxed without a real hardship and without a definite lowering of the very important minimum standards of living. When you consider that many people in Manitoba, on fixed and low incomes, when called upon to contribute further to the provincial treasury, will have to give up something, and be it partly taxed shelter or be it tax-free food, or be it taxed clothing or be it taxed home furnishings, it necessarily must be some item which will make life a little bit harder for them. It has been suggested that \$50.00 to \$60.00 a year will be the additional burden placed on each of these minimal income people. Well Mr. Speaker, we talk about the war on poverty and all the time it becomes more and more difficult for our own people to meet their bills, much less set aside a surplus for the future. The war on poverty, I suggest, is being waged by tax policies such as these which have the effect of escalating the battle against the poor rather than the conditions under which they must live.

In the constituency of St. John's, in which I have lived all my life, there are many people who are regularly employed and earning \$60.00 to \$100.00 a week. These are the people who are better off, in many respects, but to maintain their standard of living they must constantly maintain their homes in good repair. And now in addition to the rising cost of material the government has seen to it that there will be an additional tax payable even on that. Over and above this additional taxation on building materials to which I have referred, at a time when our housing must be improved and increased, we find that municipalities and school boards too will be required to pay a sales tax. On the one hand the government claims that it is attempting to relieve the burden of taxation on the real property owner and on the other hand it does so. How? By increasing the cost of the local governments which raise their funds through real property taxation. So the great attraction to governments is that the immensity of sales tax is not easily noticed as they are being paid, but in this particular case, we find that sales taxes that are being paid by the real property tax payer are completely buried in the mass of budgetary items that the municipalities will be submitting to them for payment. There are other elements in this field which are subtle but nonetheless damaging, items such as the duplication of taxation as between Federal and Provincial Governments. This 5 percent provincial sales tax will be imposed on top of a 12 percent Federal tax, and indeed the government will be receiving 5 percent of the 12 percent tax, and in addition the consumer will probably be paying a profit to the producer based on the additional cost to which he is being put by paying the 12 percent Federal tax. And as if to rub salt on the wounds, an admittedly expensive collection and supervisory machinery will now have to be established here which will duplicate the collection machinery of the Federal Government in the imposition of this sales tax.

Mr. Speaker, sales tax exemptions outlined by a government will not really resolve the basic problem of payment by those who are least able to contribute from their resources. Exemptions may be aimed at lessening regressiveness, but there are other methods which can and should be used to take care of those inequities. I think it is up to the Provincial Treasurer to make it clear to us why he has not dealt with various methods that have been used to create a better balance in equities and to convert this tax into a more proportionate one. There are various methods used to provide a rebate on sales tax paid by individuals who suffer particular hardship thereby. These involve a calculation of rebate based not only on purchases, but also on family responsibility, on income, on net wealth. But it would appear that this government has lacked the consideration required to take care of this problem in its eagerness to rush headlong into a sales tax impost, and I use the term "Sales Tax" when the term which the Provincial Treasurer would like to have become popular is "Education Tax." He thinks that this will make it more palatable.

In the last fiscal year, Mr. Speaker, education expenditures by the Manitoba Government were some \$83 million. This coming year they are estimated to rise to \$120 million - and that discounts the factor of contributions from the Federal. Let us consider, however, that out of this \$37 million increase the government has suggested that some \$10 million will come from shared taxes and between \$3 and \$7 million will accrue from the equalization formula, depending on the final disposition of that problem. So education will need not \$37 million more

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . .but \$20 million more than last year - not the \$33 million - and therefore I suggest that the tax which we are asked to call, as I just referred to, should probably be called the "Education, etc. etc. Tax" since so much of it will help pay bills other than for educational purposes.

When we talk about education as being a vital service which must be increased and enlarged, and one which so urgently necessitates such a tax, let me suggest to the government that there are two types of expenditures made by government. One is to provide for certain required services be they of a current or capital nature and the other is to provide funds for self-liquidating utilities. The decision as to borrowing, or as to raising monies out of current revenue in order to provide services, must be motivated by the various factors that I have previously discussed. And I suggest that it is foolish to limit oneself in the borrowing of money by the relating of borrowing only to the investment in items of lasting physical nature. It has been clearly established by the Canada Economic Council and by others that an investment in education in this country is a much more valued and lasting investment than an investment in some of the more traditional forms of capital investment. I suggest that when you run into a situation where you feel that you must impose a tax which has regressive features in it, you could well consider the decision to borrow, as an investment of a social nature in the education of our people. The Economic Council of Canada has calculated that the rate of return from investment in education both to individuals and the economy as a whole is at least as large, if not larger, than almost any other form of investment. Certainly Mr. Speaker, repayment over a period of time derives from the benefits of this educational program.

It is significant, I think, to note that last year this government raised expenditures on highways by \$20 million - and at the same time reached deep into his barrel of tricks to find money enough to excuse itself for transferring such expenses from the Capital Account (and almost anywhere in the world roads are considered Capital Investments) transferring it to current expenditures. This it found possible to do. But this year, when we need about that much extra money for educational purposes, we find that government claims it cannot provide it without a sales tax -- I'm sorry, "Education, etc. etc. Tax". No thought of perhaps transferring at least part of the highways accounts to its legitimate place - and borrow this needed capital - or certainly no thought of borrowing for education as a legitimate capital social investment.

Now last Thursday evening, the Premier said here in the House, "We must all hope that we do get an opportunity to completely reform and revise the tax structure of the country to make it more equitable than it is at the present time," and later he said, "It seems to me that we should recognize that the Carter Commission may give us such an opportunity."

Well, when my leader asked why the sales tax was not held back until the Carter recommendations had been received, the Premier replied, "Well, we've got to pay the bills."

In the first place, this short-sighted approach is nonsense. The principle of budgeting for a deficit has already been established in these very estimates which do forecast a deficit of \$1-1/2 million. Secondly, the expense, the inconvenience, the inequity created by a sales tax this year with a possible change next year, far exceeds the borrowing cost of financing highway construction as in the past, and education programs as is fully justifiable for the future. Is this not really another indication of the impotency of this government in the field of progressive social and economic planning?

The government too has taken the trouble to use scare language by threatening that other forms of taxation would have made the province non-competitive, and it uses extremes by giving examples and comparisons with single tax alternatives. It claims that no combination could provide an equitable solution. It threatens that any other form of taxation would drive people out, that industry would find it impossible to operate under these alternate and excessive rates of taxation. The fact is that Manitoba, having been one of the two provinces without a sales tax up to now, has not actually attracted people or industry into the province. Does the government now think that imposition of such taxes would not drive people and industry away? How much and how thoroughly has the government actually considered some of the other forms of taxation with which it has not dealt?

The Provincial Treasurer states that he fears the "tax jungle". He is therefore impelled to maintain our rates in line with other provinces, but only as he sees it, for proposals made by the New Democratic Party time and again are brushed aside by the government. We have stated that, despite the Minister's fears, we see justification for an increased personal income tax in the higher levels of income, and that there is justification for increased

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . . corporation taxes. We have stated that the revenues from natural resources are inadequate. And despite the fact that this government has propounded constitutional and practical problems which prevent its immediate consideration of a capital gains tax, we believe that a combination of the capital gains tax and other taxes could provide a substantial source of revenue better than the imposition of a sales tax.

Let us consider the capital gains tax not only as a revenue item. Remember that capital gains tax would create a great deal of equity inasmuch as it is income in the economic sense of providing command over goods and services just as any other kind of receipts. The "ability to pay" concept requires its inclusion in the tax base. Through the sales tax, the Government is measuring the ability to pay on the consumption by the taxpayer. Thus a person's standard of living determines the tax he pays rather than his income or his net worth. In the budget address we were not favoured with too much information regarding the investigations made by the government before the imposition of this tax. The budget address indicated certain types of taxation as having been rejected, and indeed had it not been for the very short comment made by the Premier last Thursday evening, we would not have known that the Provincial Treasurer was ever aware of consumption taxes, value added taxes, turnover taxes and the like. The fact that the government knew of these taxes, and the fact that the government admits that it is not happy with the sales tax approach, is to me a condemnation because I believe that the two reasons given by the Premier, firstly as to constitutional conventions and secondly, to competition with other provinces, are not sufficient reasons insofar as this legislature is concerned. If the government wishes to have our support, then the government must give us full reports on the alternatives that have been reviewed. But I do not intend to spend too much time on the question of these alternative forms of taxation. Suffice it to say that there are substantial attributes to these other forms of taxes when compared to the sales tax.

Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear, however, that sale taxes themselves are not entirely abhorrent. I suspect, however, that the most attractive feature from the standpoint of a government is that sales tax is indeed one of the least painful methods of collecting actual revenue.

This government protested loudly and vociferously that it could govern without the increase of taxes, and indeed it was able to do so for some period of time after coming into power. This was due to the fact that the prior Liberal Government had tucked away great sums of reserves in various nooks and crannies of its treasury while at the same time inching its way on the road to progress. This government was able to bring in much needed reforms without any immediate increased tax. But then as the Provincial Treasurer found it necessary to locate more money he devised schemes whereby provincial revenues could be increased and at the same time taxes would not have to be raised. The people of Manitoba, however, found out very quickly that fees for various services provided by the government were increasing by leaps and bounds as has been mentioned on many occasions and most recently by the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition. And having succeeded with this scheme, the government then embarked on a new one. After protesting for some time that real property taxes were not out of line with other provinces, were not so terribly burdensome, the government made a turn about, and bowing to public demand, agreed to lessen the burden on real property taxes. And this it proposed to do during the Special Session called in 1964 when it brought in its infamous Revenue Act. I call it infamous because it was quickly proven ill-conceived.

The Leader of the Official Opposition has already dealt with that; he referred to the abortive Land Transfer Tax, and the manner in which the government stubbornly persisted in the Heat Tax until it became aware of the fact that no one, but no one, was prepared to forgive this taxing of a necessity of life. The government capitulated to the demands of the Opposition and eliminated the tax on heat.

Mr. Speaker, I've reviewed the list of exemptions in the Budget Speech -- I know it's not a complete list; I do not find Heating Fuels as an exemption to the sales tax. What is exempt are those items already taxed in other statutes. But Heating Fuel is not now taxed. Can it be that by design or by accident this government is again planning to tax heating fuels. I think that this suggestion is so important, I think an immediate public denial would be vital, and I invite any Minister to interrupt me now I'll pardon him - to interrupt me now to confirm or deny whether sales tax will be applied on heating fuels.

MR. EVANS: If my honourable friend wants to be interrupted, I'll interrupt him. The answer is no.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well now, I breathe a sigh of relief, Mr. Speaker, and so do the people of Manitoba who have cause to doubt this government in its intentions because in the past it's fought vigorously on the question of heating tax; in the past it's fought vigorously in the question of other measures which it had to back down on; and therefore I'm glad that I invited the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer to interrupt me. I'm glad he did interrupt me because now we know. This government does not intend to impose a sales tax on heating fuel.

But in any event, Mr. Speaker, the tax does continue on important utilities that are still daily necessities to the average person in Manitoba. Taxes on power, on telephone, on gasoline, still hit hard on those least able to pay. And no satisfactory adjustment has been made by this government to those who are on fixed and low incomes.

Every one, Mr. Speaker, is aware of the strong objections taken by the Opposition to the euphemistically entitled "School Tax" Rebate. Can one be surprised that this government unblushingly calls this new sales tax an "Education Tax"?

In spite of its refusal to make a change in the last 2 years, the government has now capitulated; it's even supported a Private Member's Resolution which termed that method as being slow and cumbersome and the government has agreed both to the statement and to the cancellation of the School Tax Rebate.

Well, Mr. Speaker, our group never could understand the reasoning of this government and especially in relation to the taxation of residential rental property. We cannot conceive how anyone can argue that tenants are not paying the Real Property taxes on the premises they rent.

Every investor in residential housing expects rent to be based on his expenses and a suitable return on his investment. When his expenses are increased, his rent goes up. Competition doesn't apply where there's an increase in tax cost, because this increase is the same amongst all real estate investors. It must be clear to anyone, Mr. Speaker, that an increase in Real Property tax affects the tenant, if not immediately, then at least at the time of renewal of the lease.

In many cases leases contain an "escalator clause" providing for automatic increased rent based on increased taxes.

Well since the imposition of the special sales tax in 1964 and the institution of the School Tax Rebate which limited the rebate to a maximum of \$50.00 regardless of the number of housing units that were covered on any tax roll, the combined Opposition has hammered at the government's insensitivity to the problem of the tenant. It collected the special taxes from the apartment tenant but did not give sufficient rebate to the landlord which he could pass on to the tenant if he wanted to. Neither the landlord nor the tenant received the benefits which were promised to Real Property taxpayers, except \$50.00 for the whole property.

And now, with the much publicized Foundation program, the Government is compounding this inequity to renters of residential property. It has been stated that municipalities will be required to levy 9 mills on residential property, but 33 mills on apartment blocks which have been classified "commercial". In addition to this, of course, will be any special levies for any school costs not covered by this Foundation program.

In 1966 - and I'm sure that Winnipeg representatives from all parties will be interested - the Winnipeg School Tax amounted to 34 mills. If we assume that school costs remain constant for 1967, which of course is only wishful thinking, then apartment blocks will pay 33 mills plus the special levy which is estimated at an additional 15 mills. As a result, there will be a total of 48 mills or an increase of 14 mills which will have to be borne by the tenant through an increase in his rent. That, of course, is in addition to the sales tax - I'm sorry; Education Tax, which he will be asked to pay.

I cannot think of words harsh enough with which to attack the government for the callous attitude it shows to people who, through choice or through inability to provide the down payment on housing, are forced to pay additional sales taxes, and at the same time, are faced with an increase in rent. I think that this combination of the sales tax and the Foundation program formula is outstanding inexcusable action on the part of this government, an affront and a case of blatant discrimination against a large number of Manitobans.

You know, Mr. Speaker, many years ago I parked my car in a very large parking garage in Chicago and I had to wait an hour when I came to get it out. When I complained to the owner

(MR. CHERMICK cont'd), . . . of the garage about his poor management, he looked at me and he said, "I make \$35,000 a year. Are you trying to tell me how to run a business?" I often think of this, Mr. Speaker, especially when I think of how the Premier would say: "I don't care what you think of my attitude to the tenant or to the voter. I've been in Government for eight years. I've just been re-elected."

Well I have never again parked my car in that Chicago garage, and I suggest to Manitoba voters: Forget about the Golden Rule next election. Do unto the Conservatives as they have done unto you.

Until the voters realize in greater numbers that this Conservative Government is not interested in the individual but rather in power and its mass image, the callous disregard of the Conservatives for the voter will continue. For example, in 1965 and again in 1966, I challenged the government on a number of occasions to refute the calculation that I had made which indicated that contrary to the claim that additional taxes imposed in 1964 was to alleviate the burden of the real property tax payer, the government, in fact, made a very substantial profit. The monies received from special tax exceeded by \$5 million the monies which were used to reduce the burden on the real property tax payer. And this was in spite of the fact that the Land Transfer Tax was never instituted. In 1966, of course, the differential between the monies received in this special way and the monies paid out as promised was even greater. The government never denied my accusation and I maintain that in each year the government took more than \$5 million for general revenue which it had promised for the reduction of Real Property taxes.

That's why I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that if a sales tax were a completely equitable and progressive tax - which of course it is not - I would still hesitate to entrust it to this government for administration. The inherent inequities that exist in an apparently proportional tax such as sales tax which make it regressive in the lower and the higher income groups, prevents our Party from entrusting its planning and execution to the Government of this Province which has shown what we consider a disregard for the principle "To each in accordance with his needs, and from each in accordance with his ability."

We will, therefore, have to review very carefully the detailed proposals contained in the sales tax bill. We must assure that the exemptions be of a type which will lessen as much as possible the very heavy burden imposed on the low income and fixed income residents of this Province. We must look at all times for opportunities to compensate in some way, to these people for the imposition of a sales tax on them. We must at all times be extremely wary of this Government's proposal in the field of taxation. We are not prepared to grant that this government is prepared to live by the Golden Rule.

The Leader of the Official Opposition, in his views on the Budget, consistently criticized various aspects of the government's administration and tax proposals. He was, of course, most critical in his allegations in regard to waste and extravagance on the part of this government, but throughout the entire address, he made no definite positive proposal for the collection of additional revenues by the Government.

It is clear that the Government could not undertake an expanded program such as it has accepted for this coming year without a new approach to financing. The New Democratic Party has spelled out its ideas for increased revenues, and indeed, expressed the thought, which may be considered revolutionary by some, of borrowing for the program on a temporary basis until a new tax structure can be created on a national basis. The Liberals, who are always free with criticism, did not have a positive program to advance. We have reviewed their proposed amendment, Mr. Speaker, and we agree with certain of the contents therein. We agree that the government has failed to promote adequate growth in the province in spite of the additional tax burden placed on the people of Manitoba. We agree that the government has failed to take advantage of proffered federal assistance in the field of Education. We contend, as well, that the Provincial Government has failed to take advantage of Federal monies offered for public housing. We agree that this government has failed to have a planned and consistent tax policy. And although there are certain insinuations and allegations set out in the amendment which we do not completely support, we have decided on balance, that if we were called upon to vote on the amendment as it stands, we would vote in favour of it. We believe however, that we have presented a more positive review of the government's program and policies. We believe that our attitude in regard to same can be better stated in an amendment, which I have the honour to propose, on behalf of our Party, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks,

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)... "that the Amendment be amended by deleting all the words after the word "Government" in the first line and substituting the following:

1. Has failed to produce a blueprint for the future which would ensure each Manitoban with a reasonable standard of living, a reasonable standard of health care and the opportunity to obtain full educational benefits based only on the ability to absorb knowledge.

2. Has imposed on an already inequitable system of taxation, a five percent sales tax without due regard to the consequences on all taxpayers.

3. Has adopted the principle of budgeting for a deficit for the ensuing fiscal year while at the same time providing considerable outlay of current monies for capital purposes.

4. Has adopted the above methods of financing while acknowledging the forthcoming report of the Carter Royal Commission may recommend a broad revision of taxation policies at the municipal, provincial and federal levels.

5. Has by its impetuous tax policy failed to create the necessary climate for advancement in Manitoba. "

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I was going to adjourn debate. However, I have no objection of other members participating at this time.

.....continued on next page

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I rose because I had asked the Honourable Leader of the Social Credit Party and he told me that he didn't wish to speak at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the few remarks that I wish to make will probably qualify my contribution to this debate as a mere exercise in futility, but I am pleased to see that the First Minister is in his seat and I hope that he will bear with me for a few minutes, because some of the remarks that I wish to make are directed to him and to the Minister of Education and I hope the Minister of Education will not be absent too long.

Now some of the duties of an elected representative Sir, are pleasant; some are easy, while others are more difficult to perform. Occasionally, some of them seem near impossible and I guess it is with those in mind that we start each sitting by prayer to our God, prayer asking for courage and also for guidance. We are partisan, we will often try to take political gain for ourselves and for our party, but some principles are dear to us. They are so important, and then our duty becomes quite clear. We must then follow the dictates of our conscience come what may. Oh, one might close his eyes for awhile, turn away, but in the end, if he is a man he knows that he cannot escape, that he cannot run away. Everyone here has taken a sacred oath, an oath to do our duty to serve the people of Manitoba to the best of our ability.

Mr. Speaker, today I have such a duty - a duty that I find extremely difficult to perform. I am a human being with feelings and I resent being called a fanatic by some people. I am a business man and my stand has cost me dearly in the past. What many call my stubbornness is certainly not helping me or my party. During the last election campaign, some of my colleagues begged me to stay away from their constituencies. Many of my French Canadian compatriots tell me that I am hurting the cause of biculturalism and bilingualism. I have, to say the least, made it quite difficult for my Leader. In fact, it is possible that I am preventing him from becoming the First Minister of this Province. Some newsmen have shown sympathy for a poor misguided man crying in the wilderness, for one whose arguments have been passed by, by time, as they say. These things have caused me much anguish, Sir, I have done much soul searching. I have started up ten letters of resignation from the Liberal party. I was ready to sit in this House as an independent if it could serve the cause of justice.

Sir, I realize that my troubles do not greatly interest the members of this House. My purpose in talking as I do, is not to beg for sympathy. I am but an individual and I count for very little. I don't think that anyone here considers me a shrinking violet. I can be as tough as anyone and I probably hit harder than most, so I'm not seeking and I do not ask for favours. I simply wish to impress on the members of this House the importance that I attach to a certain principle and the grave injustice being perpetrated here in Manitoba.

The government of this province is imposing an educational tax on the people of Manitoba. I'm not talking about a sales tax, that is about the way this money is being collected, such as the last speaker did. What I want - this is something else - I want to speak about the tax on education, the tax earmarked for education. We talk a lot about priorities in this House. We have a long list of them, at the very top, the unanimous choice of all the members I daresay, we find education. The Province of Manitoba will spend \$119,788,021 on education this coming year. The Federal Government is giving approximately 48.3 millions in grants to Manitoba - and not a cent of this will go to assist the private schools of this province.

The Province of Ontario in 1964 allowed \$380.02 per pupil per annum for students educated in public schools and \$294.32 per pupil per annum for students educated in separate schools. This is three years ago, in 1964, Mr. Speaker. This is for every child from grade one to grade ten, including grade ten; and besides this any parent whose children attend separate schools, may in Ontario, decide if their municipal educational taxes go to the separate school system. The separate schools are also receiving a fair portion of corporation tax. And, Sir, apart from purchasing the books and paying for the transportation of a few, not a cent for children attending private schools here in Manitoba -- and this in the Year of Our Lord, 1967, the Centennial year of our great, our glorious country. This is the birthday present that the people of Manitoba wish to give an oppressed minority. We hear a lot about human resources, our youth, how important our young boys and girls are; about equality in education; but yet, 10,000 students or so do not exist.

Everyone of you in this house, at one time or another, spoke about the hardship of our high taxes, the high taxes imposed on the people. We heard the previous speaker speaking on it. But this money, we are told is absolutely necessary to educate our new generation. You -- many of you at least, are advocating free education for everyone. I heard a member complain because his father had to lend him some money to pay for part, a small part of his university;

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . not the elementary school, not secondary, not high school, but university. Most of the members are in favour of state financed kindergartens - and yes, even state supported baby sitters. We have heard about the callous attitude of those who were not ready to vote for the particular resolution; who were ready, as we were told, to abandon the two year old child by voting against this resolution -- but we did not hear one word about the tens of thousands of children attending private schools.

This year we are told that we should think as Canadians. Our border should not be separated by vertical lines but rather by horizontal lines, the Premier said. Let us not be provincial. Let us not be parochial in our thoughts, in our ideals, we are told. Why then must we be one of only two provinces that will not give any financial aid to all the students in the province? Why? In Ontario, in Saskatchewan every child receives some help for his education. But in Manitoba - What?

Sir, try to visualize the student force of this country, of all Canada, lining up at the B. C. border to march across this vast land of ours to the Province of Newfoundland, and all of a sudden when they cross into Manitoba then thousands of them will drop out of sight, will disappear. They do not exist. Is it any wonder that so many people leave this province, that it is so difficult to have others come and make Manitoba their home? The laws of majority you will say, Sir. What about the rest of Canada? Is everyone out of step but Manitoba? How many of you would accept this situation if the shoe was on the other foot? Today the last speaker said, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." And he also spoke about living the golden rule. Well if anyone here was transferred to Quebec, would he accept that his children either attend the Catholic schools - the schools of the majority mind you -- or pay to attend another school of his choice, and this, only after paying exorbitant taxes to finance first the Catholic schools. Oh it's not the same thing. No. But Quebec, this awful province full of damn separatists, would not treat your children as non-existent.

A few days ago the Honourable Member from Inkster was talking about liberty. The liberty even to give false information. He stressed the important point of freedom, of liberty. I believe in liberty, Sir; in parental rights in education and in equal rights for all children. Am I so vicious because I wish that this child who might choose to cross himself, be treated the same as any one of your children? Does anyone here want me to impose my conscience on him. Did I ever do it? Was I afraid to vote in favour of liberalizing the divorce laws even if my church doesn't believe in it? Why then would the members impose their conscience on somebody else? Is this the great freedom we hear about? Is the love of neighbour that my friend spoke about a few minutes ago?

Perhaps some of the new members think that I am unreasonable. Too emotional perhaps; a real radical. But do they really understand this question that they hear so much about. Let me tell them shortly what has happened since I was first elected in this House in 1959. If you remember, Sir, this was the year that the Royal Commission released its report. The members of this commission unanimously recommended that private schools should receive state aid. Nothing happened the first year; nothing happened the second year; and after three years when I asked the government when it would announce its policy, do you know what the Premier, the then Minister of Education, answered? "In due course." This is when they answered at all. They kept this up until 1963, when I advised the House that I would bring as a resolution -- a resolution demanding that the members of the House approve the principle of state aid, but only as long as it did not hurt or damage the public school system. Do you know, the new members, what your government did then? It wrote a couple of lines in the Throne Speech saying, and I'll quote: "My Ministers will present a statement dealing with the relationship between the public school system and the private schools and the principle which in their view underlies sound educational policy in Manitoba." Then, when it was time for me to move my resolution, I was called out of order on the pretext that I was anticipating.

The government then introduced a resolution setting up a committee that would study a shared services program. A committee guided by very restricted terms of reference. No decision; no enunciation of principle. But I was out of order, Sir. I asked the Minister of Education to set aside just a small sum of money to educate the people of Manitoba; to present to them both sides of the question; to let them know what this famous Manitoba school question was really all about. Oh no, that couldn't be done. Well next week all of you will be running around the province trying to sell a program - and this at a cost to the taxpayer. Mind you, not presenting both sides of the picture, but trying to sell a program. Many questions are asked in this House of the government, of individuals, and we always receive answers.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).... Sometimes vague answers, yes; but answers.

A few days ago the Leader of the New Democratic Party asked the government about its policy on taxation of co-ops. It took its time. He had to repeat his questions many times. He got a little mad and there was a bit of name calling from one side of the House to the other, but at the end he received his answer. Did the news media report that he was unfair? That he was a fanatic? That he had been too hard on the Minister? That he had been too emotional? No. He was entitled to receive some answers and he got them. What answer do I receive? Nothing or "in due course."

This year a new program, a complete change in education financing was announced by the Minister. Very quietly, without emotion, if you'll remember, I asked a few questions. What would this mean to private schools? Would any benefit at all be given to this? Was the government thinking about them? Would the students from these schools qualify for any scholarships? Would the Minister at least obey the law and satisfy himself that these children would not receive an inferior education? While selling this Foundation Program, could I report to the parents of these children that some benefits might come their way some day? I now ask the Minister of Education what he answered. "I have nothing more to say," he says, although he hadn't said one single word. The members will receive a sales kit giving the answers to all kinds of questions. Will I find the answers to my questions in this, Mr. Speaker?

Sir, am I the one that is unfair? Things have been going quite badly for private schools for many years now. But they are getting worse lately. Many schools had to be closed. Big steps were taken in the field of education. This government is the first to brag about all the progress made, but this was done, and nobody hides this, at a steady and significant rise in cost - in costs paid for by all the people of Manitoba -- all the people of Manitoba; in fact, by all Canadians. The First Minister is always crying for more money from Ottawa for education. The high cost of education is a constant source of worry. We all admit that our people are being taxed to the breaking point, all the people of Manitoba. And we make the Federal Government responsible for this. Well the Federal Government give grants to all the provinces for all the students. The other provinces are not breaking the law. It is constitutional for them to give a fair share to the private schools. Here in Manitoba, the share of this people is stolen from them. Money given to all children and collected in part from citizens of other provinces is stolen from them. And at least -- at least -- if the private schools would receive their fair share of federal grants -- and I ask the lawyers here present -- isn't this a valid point -- this money is given by people from all across Canada.

We all agree that the cost of education is skyrocketing. Doesn't it stand to reason that it is the same for private schools, especially if they wish to maintain a standard. The higher the cost of the public school, the higher the cost of the private school. Will anyone deny that these people are faced with double taxation? If the government at least said, "All right," to these people; "All right, pay the nine mills that everyone will pay, but if you have a child attending private school you will not have to pay the special levy set by the division, special levies to pay for extras for frills perhaps." But no, even those extras for the benefit of the children attending public schools must first be paid before parents start making payments on their child's education in private schools. And you call this freedom?

Then to top all this, the government places a five percent sales tax, an education tax, that again all people of Manitoba must pay. Mr. Minister of Education, you then refuse to give these children even protection. You will not even undertake to see that they receive adequate teaching. Mr. Speaker, let us look at this whole question in a different way. I will ask all the members for once to forget all about parental rights, the rights of parents to educate their children as they see fit. I ask them to forget all about the Confederation, the B. N. A. Act, the promises, the report of the Royal Commission, everything; let's say that I've been wrong for all these years. Good. Now all this is forgotten. Let us look at the children, because the children will have to play a role in the future of our country, of our province, the children who will form part of the new generation. What are their rights? What are their rights? Have they the right to a proper education? To a share of the money spent to develop this next generation here in Manitoba? Or are they to be condemned to oblivion? Remember, it is the parents that determine what school they attend. Not the children. And I ask the Minister: do you recognize that they have any rights? And if so what are you doing to safeguard their rights? What are you doing when you even refuse to obey your own law that demands a certain minimum standard in education. And the implementation of your Foundation Program will make it absolutely impossible for them to achieve this minimum standard.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....

Mr. Minister, your picture appears in this information pamphlet. It appears in three places. It appears with you smiling while extending a helping hand to a young boy representing the man of tomorrow. But I say to you there's a page missing. There's a photo missing. The photo of you blindfolded, pushing away another child; a child that you do not want to see, but a child who is very much alive; a child who is stretching his arm in despair; a child that if you took the trouble of looking at looks exactly like this little boy.

Mr. Premier, you are allowing this persecution to continue in your province and you believe that you have the strength of character to lead this country, to become the next Prime Minister of Canada? What about the rest of you? The members of the NDP. Are you still ready to claim that you wish to defend, to fight for the freedom of all Manitobans? What about you, the members of my party the Liberal party? Will you claim that there shall be no privileged class in Manitoba? And you, the government backbenchers. Haven't you any pride at all? Couldn't you stand on your own two feet but once? Mr. Speaker, are you proud of this Assembly who force some people of Manitoba to go against the dictates of their conscience or to pay an exorbitant and unrealistic penalty?

Today I do not rejoice on the occasion of my country's birthday because I am ashamed of being a Manitoban. Next week will be Brotherhood Week. Many of us will make speeches condemning prejudices. We will pay lip service to all kinds of beautiful ideas, beautiful notions and then we will return to our desks to continue this unjust persecution. We have heard the expression, "give us liberty or give us death." Well, Sir, that could very well apply here. If the members of this House do not believe in this liberty, in parental rights in education, it should at least believe in equality of all children. It shall kill the private schools but it should do so mercifully. Haven't these people suffered enough. Aren't they bloody enough to satisfy every member of this House? Wouldn't it be possible to administer the coupe de grace by closing these schools now; or should this torture be allowed to continue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): I have spoken to the Honourable Member from Rhineland previously and he told me he doesn't mind. He wasn't quite ready today, so I'd like to say a few words. I don't want the members to think that I'm jumping up like a jack-in-the-box trying to get ahead of somebody else. We had an example of this last Friday and I don't wish to be classed in the same manner.

Now the Member from Winnipeg Centre last Friday chose to criticize the liberal party. I was going to say he chose to put in his two-bits; I'd rather say two cents. I think that his contribution was quite enlightening in spite of the fact that he criticized me as I am one of the liberal party. I would like to bring the attention of the House to some of the remarks that he had made because indirectly he told us what he is not willing to support, what he is against, and at the same time he told us what his government is against, because I notice that in his speech he used the pronoun we. Therefore he included the government or the party that he represents by using the word "we" in his speech.

Now what are some of the things that he and his party is against, according to the honourable member. He mentioned the No. 6 highway, the construction of No. 6 highway and the government and he both are against the construction of the No. 6 highway. We know that the government has a certain amount of money to spend and by asking for the construction of No. 6 highway, I do not think that the liberal party was asking the government to go into greater expenditure, because we do not know what amount is going to be spent on the highways in the forthcoming year. And we are suggesting that this highway be considered, this highway to be considered in the sum that is appropriated this year which we will be discussing later, No. 6 highway. He is against the highway and probably the government is against it. He's against the auditor-general. How ridiculous to tell us that we are asking the government to spend more money and therefore tax the people a little more. It is ridiculous, because we've had examples in other jurisdictions, in other governments where the auditor-general was actually able to save money for the government. We've got an example in Ottawa, where the auditor-general drew the attention of the government to some errors that the government had made and to some waste that the government has made. And I would say that this would save money for the Province of Manitoba and probably reduce the tax. It was ridiculous to say that

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd).... we're asking the government to spend more money.

Medical and dental services, he's against that too. We all know that legislation in this form would be beneficial to everybody in Manitoba. True, it may entail a little more expenditure, but it's just a case of shifting some of the expenses -- and by the way the medical plan was promised by his Party, so why shouldn't we be asking for that? And it was promised as a voluntary -- I'll come back to it later.

What about home ownership for the young people? Does that mean more money spent? No, we would like to see loans available to young married people so that they could own a home instead of paying out rent and the end result is that they have nothing, they don't possess anything.

Community recreational expansion, he's against that too. And again it's just called for loans to be made available. And this is part of their education; it's physical fitness and so on, so I don't think that means spending more money.

The icing of highways, I think it was a worthwhile project. We complained at that time. It is our duty to complain when the roads are dangerous.

We asked for more vocational schools and that's what he is against, because he said the liberal party asked for more money to be channelled into vocational schools. We complained that this government did not take full advantage of the federal offer and I think we'd have been further ahead if we would have built more vocational schools. Maybe instead of going out now, if we'd started it three or four years ago, if the government would have been more energetic in that, we'd have had more vocational schools and more skilled labour. We wouldn't have had to import as many from Europe as we do now, therefore there would have been a saving.

What about nursery homes? Some of the members in this side supported the principle of nursing homes. It doesn't necessarily mean that it would have been an additional cost, because I don't think anyone spelled out how it was to be financed. It could have been financed probably by the school division, probably by people making use of those services, maybe a nominal fee. And probably the government might have given a small grant, we don't know; it was just the principle. I think that we were on the right track on that.

I don't think that I would like to be thought of as a bump on a log sitting in this House and not speaking on behalf of my constituents, on behalf of the people who have elected me. I think it is my duty to stand up and speak on their behalf and not just sit here in the House and get up once in a while and the main purpose of that would be simply to criticize somebody else who is doing a job here in this House. I definitely dislike that kind of an approach. We know that in the past the liberal group here did suggest, and still is suggesting, some good legislation for the Province of Manitoba and some of it would reduce the taxes in the Province of Manitoba, if the present government saw fit to accept our recommendations. And by the way, if you pick up the Throne Speech, read it through, you'll find out that almost half of all the legislation that is proposed in the Throne Speech embraces some of the suggestions given by the liberal party in the past. We can name a few in here; There's the tax rebate at source. That will save money for the Province of Manitoba. And we've been asking the government to rebate the tax at the municipal level. That would save money, that will not entail extra taxation. What about ombudsman? The present government is ready to accept some form of ombudsman. I don't think that this ombudsman would cost the Province of Manitoba such a huge amount of money because probably he would be able to work with the different departments and alleviate their work, he might be able to release some of their civil servants for other duties. We are the ones on this side who kept asking the government to accept the basic mill rate for the purpose of education. Now the government is doing it. So are we to sit here and not suggest anything, according to the member? We shouldn't. I don't think that criticism just for the sake of criticism is valid in the House.

What about tax free gasoline for farm trucks? Probably this does not mean extra taxation but probably loss of a small amount of revenue for the Province of Manitoba. He might have some basis on that. Uniform time. We were proposing this in the House here, uniform time throughout the province, whether it's five months or six months or four months, but as long as it was uniform, and the government is accepting that now. We have been proposing improved crop insurance, we wanted more coverage. Three years ago I asked on behalf of my own constituents to cover the whole of my constituency. I'm glad to hear that it is coming now.

Now another thing that two or three of our members supported was the nursery homes. We could actually save money if we had nursery homes in here, because probably some of

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd)... those mothers who are presently on social allowances if they were able to put their children in a safe place during the day, they may not be required to be recipients of social allowances, thereby the province may save money.

Now in spite of what the government says, we know that the government should take more responsibility for the finances of the Province of Manitoba. It isn't fair to go ahead and say that the liberal party is just as much to blame as the government for the mess that we are in at the present time. I reject that. The other side is the government and they should assume full responsibility, they should have proper planning and I would say if there was proper planning and good business like management of the affairs of the Province of Manitoba, this sales tax would not have been necessary at the present time. And I say that the government alone should shoulder this responsibility, the imposition of the sales. I think, and I'm sure that the government brought this on by wasteful expenditures and extravagance. Now what are a few examples of extravagance? I mentioned this before and I'll keep on mentioning it. Extravagance in the construction of high schools all over the Province of Manitoba, with some of them now being obsolete. That was quite an extravagance. It was poor planning. What about the tax-free bonuses to the cabinet ministers? That adds to the our expenses, probably part of the sales tax is going to pay for that. What about the tax rebate system? That was an expensive system; that was extravagant; that was waste of money. What about some of those cabinet minister's trips, the junkets throughout the Province of Manitoba? I would say that is expensive too. What about the overpayment in land purchases for government purposes? That is extravagance, that is waste. What about all those commissions, not all of them naturally commission, boards and inquiries and studies and so on throughout the Province of Manitoba. A lot of them are probably formed for the express purpose of giving positions to some of the defeated members of the conservative party. We've had several examples of that. Isn't that extravagance and waste? Some may say, oh well this is just peanuts, small things, it doesn't mean an awful lot. But peanuts may grow to coconuts if that is possible and coconuts can pile up and the end result is that little things build up, cents make the dollars and so on. And I would suggest that this sales tax probably would be even double what it is now. The honourable member mentioned that. He said it might even be 10 percent. I would suggest that it would have to be 10 percent sales tax if the promises that were given to the people in the last general election, if all of them were kept. They were free with their promises, all the candidates; the Conservative Party, the leaders and so on, were free with their promises. How many planks were there? Some 70 some odd planks. They were all promises, 70-odd planks. They were all promises, and whether the government did it or not on many occasions the candidates did it on themselves, and I would say with the approval of the Conservative Party. And if all those promises were kept we would have had at least 10 percent sales tax. That I would agree.

Now when those promises were made the government must have known that they have enough money to fulfill them else they would not have promised them; they wouldn't even have mentioned them. But the sales tax wasn't mentioned; therefore I deduct that there was enough money, and that wasn't fair to the people of Manitoba because I am sure that the government had the sales tax in mind at that time, because the government must have known that there wasn't enough money to fulfil all those promises and they were not being honest with the people of Manitoba. I would say that the Conservative Party at that time should have announced that, "if you elect us, we'll have a 5% sales tax," because this had been planned, I am sure. And Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that you were acquainted, being one of the candidates, you were acquainted with the 70-odd planks that were proposed by the Conservative Party, the good Conservative Party during the last election.

I am going to deal with only a few of those promises and these were promised not only in my constituency, because there were some 78, I think, planks; they were promised all over the Province of Manitoba, but I'll just deal with ten of them, just ten of them. That's roughly one-seventh of them. And now I'm going to ask the government to go ahead and spend money on them, because I have the right to do it. My constituents were promised that and there is no reason why I shouldn't ask the government to go ahead and spend money in my constituency and in the rest of the province and fulfil those promises, because if the government was honest with the people the government should have the money now and keep those promises, not just election promises to be broken later.

One of the promises, not only this year but eight years ago, and I mentioned the Honourable the Minister sitting right in front here I think, the Minister of Tourism now, who promised

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) . . . drainage in every constituency of southeastern Manitoba. He knows exactly -- he can go ahead and say it before I do, about Peter and Paul. He said, "We are not going to drain one man and drown the other one." What has been done since? Nothing.

Again this last spring in June good drainage was promised to the people of Manitoba. Go ahead and do it. You promised us and it is your responsibility and it is your duty to do it, sales tax or no sales tax. At the time the promises were given there was no announcement made of the sales tax. What about paving of the Morden-Sprague road. That was promised too and no "maybe" about it. The Minister of Highways is sitting right there, and I'll give you the exact words. . . . "This comes from the Minister's mouth" That's exactly what. . . ." This comes from the Minister's mouth," by the candidate. "If you do not vote Conservative you are not going to have this highway paved. If you do, you'll have it in 1967," and he said, "This comes from the Minister's mouth." Well that was the promise. We have a perfect right to ask for that now. Knowing the Minister as I know him, I do not think the Minister put those words in the candidate's mouth, but it was a Conservative platform, and in many other places probably a lot of the Conservative members were elected on that.

Those better provincial roads in the province of Manitoba and in my constituency; Go ahead and do it. Every election that has been promised. I'm asking the present government to do it and I have a perfect right to ask for that. Whether I am asking for more expenditure or not, it was promised, and again I'll say at the time it was promised there was no reference to sales tax so there must have been enough money to do that job and I have a right to go ahead and ask for it at the present time. Build recreational parks - and there was one specific site mentioned in my constituency. Go ahead and do it. Build that recreational park because there must have been enough money; the Conservative Party must have known there was. Institute an ARDA program at Emerson constituency, and that was promised and the First Minister happened to be at one of the meetings and said, "The Member is just talking about ARDA and we are already doing it," and I know what he was referring to. He wasn't lying but indirectly the people who were there took it as a promise, that we are already doing it in Emerson constituency. He probably referred to Interlake but it isn't fair to go ahead and fool the people that way. He said, "The Member, Mr. Tanchak, at that time was talking about ARDA, asked for ARDA to take care of southeastern Manitoba. Two years in a row, he is talking about it. We are already doing it." Yes, I agree, in the Interlake but not there, but the people were given to understand we are already doing it in Emerson constituency. You may call the people dumb, whatever you wish you may call them. I don't, but you may call them, but it was taking advantage, if they are dumb, taking advantage of their ignorance and it isn't the right way. So I say now - go ahead and do it; you promised us. There must have been money at the time. There was no sales tax yet.

Give every child equal educational opportunity. Well, at least that one promise is being tackled now. That one promise is being tackled; now there is something concrete. I am not going to quarrel with that, but still, that was supposed to be within -- there was no mention of sales tax at the time. I have a perfect right to ask for it and I am not going to be reprimanded by somebody from the other side who doesn't understand the situation at all and does not wish to do it.

Give Emerson constituency non-compulsory Medicare. That's what was promised. Go ahead and do it whether it costs money or not; go ahead and do it. You must have known that you had enough money without sales tax. Sales tax wasn't mentioned.

Give Emerson better flood protection down the Red River valley. Something is being done and I say it is not enough.

Now this is only ten out of the 78 different promises that were made in Emerson constituency and all over the province of Manitoba, and I say that it is the responsibility of this government to keep its promises and keep it even though there is no sales tax. If the government is responsible they should have known that they had enough money to do it, and I would say the people of the province of Manitoba are not getting value for their tax dollar. This government is not giving it to them.

Now we all know that the financial position of the province of Manitoba must be very strained if the government, after repeatedly increasing taxation and resorting to new taxes practically every year, not only once, now they come through with a sales tax, so it must be strained. If it wasn't, sales tax wouldn't have been necessary. But does this government acknowledge their responsibility for this mess? No. Just like a little child, like two little boys quarrelling: "I'm not to blame for this - you are; Ottawa is." I don't care who is,

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd).... It's your responsibility here, the members in the front benches. Don't try to slough it off. Even if Ottawa could have helped it's still your responsibility. It's the responsibility of the front benches. Take full responsibility for it and don't say, "I didn't; the other fellow is to blame."

Now this new sales tax. What is taxation? What is taxation? We all know that taxation is the taking away of bread and milk from the citizens. Taking away the bread and milk from the citizens; that is taxation. I do not say that it isn't necessary; we have to run our services; but it is the first charge against the income, even before the ordinary necessities of life are taken care of - the clothing, the food, the bread, the milk and butter and so on, and the government which looks upon the right to tax as a chance to grab every possible penny from its citizens, deserves nothing but disgust in the opinion of the people if they try to, and this government has taxed and taxed and taxed and taxed and is taxing again. Never a year went by that some tax was not being increased. The people are being taxed to the limit. True, for some good purposes in some cases, but I'll have to warn the government that this good samaritan who is still willing to pay the tax may disappear from this earth and who will pay the tax? He is still willing but I think that even he is strained at the present time.

The Sales Tax is to bring \$45 million in a full year and if you have a million people in the province of Manitoba, I heard another figure mentioned there about \$50.00 or \$60.00 per person. This means about \$45.00 per person on an average. A family, say, of five, would have to dish out about \$225.00 a year in sales tax. This is a very vicious tax, in my opinion, a very hard tax, and it will be equally as hard, even harder for the poor, the little man to pay than for the people who can really afford it. It will be a blow, the sales tax, to all Manitoba. It will reduce the standard of living for all in the province of Manitoba and I would like to know, or hear from the former president of the Businessmen's Association -- I am sorry I haven't got that pamphlet, the what is it? the Merchants Association about two years ago. No sales tax in Manitoba - giving praise to this government saying there was no sales tax. If that gentleman was honest, wouldn't he come out now and object to this sales tax? True, his successor is, but we don't hear anything about him at this time.

Now come back to this - Education Tax. Oh, we've heard those stories before. We've heard something about the hospital tax, and when we on this side tried to earmark all of the revenue towards hospitals, "No, No, we wouldn't do it." Now we come in with an educational tax. I think it is silly to call it so because the government needs a certain amount of money and the government is going to get it, gasoline tax or sales tax or income tax or tobacco tax or liquor tax - it all goes to the same treasury. The fact is that this government hasn't - didn't and hasn't - got enough money to pay its bills. Therefore we have to have a sales tax and I'm not going to refer to it as an educational tax. Why should I? It's a provincial tax. Call it the Roblin tax, provincial tax. Why educational tax? Because it's nice-sounding. The Premier and the front benches can go -- at the next election they'll say, "Here those fellows were against education because they voted against our educational tax," and that's what they are going to say because that has been said, that they were against hospitals, they voted against the hospital tax. We voted against "a tax" and don't try to hoodwink the people and call it an educational tax. I would say that the province needs extra money because the province wasn't spending it in a businesslike manner; therefore there is a sales tax of 5% and not educational tax. I have a business, a general store in there, and I am going to refer to it - unless I am forced otherwise by law - I am going to refer to it as provincial tax or Roblin tax, whatever you may call it. I will not agree to call it an educational tax. It is just words on paper. It's a provincial tax required by this government. (Interjection) Provincial sales tax, yes.

Now I don't think I should take more of the time. There might be some other members who wish to speak. Time is getting short. I could go on for quite awhile but I will simply end that if this government had planned the business of Manitoba properly and eliminated waste, eliminated extravagance, sales tax would not have been necessary in the province of Manitoba now.

MR. SPEAKER: We have before the House a motion for the adjournment of debate by the Honourable Member for Rhineland. Are you ready for the question?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I really hadn't intended to get into this debate this afternoon but I think it would be fair to put a little light and sunshine on the sight of the people of Manitoba. The Honourable Member from St. John's discussed wages and the poor economy that we have in Manitoba. The Honourable Member from Emerson is disappointed with the taxes that we have to pay to maintain the types of services that our people want -- the type of

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd).... taxes that they will willingly pay even though none of us like taxes. They pay these taxes because they want the services. If the honourable members would listen to some of the remarks in this House the last few days, listen to their requests for services, the increase in services that they say are needed, and relate it to the tax dollar, then they must tell their constituents that were they government they would be having more taxes without the same high degree of competence and service that this government has been making available to the people of Manitoba.

We talk about wages. We talk about low wages -- and I'm surprised at my honourable friends in the New Democratic Party who are much closer to organized labour than many other people are in this House, and they are telling me that in areas of transportation, that in areas of the meat packing industry, that in the mining industry, that my honourable friend talks about. He says, "mining industry -- gold mining, is at a pegged situation." What about the base metal mines and the agreements that have been arrived at there? Then let's take a look at minimum wages. Let's take a look at minimum wages. We hear a great hue and cry about minimum wages in this province. I will repeat again for every member in this House. I don't think our minimum wage is high enough but I don't think you auction off the economy of Manitoba by .25, .50, .75, \$2.00. I think there has to be a reasonable basis of arriving at an equitable economic condition, and I'm sure most honourable members in this House feel the same way. Our basic minimum wage is as high as any minimum wage in Canada. It's as high as the wealthiest areas in Canada, and we have members in this House who continually believe that you can say to the people of Manitoba, improve the minimum wage and there are not going to be any poor.

Now if we're talking about the same thing -- possibly we could define what we're talking about. Are we talking about minimum wages or are we talking about a fair wage? I suggest that honourable members opposite are talking about fair wages. I find on enquiry that the minimum wage in this great neighbour to the south is \$1.00 an hour -- \$1.00 an hour is the minimum wage -- that they have a fair wage of \$1.40 and over the next three or four years this fair wage is going to increase to \$1.60. I suggest to you that with the Minimum Wage Board meeting with all factors being considered in this province that if there is a need for an increase in the minimum wage that this increase will be recommended, and that this government will institute it. But I think you gentlemen have to agree that this harangue about stagnation and decay is doing more harm, Mr. Speaker, to the image of Manitoba than anything can be done. I'm surprised as we leave Manitoba, as we go to other places, Manitoba to all of us is a wonderful place. I don't see anything wrong with telling our people of Manitoba that it's a fine place and that if we improve our techniques, if we become more efficient, the production costs will be lower, where managers can pay higher wages. We want them to pay higher wages. And the nonsense of saying that we don't need more workers in the mining industry! My honourable friend knows that we can use 1,500 workers in the mining industries at the present time; a basic industry that will be good for the Province of Manitoba. I'm sure my honourable friend, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, is going to have other remarks to say about the development of Manitoba.

You tell Manitobans about a wasting asset up in the north. It's been wasting for a hundred years. It's a replenishing asset if it's harvested properly. Our labour - management relationships in this province have never been better. And let me make it perfectly clear, I don't want you to think the government is taking all the credit for that, but I suggest to you that there are people who are responsible on both labour and management side who are interested in developing the Province of Manitoba. And surely to goodness, Mr. Speaker, that we its elected representatives will be just as interested, will show the same zeal and effort and encouragement to improve economic conditions in this province.

We have gone over the labour relations in this province and I would suggest to you that while we realize and while we are waiting for a report from the Minimum Wage Board, that we should consider here at this time the outstanding achievements that have been brought about this year by the loss of time strikes. Now we all know that this past year has been termed the year of the strike in Canada; that the man-days lost have been astronomical, and yet we in the Province of Manitoba have enjoyed one of the best years in labour-management relations; in fact it is an outstanding and enviable record in this province. I think it would be worthwhile if we considered just the general situation in industrial relations this year. We're all aware that we've had many special undertakings that have been sought, and the public interest in labour-management affairs this year has been quite high. In fact everybody seems to want to

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd).... get into the act of labour-management relations this year without giving due consideration to the problems that labour and management face. I suggest to members of this House that the problems that labour and management do face are the types of problems that have to be settled by labour and management themselves; that we can't legislate it or we shouldn't legislate it until they have shown that they are incapable of arriving at proper solutions in the best interests of the community. --(Interjection)-- Fair wages -- yes. And how are we going to have fair wages in this province? We're going to have fair wages by a strong trade union movement, a trade union movement that needs to be encouraged to carry out the services that it can render to the community. The economic situation in Manitoba is not going to be improved by raising the minimum wage.

MR. CHERNIACK: Who said that?

MR. BAIZLEY: I said that. I said that. The minimum wage to the south of us is \$1.00 an hour. The minimum wage around us and supposedly in the wealthiest provinces of Canada is \$1.00 an hour. --(Interjection)-- It is not the minimum wage. It is not the minimum wage. Our economy has been maintained and is booming because of good labour-management relationships in this province. I must admit that I get very annoyed, I get really upset when we talk about poor Manitoba. I think of my honourable friend from Lakeside the other day talking about the needs of people who didn't seem to be as fortunate as my learned friend in law or possibly even a chiropractor, but at the same time we're very happy people, for we're making a contribution to this economy. The ways and means are available to our people here in Manitoba to improve their lot, if we have the fortitude to encourage and to motivate them to take advantage of the schemes and benefits that are available to them and have been made to them by this government.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): The government doesn't have to do it all.

MR. BAIZLEY: And the government doesn't have to do it all. I would like to know how many people in Manitoba are really unhappy. How many of our citizens would say they are really poor and how much of this poverty is the result -- is the result of lack of opportunity in an economy that is bouncing and needs people to work.

I suggest to my honourable friend from Inkster, talking the other day in the debate about university education being free and being disappointed that university education couldn't be furthered for compensation cases beyond a first degree. I want to tell my honourable friend, and I think I have many colleagues on this side of the House who agree with me, that we don't feel there's anything wrong with working for some of the advantages that are to be offered here in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am most happy that the Honourable the Minister of Labour found it necessary - and it is so necessary - to come to the defence of the government at this stage. And I'm also glad to hear that my friend the Honourable the Minister is so happy about the conditions in Manitoba; that he is suggesting that rather than criticize this government that we should embrace them and thank them and I suppose get down on our hands at eveningtide and say thank heaven we have a Conservative administration in the Province of Manitoba. The Honourable the Minister for Agriculture says, "Hear, Hear." What else would you expect from one who just recently has taken an interest in the affairs of Manitoba and as of June 23rd was first elected into this House.

MR. ROBLIN: You can do better than that.

MR. PAULLEY: I beg your pardon. --(Interjection)-- Oh you just sit there for a little while and maybe I will.

MR. ROBLIN: I doubt that I will. I think we've heard it all before.

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister says that he's heard it all before. --(Interjection)-- And there are none so blind as those that won't see. And I attribute this directly to my Honourable Friend the First Minister for we have been endeavouring to open his rose-coloured eyes to reality for so often now without any....

MR. ROBLIN: It's the glasses that are rose-coloured; the eyes are blue.

MR. PAULLEY: My friend, Mr. Speaker, says his eyes are blue. And so is the economy of Manitoba -- very, very blue.

MR. ROBLIN: It's better than being red.

MR. PAULLEY: So is the attitude of most of the people, blue, because of the lack of direction, because of the lack of facing up to facts of the situation here in Manitoba as exhibited by the Honourable the Minister of Labour here this afternoon. Question of minimum wage. My

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . . honourable friend the Minister says, "Well now we've got a Minimum Wage Board, we're going to listen to it, we're waiting for it, we'll give it consideration." And he agrees that the wages in Manitoba are not sufficient. He agrees. Then why in heaven's name haven't you got the gumption to do something about it - except talk? Because in your hands is the power to change that with or without a recommendation of the Minimum Wage Board. But have you done it? No. Of course you're not going to because you haven't got enough gumption to face the realities and you don't really know what the situation here is in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. ROBLIN: He's got more sense than to take that. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: You have more sense.

MR. ROBLIN: Horse sense is right.

MR. PAULLEY: It would be unparliamentary for me to suggest which end.

MR. ROBLIN: I can guess. Never mind, I'll. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: But I do say to my honourable friend if he's heard the story before he's hearing it again, and apparently it is rousing the ire of my little impetuous friend. And again I said it's all very fine for the First Minister or the Minister of Labour to stand up in this House and say, "All is right with Manitoba." But others aren't saying this, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EVANS: Not you anyway.

MR. PAULLEY: I beg your pardon.

MR. EVANS: I said, "Not you anyway."

MR. PAULLEY: Of course not. Of course not. My honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer indicates by an interruption that I'm not saying that everything is right in Manitoba. I certainly am not saying everything is right in Manitoba. My honourable friend, the Provincial Treasurer doesn't say things are right in Manitoba either and he, through his taxation policies are going to upset the applecart insofar as many citizens in the province are concerned adversely nonetheless.

But what is the situation in respect of wages that my honourable friend the Minister of Labour so glibly passes off that we're not in bad shape here in the Province of Manitoba?

--(Interjection)-- Tell you? Certainly I'll tell you. But I hope that in the telling of the story, Mr. Speaker, that the ears are a little wider open than the eyes, in order that if it is possible to penetrate the skulls of my friends opposite so that they can face the reality, they can listen to the other side of the story and listen to the statistics as published in Trade and Commerce, January 1967 issue.

My honourable friend the Minister of Labour just told us about the big deal that the employees are receiving in the mining field in Manitoba. What's the situation by comparison with the rest of western Canada? The average weekly wage in the mining industry according to this publication, Mr. Speaker, is \$121.27. In the Province of Saskatchewan, \$127.55. In the Province of Alberta, \$140.31. In British Columbia, \$128.59 - in the mining industry. Which is the lowest? Shall I write the message to my honourable friends opposite? Manitoba is at the bottom of the totem pole. Is it any wonder that the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce wants to travel across the length and breadth of the globe in order to get miners to come to Manitoba, because they're leaving Manitoba to go to other clients because of the relative wages here. And then my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer turns around and says, we're not going to receive much revenue or the same amount as previously in the mining industry because we haven't got the workers to produce the mineral from the ore.

What about manufacturing? The Minister of Industry and Commerce is lief to have high-priced ads in all of our newspapers about glorious Manitoba. And the manufacturing industry - what's the story in respect of wages in the manufacturing? Manitoba: average week wage \$85.29. Poor Saskatchewan, \$94.01. Alberta, \$97.20, per week. I won't go to British Columbia because they're even higher. Who's at the bottom of the totem pole? This land of promise of ours that the Minister of Labour told us about today.

What about the construction industry? Here in this forward province of ours under that administration, the construction industry I believe has the highest percentage decrease in construction starts than any across Manitoba --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon. . . .

MR. BAIZLEY: . . . . highest minimum wages in the construction industry in Canada.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend the Minister of Labour who has just stated that we have the highest minimum wages in the construction industry will listen to this -- and I can appreciate, Mr. Speaker, him talking about minimums, because that government is minimum oriented. And they figure that every individual should be, in Manitoba

(MR. PAULLEY: . . . . at the minimum. --(Interjection)-- But what is the facts insofar as the construction industry is concerned? Average weekly wage in the construction industry, Manitoba, \$98.75 per week. Saskatchewan, \$102.07 per week. Alberta, \$122.34 per week. Glorious, lovable Manitoba, under that government -- I know what it could be under a good government.

MR. CHERNIACK: Which is the lowest?

MR. PAULLEY: The lowest in the construction, Manitoba. Manitoba. What about the service industry, a growing field, as an employer of labour, the service industry, Manitoba. \$52.71 per week. Isn't that a magnificent sum! And my honourable friend the Minister of Labour has the consummate gall to infer to this House that our minimum wage is okay at \$1.00 an hour? On a 48-hour week basis at a \$1.00 an hour, our service industry average in the Province of Manitoba, \$52.71 -- just a mere \$4.00 over our minimum wage. Saskatchewan, \$59.25. Alberta, \$60.32. Did you ask me where Manitoba was? (Yes)

Down at the bottom of the totem pole. My honourable friend the Minister of Labour seems to think that everything is kosher, everything is hunky-dory. He says that we have to wait, we have to wait till the Minimum Wage Board gives its recommendations, and you are supported in this by your honourable leader, before we can take any action to improve the situation here in Manitoba.

MR. BAIZLEY: None so deaf who do not want to hear, I believe what was said.

MR. PAULLEY: I listened to you my friend. Here again we have my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce as I say travelling the length and breadth of the universe for miners and technicians and qualified mechanics and what's happening here in the Province of Manitoba at the present time, that they're going out of the province to other areas. And I charge part of the responsibility of that directly to the lack of action on the part of the government of Manitoba -- and at the present time, Mr. Speaker, I have in mind the drain of the personnel of Air Canada going down to Montreal. I say to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, you're a newcomer . . .

MR. ROBLIN: That's our fault is it - Air Canada?

MR. PAULLEY: Your fault? Yes, it's your fault, because you haven't continued the fight to hold them here.

MR. ROBLIN: That's what you know about it.

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend says that's what I know about it. All I know, Mr. Speaker, is what transpires in this House. All I know is that Air Canada personnel are continuously leaving Manitoba. It hasn't been stopped - and I say at the same time that it hasn't been stopped, my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce is attempting to bring into Manitoba personnel, technicians and mechanics.

The other day I received an Order for Return from my honourable friend as to what the results of his endeavours were and if memory serves me correctly there were 22 skilled workers came into the Province of Manitoba as a result of the endeavours of the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the immigration program. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of well-trained Manitoban personnel with Air Canada had left the province.

MR. CAMPBELL: Hear, Hear.

MR. PAULLEY: Is this the action and the attitude of a forward-looking government, one who realizes its obligations? I'll say not. I say that the Minister of Labour who loves and is happy to get into an argument insofar as the budget is concerned would be well advised to get the facts and to have his actions straightened off before he enunciates them in this House. I suggest that the Minister of Labour should talk to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, so that they can get together.

I agree that to a large degree, labour-management relationships in the province are pretty good. But I also want to say to my friend the Honourable the Minister of Labour that representatives of labour presented to him a week or so ago a brief on behalf of labour in Manitoba which --(Interjection)-- very complimentary in one or two instances that's right.

Weren't very complimentary as far as ex parte injunctions were concerned; weren't very complimentary insofar as the right to picket was concerned; weren't very complimentary insofar as the minimum wage in Manitoba were concerned; weren't very complimentary insofar as the attitude and action of government in the field of automation was concerned. But they were complimentary. They were very complimentary to the government, in the eyes of the Minister of Labour. But only in the eyes of the Minister of Labour.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).....

I think Mr. Speaker, if it meets with your approval, possibly on this happy note, you could dismiss us temporarily until 8 o'clock this evening.

MR. SPEAKER: It's now 5:30 and I'm leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00 p. m. this evening.