

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

BUDGET DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I closed off I was talking about the Minister of Health talking about open government and I sort of wanted to talk about something along the lines of the First Minister when he suggested that we were dealing with the big lie strategy. And I wanted to talk about the pot calling the kettle black because I had filed an Order for Return in which I demanded to know the names of all the members of the government opposite who had relatives and so on, working for the government. And the thing was that I was merely trying to point out some of the situations. I even talked about the inability of myself to get information on Mincome; the inability of myself to find anything about the workings of Legal Aid. All of these things have not certainly been open government by members opposite.

I had talked again because I've been subject in the last several months to what I consider — at least I felt that I didn't deserve it — some very strange behaviour towards myself by a number of low-lifes on the other side. I just felt that it seemed to me that if I could do something, if I was like the rabbit — say a lot of these bloodhounds on the other side chasing a rabbit — then maybe others will win. Other members of my party will win in the coming election because the members opposite have spent so much time chasing this rabbit. You know, I may not get the Victoria Cross for my efforts but at least maybe future families and future young people in this province . . . —(Interjection)—

The Member from St. Matthews says I need an education. I do have a university of life degree education. I don't need to have a bunch of fancy degrees that don't mean anything when it comes to dealing with the working people of this province. I can look forward to the day when every youth in this province will have a chance to get a proper education and that's something that our government will provide.

Well, you know members opposite are great people to talk about how much they do for the working people but there doesn't seem to have to be any tag day for members opposite. They've certainly got a couple of quarter millionaires in their midst. And I get sick and tired of their rhetoric about all this nonsense about the poor man.

Well all right, let's talk about for instance the candidates in the election. I spoke before the break on a number of things where I suggested you brought in 64 professionals to fight the last election. I'll talk about some of the candidates in the last election and even today's headline in the paper, Friday, April 29th. There he is, the Minister of Labour holding up the hands of some guy that's seeking a job that's going to pay \$18,000 or \$19,000 a year. It says in Public Accounts that the man makes . . . He says, "Mr. Wilson Parasiuk makes \$37,795.50." That information is from the 1975-76 Public Accounts. What is he making today? And you're telling me that this fellow is going to give up all this under the name of whatever.

Mr. Harvey Moats in the Public Accounts — again this information is several years old — \$25,575.51, another defeated candidate. Mr. Al Mackling, another defeated candidate, \$32,119.64. Ms. Samia Friesen \$23,201.15 and my good friend, the man who we couldn't even get the information out of the Minister of Labour who was quoted as saying he only makes \$47 an hour and I asked him if that was two and a half times the lowest worker on his staff and he wouldn't answer me. He wouldn't answer me for two weeks because it was unbecoming a Minister of the Crown to dare to talk to a backbencher on the other side — a pompous attitude.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WILSON: I'm just saying to the Minister of Tourism who is trying to use up my time, Mr. Speaker, and I'm also saying that Mr. Murdock MacKay and I quote from a newspaper article in which I provided information based on Public Accounts which totalled no less between Mr. MacKay and his firm, \$190,550.33. Are you telling me that these people really want to win? Well, that's the kind of thing that I'm talking about. That government should have answered that Order for Return. The Minister of Corrections answered it because he was one of the few innocent ones on the other side.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, one of the tragedies of it is that there's more to this than meets the eye. You get the feeling that nobody really cares. You know, nobody really cares. I point to waste after waste. I point to the incapability of the Minister of Tourism and nobody does anything. I point crime after crime. I point wrongdoing after wrongdoing.

I forgot to talk about primary priorities that that government should be involving itself in and the only thing they did; the former Minister of Tourism saved a museum for myself which I thank him very much for. But he's one of the few people that have listened. He had the courtesy to come out and give the accommodation awards as the Minister of Tourism. He was a leader for tourism and he brought it from number five down to number three in the earning power. This new Minister thinks about nothing

else but canoeing and says, "I don't care if one American ever comes to this province."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WILSON: They are more interested in secondary politicized spending. It's terrible that we have to engage in politicizing every dollar that is spent.

Well, I want to get a good feeling back and even though all those bloodhounds are chasing me if I should lose I'll have a good feeling because of the victory on this side of the House. And proof of that is the leader of them is the First Minister. It's all right for him to stand up and say every second sentence is a falsehood and incredible when talking about all the information that I give to this House. My own leader has quoted the same statements that I crystal-balled and talked about and I'm sure he didn't get the information from me in my election pamphlets. I've got one election pamphlet here that the Minister got so upset about. "What has increased faster than the cost of food, the cost of housing and the cost of clothing?" And I kept everybody in suspense; I said turn to Page 3. You know what the answer was? The cost of Ed Schreyer.

Well, I quote from the March 14th Winnipeg Free Press and the headline says, "Schreyer Wants to Shatter the PCs Big Lie Strategy. Another big lie," he said, "was the Conservative's Party claim that Manitoba Government is spending \$50 million on government projects."

The following day in Hansard, March 14th, the same day apparently because I guess the Free Press got the information the day before, the Minister of Public Works stood up and said, "Yes, we are building a computer centre; an environmental lab; a magistrate's court; a provincial garage and an Autopac Motor Vehicle Branch." Never mind the buildings in Dauphin and that, but we were talking about Winnipeg. And he's going to lose a lot of support in the core area because he hasn't got in that \$50 million, the \$1.7 million he talked about for recreation. He spent it all on buildings and blamed it on . . .

Are any of these projects being held up in giving the extra housing that is needed; to hiring an architect that will design a public housing thing so that it won't be a disgrace for people to live in there because they are so well identified? They stick out like a sore thumb.

Is there any type of money in that \$50 million that goes for people's real needs? And that's when I talk about primary priorities.

So it's all right for the Minister to make mistakes but I've got a new pamphlet I am going to send out in the next couple of days. I hope the First Minister stands up and waves it around again because he will be found out. Because I am attaching, this time, my own personal hydro bills — my own personal ones.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

Just a year and a half ago, the First Minister told us we should use more electricity. He told us that we had so much that we could sell the surplus to the U.S.A. He even got the province to buy three electric cars. You may remember the photographs in the newspapers . on T.V. of his wife driving one of these cars. Now you know the cost \$100,000 for these three cars, \$22.00 per mile, because they've only gone — it's the most expensive U-drive in the history of Canada.

As for selling surplus hydro to the United States, well it turns out now we have to buy it from them. This is just part of the situation that I'm putting out. . . .—(Interjection)— I'm sure that your high paid organizers from Saskatchewan will find a way to get one of the copies of my material.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WILSON: To the Minister of Tourism, I can assure him that I have not mentioned him in my new pamphlet because I'm saving all that for the Estimates. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I will send the Minister a copy. What I have said here is that I have a total increase over the years, you can see that the costs have risen a lot in two years, in fact, Hydro rates were up 25.1 percent in 1976, 15.4 percent in 1977 for a total increase of 40.5 percent increase. Has your income gone up that much? Well, mine hasn't, I believe the newspapers said our income went up 5 percent the other day.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Again I'm going to ask for the co-operation of the honourable members. When I ask for order I would hope they would co-operate. The Honourable Member for Wolseley. Order please.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I have not questioned why the Minister does so much business with one travel agency, I haven't said anything about the Minister of Tourism, and I think that if he's reading something into my speech then I've obviously hit a sore spot, but I do have some very important information to read into the record, and I think this government's record has shown that they have no direction for the future of Manitoba.

And I think that on unemployment, let's talk about unemployment. They have the poorest record of job creation in Manitoba, and in Canada for that matter. Last year 100,000 people entered the work force, but there was only 2,000 jobs available for them. The NDP claimed that they created 65,000 new jobs, but Stats Canada says that they only created 30,000, and again, another discrepancy. But I don't use strong terms.

I would also like to suggest, and you can all ask questions when I'm finished, that the sorry economic picture is sort of an indication of the anti-business stand, it's a feeling you get on the street, it really is, you get that feeling on the street. I think that they've driven investment capital out of the province. You only have to look, as some members have pointed out, to the causes of having one of the few provinces with succession duties still around. Everybody who has already paid taxes on their earnings, just because of the envy of members opposite, force them to move out of this province. So they go down to Alberta and Vancouver and so on and so forth, whether it's BACM, A & W, Winnipeg Supply, whether it's the McAuley Art Collection, or whether we're going to have the owner of Holt Renfrew move away because the province is just too expensive to pass away, and it's an expensive province to die in, because people pay taxes, and they have something to contribute as leaders of our community, and I'd like to see either the tax completely done away with or at least give forgiveness for the farm. I can't see taxing the heck out of some guy who wants to pass his farm along.

I thought that it would be interesting to put on the record that mineral exploration in a time of plenty, in a time that we know we've got a fantastic mineral potential, has declined 15 percent last year, and I think that that's terrible, and the tax credit scheme, and we just have to look at the sales tax, in 1968 was \$39 million, this year will it be \$198 million. And if you really examine it closely, you find that the reductions that this government talks about when they talk about 300 and some odd dollars they're giving back everyone, I won't use the strong terms the First Minister uses, but I would suggest, it's questionably put, because if you work it out it works out to only \$2.08 per household if you compare 1968 with today so that's what I'm talking about. "Government expenditures out of control" in the headlines here when the Free Press printed that provincial expenditures are triple in eight years. Everybody's saying it, and your trying to deny it.

Well we talk about some other problems, and of course, the member had talked about the government mismanagement in the Hydro project which is being debated now, and I think we need a demand metering, etc., where a lot of these meter readers give you these estimates all the time, and that's annoying a lot of elderly people.

I really think that the public debt has to be made available so that people can have a look at it. We know that in March 31st of 1975, I think that the public debt was about \$185 million, the public debit in March 31st, 1976 is \$423.7 million, and that's almost an increase of 130 percent. It's going to be one of the greatest greatest reasons, because the only excuse the members opposite have is they stand up and say, we have a AAA rating, isn't that great, I've got a pocket full of creditcards, if I went out and used them all, I'd be broke. Does that mean your going to be proud of borrowing the daylights out of the taxpayers of Manitoba? You people are really proud of the fact that you've got creditcards in your pocket, and you're out spending them, and somebody is going to have to pay that debt, and I don't see as many young people as I usually do in the gallery, but they're the people that are going to be saddled with this debt in years to come.

Well I wanted to talk about some other things, and one of them was, since he's here, the Minister of Tourism. I think that we have to ask a number of questions, and one of them is, when is he going to let us know what he's going to do for Tourism? Because every time I pick up an ad in any type of national publication, every other ad is inviting people to stop off here, we have a main trunk of fantastic tourism dollars, the Trans Canada Highway. We just have to have some imagination to support and give some people some information to tell them what's happening in Manitoba, and have more things happen here that will have people stay leave some of their money behind. But this Minister no, he's all of a sudden having a bunch of parks people take over since the last shake-up, and they want everybody to go canoeing. There's a lot of dollars in canoeing. In other words, the only cars that are going to stop in Manitoba are those with a canoe on the roof, because this is the new Minister. And he's got that state-owned hotel and the state-owned ship, and that's what he's going to do, he's going to fill it. Guess what he's going to fill that hotel with? The poor Minister of Public Works is going to find that his accommodations in Gimli are going to be suffering, because guesswhere the government meetings and seminars are going to be held? At the Hecla Island Hotel. —(Interjection) — Oh, he doesn't want to look bad.

All right I challenge the Minister in his Estimates, or even after, to deny that the Renewable Resources had a meeting up there, and they're spending \$34.00 a night or whatever it is for those rooms, and every one of the staff members up there makes at least \$7.00 an hour. —(Interjection) — I don't care what they make. The point is that you have a pipeline called the Trans Canada Highway, you have resorts that historically, that my mother, and many other of the members opposite mothers and fathers went to, Grand Beach, Winnipeg Beach, all these historically successful operations, but that's not good enough to improve those places. When are they going to get a hotel at Grand Beach? They sure got one pretty fast out in the remote area out in the middle of nowhere —(Interjection) — Well, all right I've got the information on an Order for Return in which the Minister said his share so far, is \$3,785,896.51. That's the cost so far of the Hecla Island Hotel complex, that's just the hotel according to this Order for Return.

So what I am simply saying is that this Minister has got a job to do. I remember going to a meeting of which the guest speaker, and the former Minister was there, Mr. John Hunt said, "The tourism industry has to have more politicians that care. They have to have politicians who eye tourism, especially in hard times, as a thing to bring fresh new dollars into the province." So my position against the current Minister of Tourism has not changed.

I do think that this government has — and I won't use the words of the First Minister — has engaged in a lot of questionable activity. They go out there, and I call it phoney socialism or window-dressing or false advertising would be a better word, and they talk about how they are giving the citizens legal aid. What an absolute questionable statement! They get \$750,000 from the Federal Government, and according to this chart here, the balance in trust as of March 31st, 1975, is \$1,353,546.22. They get this money from lawyers' trust accounts. In the meantime they don't spend that money on legal aid, so why are they holding themselves out? It hasn't cost the taxpayers of Manitoba any money, and they are the champions. Look what we are giving you. Everything is for free. —(Interjection)— Yes, you said it's for free.

MR. SPEAKER: Five minutes.

MR. WILSON: You've also said, under phoney socialism, you've said under Denticare — you take credit for it in your political advertising — you talk about all these wonderful things you are doing but upon examination you find they all have a budget, and a very small budget, and they are also restricted to little, small areas of the province. So I am telling you, I am warning you members opposite, be careful of what you put in your literature because I have got a yellow pencil here and I am going to underline it.

And I think the Attorney-General has some answering to do because of the increase in legal aid. I've got an old Hansard here, 1976, which says that the —(Interjection)— Well, I don't know if there is an increase in poverty; if there is, it is your fault, the government opposite. It says the Law Society gets \$338,447.05. What other professional organization gets that kind of funding from the government? You know it is like you are holding a tag game. Why do we have to hold a tag game for the lawyers of this province? —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WILSON: According to this article by Mr. Matas in the Tribune, we have got legal fees of over \$2 million in the CFI inquiry. In the meantime there are a number of other laws. The Minister is going out and spending over \$2 million of taxpayers' money while there is some —(Interjection)— and I'm talking about — there is a whole illusion going on —(Interjection)—

Well, I get really mad when I have to answer to my relatives about misleading headlines that are attributed to myself. And when the Member for St. Matthews gets up and calls me a discredit to the Legislature after the things that he has been talking about . . .

We talk about the laws of our land. I think that I am putting things on the record here that will make this a better place to live in.

And I've got an article here in which the former Attorney-General said he is going to be responsible for enforcing the laws of the province and to protect the integrity of the courts.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. WILSON: Is that right, hear, hear? Here is another article. Law students say that 80 percent of them use marijuana and they are involved in hashish and all the rest of it. Here are the future leaders of our community breaking the laws and this Minister has got blinkers on.

I'm not saying that the Minister is responsible for all the laws. Nobody is perfect, but the point is that the leaders of this community have got to turn around and stop putting nonsense in the paper they have no intentions to live up to. —(Interjection)—

Well, you see, because there are priorities again. It was alright for a bunch of government employees to form a co-op and to go out and illegally buy stuff for their own government and so on and so forth, and it was brought out by . . . Again people should spend more time in reading the Auditor's Report; there is a lot of interesting reading material. Maybe somebody has to take it and go through it and pick out the good parts, and then maybe we could get down to something serious. But I think that there is a real problem, a real problem with the fact that —(Interjection)— Well, you're not getting the leadership and I think that your leader is getting tired. He doesn't seem interested because, you know, all these things that are going on in the government opposite, he could stop them. You know the captain of a team sometimes has to take a bit of responsibility for what is going on.

I have found that there has been a great deal of co-operation from a Minister like the Minister of Public Works. When you sit down to his Estimates and you point things out to him, he gets out and does them. I had the Member for Wellington tell me I didn't know anything when I was talking about the Legislative Buildings, yet the Minister of Public Works spent \$80,000 to fix up the river bank, to beautify the Legislative Buildings, and to turn around and carry the people path down there and cut down all the bushes in which people were getting knocked over the head and everything. I guarantee you, to turn around and —(Interjections)— You laugh, you laugh, but the crime rate in the Legislative

Buildings has dropped considerably and the credit must go with the Minister of Public Works for listening. You have deaf ears, and that Member for St. Matthews really gets my goat when he won't . . . Well, he says . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is up. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. WILSON: I'll just be a minute, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WILSON: Basically, however, that was the good news for the Minister of Public Works. I wanted to talk about his inability to keep his promise pertaining to the Gimli Industrial Park. However, since my time is up, I won't spend too much more time —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WILSON: Well, he promised us in the 1976 Estimates that he was going to do something about reducing the deficit, and this year the deficit is higher. And I think when he gives out accommodation with two bedrooms, three bedrooms, and supplies all the light, all the heat, all the water, and people can leave their doors open and leave their lights on all night, I think those premises should be metered. That is the kind of savings that I am talking about, the \$10,000 here, the \$20,000 there. And I think that the Minister of Tourism is doing this province a disservice by demanding all the government seminars be held at Hecla Island. I think the Gimli Industrial Park deserves part of the action. In fact why not show some responsibility in an election year . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Continuing Education state his point of order.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe the honourable member had stated that I had issued a directive demanding that all seminars be held at a certain place in the Province of Manitoba. I would like the honourable member to produce whatever proof he has of my having made that statement.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that the Minister of Tourism . . . maybe the word "demanding" is wrong, but knowing his success —(Interjections)— Well, sometimes I use the wrong word, as the . . . Maybe I will retract that and apologize for the word "demanding", but I will say "suggesting" to all government departments that they come up to Hecla Island.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I would like him to produce whatever evidence he has that I in fact have suggested that.

A MEMBER: Well, maybe that's the wrong word.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest one only has to examine the record of the number of government departments that have used the facilities to date and the numbers that are planning to use it in the immediate future and the numbers that will be using it in order that it doesn't appear to lose a lot of money.

I will finish up with this comment, in saying that you will be found out, and I think the materials that I read from before . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: My honourable friend is telling us how virtuous he is and he would never break the laws. Can he tell me when the P. C. Party will stop using the provincial trade mark in their . . . I am sure he wouldn't want to break the law of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley. Order please.

MR. WILSON: You know there is a humourous side to that, and the humourous side is unknown to the Minister of Tourism. He ordered and bought all those buffaloes from none other than Dalton Camp's Advertising Agency.

I simply say that I see nothing wrong with using the logo as the promotion of Manitoba. I think that everyone should be proud of using it. —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: I move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the Honourable Member for Radisson wish to speak? The Honourable Member for Flin Flon has already spoken when he took the adjournment. The Honourable Member for . . . Order please. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon has a question?

MR. BARROW: Would the honourable member entertain a question? The Party speech where the union supported the organizing system NDP, would you deny that Inco, Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting and Sherritt-Gordon do not pour unlimited funds into the Conservative campaign and the Liberal campaign in an effort to destroy an honest, open, trustworthy government?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all I would like to express my appreciation

and a deep admiration for the Budget Address that was made by the Minister of Finance. He knows that in the caucus I did not always agree with all of the points that he expresses and I have my ways of saying it to him. However, I can say that I was very pleased with the way the people's Budget was presented by the people's government in the address that he made last Friday afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I once attempted to express my regrets at not seeing the Honourable Member for Riel in the House and I was rudely being interrupted by the Opposition, but I do wish to express and wish him well, that his recovery will be speedy. Having had a similar situation happen to me not too long ago, I know what it is that his wife and family are experiencing and I wish him a speedy recovery.

This morning I understand, and I would have liked to have had somebody tell me what had happened, but I understand that the Honourable Member for Lakeside, whom I admire but I don't always agree with, has had some problem and I hope that it is not serious, that he will be here among us next Monday, full of fire, vim and vigour and in his usual top form.

Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to the Honourable men on this side, that he epitomizes very much what the Conservative Party stands for. What the Honourable Member for Wolseley is saying in regard to his party is exactly what the Conservative Party stands for. He is privy to their caucus meetings and he knows better than any of us on this side what they discussed, so when he gets up here and expresses certain views, I sincerely believe that he expresses the views of that party. The other members on that side are too sophisticated, are too sophisticated to express their ideas and the feelings that they have. They are too sophisticated and they are able to gloss over, they are able to conceal and say nothing. They get up and they state . . . well, they get up and speak at great length, use a lot of words, invectives, but not express anything as to what they stand for. They are masters at misleading.

We've had the example of the Leader of the official Opposition get up time and time again and charge and then, in fact, the whole Conservative Party has used the statements of the Leader of the official Opposition, that Manitoba Hydro, that the officials in Manitoba Hydro, that the engineering staff in Manitoba Hydro advised the Board of Manitoba Hydro and therefore it led to their waste of some \$605 million of taxpayers' money and to me, Mr. Speaker, those are very libellous statements. He charges — they have seen the literature come out to homes, "This is not your Hydro bill, this is a statement of waste of \$605 million of the taxpayers' wasted money and this is why your hydro bill has gone up." Well, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Official Opposition had many an opportunity to ask those questions directly to the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, a respected man and he had been refuted every time. But he does not accept it, he continues impugning the whole integrity of all of the people in the Manitoba Hydro, the integrity of the senior staff, including me, yes, and I claim not to have any engineering knowledge, but there are some people on that side that claim to have some engineering skills. I understand that the Member for St. James is an engineer. The Member for Riel is an engineer and therefore should have some ability to understand what has taken place and what has happened. This just doesn't seem to make sense to me, Mr. Speaker.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I should speak to you. You were a member of the board in 1969 to 1970-71. I came on shortly after you. Possibly I should ask you at that time if you could tell me whether, in fact, Dr. Cass-Beggs was politically motivated when he was asked by this government, whether he used political persuasion on those top engineering staff of Manitoba Hydro — Mr. Bateman, Mr. Tom Storey, the Chief Engineer. Whether the man, the former Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, Jack Hoogstraten, was the man that was politically moved to make the changes. I would like to ask you, Mr. Speaker and you can nod whether you agree with me or not, because I was not privy at that particular time. But Mr. Speaker, you were a member of that board. Somehow, I feel that your integrity is also being impugned. I know that you had no opportunity to express it, but you can express in some mild way . . . well, maybe I should not expect to have you answer me directly because it is not proper procedure, they tell me, in the House.

But, Mr. Speaker, I just want to go back again to the speech made by the Honourable Member for Wolseley and to reiterate that what he says expresses the position of the Conservative Party and that is the kind of spectre we can have if there should ever be a change.

You know, Mr. Speaker, 1967 I believe it was, there was a leadership contest — the Honourable Duff Roblin had resigned as the Premier of the Province of Manitoba to seek other, well he had put in a number of years and he felt that he should retire from the political scene in Manitoba. I believe that it was in '67 and I wish to be corrected, that there was a leadership convention in the Conservative Party, it was '67 and it took place in the Winnipeg Auditorium. I remember watching television — some of you people might not have had the interest but I was very much interested to see what was happening — and I know there was a man by the name of Sterling Lyon running for the leadership, Sterling Lyon. There was a man by the name of Dr. George Johnson running for the leadership of the Conservative Party and there was a man by the name of Walter Weir running for the leadership of the Conservative Party. You know, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— was this Stewart McLean?

A MEMBER: Oh yes, yes.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: I am sorry there was also a man by the name of Stewart McLean running for

the leadership of the Conservative Party. Well, Mr. Speaker, what happened in that particular leadership? You know, I knew when I heard some of the colleagues opposite tell me something, sometimes, you know, sort of the confidential moments and I will not state who. You know that Sterling Lyon, they just didn't have any trust in him. He was so far right that if they selected him, that was closest to almost Fascism. He was the one that always called us these red-eyed socialists and so on, that he was so far right that they could not begin to think of the spectre of having the changes that were brought about by Roblin, that in a very short period of time he could undo it. I know Dr. George Johnson was too far left, was too far left. In fact, I know, Mr. Speaker, I happened to have been involved with the New Democratic Party. In fact, Dr. George Johnson was going to run for the CCF Party at one time. He was going to be a candidate, but Roblin — and I don't condemn Roblin, the Honourable Duff Roblin, former Premier of the province of Manitoba, — did persuade him because he was a progressive man. I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I'll admit it to the House, the Honourable Duff Roblin when he came into power after the years of the Campbell government, he brought many needed social legislation. He improved the educational system and I give him credit to this day. I know that the studies were begun under D.L. Campbell but I just did not have that confidence that when D.L. Campbell would have had that opportunity that he would have continued with some of the recommendations of the Michener Report.

However, I'll give Duff Roblin and his Cabinet . . . I know that because I also happen to be aware that one Sterling Lyon at that time, he didn't want to be party to any kind of . . . These are socialist moves, you know, to improve our educational opportunities for the youth of the province. But I remember having to speak to Dr. George Johnson when he was promoting the secondary school areas. I was a principal in a school north of Beausejour and since there was no one else I was called upon, you know, when he was trying to explain the program and what they were going to do and what the secondary school areas was about. I was called upon to introduce Dr. Johnson. It was a sincere pleasure and I certainly promoted those ideas that the Conservatives at that time advocated and did bring about. And I give them credit.

But what happened, Mr. Speaker, up to 1967? . There were a lot of changes made. There was road construction. There were things happening and there was a certain amount of pride. But what happened after 1967, Mr. Speaker? First of all, the present leader Sterling Lyon, then I believe the Attorney-General, — what did they do with him, what did they finally do with him? They turfed him out. They rejected him. They looked at Dr. George Johnston and said, "Well, he's too far left. He was associated with George Hutton, a very progressive man. He was associated with Duff Roblin, a very progressive man." They said, "No' Sterling Lyon was so far to the right, we'll select Walter Weir." — (Interjection) — Well, Stewart McLean, he sort of fell in between somewhere there. I don't really know, but I know the major players. Walter Weir was selected because the power group figured they could manage Walter Weir.

So, in 1969, Walter Weir called an election, and the rest is history, Mr. Speaker. What happened to Sterling Lyon? Just like a little puppy dog, he put his tail between his legs and ran off, he said, "That's it, you rejected me in 1967, no way am I going to be involved with this group again. You selected a man when you could have had me." So for eight years he cooled his heels and looked in every possible way, and I suppose, wasn't too successful. So they began to remodel him. Mr. Speaker, I have a neighbour who had a tire retreaded. I'm not going to mention his name, I said, "If you reject a tire, it's been discarded, would you take that tire after it's been lying around for about eight years, would you begin to retread it? Would you have any confidence in it?" He said, "Harry, you know, I used to retread small tires, but I didn't want to have the responsibility, and I wouldn't do it. I do retreading on major, large equipment, where it puts in about five inches or 500 pounds of rubber for mining companies and so on, where it is just a matter of the amount of rubber that's put on because the tire itself, it's just impossible to break it down." But you need a certain amount of rubber in order to be able to have the traction when you're working in underground mines. I know my colleague, the Member for Flin Flon, will be aware of these mucking machines and so on and the amount of tires.

Anyway, what did the Conservative Party do? First of all, they tried to remodel him. It's really amusing, Mr. Speaker, it's most amusing. After eight years, they called him back and said, "Sterling, okay I know that you were rejected in '67, but people perhaps have forgotten. It's ten years. We'll give you some money." By the way, he forgot about that when he was interviewed on John Harvard, he forgot about it and had to run back and say, "Oh my goodness, what did I do?" — so that "we'll make a new man out of you."

A MEMBER: Amnesia, Harry.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Is that called amnesia? Well, Mr. Speaker, before the retread was brought back, there was another little case, Walter resigned. All those fellows behind never put any confidence in Walter. He was a good man, but they didn't. In every possible way — that's typical — they caused him to be very unhappy and so he chose the honourable way and resigned.

There was a challenge again. There was the Honourable Member for River Heights and the

Honourable Member for Lakeside. And what positions did they take — the Honourable Member for Lakeside, I just wish him well — but I say, what was his position? What is his stance in this House? To me, a sort of neo-Fascist right wing. What did the people of the Conservative Party do? They were wise. They rejected him. They selected Sidney, the Honourable Member for River Heights, and he became the leader. But again, that group . . . The Honourable Member for River Heights was moving too far to the left, so they began to look and they began to stab and began to do all kinds of things and forced it. So what was the major decision made? By a mere 27 votes, because those guys in the back, except for the Member for Wolseley who felt some obligation, the Member for Arthur, the Member for Virden who knew the present Member for Souris-Killarney very well. And they said, "No way. No way are we going to." If there hadn't been that minor little change, if those other fellows were not ready to do the Honourable Member for River Heights in . . . —(Interjection)— Yes, but they bought it, because this guy was a retread; a new image now.

What did he do, Mr. Speaker? When he spoke on the Throne Speech? He came around, this man who was against any kind of concern for the old, any concern for the sick, any concern — the guy who's going around telling the people, "The first thing I'll do when I come into power, Autopac, the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, it's the first thing that's going to go." What did he do? He came around and now is a moderate, moderate man. He looked, he said, "It's good, it's good." He's going to apply the common sense approach to the whole process of government. He came, he saw it was good, and therefore we will continue it, we're just going to apply a little common sense. I would think that the common sense came — I have a little souvenir of a wine glass and it says, "Common Sense Government - signed Sterling Lyon." I think for a lot of those people, the commonsense came out of that wine glass, because that's the only common sense I've ever seen come from him. He's never expressed anything outside of those things that we stated we have done and we will continue to do, being a people's government, a people's party.

Mr. Speaker, it has been almost eight years since the New Democrats, under our leader, the Premier, were elected to government, and in this period there have been some dramatic changes made to benefit people. I would venture to ask the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that he would agree with me. I know he is busy and he is not trying to pay attention. It could be said not all the legislation passed by our government has always been popular. There have been various pieces of legislation which have been unpopular. They have been unpopular with me. Human nature being what it is, it is impossible to please everyone on every issue we have dealt with. Our eight years in government should be examined, Mr. Speaker, and I would say to you gentlemen there and anybody else, that it should be examined in its totality. To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker — and I would like to have anyone on that side challenge me — we are the only political party which came to power and carried out all our election promises, and we will continue to do that, Mr. Speaker. Something that I have no confidence because —(Interjection)— You have expressed your party's position and I believe you. I believe you, the Honourable Member for Wolseley. The other people are too sophisticated, you've expressed very, very well what the Conservative Party stands for.

Mr. Speaker, we have introduced universal Medicare, Pharmacare — again they said that there was going to be some changes. —(Interjection)— Universal Medicare means that it is not put on me because if you have some money. It is available to every individual, every individual in the Province of Manitoba and there is no means test required. They don't look to see, "Have you paid your premium? Have you paid your premium? Before we can admit you, we will have to make sure that you have paid your premium." You know that's what your understanding is.

Pharmacare, the best in the country; Autopac, the lowest in Canada. In fact, I would venture . . . I would say it is the lowest, to my knowledge, in the whole North American continent. There might be some conflict in this that Saskatchewan might be better, but having been in . . . The people having long practice since about 1944, we introduced it in what year, 1970. Well, I would expect that they would be getting more efficient, but the fact is, with a very short few years, we have been able to do what we set out to do, that it is less than 50 percent, the administration cost of the so-called "rugged individuals"— those great businessmen, the experts in the field of business — we have been able to manage that business with less than 50 percent of what it costs the private. —(Interjection)— Possibly, you might have had that kind of experience in your job, but I am not aware of that. Introduced personal care homes, senior citizen housing second to none, elderly persons home care.

Mr. Speaker, last night I was at the nominating meeting at Transcona and there was one thing that really moved everyone. It was most unexpected. There was a lady there who, for the first time in all her life, was able to get out of . . . she no longer had to stay in the hospital, she no longer had to stay where there was immediate medical attention at all hours, she was able to move about like other people. She was able to attend that meeting. The Premier just happened to be talking about some of the things we moved and this is that the home care — that she was able to have that service and having to live in an environment of the house of friends and family, in the environment of her home, not in a little cubicle in the hospital away from all her familiar surroundings and so on. Mr. Speaker, she came and she just yelled out, "I am an example of that type of person and I wish to express my

deep appreciation to this government." —(Interjection)— Well, the Minister of Health can take credit, but I would say it is the philosophy of this party — I'd like to tell the Minister of Health — our concern for people, and that you have been fortunate to have been given the task of doing that because — (Interjection)— sometimes you wonder but I know that you have done a fantastic job.

Mr. Speaker, in our short eight years, we have had the elderly persons' Repair Program, something that neglected people wondering from day to day — their roof is leaking, they need new windows and so on. They have had many years. I don't know how it is, Mr. Speaker, that they were not able to have these things in mind. I have some clippings here where the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition states, "Well, those things are best done by the private sector." Well, Mr. Speaker, under this government, we were able to introduce that program and enabled people to begin to live in greater comfort; they were able to live in pride and live in that type of feeling that there is a future that they can look forward to, that there wasn't a constant despair — what the heck is going to happen to them. There was a sense, yes, of security and looked for a long, happy future.

Mr. Speaker, we introduced the The Consumer Protection Act, something which was long lacking; established the Office of Ombudsman. Now who, in their wildest dream, would say to have the Office of Ombudsman — and this is one person who can look into all aspects of government actions and so on and to bring redress. People can come to this gentleman and say, look, the Minister of Tourism did something or rather, and they can cause the Minister if he made a mistake and can point it out, and he will be forced to correct it if he had made an error. This is something, Mr. Speaker, that a people's government and a concern for people has been able to accomplish.

The Manitoba Cost-of-Living Tax Credit, those people in low income, were able to receive a little help. And of course, let us not forget the property tax credit today at \$225 and the basic maximum of \$375.00. That means a lot.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I have enough time. I was going to show my —(Interjection)— Ten minutes. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have my tax bill. I was just going to work on the income tax — and the shocker of all shockers — in 1969, my tax bill was somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$390.00. After ten years, my property tax, it was a little over, somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$369.00. Well, Mr. Speaker, today, after almost ten years, you know, my tax bill was \$759.00 take away \$225.00; it brings it down to about \$525.00. Then, I filled out my income tax and, lo and behold — you know, I never believed it — I get another \$65.00. So that brings it down to about \$470.00. In nine years, Mr. Speaker, nine years. Oh, pardon me. I also filled out — you know I never did this before, this Cost of Living — I filled out the cost of living and I get \$61.00 on that. So, I'm back down to around \$400.00, Mr. Speaker. Now, after some ten years, ten years, and these people talk.

A MEMBER: Don't push your luck, Harry, don't push your luck.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, then the Honourable Member for Radisson prefers to use the property tax rebate on his property tax. I wonder if he would ask the Premier when he puts out a piece of literature the next time, that he not use the property tax rebate on the provincial income tax.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: You see, some people rent homes and they are able to use it on their income tax.

A MEMBER: Only some people.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the list that I have given about what this government has done in a few short years can go on, and on, and on, but I just mentioned a few. If one thing I have mentioned has been unpopular with you, Mr. Speaker, or with the opposition, I would like you to reflect, Mr. Speaker, what are the alternatives? What have they offered? What are the alternatives? What are the alternatives, Mr. Speaker? Have you heard anything? The Leader of the Official Opposition in his speech on the Throne Speech got up and he said, he looked at all of these things, "I saw; it was good; I'm going to continue that's all. I was good; I'm going to continue." Now just what on earth are they talking about? But I don't trust them, Mr. Speaker, and I hope certainly, Mr. Speaker, that you don't.

I trust what the Honourable Member for Riel indicated that when he comes, if they should ever have the opportunity, the first thing they were going to do when he was Acting House Leader, that they are going to remove this inequitous tax, the property tax. They are going to remove it. I believe the Honourable Member for Morris who indicated that we have to put in some kind of deterrents; people want to pay some money. So if you get sick, we have to put some kind of a tax on you so the best thing is, don't get sick. I believe that that's what they say, even though the Leader of the Official Opposition says that he would not change one whit. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Would the honourable member permit another question?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Certainly.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I wonder if the honourable member would ask the Member for St. Matthews if he agrees with reducing the tax on insulation. Does he agree with that? I wonder if the honourable member would ask his colleague that question.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, that's very easy. I'll tell you. The Finance Minister expressed that we are going to do it. I expressed my view on that to the Minister of Finance and if he wants to find out, he can ask the Minister of Finance sometime in confidence and he will tell him because I think my words would be classified unparliamentary, so the Member for Sturgeon Creek can ask the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, I have just indicated that the Member for Morris has mentioned the fact that people — this idea of having everyone go to the hospital and not worry about work, how your medical bills are going to be paid for and so on — is no good; the people want to pay and he believes that there should be some kind of deterrent. In other words, a tax on the sick people. And I believe that.

Tell me, Mr. Speaker, I know you're the best person to talk to; you are always very considerate, sometimes I wish I had not been so unruly at times, but I am taking a leaf from your page, Mr. Speaker, I am taking a leaf from your page and hope to co-operate in the same way and keep my silence when I take the Chair, but it will be difficult sometimes. So you will forgive me, Mr. Speaker, if we have this private little conversation.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, would you trust such a man who, at not too long a period of time, had indicated that all of these programs that we have introduced or the things that he is going to discard and then comes in this House and says, "Well, no, they seem to be working. Maybe we'll manage it better." How are they going to manage it better? Well, he believes in these rugged individuals. If I give it to Great West Life or I give it to that group, they'll manage it much much better, you know. I'm not going to disband it but we'll remove the civil servants, those people responsible for this House, they'll manage it better. I believe that's the way he would work. And can you trust that man? Can you ever dream? Can you trust a man, Mr. Speaker, who forgets? I believe that he was nominated last night so I wish to congratulate him in spite of the fact that he stated that he was invited by the whole executive who later repudiated that statement. —(Interjection) — The leader. Well, he had a problem but I should congratulate him. In spite of that, he did get the nomination. —(Interjection) — Well, I know that. That's. However, what I say that there was some doubt it was borne out eventually that, in fact, nobody else ran and the man who was going to run left in disgust with a few choice words. There was some indication from the executive that they did not in fact invite him so he sort of imposed himself there. —(Interjection) — Thank you, Ben.

Mr. Speaker, to quote a famous local politician — I don't know if any of you know this local politician This but I know him very well — "government once and all is the best damn government this province has ever had."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Righways.

HONOURABLE PETER BURTNIAK (Dauphin): Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that after almost a week of debate on the Budget, that sometimes statements are made over and over again. In other words, they become very repetitious. I think that this is happening — and I want to be fair here — that this is happening, not only on the other side of the House but I guess, to some degree, on this side of the House as well. I feel that what's good for the one side naturally must be good for the other side as well. In other words, what is good for the goose must be good for the gander.

A MEMBER: Not always.

MR. BURTNIAK: In the last few days, this week, since this debate has been progressing, I have been paying close attention to the statements that have been made, particularly statements made by the members on the other side. When I was not in the House from time to time when some of the speakers were on their feet, I have checked back in Hansard and it seems to me that whatever was mentioned in the Budget that particularly the Conservative opposition have taken the attitude, that sort of "me too" kind of an approach. Regardless of whether or not we are talking about Medicare or Pharmacare or senior citizens' homes or property tax rebate or MPIC, whatever, they said, "Me too, but . . ." They said, "You know, we would do it better." That is the only kind of criticism and suggestions that we have heard in the last six or seven days in this House, that they would do it better.

Mr. Speaker, as I check back into history, I find that the present Leader of the Official Opposition, the Conservative Party, would like to take us back to when the Conservative Party were in power prior to 1969 when Manitoba had the highest income tax in Canada, and now we have the fourth lowest. He would take us back to the Conservative years when they were in power prior to 1969, when we had the highest Medicare premiums in Canada, today we have none. He would like to take us back when they were in power prior to 1969, when we had the third highest sales tax in Canada, today we have the lowest. He would like to take us back when they were in power, back before 1969, when they were the ones who participated in the agreement to give away one-tenth of the province's land, and also agreed to supply these people, whoever they were, with public money for this development.

They would also like to take us back to the days prior to 1969, Mr. Speaker, when there were virtually no low income housing, no housing for the elderly, in spite of the fact that in that period of time there were hues and cries by the general public for this kind of facility. This, Mr. Speaker' is the record of the previous government and this is what they were telling us today that this is how they

would do things better if they would ever become the government of this Province of Manitoba.

I recall on Tuesday last—and I notice he's not in his seat today this afternoon—but my colleague, the Member for Ste. Rose, was very shocked when he discovered that in the Ste. Rose constituency there were no senior citizens' homes prior to 1969, and even sometime after. I would also remind the honourable member, my colleague, that the road situation in the Constituency of Ste. Rose was very poor also. There was no road construction virtually of any kind at that time. It doesn't really surprise me, Mr. Speaker, because I believe it was, oh, some two sessions ago or so when it was revealed in this House that the way the Progressive Conservative Party, when they were in government, the way they used to set their priorities was that they would sit down and take a look as to which constituencies they were sure to win; which constituencies they thought that they had a good chance of winning, possible ones; and they also looked at the other constituencies where they had no chance of winning and in that way they set their priorities accordingly. If we were to recall, Mr. Speaker, that the Constituency of Ste. Rose happened to be a Liberal constituency at that time, which was held by our friend, at least my friend, Gildas Molgat.

No wonder there were no such things as any road development in that area, any senior citizens' homes or anything of that nature in that particular time. But what even makes it more sort of ironic, is the fact that even the Dauphin Constituency which happened to be represented by the Conservative member of the Legislature, who for 10 or 11 years, as a matter of fact for the entire time of the life of the Conservative Party, from 1959 I believe it was to 1969 inclusive, —(Interjection)— well' 1958 to 1969, he too was a member of the government, as a matter of fact was a Minister during all that period of time. And I find that even though he was a member of that party and the Minister of the party, he wasn't very successful in achieving too much for the constituency of Dauphin either.

I found out—well, I shouldn't say I thought it was a known fact—but that in 1969, for example, when we talk about senior citizens' homes that in Dauphin there were something like 30 or 40 units, that's all. Today, Mr. Speaker, in the few short years we have increased that to 90 units with an additional 100 units, high rise, due to be started any time now. But that's only Dauphin. What about the community of Gilbert Plains?

They built a senior citizens' facility in Gilbert Plains a few years ago. Just a year ago we opened a new senior citizens' facility in the Village of Ochre River as well as a number in Ste. Rose. But that's not all. You know we don't set out priorities in the same manner as the previous administration. I see the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell is in his seat. I want to tell him and I'm sure he knows, that there have been such facilities and others found in his constituency in the last few years.

The Member for Swan River, the Member for Roblin, as a matter of fact I've had the opportunity to officially open some of those facilities not very long ago.

But I don't know, maybe the former Member for Dauphin was sort of chiselled of some of the programs that the government had, or maybe there wasn't too many programs to go around, or maybe there was a combination of both, I'm not sure. —(Interjection)—

I believe my colleague, the Member for Radisson, was talking about tax rebates—property tax rebates. I, too, was quite surprised—maybe I shouldn't have been—but just less than a week ago I had an opportunity to meet one of my constituents and I was quite surprised—and as I say maybe I shouldn't have been, but nevertheless it's very interesting—to find that what he told me about the property tax rebate and what it does as far as municipal taxes are concerned. He informed me that at the present time he is paying lower taxes today than he ever has in his life, that's municipal taxes.

A MEMBER: \$2.80.

MR. BURTNIAK: He told me that he has a home which is 20 or 25 years of age. He doesn't make a great deal of money a year, a moderate income. He has a wife and a family, and he indicated to me that his municipal tax bill he received in 1976 was \$370.00. After filing his income tax and taking the Manitoba Property Tax Credit rebate he now pays a sum total of exactly \$20.00. That is all he pays in municipal taxes in 1976. That, I think, Mr. Speaker, is quite a lesson. He admitted to me that at no time were his taxes any lower than they are today. As a matter of fact he also pointed out that during the time from 1965 to the early '70s, during that period of time, his taxes were the highest.

I noticed a few days ago that my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside, and I'm sorry to see that he's not in his seat. I hope that he's all right. I understand he was ill this morning, and I certainly hope that he recovers quickly. But anyway, he said and I quote from Page 2492 of Hansard: "We have also said, and we will do as Premier Bennett is trying to do in British Columbia, introduce the element of competition in Autopac." He further went on to say, "I am paying 80 percent more for Autopac now than I have ever paid in my life." Now, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is a very very broad statement. It doesn't mean anything really, because I have no idea—and I don't think he has either—as to what is he comparing.

I, very briefly, Mr. Speaker, would like to just point out to the Honourable Members of the House and see if they will agree, and I'm sure they will not, that it is a fact, Autopac payments in Manitoba are 80 percent higher than they ever were. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Members of the House, as was mentioned a few moments ago, that we are enjoying the lowest premiums anywhere in

Canada and, for that matter, perhaps in the North American continent.

I want to give you a couple of examples when we talk about insurance rates for automobiles. I will take a single person, 19 or 20 years of age, and this person has a three-year accident and conviction-free record. He takes out a \$100,000 Third Party Liability, \$100.00 Deductible Collision, \$25.00 Deductible Comprehensive, used primarily for pleasure driving. This is a 1975 Ford LTD. This is a young person, 19 years or 20. What will his premiums be in Manitoba as compared to more or less the same kind of areas, same population more or less, in other provinces. Let me take the Province of Ontario and the Province of Alberta and compare it to similar areas in the Province of Manitoba.

This young person, again, \$100,000 Third Party Liability, \$100.00 Deductible Collision, \$25.00 Deductible Comprehensive. In Thunder Bay it would cost this individual \$1,509.00. In Kenora, Ontario it would cost him \$1,735.00. In Alberta it would cost him \$1,124.00. In Brandon, Manitoba or Dauphin or any such area, it would cost him \$220.00.

On top of it all, Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba, \$30.00 Driver's Licence Insurance Premium is included in that as well as the \$15.00 per year derived from the two cents per gallon gasoline tax. That is included in that price.

Let us look at a person who is over 25 years of age, taking the same areas, taking the same car, and see what that person's premiums would be in the same towns in comparison to Manitoba areas. As I said, a person 25 years of age, he insured his car for \$100,000 Third Party Liability, \$100.00 Deductible Collision, \$25.00 Deductible Comprehensive, 1975 Ford LTD again. In Thunder Bay, \$368.00; Kenora, Ontario \$414.00; Conservative Alberta, in Lethbridge, \$293.00; in Brandon, Manitoba \$191.00. Again, Mr. Speaker, \$15.00 is included for the Driver's Licence and Insurance Premium as well as the \$15.00 per year derived from the two cents per gallon gasoline insurance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that isn't all. That isn't all. As far as Autopac is concerned, it is not the fact that we have the best and the lowest insurance premiums in the country, but there are other benefits that sometimes seem to go unnoticed and to me, I think they are very very important to take note of. I would think that the honourable friends, I would suppose they know a lot about insurance — at least some of them do — that every insurance company whether it be a private or a public insurance company, they have a certain amount of funds, in the millions I might say, and this is derived by certain claims that are not processed. The money has been received but the claims are being processed and this runs at times into millions of dollars. So the insurance companies, what they do is they reinvest this money into various things. And one of the nice things about the MPIC, our government auto insurance, is the fact that — and we have said this many times before and it's beginning to show now that we were right — this money will be invested here in the Province of Manitoba. It will not go like it used to under the private insurance to the head office somewhere in Minneapolis, Chicago, New York, Toronto or Montreal. No, this money stays right here for the benefit of the people of the Province of Manitoba.

I, Mr. Speaker, would like to go on record to indicate, to give my honourable friends indication of how much money has been really invested in the short five-year period of time that we have been in the business of public insurance. And I might say too that this money hasn't been invested only in New Democratic Party constituencies, but all across the Province of Manitoba. In the first place, in provincial bonds for Manitoba Telephone System, the investment has been \$11.5 million invested here in the Province of Manitoba. In Hospital Bonds, and I'm going to read this for the record — read the various hospitals and the amounts: Brandon General Hospital \$800,000; Concordia Hospital, Winnipeg \$400,000; Flin Flon General Hospital \$900,000; Gimli Hospital District Number 39 \$240,000; Gladstone \$60,000; Hamiota \$98,000; Lakeshore General Hospital at Ashern \$95,000; Lynn Lake Hospital \$230,000; Selkirk \$537,500; Minnedosa Hospital \$192,500; Morden \$520,000; Neepawa \$470,000; Portage la Prairie \$575,000; Russell \$725,000; St. Anthony's General Hospital at The Pas \$900,000; and Victoria General Hospital, Winnipeg \$2 million.

That is not all. Then we have Municipal Bonds —(Interjection)— No, I've made that statement; it's all over, across the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BURTNAIK: Municipal Bonds for the City of Flin Flon \$22,200; Town of Altona \$406,400; Town of Boissevain \$111,000; Town of Deloraine \$53,000; Town of Grandview \$20,000; Killarney \$410,000; Melita \$74,000; Morden \$986,600; Morris \$40,000; Roblin \$32,000; Russell \$267,000; Steinbach \$540,600; Swan River \$35,700; Winkler \$319,800; Winnipeg Beach \$94,300; Gretna \$31,000; Pilot Mound \$23,300; Shoal Lake \$56,000; St. Pierre \$49,500.00.

And as far as the municipalities: Municipality of Cartier \$15,000; Municipality of Ritchot \$22,100; Municipality of Springfield \$38,200; Municipality of Tache \$35,700; Thompson \$57,300; and Leaf Rapids Local Government District \$3.2 million.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are points that I would like to make that are the side benefits from the fact that we have had a public insurance corporation, not only because of the fact that they have given us the best insurance and the lowest insurance in the province, but also the benefits that we derive . . .

A MEMBER: Our money is working here in Manitoba.

MR. BURTNIAK: Exactly. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to mention that I have been in this House eight years but I have had the opportunity to be involved in this political game for over 25 years. As a matter of fact, it's closer to 30 years. I would think that one that has been involved in one form or the other in politics certainly learns certain tricks of the trade as it were. I have been very very interested in watching what has been happening, particularly to the political leaders in the Province of Manitoba and I think that as I review the history of our political leaders, particularly after they have been in retirement, that if I were the Leader of the Conservative Party at the present time, I would be a little shaky because I think the writing is on the wall.

I would like to tell you what — just reminding my honourable friends opposite — what has really been the past history particularly those who have retired and tried of their leaders' to come back. History, first of all, has certainly not been kind particularly to the Tory and the Grit leaders that were chosen from the past. If you recall, Mr. Speaker, the former Premier, the Honourable Duff Roblin came out of retirement and made two attempts to get back into politics and failed on both occasions. Then of course, I notice my good friend, the member for Assiniboia, is the only one here from the Liberal group and I don't think that he wants to be reminded of what happened in 1969 when the Liberal Party brought out of retirement a gentleman by the name of Bobby Bend, and remember that "Bend Wagon" or "Band Wagon" whatever it was called? The "Bent Wagon," I think that's what it came out to be in the last.

Mr. Speaker, I recall that at that time, in 1969, and some honourable members can correct me if I'm wrong, that in 1969' Bobby Bend led the Liberal Party in the Province of Manitoba from 19 seats down to three. That again was a situation or a history of when people come out from retirement to lead a political party.

But then — I'm coming down now to the present situation — and that's why I say, if I were the Leader of the Conservative Party right now, I would be just a little concerned about what the future may hold for him. —(Interjection)— My honourable Yes, by the way, my honourable colleague says "What happened to Clark?" Not only what happened to Clark — I suppose you refer to the fact that one Mr. Horner crossed the floor, but I understand there's about five or six others that are on the way also very shortly. That is very very bad news, I think, for the Conservative Party right across Canada.

To get back to the present leaders, Mr. Speaker, as I say, if I were him I would be a little scared because he too came out of retirement and made an attempt to gain a seat in the Federal House as recently as, I believe it was 1974 and didn't quite make it — he failed. You know, Mr. Speaker, sure, so now he's the leader, but one of these times within the next few months, if not sooner, there is going to be an election, no doubt, in the Province of Manitoba and I think that at that time, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba will make sure that history repeats itself and that the Tory Leader and the Conservative Party will soon have another enforced retirement. I will also say, Mr. Speaker, that as far as I'm personally concerned and the constituents of Dauphin, we'll make sure that we hasten that retirement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, if there are no other speakers, I'll move seconded by the Member for Gladstone that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to take part in this debate I see that the honourable members seem to be in quite a hurry to get away, but anyway, Mr. Speaker, I'll rise to take part in this debate at this time.

I first want to congratulate the Minister of Finance for his presentation of the Budget. —(Interjection)— He is a fine man. I quite agree with the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs. Being the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, at any time in our history in any government is not the most envious position for any Minister on the Treasury Bench to hold. I believe it is a tradition in the British House of Commons that on the evening that the Minister of Finance presents, or the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I believe he's called in the British House of Commons receives from Her Majesty about two ounces of distilled liquor — I believe it's gin — to bolster him on that evening during the presentation of the Budget in the British House of Commons. I often used to joke with my friend, the Honourable Member for St. Johns and kid him if the Queen's representative here in the province of Manitoba had ever supplied this libation to him, but he assures me that it was not forthcoming.

However, Mr. Speaker, to get back to the Budget as we have it presented for us today here, I think it's a wonderful thing that the Minister of Finance in these trying times that we have, has been able to basically present a balanced budget here in the province of Manitoba, especially when we look at two of the provinces to the east of us, and I understand that they have already called an election in the Province of Ontario. They have presented a Budget. I understand news came this afternoon that June 9th has been announced as Election Day in the Province of Ontario. But it may be interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, when the Budget was brought down by Mr. McKeough, the Minister of Finance in the

Province of Ontario —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't mind if they chatter away over there. They're not going to distract me anyway. And I don't care if they chatter over here either because they're not going to distract me.

I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, that for the second consecutive year, the Ontario Government—the Progressive Conservative Government of Ontario—have presented a Budget with a deficit nearly as large as the provincial Budget of this province. I know my honourable friends will say that there's eight million of them there but nevertheless over 10 percent of their total Budget is a deficit.

You know when we get the Members of the Conservative Party and especially—this is a message that comes through loud and clear—don't discuss us or talk about us as we were, or even as we are today, but what we will be in the future. History hopefully teaches us a lesson, but it doesn't seem to have taught a lesson to the honourable members of the Opposition I'm not referring to the Liberal Party, I'm referring to the official Opposition in this House. These are the people who have now come along and have bought, holus-bolus, everything that this government has introduced in the field of social benefits for the people of our province.—(Interjection)—Oh yes, I am wrong, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad that the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek reminded me that the Honourable Member for St. Vital who is Acting House Leader for the—not St. Vital, the Honourable Member for Riel,—they're neighbouring constituencies. I don't want to do a disservice to my honourable colleague. He stated that their first object when, in reply to a question from the Honourable Member from St. Johns last year when they would get in power they'd get rid of this Tax Credit Rebate system that we've set up, and we hear about the advertising campaign that goes with these pamphlets that we supposedly sent out.

I'd like to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I can remember—I think it was in 1965—getting in my tax bill from the City of Winnipeg, a nice little note. I believe the Honourable Minister of Health read it into the record this morning when he . . . no, the little note that he received from the former Premier of this province, who I believe by coincidence happened to be also the Minister of Finance at that time or Provincial Treasurer, I believe that's what they called it. And I remember making my application to get this \$50 rebate and lo and behold, I got a \$50 rebate. You know, Mr. Speaker, when I looked at that cheque it was made out to William W. Jenkins, Esq. or whatever it was and you know it was signed. And do you know whose signature was on it? The Honourable Duff Roblin's signature was on it. You know, Mr. Speaker, that it cost approximately, oh I would say somewhere in the vicinity of 25 cents to process a cheque; the processing, the mailing and what-not. It was good propaganda. Excellent! Paid for by the taxpayers of Manitoba. You know the Rebate system that we have—we're pikers, we should have taken a leaf out of the book of the members of the Opposition when they were government. We could have had the Honourable Minister of Finance's signature on these cheques that go out to the people, but we make out one cheque to the City of Winnipeg. We make out one cheque to the other places. We do it a heck of a lot cheaper, much much cheaper than what the Opposition did, even for those people who rent. The people that rented in those days were not even considered to be citizens according to these people because they didn't qualify whatsoever. They like to have second class citizens. That's very evident by the type of legislation that is being proposed by the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye. They like to have second class citizens, but you know people here in Manitoba who rent houses, rent suites in apartment blocks, they are entitled to a rebate. They pay taxes. They pay realty taxes. They may not pay them to the City of Winnipeg, but they pay them to the landlord, who in turn pays the taxes. We have recognized that. That is something that the Conservatives never recognized, and probably still wouldn't recognize.

You know, Mr. Speaker, there has been quite a bit of discussion on this Debate. It reminds me of a bunch of dogs chewing over a bone, because we've been chewing this bone now for about a week and it's getting pretty thin. They chewed all the marrow out of it. But you know, one of the criticisms of this Budget has been the Succession Duties. If we look at the tables in the back of the book and we see Succession Duty Returns breakdown - taxable and non-taxable—pardon me, Mr. Speaker, while I put my other glasses on so I can see here a little bit better—that in the year 1972 there was a total of 3,050 returns, of which 2,947 were non-taxable, there wasn't a penny. There were 44 in the category of 50,000 to 100,000, 18 in 100,000 to 200,000, 16 in the 200,000 to 250,000, and then on till it gets up to a million. And in that year, there were three in the million dollar category and they put them in a lower category so that they would preserve the identities of these estates.

The taxable estates and the percentage of the total returns at that time was 1.34 percent of the amount of the aggregate net value of estates, 1.34 percent. The next year it was 1.32, the next year it was 1.21, and in 1975 it had jumped up again to 1.32, and in 1976, the year just passed, it was .54 of one percent. If we were to use the new figures that have been established of 250,000, and that's not taking into consideration, Mr. Speaker, the changes that will be made in estates when we bring in the family law, which I believe one of the recommendations was that, of an estate of \$500,000, we'll say for an example, 250,000 of that, upon the break-up of the marriage, and death is a very permanent break-up

of marriage, there can be no reconciliation from that. I think, that is one thing even the members of the Opposition would have to agree with me on. Two hundred and fifty thousand, or half of that would be hers in her own right, so she certainly would not pay taxes on that. And that means that the other 250,000 which she would receive, the widow, would be also tax-free. So she would be getting a tax free estate of at least \$500,000.00.

Now, we've had all sorts of dire predictions, people leaving this province, going and locating elsewhere, and yet, you know, Mr. Speaker, using these same figures, looking at them in the really big categories of estates, I would say that those between half a million and one million, we find that in '72 there were eight, in '73, there were eleven, in '74 there were eight, in '75 there were fourteen, and in '76 there were four. Those that were a million, there was six, four and three, and in two of the years, I believe '72 and '74, we had no estates of a million dollars, or over 500,000.00.

So the Opposition is discussing the hardship that is being racked upon approximately less than one-half of one percent of the people in the Province of Manitoba.

Now, I believe that the Honourable Member for Roblin yesterday was touching on a problem, and I think it is a real problem in this country. He was talking about the lack of a transportation policy here in Manitoba. He said that we should set a provincial policy on transportation. This may be true, what he is saying is that transportation should be in one department. But you know, Mr. Speaker, that until we really, as a nation — and I'm talking about Canada from one coast to the other — sit down, Federal, Provincial and urban governments, and hammer out a transportation policy for this country, we're going to be in very very dire straits indeed, in the very near future.

I can remember, not too many years ago, when the railways were busy changing over from steam generation to diesel electric, and the efficiency of return for the dollar investment was much higher, no one will argue that, on diesel electric at that time. Mind you there were, on the market, something that we could have used in lieu of that, steam turbines delivering electrical power. You know, at that time the poor fellows that used to shovel coal on the old steam locomotives were fighting to keep their place in society, keep their jobs, the locomotive firemen. They were accused of feather-bedding and everything else. No tears were shed for them because I believe that eventually, either by attrition or transfer to other jobs, these jobs disappeared.

I remember predicting at that time that we would not have a long life span, not as long as the life span of the steam locomotive, which, and I will agree was obsolete and needed changing. But lo and behold, it's only about 25 years, maybe a couple of years more, and already it looks like the diesel electric is going to be as dead as a dodo, because I think they're going to be going back to some form of coal energy.

When you speak of transportation — it's very nice, I use airplanes to fly here and there myself — but I think we're going to have to change in our way of thinking. Just using the fuel alone, the fuel to take one aircraft from the City of Montreal to the City of Vancouver will fire the equivalent of five diesel electric passenger trains from the City of Montreal to the City of Vancouver. Now if someone can tell me that is an efficient use of a depleting fossil energy, then that's nonsense.

But as I said, Mr. Speaker, when I started talking about transportation, that I think you can go right here in the City of Winnipeg where we had a hydro-electric trolley powered transportation system of a sort, but, lo and behold, somebody did a good selling job. They convinced the City of Winnipeg, Metro, get rid of those trolley buses, get rid of those ugly spider webs and trolley wires you have got up there. Put the diesel buses in. You know, not too long ago I was reading in the paper, Mr. Speaker, they are thinking of going back to diesel-electric.

You know, hindsight is great and perhaps I am using a bit of hindsight here, but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that a transportation policy is needed in this country. It has been needed for the last fifty years. We have on one hand the two railways, the CNR and the CPR and the Federal Government with Otto Lang busily tearing up railway tracks to small towns where they were hauling grain, and the unfortunate thing that those lines have been allowed to deteriorate to the point that they are practically unusable in today's modern hauling of freight, because those tracks are of such a waste and are in such a condition that they cannot take modern boxcars.

You know, at one time when I first started on the railway, most of the cars that were used were boxcars. It was a very inefficient method of moving grain, loading and unloading. Today, the railway equipment is much more sophisticated. You saw trains at that time of 60 or 70 cars at a maximum, hauling 30-ton cars. Today, we have 70, 100-ton cars, 125-ton cars. Those tracks that are in these rural areas cannot take these cars. I think what the Honourable Member for Churchill said is quite right. Going from Gillam to the Port of Churchill, you cannot haul that type of car up those tracks; they will simply not carry them.

Do you want to call it 4:30, Mr. Speaker, or 5:30? I was just wondering. I am prepared to go on if honourable members are prepared to listen. I'm not going to keep you too long, as I said before, Mr. Speaker. I think that we have chewed and chewed over this Budget. I guess perhaps the Honourable Member for Assiniboia the other day jokingly said to me, "What really galls the opposition is that this is a Conservative Budget, with a small "c8", conservative because we have not spent all the money

that they predicted last year that we were going to have all these goodies that we were going to give away this year. Well unfortunately we are not giving away too many goodies, Mr. Speaker.

I think we have presented a sensible Budget. I think that we have kept it as close as possible to being a balanced Budget and I think that the people of Manitoba, when the choice comes which it will come this year, will recognize that this has been a responsible government. They will judge us on our record. They will judge our record against their record in social measures for the population of Manitoba. In my mind, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that they will cast their vote and return to the Government of Manitoba the New Democratic Party, for the next four years and probably for the next four years after that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Portage la Prairie, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House was adjourned until Monday 2:30 p.m.