

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 p.m., Friday, April 23, 1976

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have some Grade 11 students from Garden City Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Jorowski. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister for Urban Affairs, the Member for Seven Oaks.

On behalf of all members I welcome you here this afternoon.

BUDGET DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker. It's always a pleasure to participate in the debate on the Budget Speech, and as well it's also nice to speak on the Throne Speech, because we have wide-ranging topics to discuss as opposed to when we're debating the Estimates, we have to confine ourselves to the Estimates before us and therefore the Budget Speech gives each and every member an opportunity to discuss problems in his own constituency and other topics that he wished to raise in the House.

Before I begin, Mr. Speaker, to get into my remarks today, I have a few complimentary remarks that I would like to make to my friends on the opposite side of the House. It's not very often that I do, but I do want to thank the Honourable Member for Gladstone for bringing to the attention of the House the flooding problems in our area, in the northern part of . . . perhaps in the northern part of the Gladstone constituency, I'm not sure, but certainly further north in the Ste. Rose area, in the Municipality of Ste. Rose and also in particular the Municipality of Glenella, Alonsa, and I'm sure that everyone is aware, Mr. Speaker, that last fall, the Constituency of Ste. Rose endured very very much inundation by heavy rainfall and drainage problems which was very difficult for many municipalities in my area and many individuals. And to have to undergo the same thing again, Mr. Speaker, is almost too much to bear. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we are unable to control the elements and acts of God and we have to, as the Member for Lakeside has just mentioned, we have to live with what comes our way. We're very pleased that last year the Provincial Government along with assistance from the Federal Government were able to come in with cost-shared assistance to assist those individuals and those municipalities who suffered extensive damages in last fall's heavy rainfalls, and we have the assurance of the First Minister and the Minister responsible for the Water Resources Branch that there will again be assistance for those areas in the province that have been again subjected to severe damages by excessive run-off. For that we are very thankful. A week ago I spent the entire day in the Municipality of Glenella and I saw many many provincial roads that were washed out, many bridges, many roads closed. In fact I saw several farmyards inundated, some with the foundations gone on the houses, some homes with 18 inches of water running over the floor. It wasn't a pretty sight. It's very sad to have to be subjected to that kind of a situation and it seems to be coming more and more frequent.

I haven't had the opportunity to survey the situation in the Ste. Rose Municipality, but everyone is aware that the Village of Ste. Rose and many other areas in the municipality was very much flooded last fall, and I had the opportunity to speak with the reeve, in fact today, the Reeve of the Municipality of Ste. Rose, Mr. Vandepoule, and he advises that there was extensive damage in the southern part of the municipality. So I'm sure you will be happy to hear that some assistance will be forthcoming when the Emergency Measures Act is invoked.

I also want to thank the - I said I had a few nice things to say about my friends in the opposite side of the House, Mr. Speaker. I have a few complimentary words, Mr. Speaker, regarding the Member from Minnedosa when he mentioned

## BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. ADAM cont'd) . . . . yesterday in his remarks that he was very pleased that I had been down a couple of years ago to cut the ribbon on a nice six-storey senior citizens housing, and he was very pleased that this government has seen fit to build senior citizen housing in his area, public housing. Of course he mentioned that I hadn't given any credit to the federal people on their participation in the housing program. And I want the honourable member to know, while I have paid him a compliment, I also want to draw to his attention that I don't regard the Federal participation as that great of a contribution. I might be faulted for making those remarks, Mr. Speaker, but the reason why I say this is because they are only acting as our bankers. And if the honourable member who is I believe still a banker, or was a banker, if the financial institutions of this country were able to supply the funds for housing we wouldn't have to call on the Federal Government, or the province for that matter, to build housing. Mr. Speaker, if I did not congratulate the Federal Government at Minnedosa it's because they're only acting as a financial institution, we have to pay every cent back, every dollar back, plus interest. So what are they in fact doing, the bank, the Royal Bank, of whichever bank the Honourable Member for Minnedosa represents? They could have done the same thing had they had the willingness and they chose not to. So Mr. Speaker, I want the honourable member to know that that is why I don't compliment the Federal Government at putting up the funds, because they are only acting as our bankers, we have to pay the money back plus interest. So they're not doing us any favours.

I listened with interest to members on both sides of the House on the Budget Debate up till now, Mr. Speaker, and, you know, something has happened, something has happened in Manitoba that I don't think that many people realize. I believe that many things have been accomplished for the betterment of our province, for the betterment of the human condition in Manitoba over the past five, six, seven years that we've had a New Democratic Party Government in this province. And, you know, I could list many of the things, I probably wouldn't be able to list all of them. If we had not cut the premiums on Medicare which was one of the main platform planks in 1969, if we had not cut those Medicare premiums off by about 80, 88 percent within a year and later on to cut that completely off when our very good friends who are happy that we have Medicare premiums but were also very happy to impose a monthly premium tax in order to carry on with the Medicare premiums, if we had not done that we would still have accomplished a great deal. If we had not - another 1969 platform plank - if we had not stopped the high level flooding of South Indian Lake, we would have still accomplished something. If we had not brought in the public auto insurance, which was another 1969 platform plank, we would have still accomplished something.

MR. EINARSON: Your Minister of Health did that, not you.

MR. ADAM: I notice that the Honourable Member for Rock Lake is starting to speak from the seat of his pants. I'm sure that the honourable member - I don't know if he's entered the debate as yet but he'll have an opportunity. So I would hope that I will give him the courtesy of listening to his remarks and I hope that he will allow me that courtesy now.

Mr. Speaker, if we had not brought in in 1971 the rural water services throughout Manitoba to bring modern conveniences to farmers across this province, we'd have still accomplished something. --(Interjections)-- The rabble is still continuing, Mr. Speaker. If we had not brought in public housing for senior citizens throughout this province - one of those senior citizen housing that I had the privilege of cutting the ribbon at Minnedosa . . .

MR. BLAKE: You guys built the first one, eh?

MR. ADAM: I want to say . . . well the honourable member says "we built the first one". I want him to know that prior to '69 there wasn't one public housing unit in rural Manitoba. Not one. Not one. Not one, Mr. Speaker. They never built one public housing unit in 11 years in office. And if he wishes to challenge that statement, bring up the facts and I'll retract my remarks.

We also, Mr. Speaker, brought in family housing units. So I say if we hadn't done that we would have still accomplished something. We brought in the PEP

## BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. ADAM cont'd) . . . . . programs, PEP-70. It was very peppy as my colleague from Springfield says. If we hadn't brought in those programs, we would have still accomplished something, and I'll come to that when I'm through.

If we hadn't introduced critical home repair programs, we would have still accomplished something. Diversification programs for farmers, and I shouldn't forget the Beef Assurance Program which is probably the largest, the most ambitious, agricultural program ever undertaken by any provincial government in Canada. If we hadn't brought in those programs we'd have still accomplished something. If we hadn't brought in Pharmacare to allow everyone some assistance to those people who are obliged to buy prescription drugs beyond their capacity or their financial ability to pay, we would have still accomplished something, Mr. Speaker. If we hadn't introduced Denticare this year for pre-school children up to age six, we could have still accomplished something. If we had not introduced the extended care home programs, we would have still accomplished something. Mr. Speaker in my constituency we have a 40-unit extended care home in Ste. Rose that wasn't there before. There will be one in Winnipegosis someday and I believe there'll be one in McCreary, because the need is there, Mr. Speaker. Where was the government prior to '69 with these programs Mr. Speaker? These programs were nonexistent. Where was the day care program Mr. Speaker? Non-existent.

Mr. Speaker, the Property Tax Credit plan, Bill No. 55, 1972, I advised the opposition when I spoke on that particular bill in 1972 that I would never let them forget the day that we voted on that bill. And I'm going to remind them again today, Mr. Speaker. I have here the division and I intend to name the fellows who voted against this program. I want the people of Manitoba to know who sits on that side of the House and who sits on this side of the House. Here is a program that would have transferred \$40 million away from the property tax owner of this province. Where were they, where were those gentlemen? There was a few that were not there. The Member from Wolseley wasn't there so we can't fault him, or the Member for Crescentwood wasn't there. --(Interjection)-- You were there, and I'm going to name you. Mr. Speaker, the proposed bill was to transfer \$40 million off the taxpayers in direct payment back to the people who have to go into the municipalities and pay the taxes. --(Interjection)-- If the honourable member will be patient, he will learn something. The Conservative Members who voted against that bill, Mr. Speaker, are: Mr. Bilton, the one is speaking; Mr. Blake, the banker; Mr. Craik, the leader; Mr. Einarson, the farmer; Mr. Enns, the rancher; Mr. Ferguson, who left the ranchers, Mr. Graham, who is not here today; Mr. Henderson, the true Conservative; Mr. Johnson, Sturgeon Creek, who is not in his seat today; Mr. Jorgenson, the House Leader of the Conservative Party; Mr. McGill, Member for West Brandon; Mr. McGregor, my friend on the opposite side which I admire very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker it's with sorrow that I mention the next name, our departed colleague, Mr. McKellar. We're sorry that he's not with us here today, sadness I say that he voted against this bill. Mr. McKenzie from Roblin voted against this bill. Mr. Sherman, Bud Sherman from Fort Garry voted against this bill. Mr. Spivak, the former leader, and Mrs. Inez Truman who is no longer here. Those are the fellows who voted against this bill, Mr. Speaker. These are the fellows who stand up today and say they want to help the people of Manitoba, give us a chance and we'll help you. --(Interjection)-- I'm being prompted by my colleagues to question why the other four Conservative members ducked out on the vote. And I say there were seven or eight fellows on the Conservative Party that ducked the vote on the Beef Assurance Program as well.

Mr. Speaker, these are the good samaritans that want to regain control of this government, and they call themselves progressive. Progressive, Mr. Speaker, they've changed their name Conservative to Progressive Conservative. Mr. Speaker, they have a new leader, and we're not supposed to talk about the new leader, we're not supposed to talk about what they done when they were in office. We're not

## BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. ADAM cont'd) . . . . supposed to talk what they're going to if they ever regain office, heaven forbid. And we're not supposed to talk about what they're doing now because that's not fair, that's not fair ball. I say that with their new leader they should drop the word Progressive, let's go back to just the plain Conservative. It sits better. It fits better, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker if we had not brought in property tax credits, we would have still accomplished something. If we had not brought in recreation programs, lotteries' commissions to help different communities obtain funds on a shared basis, to build recreation in rural areas, we would still have accomplished something. If we had not brought in the cost of living tax credits that would help the lower income groups somewhat - I'm not saying that it solves all problems, but at least it helps those in the lower income groups and those on fixed incomes - if we had not brought in the cost of living tax credit we'd have still accomplished something. If we had not extended telephone service throughout this province in remote areas that never had any communications with the southern parts of this province. --(Interjection)-- The Minister's congratulating me because he's responsible for the telephone. We extended telephone service in many areas that were not serviced prior to 1969. That means something to those people Mr. Speaker. In remote areas we've also extended hydro service - about five areas in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, that were only a few miles away, but were disregarded - services that we took for granted in the southern part of the province were denied to these areas. If we had not done this, we'd have still accomplished something. --(Interjection)-- There's lots more.

Mr. Speaker, I hate to say this --(Interjection)-- You've twisting my arm. Prior to 1969 a road program for this province was given in to, and I dislike to say this, Mr. Speaker, but most of the road works went into the constituency that was represented by a Conservative member. I say to you, be very careful, because I'm about to drop a bombshell on you. In 1969, the Ste. Rose constituency was represented by the Honourable Senator Molgat --(Interjection)-- 18-1/2 years, Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues will not take away my time and let me speak - my colleagues. In 1969 the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, Senator Molgat, he wasn't a Senator then, when the new government was elected, came on bended knees to Joe Borowski. --(Interjection)-- Yes, suck-hole, suck-hole, right, because you fellows wouldn't give any money for Ste. Rose. In 1968, \$400,000 went to Ste. Rose for roads. Mr. Molgat came on bended knees and pleaded with Joe Borowski, please help me, help me, these fellows won't give me anything. He got \$800,000 in 1970, double, double, of what you were giving him. How many roads have you got in southwest Manitoba? You got No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, and everything in between is all paved and everything else. That's where the money went.

The Honourable Member for Wolseley got up the other day and said that we were buying votes. We bring in programs to buy votes. Well I have in here a confidential document, Manitoba Treasury Board, one of your documents. A document written by Conservatives prior to 1969. I'll show you where the money went. This is a confidential document, but I am making it public today because the people of Manitoba have a right to know --(Interjection)-- the people of Manitoba have a right to know how you fellows allocated the funds in this province. This is a confidential inter-department document requested by the Tory Government . . .

MR. BILTON: On a point of privilege. I wonder . . .

MR. ADAM: I know he wants to take some of . . .

MR. BILTON: No, no. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if there is not a question in your mind as to whether or not this document should be tabled, if it is as the honourable gentleman says "confidential and inter-departmental" . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has offered to do that. No problem.

MR. ADAM: I'll be glad to table it because I'm making it public. This is a suggested approach to the government of the day by their lackies. --(Interjection)-- You know what lackie means? You should know. You should know, you're a lackie of the corporate sector. Mr. Speaker: "In Manitoba the government seeks election in 57 constituencies . . . "

## BUDGET DEBATE

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

MR. BLAKE: On a matter of personal privilege, I've just been referred to as a lackie of the corporations by the Member for Ste. Rose. I would like him to retract that statement, I'm not a lackie of any corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister on the same point of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: Well Mr. Speaker, I believe that under House rules, copies of which you were kind enough to distribute for our refreshing of memory just a few days ago, I think would make the distinction that if an individual honourable member is thus accused, that it would constitute a matter of privilege, but if the matter is said in debate in a general sense, I don't believe that that constitutes a matter of privilege of any honourable member.

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

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has a very cute way of trying to weasel out from what is a bonafide question of privilege. The fact is, Sir, that the Member for Ste. Rose accused the Member for Minnedosa of being a lackie of the corporations that, Sir, is a clear violation of our rules and a definite question of privilege and he should be asked to withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I will gladly withdraw it. But if the shoe fits he should wear it. Mr. Speaker, I don't want them to take of my time, so I hope that you will not cut that off my time.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has 11 minutes.

MR. ADAM: --(Interjections)-- I know. You're worried, you don't like it. I know you don't like it. Mr. Speaker: "In Manitoba the government seeks election in 57 constituencies. In some of these a government finds greater difficulty in obtaining a plurality than in others. In a purely political sense, therefore, some constituencies have greater impact on the government's overall ability to maintain itself than others. We suggest a weighing of constituencies. . ."

A MEMBER: Who said that?

MR. ADAM: Oh, it's the Conservative lackies. Don't interrupt, for God sakes. We suggest a weighing of constituencies according to the threat to the overall security of the government! - now get the import of this question, what they're saying is, let's spend the money where we have a chance of getting elected, that's what they're saying - "from least to great importance as follows: - Solid opposition; seats traditionally held by the opposition where voting patterns are stable and there is little chance that government action could shift a balance." So let's not waste any money there. Let's not waste money where there's no chance of getting elected.

Now here's No. 2: "Solid Government: Seats traditionally held by the government and where voting patterns are stable and predictable." That's another category. That's where the money should go. "Volatile opposition: Seats held by the opposition where changing population patterns, aging groups or other factors make prediction of voting patterns difficult. Volatile government: Seats held by the government where changing population patterns, age groupings or other factors make prediction of voting patterns difficult. Marginal opposition: Seats held by the opposition but with a slim margin and with some stability in voting patterns. Marginal government: Seats held by the government but with a slim margin and with some stability in voting patterns.

"Each of some 300 programs of the government has a differing impact on the political scene in each riding. In some areas for example, hospital services to Indians are of political significance. In another riding, vocational basic training for skilled development meets a greater felt need and is a more powerful eliciting political response than the hospital program for Indians. Indeed programs which are vote-getters in some ridings may have a depressing effect on the electorate in others.

"A systematic comparison of each program against each riding yields information which focuses attention on those programs which are most important to the

## BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. ADAM cont'd) . . . . political security of the government." Now if that is not vote-buying, tell me what is not vote-buying. And I address my remarks to the Member for Wolseley, who accuses this government of bringing in programs to buy votes.

"This appraisal, unlike the analysis in the Planning and Priorities Committee which deals with long-range needs, aims at the short run. It considers the impact of the programs in the context of the short-range political situation. Its time horizon extends to the next general election," - So now you have to find out what they were doing, now we're getting the picture - "And to the extent that these programs cannot shift or cannot appear to shift that rapidly to the election following." In other words, if there's no incentive of putting funds in a certain constituency that may not change the vote - you know, concentrate on those areas which will bring or return a Conservative member.

"The process we suggest is similar to the one followed by all political parties" Well I want to tell them that that's not what's happening now. --(Interjection)-- Must have been speaking about the Liberals. "But we have extended it in three directions. Firstly, we have forced the process into a systematic framework which deals with all programs and all ridings simultaneously. Secondly, we have based the political analysis on the inventory of government programs so that the expenditure items considered are concrete and easy to manipulate and are described in the same terms that administrative decisions are taking. Thirdly, we have built the political analysis into the formal process of government priority review. Through this process each of the government programs will be examined separately against each constituency, separately." Separately, not as a province to build a road program . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Five minutes.

MR. ADAM: . . . to divide the money in every area. No way.

MR. SPEAKER: Five minutes.

MR. ADAM: No way. I will have time. "For each pair of constituency and program the following values should be assigned:

1) Where a program effort has a negative impact on the political scene, zero, they've designated the number of their programs; where the program efforts are a negligible effect, one; where program efforts has a favourable impact; and 2)" - the first one was minus one, zero and now one - and 2) "Where the program effort is exceptionally important, multiplication of these values assigned to the program riding assessment by the value for the riding itself yields a number giving some indication of political importance. The summation of these values for each program over all ridings in the province yields an aggregate index of political priorities. It is probable that only a relatively small number of programs are highly important from a political sensitivity point of view. The implications for Cabinet are obvious." I repeat that. "The implications for Cabinet are obvious." --(Interjection)-- The Conservative Cabinet.

"The programs that have a high sensitivity index must receive first attention in allocating funds. This is essential for the political security of the government."

Mr. Speaker, let them never stand up again and accuse this government of buying votes with programs. --(Interjection)-- Ah, it's in 1970 or in 1966.

I was very disappointed - I know all I have is about four minutes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Two minutes.

MR. ADAM: Two minutes, all right, all right. I'll get right down. I said that if we had not done all these programs we would have still accomplished something.

Within the time that I have left to speak I will say that I listened on Tuesday to three Conservative members stand up in this debate and champion the cause of labour. What is the word? What have we done to this party in the last five or six years? What has happened? What has transpired? What is the word? We should coin a word. We have "humanized" the Conservative Party. They are now standing up and defending labour. They are now standing up and defending labour, Mr. Speaker.

## BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. ADAM cont'd) . . . . . If all we had accomplished in the six years that we were in office, or the seven years, if we at least make the Conservative Party realize that there are other people besides corporations and banks and multi-nationals, that there are people and workers, if we have only accomplished that in our term of office we would have accomplished a great deal. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, as the debate has progressed, the last 24 hours at least, it's taken rather an interesting turn. We discovered that in the early stages of the debate the honourable gentlemen opposite were very reluctant to participate. One after another they sat in stony silence either immobilized by the words of the Minister of Finance when he introduced his Budget or stunned by it's contents or just plain stunned. One has some difficulty in determining the reason for that kind of silence.

But in the last 24 hours suddenly they have come to life and of course we on this side of the House know the reason for it and it can't be much of a secret. But it's interesting to watch them one after another now parade to the podium and try to deliver themselves of speeches that were unprepared. That, Sir, has produced an interesting revelation because honourable gentlemen opposite now are saying the things that are closest to their hearts; they're saying the things that have been in the back of their minds all the time but they have been afraid to say. We're getting a new perspective on honourable gentlemen opposite and particularly from the words of the Finance Minister when he introduced the Budget and in the speech that he recently delivered in the Riel Constituency.

People of this province now are beginning to see this government in their true light. --(Interjection)-- My honourable friend opposite says they love it. Well we're going to see how much they love it. We're going to see how many people who are going to be affected by the proclamation just made by the First Minister in Riel the other night are going to remain in this province. You know the interesting thing about that kind of a proclamation is its total disregard for the facts of life and for the things that motivate an economy, the raw belief, Sir, that government by government decree and by government edict, that they can proclaim things to happen in this country.

Sir, it has not been true of history in the past and it will not be true of history in the future. The reason for that, Sir, is because governments are not designed for the purpose of guiding, directing or decreeing the direction in which an economy will go, the direction in which people will want to be motivated or moved. Because you don't base decisions on economic situations. You're dealing with people. You're dealing with human nature and human nature hasn't changed since the beginning of time. Any effort to attempt to change that is fraught with disaster as my honourable friends opposite are beginning to find out. We can recognize the frustrations in their words; we can recognize the frustrations in their actions in knowing that no matter what they attempt to do human nature almost invariably prevails. They seek to move the economy in one direction and human nature compels it to move in another direction and so it has been going on.

My honourable friend, the Member for Ste. Rose, in his remarks just concluded, chided past governments because they hadn't built enough public housing in the past. Now the thought never occurred to him that perhaps in the rural areas of this province 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 years ago, public housing was not needed, that there was no great demand for it. But you know it's rather interesting to note, Sir, that the demand for public housing has coincided with the advent of socialism in this country. I tell you, Sir, in a country - and I don't pretend to suggest that this quotation is original because it isn't and some honourable gentlemen opposite will obviously recognize it - but it seems rather unique doesn't it that in a country that has a surfeit of lumber, a surfeit of building materials, that there's a housing shortage. It takes some kind of political genius to create a housing shortage in the face of all the surpluses that we have in raw materials. I tell you, Sir, that kind of genius is a characteristic of the socialist.

## BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd)

The First Minister and his colleagues have continued to emphasize the absolute obsession that they have with the "progressivism". We know the definition of progressive, of a progressive in their terms because it was illustrated to this House by the Minister of Mines and Resources just a short while ago when he said, "When we're in power, we will progress." And he said, "I'm not so naive as to think that from time to time honourable gentlemen opposite will not be in power. And when they're in power," meaning us, "then the country will not progress, that we'll just stand still.

But the meaning of the term "progressive" in their terms is a movement to the left. From the words of the Minister of Mines and Resources, who has a capacity for saying the things that he believes in in this House, one can only conclude that their intention is to lead this country to the ultimate in progressiveness and that is communism.

The First Minister indicated that same attitude and that's the first lapse that he's had. He's carefully cultured and nurtured the image of a moderate person and he's sold that image to the business community in this country. I had an opportunity to listen to some of the comments from the business community today and they're beginning to wake up and they're beginning to recognize the First Minister for what he really is and what his real intentions are. This attitude of assuming that the only direction that the economy should move and this country should move is in the direction of communism, is one that will be rejected by the people of this province and by the people of this country.

My honourable friend, the Minister of Public Works, who has given vent to some profound pronouncements from time to time has just echoed. He said "and to us too." Well then my honourable friend is either just ignorant of what he is doing, if he now admits that he is not cognizant of what he's doing - and I don't think that ignorance on the part of a government is any excuse for the direction that they're going or the actions that they're taking. This government has given all of the appearance in the various directions that they're heading this country in - in the conflicting statements that are made from time to time by one Minister and another and then the backbencher on the other side - they've given all of the appearance of having the mental and the physical co-ordination of broken fly wheel, not knowing where they're going and not caring. Not caring of the eventual direction that they're leading the economy and the people of this province. There can only be one conclusion and there can only be one result of the so-called progressivism of honourable gentlemen opposite.

The Member for Ste. Rose chided us and said that we're no longer progressive and that we shouldn't be called progressive. I agree with him. I don't want to be called a progressive if being a progressive means that I'm going to be a communist and that I'm going to lead this country deliberately or otherwise into a communist state. I would much rather be called a Conservative and much rather be called someone who knows what is happening and is prepared to prevent that from happening because we know it is the ultimate destruction of mankind.

These are not necessarily my words, Sir, because there are other people who perhaps are a great deal more knowledgeable in this subject than I am who have some words of wisdom to say on this particular subject. --(Interjection)-- Well now my honourable friend says Joe McCarthy. I quote from certain such people as Marshall McCluen - I don't think he was a Joe McCarthy. McKenzie Porter was not a Joe McCarthy and neither is Alexander Solzhenitsyn a Joe McCarthy. But these people have given us a fairly good idea of what's going to happen in this country in the direction that we're going unless we recognize what is happening. My honourable friends opposite, you know, and it was demonstrated by the Member for Ste. Rose and I certainly, Sir, do not want to quote him as the authority on the other side although I presume that from time to time while he listens to the wheels in the Cabinet discuss matters in the caucus of his party, that from time to time he picks up the odd quotation and he picks up the odd word and he picks up the odd suggestion, and for lack of something better to say in this House he repeats them in this House, as he did that so-called confidential memorandum that has been repeated in this House at least a half a dozen times.

Now then, Sir, McKenzie Porter says this in an article that appeared in the Tribune of April 27, 1972 - and that was as early as 1972. We've gone much further



## BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) . . . . since. He said that the spread through capitalist countries of social, economic, and political theories evolved by small "l" liberals undoubtedly has cushioned the weaker members of the population from the intolerable degrees of poverty that prevailed during the nineteenth century. And that is true. No one denies that. But these theories vociferously defined as progressive, simultaneously have softened the brains and the bodies of stronger members of the populations - that's obvious when one listens to the speeches of honourable gentlemen opposite - and so have brought capitalist society to a state of decay that compares with that of the Roman Empire in 400 A.D. Five signs of an impending crack-up in the west are visible. Then he goes on to point out the five visible signs. I'm not going to recite them here, Sir, but suffice it to say that the signs are recognizable. For anyone who wants to read it, he can. I've indicated the publication from where this comes and my honourable friends opposite can look for it.

Solzhenitsyn had this to say, and no one can suggest that Solzhenitsyn is not one that doesn't know whereof he speaks. He came from a country of that nature and he recognizes the signs in western civilization as he recognized them in Russia. This is what he said. He likened life in the west to life in pre-1970 Russia, just before the revolution. What we see is always the same. Adults deferring to the opinion of their children; the younger generation carried away by shallow worthless ideas; professors scared of being unfashionable; universal sympathy for revolutionary extremists.

My honourable friend, the Member for Point Douglas, has very frequently in this House referred to that moral decay that is taking place in our society and very eloquently attempts to warn us of what is happening, attempting to dissuade us from proceeding on the course that we're following. His words, Sir, fall on deaf ears of honourable gentlemen opposite and it's a pity because these are words that come from one who has had, and has intimate contact with that kind of life and recognizes the signs in his training and his experience with people.

Then he goes on to point out one example of the kind of moral decay that takes place and he goes on to say this. He said, "Britain never recalled its Ambassador from Eastern Europe when the Soviet tanks rolled into East Berlin, Budapest and Prague." And they didn't. "In southeastern Asia unknown numbers of prisoners have been killed and are still being killed in secret. Yet the British Ambassadors have never been recalled. "Every day in the Soviet Union psychiatrists murder people with their hypodermic syringes merely because they do not think along accepted lines." Again the British Ambassador is not recalled. But when five terrorists who had actually committed murder were executed in Madrid then the British Ambassador was recalled and the din reverberated around the world. What a hurricane burst forth from British Isles.

Sir, I have had an opportunity to talk to somebody who recently returned from Russia and visited a relative of his. His 92-year-old mother was being taken care of by relatives. I said, well why do they not take care of them in senior citizen homes as we do here. Do they not have security from the cradle to the grave in Russia? Yes they do, he said. But if we were to take her to a home in Russia, in a week she'd be dead because they would inject her with a hypodermic syringe. They have no use for people who cannot contribute to society. Is that what we're going to expect in this country when honourable gentlemen have reached the ultimate? When we have reached that millennium that they're striving for? That progressivism that they talk about? Because that, Sir, whether they like it or not, whether they want to believe it or not --(Interjection)-- Yes, I am serious. It's the ultimate in the direction that the honourable friends are heading.

I'll give you one example. Let's just take the example of two agricultural products. Let's take milk and let's take eggs. What has happened? When they started out they decided that it was necessary to have some control over these industries so marketing boards were set up. I have no philosophical objection to marketing boards as long as they're used for the purpose for which they are intended. That is to obtain a better deal for the people that they're serving. But when they are designed to impose undue and unnecessary controls on the individual then they're, I think, stepping outside their bounds that are prescribed for them.

## BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) . . . . .

Just recently we've had a great outcry by the Minister of Agriculture, by farm union leaders, by socialists across this country, complaining because the Federal Minister of Agriculture has cut back on the subsidy on quotas for manufactured milk. Oh, they say, what a terrible thing that is. But what they have not recognized, Sir, that is the logical result of the application of their kind of a philosophy to agricultural production and distribution. Supply management, the reduction of quotas, the increasing of quotas, the changing of quotas, the changing of subsidies, is all part and parcel of supply management. If any group of producers are going to accept the principle of supply management, then they've got to accept the inevitable results of it and the extremes to which supply management will lead them.

The same is true in eggs. What other system in the world, Sir, would create a situation where you have to destroy, literally destroy 28 million eggs and heaven knows how many million chickens just to get rid of them. That, Sir, is supply management at its very best.

Well, Sir, just what is the intentions of my honourable friends opposite? If illustrated by the Minister of Mines and Resources, and again reiterated just recently by the First Minister, progressivism is really what they're after and the kind of progressive society that they're leaning towards is the kind of society that they have in Russia today. And my honourable friends, they deny it. They scream about it when you attempt to mention that that is the direction that we're heading. But, Sir, what they must recognize is that once you have started in that direction there is only one logical end to it. That is the complete denial of individual liberties and individual rights. How far --(Interjection)-- Well my honourable friend says how about Fascism? I'm happy to answer that. I have no more use for a dictatorship to the right than I have to the left. One is as evil as the other. There's only one way, Sir, to protect and to prevent a dictatorship to either the right or the left and that is for the preservation of individual rights and human liberties.

I tell you, Sir, you begin to deny individual liberties and rights the moment that you start collectivizing the nation's surplus and collectivizing the people of this country. --(Interjection)-- Well my honourable friend says vote NDP and these are profound statements that should be placed on the record because it epitomizes the kind of nonsense that we hear from time to time by honourable gentlemen opposite. My friends opposite do not recognize - and they continue to talk about the necessity of protecting rights. What rights? What rights are they protecting? They're encouraging not liberty but the libertine attitude. Again I use somebody else because nobody believes what I say but they might believe what somebody else says. Here's an article that appeared in the Tribune just recently by Arthur Thompson, and he says this: that in a meeting held recently that was chaired by Christine Newman, "are we in law becoming a more liberal society?" The conclusions that that particular committee came to was that what we seem to be saying is that we're a more libertine society but a more regulated society at the same time. That's a fact Sir. My friends opposite proclaim the virtues of a libertine society but they say very little about a free society and a society composed of the liberty and the freedom of the individual and don't make that distinction as I believe they should.

Human rights, Sir, cannot be assigned to any particular group. I was intrigued by some of the comments made by the Member for Ste. Rose and others who talk about how they have given rights to certain groups: to the labour unions and to the mothers, to the teachers and the like. Sir, rights cannot be signed to any pressure group. Rights are the property of the individual and there's only one way of ensuring rights and of ensuring our society that we're not going to drift either to the right or the left, to the extremes of either. That is by preserving individual rights. What is the basis of individual rights? The basis of individual rights is the ownership of property, the right to own the things that you earn for yourself, the things that you have earned for yourself. It's obvious, Sir, that if you're going to produce simply for the state to distribute to others, you're nothing more than a slave.

## BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd)

I was interested in listening to conversations by honourable gentlemen opposite when they returned from their sojourn to Cuba during the past winter, talking about what a wonderful society they encountered in that society. One of the great virtues that they saw in life in Cuba was the fact that the workers, while they were toiling in the fields were singing. Well, Sir --(Interjection)-- Yes, they had something to sing about. So did the Negro slaves in the southern United States. Yes, Sir. That is a characteristic of slavery, Sir, because you have nothing more to look forward to than song. That, Sir, is very illustrative of the kind of mentality that we see from honourable gentlemen opposite.

Well, Sir, in this country we have, or at least we had, created a society that endeavoured to set men free. It was different from any other society in the world. It was based on the concept of individual rights and individualism. When this country was settled it wasn't settled on the basis that we were going to relegate the people of this country and melt them into the grey conformity of collectivism but rather that we were going to protect their individual rights and that was the difference from this society and any other that had ever been created. That, Sir, is beginning to slip away from us because of the false doctrine that is now being preached by honourable gentlemen opposite. I was rather intrigued to listen to the Minister of Mines and Resources the other night when he chided the Member for Lakeside for peddling snake oil on this side of the House. Well, Sir, it takes a cobra to recognize snake oil.

I think that one of the things that we must recognize in this country is the difference between individual rights and liberties in a legal sense as opposed to the individual rights and liberties in the economic sense. There was an editorial in the Manitoba Co-Operator that appeared a short while ago, January 8th, and it had some interesting things to say as a result of the proclamation or the pronouncement made in Ottawa by the Prime Minister, a pronouncement that was met with the eager welcoming arms of honourable gentlemen opposite because it's the kind of society, Sir, that they relish in and they would like to see. "Since 1976 will witness the celebration of the 200th birthday of nationhood for our great neighbour to the south, it might be appropriate to quote from their Declaration of Independence at the start of this first editorial of a new year." And here's the quotation, "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Equality is at once the most natural and chimerical thing in the world: natural when it is limited to rights, unnatural when it attempts to level goods and powers." What brings about these philosophical quotes is the tendency for more and more people to take the passage from the American Declaration of Independence out of context and to interpret it to mean an inalienable right to equality of economic well-being rather than equality before the law. They are two different things.

So when we talk about rights in this country, let's make that distinction. Let's make the distinction between what are inalienable rights before the law as opposed to rights in an economic sense. My honourable friends opposite are guilty of attempting to confuse the two. Whether that is a proper statement to make or not I leave it up to them. Whether it is done deliberately or whether it is done by simple ignorance of the facts is difficult to discern at this time. But I suggest to my honourable friends that if our society is to survive then our primary responsibility as a government and our primary objective is to preserve those rights of the individual. Because if they have been preserved there is no danger of a drift either into a left wing or a right wing totalitarian state.

But when those rights are abridged as I maintain, Sir, they are being abridged today and we see it on every hand, then the drift will be in whatever direction the government of the day chooses it to be directed. And there is no doubt in anybody's mind in this province, this is the direction that honourable gentlemen opposite are intending to head us.

And they put a great deal of faith in what happens in Sweden. And they set

## BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) . . . . Sweden up as the shining example of a Socialist State. They have not recognized some of the inherent dangers and some of the problems that have been encountered as a result of the application of that Socialist State in Sweden. I refer again, Sir, to an article that was written by Roland Huntford who was a correspondent in Sweden for a number of years. He says this: "Crimes against the State must now be regarded as more serious than crimes against the individual." That, Sir, is an indication of the dangers that we're now beginning to face. Mr. Huntford goes on to say, and he's quoting Mr. Raynar who is the Minister of Justice in Sweden. He said, "People today now live in a collective, and any attack on that collective must be judged more severely than is the case today." As an example of what he meant, Mr. Raynar said that offences against the individuals such as assault, fraud and theft would be treated more leniently and prosecutions might be dropped wherever possible, even if the evidence was available. On the other hand, tax evasion is a premier crime against the State. That, Sir, is an indication of what we have yet to see if honourable gentlemen opposite remain in power much longer.

There he goes on to state further, that there is a school of thought within Sweden, in the Swedish government, that would like to turn all lawyers into civil servants. Well, Mr. Speaker, honourable friends opposite very frequently quote Sweden as their example and their idea towards which, to quote the words of the First Minister, "towards which we should strive". But what is the idea and the goal towards which they are striving? It now seems that this will indeed happen. At the same judge's meeting addressed by Mr. Raynar, another official announced that in the near future State lawyers offices would be established in each Swedish province. What do we have here, Sir? These offices would allot defence counsel and provide legal advice for a nominal fee without a means test. What do we have here, Sir? As in the case with present legal aid, the strategy behind this is that with cheap legal services freely available, lawyers in private practice will find their livelihood eroded and be forced to enter what are State lawyers' communes in all but name. Sir, the day that the legal profession in this country is deprived of its right to defend the rights of mankind and of the individual against the State, then we have indeed reached that millennium, then we have indeed reached that stage which honourable gentlemen opposite proclaim as the ideal.

Sir, how far must we go for the people of this province to recognize the dangers that we face, in a government that in the name of providing equality, in the name of substituting a competitive society with an egalitarian, one attempts to gain and curry favour amongst the voters. They do not tell us what the ultimate goal is, and they dare not tell us, it's only occasionally when we have a slip of the tongue by honourable gentlemen opposite that we recognize the true meaning of what they consider to be the ideal State.

The First Minister, in an interview with McLean's magazine, went on to point out that he endorses the Galbraithian theory of greater and greater government involvement in government spending. But I don't think even Galbraith himself would have endorsed the kind of philosophy that he enunciated in the late Fifties and early Sixties, as applicable today, because even the most enthusiastic Galbraithian supporters who I would presume would be in Great Britain, have rejected that now and have recognized that it is necessary to return to the individual some semblance of a right to govern his own destiny and to provide for himself.

During the course of this debate, Sir, we have had one speaker after another on the other side rise in their place to tell this House how great they are, primarily because they removed the medicare and the hospitalization premiums. That, Sir, in their terms, is measurement of a success of a government. But what they have failed to point out, and what I again point out for their benefit, is that in 1969 medical and hospital insurance was available to every family in this province for as low as \$60 a year through Blue Cross and there were only 15 percent of the people of this province that were not covered under hospital insurance. And it would have been far better, far better, if the government of that day and government today would have subsidized those insurance premiums so that they were all covered rather than the kind of monstrosity they have created now. Today, Sir, they talk about free medical and hospitalization.

## BUDGET DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) . . . . It's costing each man, woman and child in this country \$412.000 a piece to be covered. --(Interjection)-- Well, it's still less than the United States, my honourable friend says. As if there's some virtue in that knowledge. I say to my honourable friend there is no virtue in knowing that it is less than in the United States. I suggest to my honourable friends opposite that that kind of insurance should be made available. Nobody denies the need for some kind of an insurance program to protect people against those enormous costs that can accrue as a result of illness or hospitalization. Nobody quarrels with that. But to suggest that it has to be universal, that it has to cost each man, woman and child \$412.00 a year is sheer lunacy; \$412 this year, \$450 next year, where will it end? When are we going to take some steps and some measures and some common sense in preventing that from escalating before it ruins us all. My honourable friend opposite refuse to accept that is a possibility. And maybe they don't want to stop, because that's the kind of a society that they want. A ruinous one, where they can pick up the shambles and create the kind of society that they want, which is a totalitarian one.

My friends opposite, every time that somebody on this side suggests that we should be looking at means of improving the present system, of restructuring it, so that the abuses can be removed, shout down any suggestion of that nature. My God, everything at all cost! \$412 per person. Sir, there is something abysmally immoral about a government that brags about how they have removed as a cost to the individual their hospital and medical insurance premiums for everybody over 20 who is receiving a \$25,000 a year income, and yet imposes what will be in a very short time, 100 percent increase in the power rates to people who are earning less than \$10,000 a year. Where, I ask my honourable friends, is the morality and the rationale in that kind of a system? --(Interjection)-- Well, my Minister of Agriculture who sits in a dejected pose in that bench of the House says that that's nonsense. And that's what we hear from honourable gentlemen all the time. They continue to suggest to us, why don't you provide some alternatives? I have suggested some alternatives here today, and the first alternative, I suggest some alternatives here today, and the first alternative, I suggest to my honourable friends opposite, is that you give some consideration to the preservation of individual and human rights in this country. If that, Sir, isn't a desirable alternative, then I don't know what is, and I suggest to my honourable friends that we can reduce the cost of government by re-examining the whole concept of medical and hospital insurance and all these other programs that are acting as a drain on the resources of the people of this country, destroying their initiative, destroying their ability to provide for themselves. Sir, if we don't examine methods, and if my honourable friends opposite refuse to examine those methods, then I can only come to one conclusion, and the conclusion is, Sir, that they don't care to, that they're perfectly happy in the direction that we're going. Indeed, they're anxious that we get there.

. . . . continued next page

## BUDGET

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, it is always rather interesting to hear the Member for Morris deliver himself of the kind of philosophy that the people of Manitoba can look forward to if the Conservative Party ever wins another election in this province. It is pretty evident from having witnessed the Member for Morris over the last seven years, that the Conservative Party of this province is moving further and further to the right. What we have just witnessed, what we have just heard, is the kind of extremism, the kind of extreme right wing non-philosophy that is so exemplified by their new leader and by those who sit opposite. It is pretty clear, Mr. Speaker, to me and certainly to everyone on this side of the House and I think too to the public of Manitoba, that the Conservative Party in this province would like to go back to the kind of system, the kind of political economy that we had 50, 60 or 100 years ago, where those who had could get more and those who had little could get nothing more at all. That is what we are hearing. That is the kind of extreme right-wing philosophy that the Member for Morris is so good at enunciating.

It became so apparent here when he recited the figure in his mind for Blue Cross and those who were excluded from participation in that program. Those people he said ran around 15 percent. I think the figure was between 15 and 30 percent of those Manitobans who did not participate in Blue Cross. I suggest to you that of the 15 to 30 percent who were not participating in Blue Cross, most of those could not do so because they simply could not afford the premium. And what the Member for Morris wants to get us back to is the kind of medical program that will exclude those who can't afford to pay, and we have seen in the United States today and in other countries . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. TURNBULL: . . . that there are people who cannot afford medical care and they are simply forgotten. They are made bankrupt if they have the misfortune of running into ill health. That's the kind of system that he wants.

And when the Member for Morris suggests that what the Conservative Party wants to do is re-examine the financial arrangements for medical care in this country, that is snake oil, because what they intend to do is to get back to the system where the poor cannot have health care. It becomes so evident, Mr. Speaker, when you listen to the concept that the Member for Morris, the House Leader of the Conservative Party speaking for his party, the concept that he has about the idea of individual rights. Individual rights for him does not mean the inherent worth, the inherent rights of the individual as a person. What individual rights means to the Member for Morris is the ownership of property, and the more property you have then the more rights you should have. That is Conservative philosophy. I've been waiting for seven years to hear it put that way and he's finally come through and put it the way the Conservative Party in this province intends to govern on the basis of the ownership of property. That is to them individual rights, and he well knows, Sir, - he was talking about slips in his own speech - he well knows that he let that one out of the bag, because he didn't again refer to the fact that individual rights lay in a person's ownership of property.

Now, I want to clarify so that no members misunderstand, that clearly a person's individual rights mean that they can own property, and I wouldn't want these extremists on the opposite side to say that because I believe that the inherent worth of the individual is the basis for their individual rights, I wouldn't want them to misinterpret that as they normally do and say that I would deny people the ownership of property because that, Sir, would certainly be a misleading statement.

This Member for Morris, I must say, he reminds me of those individuals whose best loved stories are the nonsequiturs. You know, like the well known story that pretends to prove that the poor people get rich if you give rich people tax breaks. That's the kind of philosophy, the kinds of nonsequiturs that this Member for Morris would like to put forth in this House as being somehow, by giving the rich people tax breaks you could make the poor people better off. And that is just nonsense. Complete nonsense. And I think that it has been proven in the past 50 years that that is no way to try to bring about in our society greater equality, whether it's the redistribution of income or by any other means.

## BUDGET

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd)

And then, Sir, the Member for Morris again to demonstrate his extreme right wing tendencies, becoming more and more evident on the opposite side, he began reciting the terms of communism. The Red Scare Tactic, the Joe McCarthy kind of approach to politics - which fortunately, continually, the history of this country has managed to avoid. And I couldn't help, because he spoke so long, with such long quotations, going through a book that I happen to have in my desk by Peter Newman called "The Renegade in Power - The Diefenbaker Years." And you know, in here is stipulated the kind of smear tactics, the kind of garbage approach to those who oppose Conservatism that the Member for Morris is so good at. Although, at least in this speech today he avoided the kind of barnyard language that he has in the past resorted to. And I would like to quote here, just to show the kind of repetition, the kind of dragging up red herrings and scare tactics that the Conservative Party is so good at - and they're good at very little else. And this is from Page 132 of the book that I mentioned. "Although he had always been a tough campaigner, Fleming had in past elections fought a clean battle. But in 1962, he ended his appeal for votes," Now get this, Mr. Speaker, "by accusing Lester Pearson, the past Prime Minister of this country, of being the Kremlin's candidate for the Prime Ministership."

I mean can you imagine anything so stupid, but that is the kind of stupidity that a Conservative will stoop to in order to try to curry up a few votes here and there and I couldn't help, Sir, because he gave us the opportunity through his speech of finding that quote which I'd seen some time ago in this book. And he ended up, Fleming ended up his final election rally saying that the Soviet government wanted Pearson to win the election because quote "the man they want is the one who said, much as he regretted it later, 'that he'd rather be red than dead'." end quote. A past Minister of the Crown in the Federal Government of Canada and the leader of the administration that the Member for Morris was once part of. That's the kind of irrelevancy that they degenerate to when they degenerate to when they realize that they haven't got a good case. And, Mr. Speaker, they do not have a good case in trying to attack this Budget that the First Minister, the Minister of Finance brought into this House last week.

This Budget, Mr. Speaker, is one that is designed to maintain the Manitoba rate of recovery in the economy here, and it will support and strengthen anti-inflation measures, and it will create new jobs to ensure that our human and natural resources are utilized near full capacity. Those are the goals. They're clear. Even the press has got them reported here. And I think that we can welcome a Budget that attempts to do that.

Also, Mr. Speaker, it is clearly a fact that most of the Budget proposals that we have heard in the last week from the Minister of Finance have anti-inflation and, in my opinion, a very important principle, the principle of equity. And the equity of the Budget is clearly contained in the surtaxes that are going to be put on high and excessive personal incomes. Again equity can be seen in the 2 percent increase in the corporate income tax surtax. There are other provisions there, too, as well that would indicate to me that this Budget is one that contains the principle of equity. Not the equity that the Member for Morris talks about, the equity based somehow on a person's ability to own property.

Mr. Speaker, the Estimates of the government have been reduced by some \$170 million, and capital spending should be down by \$146 million. These are clearly anti-inflationary proposals and ones that I fully support.

The members opposite, you know, if they want to attack this Budget should do so in a very clear and straightforward way, rather than bringing up the Red scare tactics; rather than talking about individual rights being inherent on the persons ownership of property; rather than psyching the kind of irrelevancies that the Member for Morris tends to get into - he talks about agriculture at every opportunity he gets.

There should have been some citation of where a Conservative administration in Manitoba, if they have the good fortune to get elected, would cut the Budget. I haven't heard yet where they intend to cut the Budget. I haven't heard them say, for example, that even though 60 percent of the Budget is spent on Health, Education and Social Development, that they the Conservative administration of this province would in fact go through and take out grants to school divisions, take out grants to Personal Care Homes, take out

## BUDGET

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) . . . . . the money for Home Care Programs. They haven't got the guts, pure and simple, Mr. Speaker, to put it on the line like that. And do you know why? Because Walter Weir was defeated for trying to do exactly that kind of thing, and they know well, they know well where that kind of approach will get them with the people of Manitoba. So what they like to do, Mr. Speaker, what they like to do is attack what they consider to be overspending. No particular focus of their attack. They don't pinpoint the 60 percent of the Budget that goes for Education, Health and Social Development, no Sir, they just talk about overspending.

And you know because they are so lacking in focus, so unable to stipulate clearly, so completely lacking in the articulate ability to put their program forward, one has to go and seek out some of the history that this party has got itself in this country. When you talk about overspending, for example, let me cite again from "Renegade in Power - The Diefenbaker Years" this particular quotation, which I think sums up the kind of overspending that a Conservative administration really can get the country into, and would get the province into if they have the opportunity. It says here on Page 121 that the Minister of Finance is normally closer to the Prime Minister than any other member of the Cabinet, enjoying the kind of veto power over the spending plans of all government departments. Under Diefenbaker, Fleming never achieved this status, he was constantly overruled, and frequently not even informed ahead of time about new major spending proposals. Rather than insist on his prerogative, as any Finance Minister with guts would do, he failed to exercise it and lost the prerogative altogether.

The dimensions of Fleming's surrender, the Conservative Finance Minister, were impressive. He served as Minister of Finance for 1,874 days. Mr. Speaker, do you remember what a shambles those days were for this country with a Conservative Government in Ottawa? He tabled seven budgets, the federal revenue collected during his tenure amounted to just over 32 billion, while expenditures totalled just over 35 billion. This fact meant that Fleming was responsible for spending an average of 1.56 millions more per day than he was taking in. A record in peacetime deficit financing not surpassed even during the depression of the 30s. Mr. Speaker, that is the record of a Conservative administration in this country. One that has a great majority when it was elected for the second time and one which the Member for Morris was a part of. He was a part of that kind of administration. Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of spending program that the Conservative Government can bring to this country.

Now when they deal with our Budget, you know, they tend to ignore - I think it's Rule No. 7, according to the Conservative from Lakeside - that they don't like us to get into citing Rule 7, or whichever rule it was, the one that refers to other provinces. And I have here, Mr. Speaker, an article which appeared in today's Globe and Mail. This article sets out the impact, the effect of the Ontario Conservative Government's Budget on the people, the ordinary wage earner in Ontario - and it's a sorry tale that is related here. The headline of this article, Mr. Speaker, says that the 150 dollar a week man whose tax rate is higher than a millionaire's, that's the kind of budget the Conservatives want. That is why they criticize our Budget, which of course does exactly the reverse.

The article is by Thomas Clarridge and I'm quoting: "Courtesy of the latest provincial budget here is a low income father who is about to be in the worst tax bracket in Ontario. Meet Gordon C. . . , who makes about \$150 a week, and since he lives in Ontario the tax rate on his last thousand dollars will be higher than on a millionaire's. As Provincial Treasurer Darcy McKeough saw it in his Budget Speech April 6'--(Interjection)-- McKeough. What does it matter. "The increase in Ontario Health Insurance Premiums May 1 would have only a modest impact on most working individuals and families, but from Gordon C . . .'s vantage point the impact on him is an extra \$120 a year. A 60 percent increase in provincial taxes he can't avoid. It takes a lot of factors to make anyone as unfortunate as Mr. C . . . , but the cruncher is the Ontario Health Insurance Premium increase that is effective May 1."

Mr. Speaker, when the Member for Morris talks about a re-examination of the financial arrangements for medical care, that is what he's talking about. That is what the Ontario Conservative Government has done, and that is what they will do here, you better believe it.



## BUDGET

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, the Globe and Mail has an additional article in the same issue. And this one is titled "The Argument for Making Less in Special Circumstances." Here's a real disincentive. A real disincentive in the Ontario Conservative Budget. A further title here is "How Governments Get \$661 if Taxable Income Rises \$1,000." Mr. Speaker, this article says the following: "For some people with low incomes the Ontario Budget of April 5 strengthened an argument for making less. It means that next year in qualified circumstances the head of the family of four with a taxable income of 3,000 will pay, barring tax changes, \$661 more to the three levels of government than he would if his taxable income was \$1,000 less. Those figures are based on the assumption for purposes of a comparative analysis of tax burdens in the various provinces that such a person pays \$200 a month rent or \$480 a year in property taxes, given his income he couldn't afford much more. So his unavoidable payments to the three levels of government come about this way in calculations done with the assistance of a Toronto Tax expert."

And it goes through here, Mr. Speaker, and it does indicate that there is a particular break point in the tax schedules and \$3,000 is one of them, but nonetheless that the person at that level actually would have a disincentive because of this Ontario Conservative Budget. And there is a table given here and it's a table that compares taxes in various provinces and it says, for example: "The head of a four member family who earns \$8,226 in Ontario and must pay his own Health Insurance Premiums will face \$1,078 in unavoidable payments to government as a result of the recent provincial budget in Ontario." And there's a tax table set out there, Mr. Speaker, a tax table that in terms of total taxes paid for people with that income and that number of dependents, indicates that Ontario, the Conservative Province, is right at the top of the heap and Manitoba is at the bottom in terms of tax paid. And I think that that, Sir, again is an indication of the kind of budget that an Ontario administration would introduce here.

They would go further than that, they would go further than putting it to the working man through their tax program. It's pretty obvious to me that one of the things they would do in re-examing the financial arrangements for the medical care premium is eliminate it altogether. Simple as that. Because that's the way they like it. Because individual right based on a person's ownership of property, as the Member for Morris indicates, means: Baby, if you've got the money you can buy your health care and if you haven't, tough luck.

Mr. Speaker, if that health care premium were reintroduced in this province in the manner that it was introduced by the previous Conservative administration, the cost to an ordinary Manitoban would run around \$380. And when you take that and add it to some of these other programs that we've introduced, you come out with some totals, which I'll get to in a minute. One of the programs we've introduced here - and I want to go through these various programs and just show what it will cost Manitobans if the Conservatives return to power. I've already got a figure of 380 on the books, okay? The Property tax Credit Plan right now with our present Budget this year has been raised to a maximum of \$350. Now the interesting thing of course about the Property Tax Credit Plan is that the members opposite, they don't like it. You know why they don't like it? Because it gives to those who are at the bottom end of the income level a tax break, and it takes it off, of course, the people at the top. They don't like that any more than they like the increased fee that will have to be paid for heavy automobiles.

The Property Tax Credit Plan though is a rather interesting scheme because the Conservative Party in Canada when searching around for something that would bring them votes came up with the idea that there should be a scheme which would enable property taxes to be taken off of income tax. In other words, Sir, the Conservative Party at one time suggested that kind of a program. But this party, this group of men here, they voted against it, they don't like it, and I believe, I really and truly believe that if they are re-elected they will eliminate the Property Tax Credit Plan and that will cost at today's rebate rates the ordinary guy, at the maximum, \$350 in money every year. If you take the Cost of Living Tax Credit Plan, Sir, at today's adjusted rates, it's \$140. So there's \$490 in tax credits that go out to those people who are admittedly at the

## BUDGET

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) . . . . bottom end of the income scale. I believe that the Pharmacare Program, which is a universal program, averages about \$60.00 a year in payments. So if you take that \$60.00 and the \$490 for the rebates and the \$380 for health premiums it should come to \$930. Well, Mr. Speaker, quite simply I'm looking around for some more money to get it up to the figure that I think it will cost Manitobans, which is \$1,000 more in personal outlay every year if that government does what I think it will do. So we have to look at some other programs. The Dental Care Program, the Critical Home Repair Program, Autopac, all of these programs could come to the additional \$70.00 that's needed. But Autopac alone will be a good enough one.

If the members remember the Toronto paper some months ago that showed a big article with a Volkswagen bug on it and some comparative rates, they might recall how much more an owner of a 1973 Chevelle would pay if he operated that vehicle in Quebec City as compared to the operation of a similar vehicle in Winnipeg. The additional extra premium paid in Quebec, by such an owner in Quebec City would be \$150. Mr. Speaker, I'll just take \$70.00 of that difference and add it in here and it comes out to \$1,000, because they would abolish Autopac. They voted against it. They fought it tooth and nail. They would get us back to the kind of system that they have or are going to have in British Columbia. It would be a system quite simply where they would bump up the rates of Autopac Insurance in this province to \$300 or \$400 more than people are now paying. Under that kind of a premium shelter the private people could come flooding back in here and make a bundle. Simple as that. I believe they'll do it. And if they do it, it will cost Manitobans more for car insurance. And that means, Mr. Speaker, if you take all these programs, which I think they would abolish, \$1,000. A thousand dollars more in private outlay, personal outlay in order to cover the kinds of programs that this government has brought in to benefit most people under \$15,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, there is I think a very clear indication that is coming across, particularly from the Member for Morris who has the lack of facility sometimes of saying what he means, that they really do want to get back to what in their minds are the good old days. The good old days of, you know, letting the rich make more and putting it to the little guy in the low income level. That's what they want. That government when they were in power would never have introduced the Critical Home Repair Program. I doubt that they ever would have got into building senior citizens' apartments. I doubt that they ever would have got into home care for those who are ill and aged in their own homes. They certainly would never have got into Autopac. The health premium thing, we saw that, Mr. Speaker. You know, back in '69 when I was campaigning, I remember so well the retired people that I encountered in my riding who were living in very poor accommodation simply because they could afford no more, no better, and they were telling me that the hundreds of dollars in premiums that the Conservative Government was imposing on them was simply going to break them, they weren't going to be able to pay. And those senior citizens, again retired people who lived in that part of my riding, which is very pleasant and they own their own homes, they were telling me that the Manitoba Conservative Party government had put the hospital premium on them, that was going to put them in a position of having to sell the home in which they lived all their lives. That, Sir, is what the people of Manitoba can expect from a Conservative administration, and I don't think that we need to look much further for evidence of that kind of thing than the extreme right-wing statements and philosophy that the Member for Morris has put before us in this House today. Mr. Speaker, I think that the Budget we have heard introduced here this session is one that can be defended, it's one that I think makes fiscal sense, it's sound in a fiscal way, it is anti-inflationary and it deserves the support of the Members of this Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the government side of the House would be disposed to call it 5:30. Okay, then, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Riel, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the members to call it 5:30? Agreed? Consequently I declare the House adjourned and the House stands adjourned until 2:30 Monday next.