

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8 p.m., Monday, April 19, 1976

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise to contribute a thought or two, hopefully a perspective or two to this particular debate, while acknowledging the complaint of many persons who have exposed themselves to it and looked at it and come away dismayed with the judgment that it's a pretty hard budget a pretty hard document to get your teeth into, or to get a fix on, Mr. Speaker.

I must say that I agree to a certain extent that in terms of debate and fire and fight and the exchange of brimstone in this Chamber, it strikes me as being a document that doesn't lend itself to that kind of activity. It was relatively low key, relatively bland, played pretty softly and pretty carefully by the First Minister, and from many points of view it doesn't lend itself to the best of political criticism or the best of political attack. I say that because when I refer to the best of political criticism or the best of political attack I'm referring to constructive criticism or attack. I think, Sir, that it is difficult to approach this particular document from a perspective of constructive criticism. One can hardly despair over the fact that the sales tax was not increased; one can hardly despair over the fact that there have not been impositions of new degrees of personal income tax below a certain income level. At the same time, Sir, one can hardly exult over the alternatives that were chosen by this government. But if one does attempt to approach it from the point of view of sales tax and the point of view of personal income tax below a certain income level, one finds oneself in a position of that political difficulty that I am talking about. The First Minister and his colleagues have framed it and phrased it very carefully and very calculatingly I would say to make it as reasonably palatable a surcharge on the taxation load of the citizens of this province as possible in the circumstances.

Faced with the kinds of spending that the government has assured us through their Estimates, both regular and supplementary, that they're embarked on; faced with the kinds of rationalization and justifications that seem to present themselves from neighbouring provinces in terms of taxation increases; and faced with the argument that they are always hearing foremost in mind the necessity of fighting the battle against inflation, leading the battle of restraint, this government or any government in its position today would find it, I would suggest, reasonably saleable to introduce specific increases in taxation in particular areas. I say reasonably because I think that Manitobans are over-burdened and over-taxed to a very onerous degree and in view of the average Manitoba taxpayer no further increases in taxation are justified. But I have referred to the kinds of forces and kinds of pressures that are at work in the economy nationally, provincially, and on our borders at the present time, and I think in the light of that there would be reasonable justification for a government to impose new taxes at certain levels and argue that they were doing so to help in the fight against inflation, to help in the fight to cool down the economy, to help in the fight to cool down expectations. So recognizing that I start from the premise that it's a difficult document, a difficult statement by this government to attack in a constructive political sense, because for everything we say in terms of justifiable criticism, the government can retort, but we didn't raise sales taxes as they have done in some other provinces. Well up to a certain income level we didn't raise provincial income taxes as is being done in certain other jurisdictions.

And, of course, we can't argue with that, Mr. Speaker, so I acknowledge the shrewd and careful creativity on the part of the First Minister and his colleagues that went into the framing of this document. Having said that and having acknowledged the restraints within which we have to operate in terms of our approach to it, and having put on the record my recognition of what I think are the difficulties in that respect, I want to add two or three perspectives to the debate that has taken place up to this time, just so that I leave no doubt on behalf of my colleagues and myself that for all the careful work and careful phraseology and careful creativity that went into framing of the document by this government, for all the pressures that they might argue as justifications for the things that they have done, we are not satisfied, Sir, and I personally am not satisfied that this kind of direction, this kind of approach is justified at the present time

BUDGET

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) in Manitoba, is deserved at the present time in Manitoba, or is anything but retrogressive in terms of the health of the economy of this province.

I think, Sir, that the Budget is a discouragement to initiative - and that's the biggest criticism and the fundamental criticism that I would make of it for the record at this stage. I think that discouragements to initiatives are serious problems and serious events for Manitobans. I'm not sure that this government has yet come to recognize what some other governments, oriented in the same philosophical direction as they but in other jurisdictions of the world, have come to recognize in recent years, and that is that the surest and most certain way to kill a society and to kill an economy is to strangle and thwart initiative. There have been a series of measures since this government was elected which collectively have combined to blunt initiative and enthusiasm and risk-taking activities by Manitobans, they had not up to this point in time succeeded in snuffing out that last spark of entrepreneurial energy and hope possessed by Manitoba society, but if this government keeps on taking the steps that it takes, sometimes tiny, sometimes large, the total overall result before very much longer will be that Manitobans of entrepreneurial energy, Manitobans of commitment to the work ethic are going in despair to figuratively and probably literally throw up their hands and ask, what's the use.

When one looks at this Budget one has to ask the basic question that I think we have asked since the session assembled this year, Mr. Speaker, and since we were confronted at any rate with the program of the spending Estimates and that is: Where are the incentives being offered to industry and energy and enterprise in this province in the program of this government today? Where is the policy and the posture that this government takes towards Manitoba and Manitobans, are the incentives to make this society and this economy move and prosper and grow? There are no such incentives in this Budget before us, just as there were no incentives in the Estimates of current spending that were presented to us a few weeks ago in this Chamber.

So if you look at those two basic facts you come very quickly, Mr. Speaker, in my view, to a confrontation with the two basic flaws and failings in this Budget. (1) It is by the taxation measures that it imposes, the taxation penalties that it further imposes on Manitobans, a working discouragement to initiative; and (2) It is a document that contains no incentives for energy and for enterprise, and in fact fails even to recognize the necessity for those incentives if this economy is to prosper.

I think that we perhaps may be reaching a point in our province and in our country, Mr. Speaker, where we could justifiably ask the question, at least rhetorically, and at least for examination - and I'm not suggesting that I have the answers to it - but at least for examination as to whether the time has not come when corporations and businesses in this province and in this country should be rewarded for productivity and should be permitted to move into less onerous taxation categories depending on the gross provincial product that they produce and the number of jobs that they provide. Instead of that we get the reverse philosophy, which is the classic philosophy of the New Democrats and all socialist parties, which has never been updated since the original philosophy of the socialists was enunciated, and that is, that profits are a bad thing and that productivity leads to consumerism and consumerism carried to any kind of widespread degree is a bad thing, and that people should be penalized, held back, if they threaten to surpass others in the economy and in society by dint of intelligence, effort, or whatever. That's the basic philosophy. It's persisted since the birth of the socialist point of view; it's been articulated through parties like the old CCF and the New Democratic Party and their sister parties, the Labour Party in Britain, and elsewhere, and to a certain extent at least a substantial wing of the Democratic Party in the United States.

And I say, Sir, confronted with the kinds of problems that a free market economy and that the western parliamentary system has today, the time has come in my view to examine at least rhetorically, at least clinically, the question of whether or not this kind of attitude should not be completely reversed and that those who produce more, particularly at the corporate level, those who create more jobs, those who create more wealth, should be given further incentives to progress and they should be recognized as contributing to the economy in a very essential and critical degree. And that perhaps based on

BUDGET

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) the amount of productivity and the number of jobs that they can generate and produce, they should be rewarded by moving them into taxation categories that tax them less rather than to tax them more.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget was presented to us as the fiscal posture of a government that came into this House a few weeks ago and announced to Manitobans that this province and this administration would be participating full steam and in full partnership in the battle against inflation in this country and the fight to get the economy back on the rails and in the effort to have restraints on costs and prices and wages and spending accepted generally in our society for the next few years, as a means of restoring a semblance of economic health. But, Sir, how ironic, in fact how ludicrous it is for a government to have made that kind of a public commitment, or to have professed at least to that kind of public commitment, and then to turn around with the kind of Budget that has been presented here as a follow-up to the spending Estimates introduced in this House a few weeks ago.

My colleague the Member for Sturgeon Creek has already referred to the degree, the level of additional taxation being imposed on Manitobans, being extracted from Manitobans in the next year by this government. I want to refer once again to the . . . not to that aspect, on which my colleague I think did an excellent and a necessary job, but I want to refer to the spending that this government has undertaken and measure that against the kind of Budget that has been brought in here and against the kind of posture, as I say, that this government and this First Minister has taken publicly in terms of the battle to impose and win acceptance for certain economic restraints at this time. By the time we finish with Supplementary Estimates for the fiscal year in which we're now embarked, Sir - and we'll get some additions next February and March, we always do - the total expenditure by Manitoba for this current fiscal year ending on March 31st, 1977, will have increased by some 150 millions of dollars over that for last year.

Now what kind of a commentary is that, Mr. Speaker? What kind of a record is that in a year of so-called restraint? A \$150 million increase in expenditure in this one year, and in this particular year, this year of warfare against inflation. And that figure of \$150 million, Sir, is made up of the Main Estimates and the Supplementary Estimates that we have been confronted with up to this time, and does not include the Special Warrants, which are certain to come in in substantial number and size as they always do, so that when I cite a figure of \$150 million, that's low and no doubt conservative, Sir. But even giving them the benefit of the doubt, \$150 million is the increase that we can be sure of that Manitobans are embarked upon in spending this year as against last year. And stacked up against the spending estimates for the fiscal year that ended last March 31st, we have an increase, referred to by my colleague and Leader of the Opposition the Member for Riel in his response to the Budget Speech, that something approximating 18 to 20 percent.

Sir, alongside that I would cite for your study and your assessment the position of the Province of Alberta, which up to this point in time at any rate, without determination as to what Special Warrants will amount to in that province, as is also the case here, up to this time at any rate looks to be embarked on a spending program that is something in the neighbourhood of seven to eight percent greater than the spending program embarked on last year in that province. That in a jurisdiction that currently enjoys the greatest surfeit per capita prosperity ever known, certainly in western Canada and probably ever known in any Canadian province since this country was founded. Against that in Alberta, against that apparent embarkation on a spending program reflecting a seven to eight percent increase over last year, we in Manitoba struggling as we are to keep up and to keep afloat are embarked on one that represents an increase of 18 to 20 percent over last year.

And I ask you, Sir, in all non-partisan sincerity, how could anybody say that this kind of performance, this kind of posture, is a realistic and a practical one, and an honest one for a government to take when that government is standing up and professing to be interested in fighting inflation and in winning acceptance for restraints. It doesn't make mathematical sense, Mr. Speaker, and the only result of it can be a further decline in terms of relative economic positions where Manitoba is concerned, and a further burden, a further difficulty for business and industry and enterprise and individuals in this province

BUDGET

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)to try to support in the year immediately ahead.

The First Minister made many references or at least some references during his Budget Address to squeeze out dollars, Mr. Speaker, and lacking a precise definition of that term from the First Minister when he delivered his address, one can only conclude that what this government means by squeezed-out dollars are those dollars that are squeezed out of the taxpayer, and squeezed out under considerable duress and under misguided economic policies such as the one reflected in the spending program for this year.

Mr. Speaker, I was in conversation, unsolicited, the other day with a businessman in this city who was despairing over the impact of some of the effects of the Budget a day or two after it had come out, while many others, not perhaps as concerned with political and economic matters and perhaps not as used to examining Budget documents quite as carefully, were taking some satisfaction for 12, or 18, or 24 hours in the fact that there had been no increase in the sales tax and that if their income was under \$25,000 or \$22,000 a year there was no increase in their personal income tax. Well it hasn't taken long for even those latter citizens that I've referred to to become acquainted with the hidden traps contained in the Budget. But on this particular day I think that some Manitobans had not yet had time to assess and to digest the Budget, and to understand all the implications, and they were perhaps basking in some small glow of satisfaction, which is as was intended by this government in the way the Budget was framed and presented, but not so those people in business who are concerned with making their enterprises profitable so that they can continue to provide jobs and work and provide income and provide input into the economy. It was one of those Manitobans, one of those businessmen who was talking to me a day or two after the Budget in some despair about the effects, the ramifications that he felt this Budget would have. Some of them were alluded to in the remarks of my colleague from Sturgeon Creek a few hours ago, and he said to me that he believed that the net effect of the government's new taxes, professed by the government to be a step forward in the battle against inflation, he said to me that he believed the net effect of the government's new taxes will be the exact opposite of what this government says it seeks. Rather than combining to form an attack on inflation, rather than contributing to cool down the economy and to participate in greater acceptance of the restraints program, this businessman said to me that the government is going to find that its policies are totally misplaced and totally misguided because they're going to wind up contributing to inflation. What will happen is that executives and middle rank executives and other personnel won't accept transfers into Manitoba unless they're paid substantially higher salaries to compensate for the additional tax burdens and the additional cost burdens all around that they must pay here.

Now I think that this is a consideration that is worthy of the government's attention because I do believe that in the last year or two because of pressures, economic, social and otherwise, that have been erupting in various parts of the continent, there are many persons who originated from western Canada that went elsewhere to seek their opportunities and began to cast their eyes longingly back to western Canada, to Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, and think perhaps they should come back here and reinvest their time and their efforts in the fields and professions and businesses of their choice in this part of the country. I believe that kind of psychology was developing notwithstanding some of the difficulties that were obviously being created weekly and monthly by New Democratic administrations on three sides on the prairies. That psychology was taking hold because there were difficulties not always economic, many times social, that appeared to be developing in various other jurisdictions and various other parts of the continent, and it held the promise of a fortuitous kind of future for western Canada. I think that if that kind of psychology is developing, if that kind of future is there, that all Manitobans want Manitoba to have a fair share of what that kind of interest and input and return to western Canada would mean. But I say, as this businessman said to me, and I think if this government examines the position they'll have to recognize the reality of it, that the continual building and increasing of burdens, tax burdens, and business burdens and living burdens that this government heaps on the taxpayers and on the enterprisers of this province, will create a continuing discouragement to those persons who would be interested, either in coming back here or in coming here for the first time,

BUDGET

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)in being moved here in corporations or industries for which they are working, or in coming here to practice professions in which they have taken their training.

This was the essential point that that particular individual was making to me, and he was making it in considerable despair because he is a man who has spent all his life in Manitoba, building a business in Manitoba and contributing to the economic health of this province, so I commend that kind of consideration to this government to think about when they come into this House as they have done in the two months that we have been in session here and load new spending programs on the taxpayers of this province, and have to follow them up with new taxation burdens on those taxpayers.

A further particular in the Budget that causes me extreme concern, Mr. Speaker, is the taxation on capital, the new tax on capital, and I just wonder where that is going to lead us before we're finished with it. It's the type of insidious innovation that in the best sense of the term might I'm afraid be described as the thin edge of the wedge. One has no guarantee that that one-fifth of one percent will not be increased to an extremely onerous burden at the government's whim, or at any government's whim in the foreseeable future if the economic pressures and the demands of self-styled and otherwise are conveyed by those in office as a justification. There's no telling where that kind of insidious burden can lead or where it will end, and it adds up to another of these discouragements, another of these additional burdens to which I've referred, which I think are harming the economy and the health of this province, and that means the society of this province and the future that we all want for it.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Churchill in speaking this afternoon made an eloquent and a timely plea for the north, and I commend him for it. That kind of a challenge must not be minimized. But I think it's also time, Sir, that an eloquent plea, or a plea of some sort, should be made in this Chamber and in this province for this capital city of Winnipeg. I think that there are many many glamorous kinds of arguments that can be made and that are accepted in goodwill by all members of this House for the north and for the native people of our province and for the rural communities of our province and for the great industries related to rural life, related to agriculture and rural life. And those are glamorous kinds of arguments and they're easy to subscribe to. It's I think almost time worn accepted procedure that nobody in this House argue against programs aimed at improving the lot of the north and of the native and of the rural municipality, the rural community, and of the agricultural industry. We all subscribe to them like we subscribe to motherhood and we all subscribe to them sincerely. But I think it's timely, Sir, and I think it's nowhere near as easy and nowhere near as acceptable to stand up in this Chamber and make an appeal to all members on a non partisan basis as Manitobans for the capital city of this province, the City of Winnipeg, which is in deep difficulty at the present time in terms of financing its life and financing its health, and is going to require aid and assistance and enlightened programs, enjoying the support of all parties and all members of this Chamber if it is to enjoy the kind of prosperity that other cities in western Canada are enjoying and the kind of prosperity that it is similarly entitled to.

If this government has failed anywhere, Mr. Speaker, it has failed the City of Winnipeg. It has failed in the City of Winnipeg and it has failed the City of Winnipeg and all around, all around us is unfortunate and unattractive testimony to that fact.

The arguments that have been raised by urban members in this House in the time that I've been in here for additional programs of support and funding and for consideration for the problems of the City of Winnipeg, have fallen for the most part on completely deaf ears. The only activity that this government has undertaken in the area of the city and the problems of the city was the ill-fated and infamous unification under the City of Winnipeg Act which has burdened us with a monstrous jungle of bureaucracy that discourages developers and even discourages energetic politicians from entering civic politics and from contributing what many of them could contribute.

I don't think that the problems of Winnipeg devolve necessarily from a philosophical or a dogmatic point of view. I don't blame the problems on the New Democratic Government because it is a New Democratic Government, I blame it on this government

BUDGET

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)because this government is unlightened and disinterested in facing up to the problems of modern urban life and modern urban organization. That is not because they're New Democrats it's just because they happen to be uninterested and uneducated and not prepared to even attempt to identify the problems. It results from the fact that this government doesn't understand the problems and doesn't want to understand the problems. You can't find any solution to any problem, Mr. Speaker, unless you're going to admit that there's a problem.--(Interjection)--Well, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture as a matter of fact anticipates a comment that I was going to make, because I was going to say to him that a very popular catch word slogan of the day seems to be that if you're not part of the solution you're part of the problem. And I say, Sir, that that slogan is 100 percent applicable to this government where the City of Winnipeg is concerned.

We've got the monstrosity of a council and an administration which is so large and so cumbersome that effective realistic work cannot be undertaken on a day to day basis and effective realistic decisions are mired down to the point of hopelessness. We have a City of Winnipeg Act that in terms of effecting rationalizations of cost and in terms of effecting more efficiency in the conduct of the City's business is a joke - and my colleague the Member for Sturgeon Creek has made reference often enough to that. In fact I shouldn't use the word joke because a joke implies that it's humorous, and this isn't humorous, it isn't funny; it's not a joke, it's a tragedy, Mr. Speaker.

We've got the burden of realty taxes, which is monstrous in Winnipeg, and as referred to in a thoroughgoing article on Winnipeg's plight in the Winnipeg Free Press the other day, far exceeds the realty tax burden borne by any other city in this country of major size; far exceeds the burden of realty taxes borne by citizens of Calgary, Regina, Vancouver, Edmonton, you name them. We've got a literal jungle of red tape for developers which discourages the kind of development that would produce revenue growth, revenue producers and revenue growth for the City of Winnipeg and thus just further exacerbates the situation from the point of view of the individual taxpayer. We've got worse than no incentives, we have disincentives to industry because of the decay of the central part of the city because of the long drawn-out tedious and destructive debates that one always has to go through when one wants to try to develop a piece of property and to build anything in the nature of a commercial enterprise on it within the city's perimeter.

And we have over and above all that, Sir, the enduring blight and eye-sore of the decaying core area which has never been, never been resurrected and never even in fact been given any cause to hope for a reversal of the decaying trend in the time that this administration has been in office. The situation as far as the downtown core decay is concerned has gone from bad to worse. Not from bad to better, nor has it even stayed from bad to bad but it has Sir, gone from bad to worse. And those are the monuments to this administration to be seen in the City of Winnipeg and that's why I say that if this government has failed in any area, it has failed the citizens of Winnipeg and it has failed the City of Winnipeg and the testimony of that is all around. It's time that when our colleagues stand up and talk to us urban members in this Chamber about the needs for the north and the needs for the native, and the needs for the rural community, to all of which we subscribe and all of which we agree, it's time that they listen to us when we said that it's incumbent upon the 57 members of this Chamber at any given time, any 57 members from all parties, to address ourselves to the problems of the capital city of this province in which reside more than half of the Manitobans in the province. We've got nearly three-fifths of the population of Manitoba in the City of Winnipeg and this government is squeezing and strangling it to death by extracting all the revenues to which it feels it's entitled, plus many to which it certainly is not entitled, for provincial programs while the city is strangling in its own red tape and decaying because it has no access to the kinds of funds it needs to pay for the services necessary in a city of a half a million people.

So I leave those three challenges to this government, Mr. Speaker, where the budget for 1976/77 is concerned:

One, is that it has not one iota of recognition of the importance of initiatives

BUDGET

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) in this province and contains no initiative for anybody.

Two, is that it is an active working disincentive to people to contribute to this province, to move into this province and to participate in building this province. That's a conflict in terms but I put it on the record anyway.

And three, Sir, three, Mr. Speaker, is that it fails completely to allow for the fact that this is Canada's fourth largest city, that three-fifths of the people in Manitoba live here and that this government has allowed this city to strangle and decay in the seven years that it has been in office.

Now I could probably think of a few more, Mr. Speaker, but I'll have to wait for another time in which to enunciate them. I'd like to leave those three with the First Minister and with his colleagues and ask him for some action, ask him for a document that will help to build this city, that will help to give us incentive, and that will help to reward initiative.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member referred to the real property taxes in Winnipeg as compared with a number of cities which he named. Could he please give us the source of his material and the basis for his statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: I can, Mr. Speaker, but I would just remind the Honourable Member for St. Johns that I referred specifically at the time to the fact that an article in the Free Press last Thursday, I said, pointed out the fact that a greater share of this city's municipal revenue is derived from real property taxes than is, a much much greater share, than is the case in almost any other Canadian city, and I cited Edmonton, Calgary, Vancouver, Regina. The source of the information, and I think I quoted at the time, was last Thursday's Winnipeg Free Press Business Report.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. By unanimous consent his forty minutes are up.

. continued

BUDGET

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to primarily focus on the area of expenditure of the part of the Provincial Government that has ramifications far beyond the borders of our province, and that is namely with the policy and philosophy of corrections which I think must be a concern to legislators at every level, federally with obvious implications, provincially because two departments are primarily concerned with the administration of justice and namely, the Attorney-General's Department and the Department of Correction. I speak as a legislator at the provincial level but also as a citizen and a parent and as a citizen of the City of Winnipeg, the Province of Manitoba, and a member of the Nation of Canada.

I think in the first instance one might regard this subject to fall under the heading of law and order but I believe that in the deeper examination of these issues that one would have to say that this is a question primarily of justice. Like many other members in the Chamber I feel a growing concern about violence in our society. This starts in such areas as television and the movies and then quickly moves to the field of sports, where I think we have seen some pretty sad times in Canada and in the United States, recently when the once great sport of hockey appears to have deteriorated and degenerated into little more than boxing on ice. I think that there is an obvious need for people who are in positions of responsibility to crack down heavily on the kind of activity that is seen in this so-called sporting field, I think that for a hockey player who goes out on the ice and plays in a clean fashion, I think that he may find it very difficult to survive in this day and age. If one is expert in spearing and boxing and elbowing, and all sorts of other things, then perhaps he will be able to have a viable career as a hockey player. But far beyond that, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that when one picks up the daily papers there's an unending flood of material dealing with beatings, killings, and murders, and so on.

I wish to make a comment, perhaps in line with some of the members opposite, in regard to the new proposed legislation that is being dealt with in our nation's capital. New legislation in regard to capital punishment, gun control, and so on, and I feel that it's imperative that men in public life as well as private citizens make their voices heard at this particular time, because of the fact that the legislation is now being fashioned, and it's simply a case of speak now or forever hold your peace, because the decisions that will be taken shortly, nationally, will be binding on the Canadian Nation for at least the next decade and beyond, and I think that the kind of tone that is taken in this particular debate will filter down through all the various levels of punishments and legislation that is meant to deal with other lesser misdemeanors in crimes.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debate on this topic for about the past twenty years and I have not changed my position in that period of time, I have simply not expressed it, but I find it no longer possible to sit silently while new legislation is being prepared and new proposals are being put forward, which I believe deal more with the welfare of criminals and ignore the safety and the well-being of our citizens. Mr. Speaker, my party has been traditionally opposed to capital punishment but it is not a party policy, it is more a tradition. When the vote is held in Ottawa, as it was put to me by a member of our federal caucus in a letter, he simply said that the individual decisions which will be taken do not bind the party, but it will come as no surprise to any of us that our federal representatives feel on an individual and conscience basis that they cannot support this legislation, pardon me, that they do support this legislation, just as I feel in conscience that I cannot support legislation which offers to replace capital punishment with long terms in prison. I believe that this is a moral question like a number of others that are dealt with by legislators and therefore it is one that we will find ourselves on both sides of the issue. I think that there will be a mood and a result that may cut across party lines.

I listened last year with considerable interest in the Legislature to the views put forward by my colleague, the Minister of Mines who spoke on this subject last year, the Minister of Corrections and the Member for Point Douglas. Although I found their remarks interesting and informative I did not personally share them. Mr. Speaker,

BUDGET

(MR. DOERN cont'd) what is the proposal that will set the tone for justice, and the administration of justice, the implementation of justice in our country from now on for the next decade?

First of all, it is proposed that the new bill, the Abolition Bill as it is correctly called, will replace capital punishment with a 25-year sentence in prison. This is defined as for first degree murder which is defined as any planned or deliberate slaying, including contract murders, killing of working police or prison employees and murder committed in the course of a kidnapping, rape or other sexual offence, or during a high-jacking of an aircraft. Well, Mr. Speaker, no sooner does one read that out and get the impression as to what the Federal Government intends than in the very next breath it is made clear that the Federal Government will not hold to that new proposal. No sooner does one come to believe that capital punishment will be replaced by long terms in prison than one quickly learns that there is a loophole, and if after 15 years of prison and a review by three Superior Court Judges an offender is felt to warrant parole, then that may occur. Or secondly that after a term of some 22 years in prison that it is possible that a convicted murderer, first degree, will be allowed day parole or an unescorted temporary absence.

Well, Mr. Speaker, right away, I think you see the kind of attitude that is common at least in the Federal Cabinet and in various sectors of our society that although there is an apparent tightening up, an apparent clampdown, there's immediately an escape hatch and there's immediately a softening and a concern for the welfare of murderers. Mr. Speaker, I think that the result of the current national debate can be predicted, that no doubt the bill will carry because of the fact that the Liberal Cabinet has decided to support in bloc the legislation which makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for the backbench to vote according to conscience, when they will immediately feel that they are betraying their party, that they are not supporting their leadership, that they are chancing or risking the possibility of their ultimate promotion into the front bench. We also know that the Liberals have a majority, that the Conservative Party will vote overwhelmingly against the bill and that the New Democrats will basically support the legislation and I suppose the Socreds will also - my honourable friend the Member for Wolseley, I think, can probably tell me since he has some endearment for that political party, but that they will probably vote with the government in support.

Mr. Speaker, this is somewhat surprising, somewhat surprising in that the mood of public opinion in the last few years has I think changed radically. I think that I can see a change in the public and the people that I talk to and partly in my own thinking, when you observe what has happened over the past decade or so. As more and more sentences are commuted there appears to be a growing frustration on the part of the public and a concern on the part of the public for their own welfare and for their own safety and security, and a concern that people are loosed among us who cannot be trusted, who should be incarcerated and in some cases should be done away with completely. I have for instance a number of random polls, some of them taken nationally, some of them taken in Winnipeg. For example the Tribune conducted several polls and in March of 1975, a year ago, ascertained that about 70 percent of the public was in favour of capital punishment in Winnipeg. Then more recently they conducted a poll in March and 91 percent - this was on a mail-in ballot so I'm not going to give undue weight to this particular result but some 90.7 percent of those who replied supported capital punishment. Mr. Richardson, the Minister of Defence, ran a survey in his ward and concluded that 73 percent of those surveyed were in favour and I guess more recently a national poll indicated some 48 percent were in favour of capital punishment.

The point that I would make here is simply this: that too often I think politicians flatter themselves with the view that they are in advance of the public, that they lead public opinion. On some issues there is no doubt that that is true but I think that this is a good example of an issue where many politicians are running behind public opinion rather than leading it. The results of the kind of legislation that is being proposed and the kind of policies that the various governments are enacting is, in my observation, that there is increasing public frustration, that there is discontent in law enforcement

BUDGET

(MR. DOERN cont'd) agencies because there is in effect a frustration of justice in our society.

One of the interesting effects of this new legislation I think is how it will affect our prisons. Those of us who have delved somewhat into this subject, and I certainly have talked to a lot of people and done some reading although I do not pose as an expert in the field of corrections. I know that we have several ex RCMP men in the Chamber and perhaps other people who've had experience in law enforcement. --(Interjection)-- My colleague says he doesn't agree with me. Then there are the two Ministers who are basically responsible. But there is I think known to all of us that there is a sub-culture in the prisons, that although superficially everything is probably rosy and the guards are doing their job and the prison personnel are reforming --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon?

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): You've never looked down the barrel of a gun, I can see that.

MR. DOERN: No, I have never looked down the barrel of a gun nor have I looked down it the other way as well.

Mr. Speaker, I think the average citizen tends to be surprised at some of the things that go on in prison. I think they're often surprised at the fact that dope is sometimes smuggled in or liquor is smuggled in or in some cases people seem to have a fair degree of liberty to do what they want within the walls. As one person said in an article that I have that was in the Tribune last December: an Ontario Supreme Court Judge said when he sentenced a convicted killer and rapist to Mississauga Prison, he said he expected him to be killed within two months if he was sent to jail. He said, if he goes to the penitentiary it will result in his assassination. He said, it is time that the public and legislators know that prisons today are not run by the administration but are run by the sub-culture of prisoners with their own code of law. I think that anybody who has delved into that will agree that that is so. It's nothing new but it certainly has been new to me in the last number of years.

I know that on a number of occasions and visits to Headingley and Stony Mountain I've talked to guards and asked them about certain problems which they've denied. If you ask them about things like homosexuality in prisons and so on the general response is well, you know, there's really nothing like that going on here, it happens in the States or down East or something. But I think it's a fact that there are many things that are going on in prison that are very savage, very shocking and that the public would be very surprised at. Just to give some slight examples - and I'm leading up to a point here as to how I think this legislation will affect our prisons in the sense of the people within them and the guards within them as well.

I was talking to one gentleman who was recently in jail, I guess about a year ago, and he said that while he was in there, there were several tough guys who in effect ran the show and they were very much deferred to by the prisoners. They frightened the prisoners, they frightened the guards. If they wanted their way, their way tended to prevail. If you were watching a TV channel, if one of these guys came up and changed the channel you'd be better advised not to say anything. Otherwise there might be a beating right there.

Another young man I spoke to who was in jail in Saskatchewan for a number of months told me that the murderers are the elite of the prison and that the people in the bake shops and in the kitchens made them special cakes, gave them prime cuts of meat, gave them all sorts of special treatment. --(Interjection)-- You don't believe me? --(Interjection)-- Well I tell you that this is what was told to me by somebody who was in prison who observed this behaviour, and I don't approve of this. --(Interjection)-- You're obviously not listening to what I am saying.

Mr. Speaker, my point is this: if this is the present situation where you have certain people ruling the roost now who are more prone to violence or have little to lose, how is it going to be in the near future when we're going to take people who up to now have had the opportunity or the possibility of being released and to make it plain to them in no uncertain terms that they are going to in effect stay in prison for 25 years, taking

BUDGET

(MR. DOERN cont'd) the strongest possible case. Because right now the possibility exists that their sentence will first of all be commuted, that's a guarantee; and secondly that they will be paroled in ten to twenty years. That's also pretty well - well that is a guarantee as well. When we read of people who have come out of Manitoba like the Lucas brothers, who were involved in one of the most vicious murders and attack on somebody, I believe they killed one person with an ax and chopped up somebody else and since that time one of them has been involved in two attempted breakouts and has been able to obtain knives or guns and been involved in two affairs in British Columbia. What will happen in the near future when you have people who will have absolutely nothing to lose because there's no danger whatsoever that they will be executed and there is no possibility that they can obtain their release unless they serve two and a half decades of time. You know some people are able to undertake the most extraordinary breakouts imaginable.

In today's paper, I don't know if the honourable members had a chance to read it, but in today's paper there's a story which mentions that a bank robber who was convicted of attempted murder was in his hospital room after a dramatic escape from a third floor room. This man had 15 bullet wounds sustained in a shoot out with the police in July, 15 pieces of lead in him. He had one leg in a cast in traction and he had another shackled to a bedpost. He was able to break out of a window using bed sheets knotted into a rope and he was last seen and then picked up hobbling across a field a mile away wearing a nightgown and using a small folding chair for a crutch. Now if that guy could get out, pumped full of lead, one leg up in the air, another one tied to a bedpost, he could get out, he apparently was more dead than alive. He had all sorts of medical apparatus attached to him. If he was able to break out how about somebody who is of sound body and sound mind - at least in the sense of physically intact - who is determined to get out of prison come hell or high water. I suggest that things are going to get pretty rough in prison and I really think that anybody who has to serve in any of our penitentiaries is going to find it more and more difficult and in some cases their lives won't be worth a plug nickle.

Some people I guess feel that capital punishment is very cruel and that it is preferable for a person to sit in prison and spend the rest of their days in a small cage or container. I've heard people say that to me. They think that that is preferable and more desirable and higher on the scale of morality than the enactment of capital punishment by a government.

Mr. Speaker, as I said life in prison today means a minimum of ten years and a maximum of 20 and under the new legislation we're going to now have the doing away with of capital punishment which has been a fact since 1962 and we're going to have this new legislation of long term imprisonment. I don't normally support - and maybe it's because of my position on this issue - but I don't normally support a plebiscite for the resolution of issues. But I think if ever there was an issue that a plebiscite could be held on or should be held on this is the issue or this is the kind of issue that could be considered. I don't believe that the issue as it is put by so many people is really one of deterrence. I don't believe that you can prove one way or another that people are deterred or are not deterred by the threat of capital punishment. I don't think you can calculate the number of people who have been dissuaded from committing serious crimes and murders by the threat of capital punishment: nor can you calculate those who have not been involved or not undertaken certain crimes by the threat of imprisonment or punishment or fine. I think it is impossible to deduce that. Nor do I think that it is an issue of economics, if one can or should argue this issue on the grounds of economics, although if that's the ground then it is obviously simple to show that the cost of keeping somebody in prison for twenty-five years, that's some \$20,000 or \$30,000 per year compared to the cost of a .38 caliber bullet, or whatever, that that is the basis upon which this decision should be made.

Nor do I think, Mr. Speaker, that one can argue the issue on the grounds of aesthetics. I have heard vivid descriptions before. My colleague the Minister of Mines gave his version last year. I have read more gory and frightening descriptions of

BUDGET

(MR. DOERN cont'd) capital punishment than that in the sense of a detailed description of a hanging, but I would ask anyone who feels that that is repugnant to simply read the detailed explanations of crimes and murders in our society that one can find all around us to compare. If they find that repugnant, and all of us would, to compare that with the kind of feeling they get in the pit of their stomach when they read of mass murders like Charles Manson and his crowd, or Richard Specht, who killed eight nurses in Chicago for kicks, of somebody in Idaho who killed 42 people, of the person in Saskatoon who killed four children, and so on. Those are the counter-examples, those are certainly ugly and repulsive and repugnant and all we recoil in horror at those, as we do in the act of what would be considered capital punishment.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we have also heard debate on the old biblical injunctions and considerations of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, etc. I once discussed that with a minister of the church who indicated that he thought the wisdom in that particular saying was that it also showed a limit that the argument was not an eye, or two eyes for one eye, or four teeth for one tooth, but it was in effect the maximum, which he believed was the basic philosophy in the Old Testament, and obviously there is a concept of balance or judgment involved there.

In the New Testament, many of us have been influenced by the teachings of Christ who argued that you should turn the other cheek, and that that has been adopted by many people as a basic philosophy, but I think when you're dealing with a certain class of people and you turn the other cheek you'll be hit again, and if you turn around you may be stabbed in the back or shot in the back. I think there are some people you can turn the other cheek to, but I think there are some that you have to strike back and some that you would never turn your back on.

Mr. Speaker, the issue as I see it, is one of justice and the question is as follows: Namely, what is a suitable or just punishment for the crime of murder? That really is the issue, and I believe that in the case of cold-blooded, premeditated murder, where you have the life of a police officer, or prison official, or you have treason and other high crimes, a person who takes the life of another citizen under these conditions, deserves to die, that it is in fact a matter of justice.

I also think that the pendulum in the field of corrections has swung too far. I think we have made many necessary and long overdue reforms. I think that there have been many improvements introduced in the last couple of decades: Legal Aid, a liberal parole system, conjugal visits, new facilities, a whole range of programs has been introduced, but it seems that in this very effort there is more concern shown for the convicted criminal than for the innocent victim or citizen. I think that too many criminals walk the streets and laugh at the police and the courts and repeat offences with near impunity.

So the time has come to assess and evaluate some of our present programs and procedures to see whether there are some changes that should be made. This will not be difficult - this will be difficult in a period of permissiveness in which we live, because I think the public is getting fed up with the present pattern of injustice that has been seen in our nation. You get a murder followed by a trial, followed by a conviction, followed by a death sentence, followed by a commutation to life imprisonment, and then you get a sentence of ten years in prison, with a course in personality development and electronics, and then you get freedom and a return to society.

Mr. Speaker, in my last section I want to deal with what I believe is part of this fundamental problem, and I believe that it is this. That there is too heavy a reliance placed in the field of corrections, in the philosophy of corrections, on professional people like psychologists, psychiatrists and criminologists, and I would use as a shorthand for all of those professions the word psychology, when I refer to psychology or psychologists I would include those other members of those disciplines, and I speak directly to my colleague here the Minister of Corrections because they may have his ear and I hope that he will take some of their comments with a grain of salt.

Mr. Speaker, these people fail to recognize moral terms that all of us are familiar with like right and wrong, and good and bad and duty and responsibility, etc.

BUDGET

(MR. DOERN cont'd) They replace all of this with a blanket phrase of inappropriate behaviour, and they believe that anyone or everyone can be conditioned to an acceptable level of behaviour and then set free in society. That is the basis of their suggestions. They would ask a question like this. They would say, "Can Charles Manson be rehabilitated?" That would interest them. I would say in opposition the question should be, "Should Charles Manson be rehabilitated, or should we attempt to rehabilitate a man like Charles Manson?" That should be the question. They employ a variety of techniques for behavioural modification, ranging from heart to heart discussions to shock therapy to frontal lobotomies. They tell us that we should take people who are rapists - this is coming out in the newspapers, and so on - they say that in the case of rapists one solution, some psychologists argue, is to castrate them and then set them free in society. Others say we should educate murderers, give them courses, etc., and let them take their place in society as useful citizens; or that the child molesters should be given sympathy and should be sent back in the playground and in the community. They believe that through a process of maiming and shock therapy and incisions and brainwashing they will create and make useful citizens out of hardened criminals, perverts and murderers, and they think this is all more humane, far more humane than capital punishment. Mr. Speaker, it is well known that in Saudi Arabia if you steal and you are caught they will cut off your hand, and I think a lot of us feel that that is a brutal punishment, but if you examine --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DOERN: . . . if you examine what is being proposed in many other areas you will see that it is little better than that. With the aura of scientific respectability they attempt to defend certain policies that I think are indicative of a breakdown in modern society. What would they say, for example, about men like Hitler, Stalin and Genghis Khan? Would they say that they could be rehabilitated? For instance, would they forgive them for their actions? Does it really matter to us as individuals and people in society, if Hitler's mother didn't love him, or if Stalin was shy, or if Genghis Khan was a high school drop-out? Does that really concern us? Does that really provide us with any useful information in the face of the kind of crimes that they have undertaken? And I would recommend to members of this Chamber the movie Clockwork Orange, which I think dealt with some of the techniques and some of the implications, some of the results obtained by modern behavioural modification. All of this is done at a tremendous cost to the taxpayer and the laboratory is both the prison and the community that we live in.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say that in many cases, in many cases in this debate or in this debate in general, the views of the majority of Canadians and our police and prison guards are being ignored. I say that we should not forget the victims of crime and that the ultimate question for us as legislators is this: Namely, how can we structure society to reward the honest, hard-working law abiding citizen and punish the wrongdoers who prey on them? When we do this it will become clear that the only fitting punishment for first degree murder is capital punishment, and then the scale should filter down from there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had intended to interrupt the last speaker on a matter of privilege, but I chose not to, but I feel nonetheless that I should mention it. I think it is highly unfair for him to have traded speaking notes with the Honourable Member for Pembina. Those sentiments, I thought, were fairly clearly expressed in this Chamber from time to time without his underlining them. But nonetheless, they are welcome. They are welcome.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to enter the debate at this stage in the kind of time-honoured tradition that pays passing homage to the Budget and does what most of us do, speak from the heart with a great deal of feeling about some of the things that bother us in the affairs of public life. I say the Budget deserves little attention and that's perhaps not correct. It is as the Member from Sturgeon Creek pointed out this afternoon, a Budget far more severe than most of us realized at first glance.

It is a Budget that doesn't show restraint and perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the best

BUDGET

(MR. ENNS cont'd) way of demonstrating this lack of restraint on the part of the Budget is the efforts that we have been going through for the last three or four days at the committee stage, that the one major bill that we had before us in this session, that is the Rent Stabilization Bill, where most of our time was spent about devising reasonably fair - and I'm prepared to pass that accolade on to the government - reasonably fair provisions of pass-through costs to the landlord. And what do these pass-through costs consist of? Higher taxes, higher utilities, higher hydro rates. All of these things that the governments of the day seem to be the prime instigators in.

So, Mr. Speaker, to me that seems to indicate that there really is no will on the part of the government to check inflation. There is no deep-seated desire to do that, despite the mother-all phrases coming from the First Minister on this particular subject, and of course it is no secret, it is no secret that governments are the major benefactors of inflation. Governments are the major benefactors of inflation. There was no need on the part of this government to increase the rate of taxation imposed by the Roblin administration, namely the five percent sales tax which was imposed to generate some 40 millions of dollars at that time, in 1967. It's now collecting 100 million, 160 million. Need I say more about who benefits most from inflation, who collects most of the benefit from inflation? None other than the governments. Mr. Speaker, that is a very serious problem, that is a very serious problem that we face. Mr. Speaker, I did not listen to the honourable former Minister of Finance, the Honourable Member from St. Johns, when he, I understand used the opportunity that the people's broadcasting system provides us political parties from time to time to offer our views for a brief five minutes in a program called "Public Affairs." But I was given to understand by no less than a President of a major corporation here in Manitoba his impressions about that speech and I must tell you he was very much impressed. He challenged me as a member of the opposition, the kind of really basic question that has to be asked. It's easy to talk about restraint; it's easy to talk about cutbacks in programs but in actual fact what programs are you going to cut? What areas are going to practice the restraint that we in the opposition often talk about? Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that's a very legitimate question and it's a question that faces not this government, it faces governments across Canada, it faces our Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks about this and I know before I start, because they are as bound to the traditional responses as anybody else before them and they will throw them back at me, but I will attempt nonetheless because I see it as my responsibility. I say surely, and I will argue with them with reason that times do change, that this is 1976, not the latter 1950s or the early 1960s. Simple responses that say, well you did this when you were in power or a Conservative Government is doing this today or did that yesterday or some other jurisdiction is doing that or did that when they were in power a few years ago, surely that, Mr. Speaker, is not good enough. It is not good enough, Mr. Speaker, if we are to accept the First Minister's statement seriously when he indicated to a meeting, I suppose somewhere in the community of Brandon, and he came out very strongly that the nation must live with restraints, says Schreyer. "Canada needs a national all effort akin to the spirit displayed in the Second World War if it is to avoid economic and social disaster in 10 years," says Premier Ed Schreyer. Mr. Speaker, that's a pretty firm statement, a pretty firm feeling of commitment on the part of the First Minister of this government, on the part of the Minister of Finance of this government, about the feelings that he has about the necessity of restraint. Mr. Speaker, my Leader demonstrated just a day ago that those are hollow words, that in fact this government is merrily spending on at a rate of some 18 percent when workers across this nation are being asked to go for ten. The Member from Sturgeon Creek vividly indicated that this year alone this government is asking more money in new taxation than they have ever asked during their entire six-seven year period in government. But that, Mr. Speaker, has to be put alongside the statement of the First Minister in Brandon when he says that we have to gird ourselves, as though we were in a world war confrontation, to fight the battle of inflation, to fight the battle of restraints.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister, members of the government - the Member for

BUDGET

(MR. ENNS cont'd) St. Johns as he indicated on Saturday night on the CBC broadcast of Provincial Affairs has every right to ask of members opposite: how do you intend to exercise some of these restraints? How would we intend to exercise some of the restraints? Where would we cut without cutting off our political noses because we are as political as they are and we all operate in the same arena in that extent. We all know the value of the dollar spent in terms of its vote-catching appeal. But, Mr. Speaker, I am for one, and I think a growing number of Canadians are prepared to accept the First Minister's diagnosis of the problem. I don't think there are too many Canadians nor are there too many Manitobans that quarrel with him on that basis. I think, Mr. Speaker, nothing demonstrates that better than the First Minister's preparedness to tackle within his own community, and I speak - well Mr. Speaker, I retract that. It's never been his community but it's one that he tends to or the ND Party likes to usurp as being their community. I speak of organized labour. Organized labour has never supported that party anywhere near to the extent that they would like through their PR to have the rest of Manitobans believe, or else they'd be sitting in this House with 40 or 45 seats.

But, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister correctly identified the concerns of organized labour and of a vast majority of Manitobans that run away inflation, galloping costs, unrestrained government spending was becoming rapidly that kind of global, ill-defined, intangible kind of a thing that everybody was beginning to worry about. Not everybody had the words or the wherewithall to put words to it but he, as an astute politician, knew that that was the concern of Manitobans and he was prepared to - against advice I'm sure, against pressure I'm sure from many people within his party, many people that sit on the benches with him, from his national leader - to oppose the position taken by his national party and support generally speaking the programs of restraint put forward by the Federal Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the question that the Member for St. Johns asked the other night on television has to be a very legitimate question. Where, just where does a responsible opposition intend to exercise some of these areas of restraint? What programs do they intend to cut and how do they intend to reduce government spending? Mr. Speaker, I said just before I started this train of thought that I was going to get the kind of traditional - I was going to get the kind of traditional responses from them. But I will try it anyway because I honestly believe that we're not dealing with 1959; we're not dealing with the early 1960s; we are now in 1976.

Let me just simply list three particular areas that I think the public and I think that the Official Opposition is prepared to commit itself. In fact we will fight an election on this and we will beat you gentlemen, we will beat you gentlemen on these issues. They'll be better defined than I can tonight because we have a Leader that can define them in the words that the people of Manitoba can understand. But I will attempt in my humble best to mention a few of them.

Firstly, there is the question of simple housekeeping, there is the question of simple housekeeping. I'm not going to dwell on that but that's a question that I think we can throw at any government of any political stripe, any government at any time, any government that employs 12,000 - 15,000 people, any government that has thousands - I don't know how many cars running around the province. You know there is always - and I think that's a legitimate position for an opposition to take, simply that we can tighten up the housekeeping. But I don't present that, Mr. Speaker, as a major savings that can be afforded, not one that will materially reduce the costs of government. I simply don't want to pass that over, Mr. Speaker, because you know those who do not worry about pennies will never save a dollar. So even the minor expenses, the minor business of housekeeping is worthwhile paying attention to by those of us who are the custodians of our taxpayers' money.

In terms of program cuts, Mr. Speaker, the area gets a little bit more difficult. I'd like to suggest just one or two. Mr. Speaker, in the post-war years, the fifties, there was a considerable amount of feeling by those provinces who counted themselves in the ranks of the have nots that the post-war boom was passing us by, that as always central Canada was getting the major share of the economic pie in Canada. There

BUDGET

(MR. ENNS cont'd) was a scramble, Mr. Speaker, by governments of every political description, Liberal, Conservative, and NDP to offer lures to offer inducements in the sphere of economic development. Rightly or wrongly we all pursued that course. Mr. Speaker, we pursued that course because basically and essentially we had the support of the people that we led. There was an all out growth syndrome in our society at that time. We believed in it.

Mr. Speaker, in 1976, we take different attitudes towards that. They have nothing to do again with the politics of the day. It's just that, whether you want to call it a maturity, whether you want to call it a recognition of some of the problems that unlimited growth has with it - Mr. Speaker, in 1976 there is no more room for the drummer boy type of a Minister of Industry and Commerce that says growth at any cost. There just simply is no more room for that. I am prepared to acknowledge that as do most other thinking Manitobans and Canadians recognize this.

So what I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker, that there has been a change and it's not a change that has come about on that side of the House; it's a change that's come about universally within our population. So, Mr. Speaker, I say is there room, is there room for this kind of overlapping effort on the part of such agencies as the Manitoba Development Corporation which we threw in some \$70 million this year and lost. And lost. Is there room for it? I say, Mr. Speaker, there is no longer room for it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we do come on this particular point of course on a change and we get hung up on ideology because whereas we were prepared to use that means of public funds as a court of last resort, where the private sector would not move and where jobs were at stake and where we felt the development was of economic and social importance, we moved. This government has made a significant change. They now want to really leave that aside, they want to get in on the good action. They want to buy equity; they want to buy shares; they want to usurp in a far greater way the role of the private sector with the use of public funds. That's an argument for a different day, gentlemen. That's an argument for a different day. All I'm saying and all I'm suggesting to the Minister of Finance and to the former Minister of Finance who asked the question: which programs can you cut? I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that today in 1976 or in 1977 Manitobans are prepared to say the government can afford, can well afford and should get out and save ourselves the forty, fifty, sixty, seventy millions of dollars that we are putting into that venture. We get challenged and these are legitimate areas of debate. The former Minister of Finance challenges, correctly, what areas would an opposition move out of? I'm listing a few of them; I'm listing a few of them.

Mr. Speaker, aside from the well intentioned remarks made by the Minister of Agriculture, by the First Minister when they allude to their program of allocating millions of dollars to the purchase of prime agricultural farm land in this province, that they do that with no ulterior motives, that they do that to support their stay-option program, that they do that to enable young farmers to maintain actively and encourage young farmers entering into the farming business, we in the opposition say that there are other routes to travel, that there are other capital sources to tap to do that. We know that this government never speaks to the banking institutions but I will tell you something. If I should happen to be privileged in being the Minister of Agriculture or being any member of the treasury bench of a future government of this province, that's the first people that I would knock heads together, is the banking institutions of this country and tell them to loosen up their purse strings - as I did in 1967-1968 and allow the private sector to provide those funds, those funds that are there, rather than tax the people of Manitoba to make it possible for young farmers to stay on the farm and to maintain and to operate the farms in the family tradition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac Du Bonnet): Yes. Could he tell me how many loans are made under the guaranteed program in the last year of your government, that is 1968-69; and secondly, who is now preventing the banks from making allocations of capital to the farming community?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture deserves an

(MR. ENNS cont'd) answer. The fact of the matter is that the program was just barely instituted, had some six months duration to begin with when we lost government and when this government withdrew the kind of co-operation and the guarantees that we were prepared to underwrite to the banking institutions to provide these funds. That's what happened and that's understandable. You know I can understand why they did that. The only difference is this, the only difference is this: that I would sooner have private capital put up 90 percent of the capital to do the job that had to be done, and underwrite perhaps ten percent of the loss whereas this government is prepared to accept 90 percent of the risk, put up 90 percent of the capital and underwrite it all, and underwrite it all and charge you taxes. So that's a matter of ideology. We accept that.

Mr. Speaker, my object tonight is not to engage in the merits of the various programs that I am suggesting that could be changed but simply to list in a relatively responsible manner some changes, some basic changes that involve millions of dollars, that involve millions of dollars that could have made it possible for instance for this government today to come in with no increase in taxes, could have balanced our budget and not imposed any increase on any Manitobans. --(Interjection)-- No, not the way they did in Ontario, the way we intend to do in Manitoba, the way we intend to do in Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned a few of them in terms of as examples of policy changes which affect in an appreciable way the demand on the public tax purse. Mr. Speaker, I would be negligent if I thought for a moment even these that I suggest will appreciably change the amount of public spending that all governments in this country and this province are committed to. I have to then - although I am not noted and I don't present myself tonight as an expert in the fields that I now want to talk to for a few moments - but it's just inconceivable that we can talk in any serious terms about a restraint program in this country without dealing seriously in the two major fields, the two major departments that contribute in such a massive way to the ongoing costs of government. They are none other than my honourable friend, the Minister of Health and Social Development, and to a somewhat lesser extent the Honourable Minister of Education and Colleges and Universities. Mr. Speaker, let me make this very clear. We can be doing our jobs as opposition and we can go after this government on housekeeping miscarriages; we can worry about who's getting paid what or are they necessary or something like that but unless we are prepared collectively to seriously address ourselves to the questions of health delivery, medical delivery in our province, then, Mr. Speaker, we will all miss the boat.

. continued

BUDGET

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, I would honestly and very earnestly like to suggest to the Honourable Minister of Health that in this context I would like to reiterate the First Minister's remarks that he made in Brandon that we really do face an all out effort akin to the spirit displayed during the Second World War. Mr. Speaker, we see that by the announcements coming out of the Federal Government; we see that by the actions that have already taken place in Ontario; we know that for our own projections here in the Province of Manitoba that we have to use the Minister of Health's words, find some plateau that we can collectively as a society live with in terms of what we can do in terms of health care for our people. Mr. Speaker, I believe that if we could divorce ourselves from the politics of the situation, like if they could stop reminding us every time they get up and stand that for the first time in a hundred years somebody is getting treated medically for nothing. Now remembering a hundred years ago there was no road in Manitoba, there was no hospital in Manitoba, I don't think there was a doctor in Manitoba and I don't think it was much better fifty years ago.--(Interjection)--Well Dr. Schultz was here but he led a revolution.

So, Mr. Speaker, I speak earnestly to the government, to the Minister, that it requires in my judgment really a kind of bi-partisan, a non partisan approach to the solution of the health problem. Oh I will not disappoint the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources because the dividing line that separates us there somewhere in between the mace in this blue carpet - thank God it's blue.--(Interjection)--They'll change it, I know. The dividing line is there and ideology does intervene in this case. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Honourable Minister of Health and the First Minister that I think we recognize on this side that this is the major area of concern and that in this particular area there is very little room for partisan politics. We can play it at all our expense. I don't know what kind of partisan politics this government is prepared to play. I raise the question recognizing that just by raising it, it may cost my party votes.

But at the time that we're talking about, and we are being warned that 1,800 acute beds are going to be eliminated or a suggestion that there will be some cutback. All right, I accept the admonition of the First Minister from the seat. Some cutback is being contemplated. Can we then say with clarity and completely divorced of politics that we have justification for building a new acute bed centre anywhere in this province? I just ask the question, Mr. Speaker. If you want to put it more clearly I speak directly about the Seven Oaks Hospital. I simply ask that question. But I invite the First Minister, I invite the Minister of Health to approach us on the acuteness of the problem we face and leave the politics out of it. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Honourable Minister of Health that in his dealings in terms of medical health and medical delivery of service, his dealings with the doctors, with the medical profession, are we engaged in an ideological battle with him or do we want to somehow devise a system that will continue to deliver the best possible medical care to our people at reasonable costs. Mr. Speaker, the kind of criticism that I have to make to the First Minister and to the Minister of Health is that for some reason he has chosen the vehicle of kind of - and I have to call it confrontation for very base political reasons. Not unlike, Mr. Speaker, the kind of blatant, base politicizing that the First Minister exhibited in the delivery of his Budget when he indicated that the Lincoln IV or Mark IV drivers were going to be paying X number of dollars. The fact that for every one Lincoln driver there are ten station wagon drivers earning \$6,000 or \$7,000 a year and they are going to be paying the same \$80 or \$90 as the Lincoln driver, that kind of exploitation, Mr. First Minister, that kind of incitement to a class warfare in this province, Mr. Speaker, does not help the situation. The kind of confrontation that we have seen with the medical profession, the kind of statements that the First Minister has given about the medical profession, about how they should not expect as a matter of right to have their security of income protected forever and a day only aids and abets the kind of situation I describe.--(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, but we don't single out all others. Now I have here and I am sure the First Minister has a little document put out by the physicians, How Much an Hour? It gives a

BUDGET

(MR. ENNS cont'd) contrasting description of salaries earned, of salaries earned by the echelon of our society. Presidents of big companies, \$52.50 an hour; airline chief pilots, \$37.00 an hour; Members of Parliament, \$15.25 an hour; Phd. Engineers, \$15.00 an hour; air traffic controllers, \$13.20 an hour; seaway pilots who shepherd our wheat down the St. Lawrence Seaway, \$13.19 an hour; lawyers, we have a few of them there, \$11.15 an hour; railway, yes they're very modest. --(Interjection)-- No it shows you how fair it is. Railway engineers, \$10.25 an hour; bank managers, \$10.05 an hour. That compares to the average Manitoba physician's wages of \$9.69 an hour.--(Interjection)--No, no let's not take a collection. Let's not take a collection. I told the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources I would not disappoint him and he has responded of course. He has responded in a way that I would expect him to respond.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in the whole area of health care, in the delivery of medicine in the Province of Manitoba, that we face a very serious position, a very serious position and there is a tremendous amount of distrust that's prevalent in the negotiations taking place. --(Interjection)--Well, the Honourable Minister, he wants to refute the figures. I suspect that they are very accurate, very accurate. What worries me most, Mr. Speaker, is that we should be able to learn from what has happened in other jurisdictions. The confrontation obviously exists simply by the response even tonight, that this government is prepared to place ideology ahead of the service that the people demand and deserve and, Mr. Speaker, more important, have demonstrated that they will insist on getting.

In those jurisdictions where it is by law prohibited, in the national health schemes of other countries, Mr. Speaker, that have precluded, where the heavy arm of government has insisted on a particular kind of health delivery, what has happened? This is the irony of it. Countries like Great Britain that have pioneered in this field with the heaviest load of National Health Care on their shoulders, the people that choose. Yet you have people under that burden of taxation doing what? Choosing out the private service of doctors on off hours. You have people in Sweden choosing and going that ironic thing of paying privately for health care, that they refuse to accept that is being provided to them, at tremendous costs, by the state. Are we moving in that same direction? Are we moving in that same direction? What leadership has the Minister of Health given to our medical people? Are we threatening to have a medical community with either you come into our scheme of things or else?

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to briefly just read a few of the remarks that were made about the health situation in Sweden. The Honourable Minister likely is familiar with them. It's been offered by a Doctor Sanblum who was awarded the honorary fellowship in the American College of Surgeons in 1952. He spent all his medical life in Sweden, now retired, and he speaks with a great deal of pride back in the year 1955 when the compulsory bill on health insurance was passed in that country. He, at that time, used to tour the countries of the world speaking with pride and enthusiasm about the health care scheme in Sweden. He indicates that in this organization the medical profession functioned well. The doctors were satisfied with the combined salary and fee-for-service system that rewarded hard work and professional improvement. The patients received good care and could choose their own doctors. But this situation did not last. Why could Sweden not stay on the middle way? Why did we have to fall in the ditch on the other side of the road? The answer is that the socialist ideology founded on a mixture of envy and distrust in individual enterprise on the one side but trust in government planning on the other has to run its dogmatic course at any price. What in effect happened to medicine in Sweden was the total absorption of any segment of the private practice, any responsibility that the surgeon had, the doctor had to his individual patient, to the individual, and the tragedy is all this costing and adding monumentally to the year in, year out costs of operations of government--(Interjection)--But they were prepared to work for nine. They were prepared to work for nine. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am disillusioned tonight by the honourable members opposite. Not really. Because it reinforces - I will henceforth revert back to my more standard speeches because I do believe, and

BUDGET

(MR. ENNS cont'd)I'm only reinforced by the fact that this government believes and honestly believes in that total absorption of all human activity under the umbrella of government and that this government is bent on that course and that this government sees no danger signals at all whether the gross spending on the part of government reaches 30, 40, 50, 60, 80 percent. In fact they're always worried the fact that it isn't 100 percent. They're not worried about the fact that they hired 12,000, 14,000, 15,000, 16,000 civil servants, they're worried about the fact that there are still some Manitobans not working for the government.

Mr. Speaker, there is no room for restraint on the part of this government. Restraint on the part of this government can only be exercised when they have total control over the lives of Manitobans.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 10:00 - I'll take the Honourable Minister of Health next but it'll have to be tomorrow. The hour being 10:00 o'clock, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Tuesday)