

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, March 16, 1972

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am what you could call one of those politicians that has what they call two ears and one mouth so I listen twice as much as I speak. I would firstly, as all other members have, congratulate you on the conduct that you have carried this House forth in the last session and it is quite evident in this session that you will be able to keep it in a very steady fashion.

I would like to congratulate the Honourable Members of St. Vital and Ste. Rose on their seconding the reply to the Speech from the Throne, and as well, welcome the Honourable Member from Minnedosa and wish him well in this House and in future elections. At least when I make a comment like that it will get people dandered up and they will listen to what I have to say.

There were some comments with respect to the Speech from the Throne and I will deal with some of the notes that I have made from members who spoke from the opposite side with respect to various agricultural policies and some remarks that the Leader of the Opposition made in his speech.

The Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell, he spoke and he mentioned that farmers in various commodity groups, their views are different, their interests are different and they may oppose one another. Well it may be so that their views may be different but I think in all rural communities and the total farm sector the problem still remains the same even though the views of the farmers may be different, and of course, that is the decline of farm income and the ever increasing cost price squeeze. Now the member when he spoke, he stated, you know, farmers should really organize in various commodity groups and because of their views differing from one another they shouldn't even organize, almost talk to each other, one commodity group will tend to fight one another. Well, I say that if the farmers having been given an opportunity by this government in the strengthening of the marketing legislation and the encouragement of farmers organizing into marketing organizations, marketing boards in which they can take full control of their products and encourage an avenue of what one might call supply-management in that they may control the destiny of their product, right from the farm to the producer and the consumer in its household.

Now maybe to you it may sound good but you know, for many years, and the preaching has come from the other side of the House that let's just go with the theory of supply and demand. Now if you look at statements like that and you look at the methods that big corporations have used - and not big, all corporations that are in existence that are operating which you might call successfully, what do they do? They don't just go hog wild and produce, produce, produce and then sit back and close shop. If you look at, say, General Motors, they don't just go out and on mass production produce the cars. They study the situation as it exists then they program what they think the market will hold, and what has been carried on in our agricultural society, what has been really promoted by the corporate sector and farmers being like farmers not organized they hear so many versions from so many different people that they really don't know which way to turn. Now the avenue that this government has provided, not the organization of marketing boards, but being that the farmers can organize effectively and be the sole bargaining agent on behalf of either one commodity group or any commodity group should they wish to organize, that way there they can sit down with the best of the interests in the corporate structure and bargain at equal will rather than be torn apart by two or three salesmen or what have you from different corporations going from farm to farm and saying, well, I got a better deal here, you better knock down your price and things like this.

Now the farmers if they utilize this avenue that has been provided by this government and say we will bargain together as one unit through an organization of elected people on our board and say to these firms, how much, your market needs so much -- let's say for the turkey industry, for example. Being a turkey farmer I'll speak of my own gobble gobblers in the Interlake and all around the Province of Manitoba. And I'll tell you what has really happened over the years. The companies have carried on and have played a game in a sense of favoritism with some producers and with others they have relegated in any way at all just to shove them off the market, they have even gone so far as to sign up contracts with many

(MR. URUSKI cont'd) . . . . farmers for the sale of feed and thus they tie the farmer up through the contract of these sales and then the farmer has nowhere else to go but to that feed company who, of course, in the initial contract specified where the product must go and at what price he must sell.

Now if through the means of a Marketing Board system the farmers are to bargain collectively, then they can through the Marketing Board say that they will control all the products. If an industry, let's say Canada Packers, KAM Foods or whoever is in the processing business, wants turkeys, they can come to the Board and contract out as many pounds as they wish rather than tie up the farmers on an individual basis and play one farmer against the other. That's been happening for years and you know, the National Farmers Union has been working for years and years in trying to organize the farmers into one collective bargaining unit, and I think they should realize that the step that this government has taken in the form of the Marketing Board system and organizing farmers into collective units is really one step towards that ultimate goal where farmers will finally realize that either, call it what you like, a marketing board, no matter what you like, call it what you may, they will eventually organize on a national basis to promote their product to get a fair share of the dollar value that the producers have been losing all these years.

You know, the Member from Gladstone mentioned this afternoon and he stated that, you know, I support the law of supply and demand and the free enterprise system let's let it go. But you know we've had this system long before my time and the farm population, and the farmer, and I speak of them, has been going down and down and down. There may be some group that have prospered and he is the cattleman and the cattle prices have been better but I can assure you that they have had their bad times as well. Now you know, this trend really can't go on because of the loss of the farm population from rural areas the farmers just have to get together and the means provided, because if they don't get together they've had it and the amount of loss of people from the rural areas is very evident. You look over the past years at redistribution right here in the House. Where have the population trends gone? Not out, they've come in. We've lost constituencies in the Interlake, we've lost constituencies all over the western southern part of the province. So you know, it's been evident for years and mainly because the people of the rural areas have not been able to maintain a decent standard of living.

There were comments insofar as the transferring of land from father to son and the estate tax that is being proposed by this government this coming session and the problems that a farmer father will have in passing his estate or his land holdings on to his son or his wife. Well, you know, it's not as if estate taxes are something new, they've been in existence since I believe the 1940s. It's nothing new that this government is taking over and besides this government nine other governments in the Dominion of Canada are taking over the relief from the Federal Government and taking up this field of taxation, and the proposals that have been proposed by the Province of Manitoba I can't see - in fact the exemptions that are going to be put forward in the new estate tax bill are much more liberal, if you call it, much more generous than were in the past in a previous bill of the Federal Government.

There were comments by the Leader of the Official Opposition with respect to, you know that our civil service is increasing with a great degree and we're just going hog wild on this. Well, he can ask his members that were on the Agricultural Committee that travelled across the province and there were about a dozen meetings and in almost every meeting that we held throughout the province there were comments that they would like this program expanded, that program expanded, all sorts of programs expanded that the government should go into, and when people were questioned on, you know, which way to go, well you could stand another one or two people in this area of the department, you could stand another staff person in that department. So what does that leave you to believe? You know, that if in effect all the suggestions that were given to the committee, you know, it would be natural that an increase would occur in the civil service to try and accommodate some of the programs and suggestions that people have made. But when the Leader of the Opposition goes off into a tantrum and says that the civil service is growing by leaps and bounds, I challenge him as to in what way does he intend to propose, and I don't think he's ever stated in any of his speeches, to cut the civil service and decrease the programs that he may call ineffective in the Province of Manitoba.

I would like to comment on the Throne Speech somewhat insofar as the highway program, the comments made in the Throne Speech with respect to the highway linking the Interlake with the western part of the Province of Manitoba and tying this into a link with Saskatchewan. I can

(MR. URUSKI cont'd) . . . . only say that I am so happy that this is finally coming about that the people of the Interlake and of this southern portion of Manitoba, and even people travelling from the East, that I feel eventually this connecting link through the Interlake and through the western part of the province will probably become the second Trans Canada Highway in linking up Manitoba with the rest of Western Canada.

The Province of Manitoba in the past two years has gone deeply into the field of public housing and I can only sincerely thank the Minister of Municipal Affairs and his staff for the added incentive and the funds that have been provided to the Interlake and to the rest of the province in the field of public housing. The need for senior citizens housing in the Interlake -- you know, it's a crying shame, there is one unit in Lundar, there is an extended care unit in Arborg and that's practically -- you know there are some units in Selkirk and Gimli but the areas of Ashern, Eriksdale, Arborg, Riverton, there are now discussions on the way with Ashern and Riverton and the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. The Town of Eriksdale has proceeded in construction in senior citizens housing in that town. The town of Arborg itself is going to be proceeding with some added construction for senior citizens who don't need the extended care facilities that are provided now in Arborg, and I think that the statistics that were produced by the Interlake Development Corporation reveals in great detail the crying need of the Interlake and in that area especially that has been neglected over the years in this area of housing and needs of the people in that area. -- (Interjection) -- I do, yes. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye mentions "thank the Federal". Yes, that same program, those same amounts of money were provided many years ago. But you know, I say shame to those boys on the other side that they never took advantage of the 90 percent loans . . .

Now, the proposal for the extension of sewer and water facilities for our rural towns - you know, there was talk that many rural areas would be fighting amongst each other saying that, "Well, since we have sewer and water facilities in our town, well the government better not go into that kind of a program because they are going to be giving something to someone else that we have already had to struggle and pay for." But that isn't the case. You know, the reports shown by the Interlake Development Corporation indicate a solid support and a need for this type of a system. I don't know the details of what is being proposed, but a system for sewer and water facilities within the Interlake.

The towns of Ashern, Eriksdale, Arborg, in my constituency have been fortunate enough to be able to provide for themselves some type of facility, either of sewer or both sewer and water. But there are towns such as Stonewall, Teulon, Lundar and Fisher Branch that do not have these opportunities. They have inherent problems either through the lack of water or the stone formations where added costs would be a tremendous burden to the taxpayers of that area. And I wholeheartedly endorse the thinking of the programs of extending these facilities to the rural areas, as well the program now in effect of providing grants to the rural population, to the farmers of our province, insofar as the 15 percent grant on water, supplying water facilities to the rural areas. I think the program over the years will really help and enhance the quality of life for the rural people who have been struggling for all these years and give them some of the comforts that have been enjoyed by other people in our society in the city and other communities in our province.

I skipped one part insofar as the road program - you know, the Member from The Pas brings that out. I can readily say that the program of the surfacing and the building up of the No. 6 highway linking northern Manitoba and Thompson and shortening the route from the north central area of our province with the Interlake has really tied in a lot closer the people of the north and of the north central part of the Interlake and the central part of Manitoba, and of course into Winnipeg. This has not only helped the northern people but it has given the people in the western part of my constituency the needed transportation link that they have practically begged for years and years.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and relate the many, many programs that have been developed in the rural areas, and continue citing, you know, the Vet Clinic program, the added incentives for the veterinary students to continue their practice and go out into the rural areas, programs such as these to strengthen the agricultural economy of our province. These and many other programs that have been effected will, and I am sure this government will continue in its struggle to enhance the life of not only our rural people, our northern people and the people of our major cities as well.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After listening to the Member for St. George extoll the virtues of socialism, one wonders if I should venture into making the comments that I propose to make on this particular debate. I don't intend to deal with the honourable member's speech other than just simply to say that he defeated his own argument when he was attempting to suggest that free enterprise economy has not worked and will not work, when he mentioned the cattle industry, and he backed away from that very quickly. He backed away because there is an industry that has consistently, over the years, invited governments to stay out of their business and let them run it themselves and they have done it very successfully, and the results have been shown in the fact that the livestock industry is one of the more stable aspects of agriculture in this country. But, Sir, I don't want to dwell on that.

I would like, Sir, to express my pleasure at seeing you back in the Chair presiding over the deliberations of this House, onerous as they are. Although we do have rules that purport to guide us in our deliberations, there are times when most of us at one time or another feel the need of expressing ourselves perhaps a little bit beyond the rules, and I hope, Sir, that you will use that kind of tact and judgment that will enable us to stay fairly close to the path without imposing the kind of restrictions that inhibit debate in this Chamber, and I know, Sir, that you are attempting to do that and we will do what we can to assist you in that task.

Sir, the purpose of the Legislature meeting essentially is to provide an opportunity for the members of the Opposition or, in the case of this Legislature, for those that are not in the Cabinet, to seek information from the government, and I know that you will want to ensure that every opportunity is provided to make sure that we have that privilege of questioning the activities of the government, and that the answers are provided insofar as it is possible for the members of the Cabinet to do so.

We had a rather interesting experience on the second day that the Legislature met, when a question was directed at the Minister of Lower Education regarding a speech that he made, to I believe it was St. Paul's College. A rather surprising answer, Sir. He suggested that when we want information from the government, that the place to go is to the press. Is it now going to be a habit of the government to refer us to the press when we want information, knowing that the Member for Ste. Rose has something less than high opinion of the kind of information that you can get from the press. Do they now want us to get that kind of information? I thought that they wanted to ensure that the people of this province were properly informed, and supplying the text of a speech, a speech that was of considerable interest to the people of this province and, indeed to the members of this House, should have been a routine matter for a Cabinet Minister. Well, Sir, we hope that that is not going to become a continuing practice in this House and that we can expect that the answers to the questions that we will be asking, not only on this side of the House but on the other side of the House as well, will receive the kind of attention and the kind of answer that is deserving of the question.

Well, Sir, -- (Interjection) -- Sir, the Member for Thompson seeks information in this Chamber that I am sure the people of this province are interested in finding the answers to, but he seems to have some difficulty getting through to you, Sir. He consistently defies the rules that govern the oral question period and I want to help him. I want to make myself available to the Member for Thompson in assisting him to frame his questions so that they can meet with the requirements of the rules, and as a starter I want to send over to a him a copy of the annotations that govern the asking of questions during the oral question period, and if he will peruse that we can at least have a start in that direction and tomorrow I expect that he will be in my office and we'll help him frame those questions that he believes are necessary to . . . the information, difficult as it is, from this government and he's beginning to find now the kind of problem that we had when we were in past sessions of the Legislature.

Sir, I want to extend my congratulations to the Deputy Speaker, who demonstrated last evening when he spoke that it is his intention to be as completely impartial as possible, and we welcome him in presiding over the deliberations of our committees and offer him our assistance.

I want also at this time to express, on behalf of those on this side of the House, our gratitude to the service performed by the Member for Winnipeg Centre when he was Deputy Chairman of this Legislature. He demonstrated an ability to be tactful when the occasion demanded it, to be firm when the occasion demanded it, and to be fair at all times, and we

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) . . . . want him to know that we appreciate that very much.

I want also to say, although the message of condolences went out to the late Leonard Claydon earlier today, that I have never known a man of greater courage than that demonstrated by Mr. Claydon during the years that he was in this Chamber - his determination to come into the House day after day to carry on the responsibilities that his constituents had assigned to him, is a lesson in courage that many of us could emulate.

I want also to welcome the new Member for Minnedosa who, when he spoke this afternoon, demonstrated that we can expect a great contribution from him in future years.

I want also, while I'm at it, to congratulate those who have been elevated to the Cabinet. They remind me over there of the swinging doors on a saloon. Some come in and the others pass out. But I do want to especially congratulate the Minister of Public Works, who, since he assumed that - although it's in an acting capacity - since he assumed that portfolio, has demonstrated a desire to be as cooperative as possible, and we want to thank him for the many kindnesses and courtesies that he has shown us since he has become Minister. It is an example, Sir, that could be followed by some of the other Ministers.

Now, Sir, in offering my congratulations I find that the mover and the seconder have placed me in a somewhat difficult position, because traditionally, when the mover and seconder move the message in reply to the Speech from the Throne, they endeavour to say something that will make it easy for members of the Opposition to congratulate them, and they have made my task impossible; so I cannot offer any more congratulations than those that should go to the people who they represent by having them given the honour of moving and seconding the Address in Reply. The contents of their remarks I will deal with briefly.

The Member for St. Vital demonstrated a state of mind that was characteristic of the Speech from the Throne itself. -- (Interjection) -- Well, the Member for Thompson has taken the words out of my mouth, so I will not carry that any further. I'll let it go at that. And the Member for Ste. Rose, who seconded the Address in Reply, and one we shall never forget. It was described here the other day by the Member for Lakeside, in that plaintive tone when he cast his eyes to the press gallery and pleaded with them to be honest. This is the same press gallery that the Minister of Lower Education wants us to seek information from. But surely the Member for Ste. Rose, surely the Member for Ste. Rose must know the role of the press in this Chamber. It is to watch the proceedings in this House, gather the information, and then decimate it. -- (Interjection) -- In the words of the member himself. You know, the First Minister - - (Interjection) -- no, I don't have that much time, Mr. Minister. I wish the First Minister would undertake to debate with me, during the course of the consideration of estimates or something like that, so that there can be that kind of an exchange that makes it easy to debate with the Minister. It's not that I wouldn't like to hear the question of the First Minister but I would prefer to deal with my remarks and I know that the time is short -- as a matter of fact there have been several minutes gone by and I don't want to place myself in the same position that the Attorney-General did the other day.

But, Sir, I would like to make just a few remarks about the Cabinet as I see it today, and the government. You know, anyone who has ever read the fairy tale or the book Alice in Wonderland, you will get some idea, you will get some idea of what the present Cabinet is made up of. Well, Sir, with the comings and goings of various members of the Cabinet it was very well described in Alice in Wonderland in these words. This was at the time when she was drinking the contents of bottles marked "drink me" and she had shrunk to the size of a person only ten inches high. And it goes on to say, "Alice was very fond of playing the part of two people." And the Member for Lakeside described how this government is trying to play the part of two, indeed three people. "But it is no use now," thought poor Alice, "to pretend to be two people. Why, there is not hardly enough of me left to be one respectable person." And that, Sir, is almost the government. There is not enough left of them now to be one respectable Cabinet.

But the group as a whole is also described very well in Alice in Wonderland. As a matter of fact, their entire performance as a government Lewis Carroll couldn't have had better material for a story than he would find in this particular book. They describe the caucus race, and that's really what it's described as for the benefit of those who haven't read Alice in Wonderland recently -- the caucus race. First it marked out a race course in a sort of a circle; the exact shape doesn't matter. Then all the party were placed along the course here and there -- and that's exactly what they've done there. There was no one, two, three and away, but they began running when they liked and they left off when they liked so that it was not easy

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . to know when the race was over. However, when they had been running for half an hour or so and were quite dry again, the dodo suddenly called out -- and I don't know who the dodo would be on that side -- "The race is over," and they all crowded around again panting and asking, "Yes, but who won?" And we are going to be interested in watching to find out who won. -- (Interjection) -- Well, as a matter of fact, since the First Minister asks, it just occurred to me after watching the performance of the past few months, surely, surely this must be an Alice in Wonderland performance and I thought I'd better refresh my memory to find out if there was any resemblance, and I find out not only the resemblance but I'm sure Lewis Carrol, although the book was written in 1870, could not have projected his thinking this far ahead to imagine that there was a government that could act in the manner that this government has acted during the years that they have been in power.

Now, Sir, the Speech from the Throne itself, the Speech from the Throne normally attempts to determine or to portray an attitude, an attitude of government, a position. And it's interesting to -- and for the First Minister's benefit I've done some more reading besides Alice in Wonderland; I have read some of their past Speeches from the Throne -- and it's rather interesting to watch the progression, or I should say the regression, in the attitude of the government insofar as the Speech from the Throne is concerned.

The first one -- and we all remember those days -- was so full of boastful arrogance. Why, I remember the members on the opposite side firmly proclaiming the problems of society would be resolved before they left office, that it would only be a short time. Well, I remember particularly the remarks of the Member for St. George and I reminded him at that time because I followed him on that occasion too. I reminded him at that time that it wouldn't matter how long they were in office there were still going to be a lot of problems remaining.

Well, Sir, the second one, the second Speech from the Throne still demonstrated some confidence in their programs, still led us to believe that theirs was the right way and it was going to lead us to the Kingdom of Heaven. The third one was constructive although there was an aura of some consternation in the tenor of that particular speech. But this last one, this last one demonstrated an attitude of bewilderment, disarray, retreat, seeking desperately to find somebody to blame their problems on, and particularly the Federal Government, and what they don't realize, Sir, in blaming their problems on the Federal Government they're blaming them on a Socialist government and their attitude, as demonstrated by the Leader of the NDP Party in Ottawa, was that they believe that this country is suffering from a dose of strychnine and the way to cure that patient is to give him a double dose, and that's exactly what would happen if my honourable friends opposite ever -- or this country ever had the misfortune of seeing them arrive in power in Ottawa in the unlikely, in the unlikely event that that might happen.

Now they talked about the 300 or so bills that they introduced and said, well, you know all of those bills, 300 of them; never such a record in the history of this country. Well, let's take a look at some of those bills. Here's one, Bill No. 72 passed last year, an Act to amend The Public Servants Insurance Act. "Subsection (2) of the Act is repealed. This Act comes into force on the day it receives Royal Assent." Now this, Sir, demonstrates a direction of government. This was one of the 300.

And now Bill 68, an Act to amend The Wheat Board Money Trust Act. Under Bill 68 they set up -- "Section 10 of the Act is amended by striking out clauses (c) and (d) and substituting therefor the following clauses: (c) in making grants are hereinafter provided", and "(d) in providing expense of the Board and its members," -- they never forgot that. "Section 11 of the Act is repealed and the following subsection is substituted therefor" -- and that again deals with remuneration. And that, Sir, certainly demonstrates a direction that this government is going.

An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act, Bill 67, Section 4 of The Crown Attorneys Act being chapter (c) 330 of the Revised Statutes as amended, by numbering the present section as subsection (1) and by adding thereto at the end thereof the following subsection: "students acting as Crown attorneys" and goes on to describe how that happened. Now there certainly is demonstrated a direction of government in those three bills and the fourth one is the same.

Bill 59, an Act to amend The Corrections Act: "a person entitled to alimony or maintenance payments under a judgment or order of the court" -- you ought to read this -- "of the Court of Queen's Bench or the County Court may file a copy of a judgment or order in the

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . . Family Court having jurisdiction where the person ordered to pay alimony or maintenance resides, and when so filed a judgment or order may be enforced in the same manner as if a judgment or order was made by that Family Court." -- (Interjection) -- Of course. Of course. We supported it, they say. It demonstrates a direction, and the point that I'm attempting to make, and I know I won't get through to the Minister of Labour, is that the 300 bills that they claimed that made such a tremendous difference in the lives of the people of this province are demonstrated in those four that I've just put on the record. Now I submit, Sir, I submit, Sir, that there are perhaps somewhat less than 300 that establish a direction of this government, and I suggest also, Sir, that that direction is one of regression rather than progression.

Well, Sir, then the Attorney-General rose in his place and demonstrated that he has developed a capacity for debate which he certainly didn't have when he first came into this Chamber, while flailing his arms in ensuring that we kept awake and loudly proclaiming that the words that were uttered by the leader of the party, by the Member for Lakeside, were indeed false, and he used as an example, I think, a rather unfortunate one. He said -- I'll have to paraphrase him because I am not going to take the trouble of looking up his words -- but he said, "and for the farmers we have done such wonderful things." He said that we had derided them when they had brought that test case before the Supreme Court dealing with the Egg Marketing Board, and I don't think that that is an accurate statement to begin with because I don't recall anybody deriding it. As a matter of fact I think, if I recall correctly, we applauded the government on the very few occasions that we have reason to applaud the government for taking that action. But, Sir, what happened? What happened after that decision had been handed down by the Supreme Court, after this government had established the trade barriers between provinces are not constitutional. Did they follow that up as they should have followed it up and insisted? The Minister of Agriculture shakes his head vertically, indicating that he is in agreement. But what really happened is that the Minister of Agriculture was down in Montreal the very next week working out a plan to share markets in this country, working out a plan to ensure that Manitoba egg producers would never have an opportunity to compete in the markets in Canada.

SOME MEMBERS: That's nonsense.

MR. JORGENSEN: Ah nonsense, they say; nonsense, they say. They divided this province up or they divided this country up -- (Interjection) -- Oh no, oh no. Oh no, he didn't do that alone. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, he did that at the request of the Minister of Agriculture from the Province of Quebec with the assistance of the Minister of Agriculture of the Province of Ontario. And why shouldn't they? Those two provinces, those two provinces, Sir, in Ontario and Quebec have many advantages that we don't have in this province. They have the advantages of the sea lanes, they have the advantages of density of population, better markets. They have many advantages in manufacturing that we don't have in western Canada but there is one advantage that we do have in this province and that is the advantage of being able to produce live-stock and poultry products cheaper and better than any other province in Canada. That advantage, Sir, and that advantage, Sir, was taken away from us, given away by the Minister of Agriculture when he attended that meeting. Now he pointed out -- (Interjection) -- No. No. I will not permit a question. My honourable friends opposite, they get hilarious when a member refuses to answer a question. The purpose of debate in this Chamber is to give one member an opportunity to make his remarks and you can reply any time you like. There is nothing stopping you from doing that and I hope you'll take advantage of that.

. . . . continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, my point arises from the last comment made by the Honourable Member for Morris when he said that the purpose of debate in this Chamber was to allow honourable members to make their point, and I should like to know, Sir, if the rules of the House do not also insist that along with that comes a demand for accuracy.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Sir, when my honourable friend the First Minister talks about accuracy he'd better relate his remarks to members of his own Cabinet, the members of the government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister on a point of privilege? Order please, Order, please. One at a time. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I understand that if a person makes an incorrect statement, that it is the right of another person about whom he is making his statement, he has the right to challenge at the moment. Am I not right?

MR. JORGENSEN: You have the right . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege, . . . ten provinces got together to divide the Canadian market, and that is not true.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. Now when I ask for order it's on your behalf, not on mine. I can sit here and listen to it all evening. I would like to suggest to honourable gentlemen that they do consider their behaviour in this Assembly, all of them -- and ladies, I'm sorry. I think we're all trying to do our best. I'm only here to guide you according to your rules. I shall do my utmost. If you will do the same, I'm sure we can expedite the work of this House. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, thank you and I hope that the time that was taken up during this interjection will not be counted against me. But I would like to read into the record the wise words of the Minister of Labour who was acting as House Leader, and they were delivered in this House just last night. " . . . appeal to you all, the members of the House, to respect the decorum of this House. There is an honourable member of this House speaking" -- who just happened to be on that side of the House last night -- "and I think that it is historic in this Assembly that every member is given an ample opportunity to express his views. I commend those views to honourable gentlemen opposite."

Well, Sir, the Attorney-General attempted to demonstrate the activities of the Provincial Government in bringing that particular case before the courts, and I commend them for it, but I deplore the subsequent actions of the government in refusing to follow up the advantages that were made by the decision and allowing the market to disintegrate.

Sir, the other day, during the course of the Throne Speech, the government saw fit to insert into that speech credit for the rising price of hogs on the Manitoba compulsory Hog Marketing Board. They said that since -- and I'll just paraphrase that; I'm sure the honourable minister will remember it because he smiled quite sheepishly when that passage was read. He said that since the Hog Marketing Board was established on the 1st of January we've been pleased to note that the price of hogs has risen steadily since -- the price of hogs in Omaha, St. Louis, all across the United States. That was the action, Sir. That was the action of the Hog Marketing Board, if you will, in the Province of Manitoba. One percent of the hogs. Case of the rather large tail wagging the small dog. But, that wasn't what a marketing board should do for the people of the North American continent. But what happens in our own country?

Sir, I have before me the Poultry Producers Market Report, February 19th, 1972, and I only desire to put some figures on the record as a result of a statement made by the Minister the other day on the By-Line, which is a favourite habitat of my honourable friends opposite, when he said that the reason for the chaos in the egg industry was free enterprise. Well, Sir, just let me quote you some prices. We've got some pretty bad free enterprisers in this country if they can't do better than this. In Victoria and in Vancouver the price of eggs to the producers in that province, 48 cents a dozen. The price of eggs in Winnipeg, that is A-large, the price of eggs in Winnipeg at the same time, 14 to 18 cents a dozen. Sir, 30 cents a dozen difference between the Province of Manitoba and the Province of British Columbia. Now if there are any free enterprisers allowed to operate in this country, it costs about five cents a dozen to ship eggs into that province. Look at the profit -- 25 cents a dozen a shipper could make by shipping eggs to those provinces, if they could. 42 cents a dozen. I'll just check that to make sure that



(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd): . . . . I'm right. 42 cents a dozen. That, Sir, is not the result of the free enterprise system. For the benefit of my friend the Member for St. George, that is the result of socialism. That is the result of closing off markets and preventing free trade between provinces, and if free enterprisers in this country were given an opportunity to operate without the restrictions imposed upon them by virtue of marketing boards in the province of British Columbia, those --(Interjection)-- Yes. Yes. I don't care where it comes from. Socialism is socialism whether it comes from the Conservative Party, the Liberal Party, the Social Credit Party or the NDP Party. What I'm suggesting to you, that socialism by whatever name you want to call it is bad for this country.

Now the Attorney-General again demonstrated on behalf of the government a complete incapacity to govern this province. Sir, he couldn't even plan a 40-minute speech. He had to speak extra time, and that is the kind of planning that we've been getting from honourable gentlemen opposite ever since they came to power.

The Minister of Autopac had some words to say when he arose in his place to defend the indefensible, and I don't care what the Minister says; he can call it by whatever name he wants to call it, he can justify by whatever means he wants to justify it; the facts are as demonstrated in a letter that I received the other day from somebody that is concerned, somebody who is feeling the effects of the Minister's policy. He says, "My driver's license cost me \$2.00 for two years. This year it cost me \$2.50 plus \$5.00 for insurance, which I already had with a private company. Then my license plates used to cost me \$18.00 before. This year they cost me \$21.00 plus \$16.00 extra for a \$50.00 deductible clause, and my insurance cost me \$43.00 whereas my insurance with a private company cost me \$42.00 for a \$25.00 deductible, which means it cost me \$25.50 more under the NDP this year to run my car for \$50.00 deductible than it did under the other government. That, Sir, is an example . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member please table the letter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has five minutes, then he can make his point.

MR. JORGENSEN: Five minutes. That'll just give me enough time to put this letter on the record. I'll read it in its entirety and then table it. The letter to me, it's addressed to me, and it says, "Honourable Sir," - that's a little bit flattering but I appreciate the title

"I am getting awfully tired of the NDP fanatics phoning into the hot lines" - and he must be talking about Joe, "and writing to the editors of papers in praise of the NDP. I believe they pay those people to keep up this brainwashing. I spent 15 years in Saskatchewan under the CCF and they carried on the same program, and they stayed in power as long as . . ." and here he takes a strip off us, "as long as the two old parties remain split. Always they were elected on a minority vote which you have noticed has also happened here in Manitoba. As long as they're in power and remain in power, everything keeps going up and up. They're greedy for money and many of them in Saskatchewan became wealthy while in power. Why do you old parties not look up and study the Saskatchewan records? They took over 17 businesses in that province and all but three went broke and out of existence. In 20 years the population never increased by one person, and many businesses closed down and left the province. I'm complaining because, according to my figures, the NDP have increased my cost of living by \$10.00 per month in the last year. First, I'm an old age pensioner, 74 years old, and I have trouble walking as my legs are not so good any more. I'm a veteran of both wars and the Korean War, so I need a car as I have to go ten miles to a shopping centre for --(Interjections)-- groceries." -- (Interjections)-- Yeah, I know -- you see, you see, Sir -- (Interjections)--

A MEMBER: That's what they think of old age pensioners.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. JORGENSEN: "This year" -- and then I've read that part, I'll skip that . . . the part that I read put on the record. --(Interjections)-- "Which means it cost me \$25.50 more under the NDP this year to run my car for \$50.00 deductible. I have driven my own car for 46 years, was in charge of a field artillery transport of 185 vehicles; I have trained hundreds of drivers, and sat on the Driver Testing Board with two other officers in five different camps that I was stationed in. My military record will prove this. I have never as much as received a parking ticket in 46 years of driving. They have re-assessed our property and raised my taxes by \$30.00 last year on my home. Heating fuel was raised three cents per gallon, gasoline by one cent, now milk by three cents, and the cost of living in rural areas has gone up by about an average of \$10.00 a month. The storekeepers claim the bigger freight costs due to higher government transport licenses.

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . . .

"We in the rural areas do not have a chance to take advantage of the sales put on by the larger towns and cities by the chain stores. I receive a small disability pension and a small superannuation pension. The Old Age Security has been very generous with their supplements, and I receive \$4.80 a month Veterans' Allowance, but when my superannuation goes up two per cent it is deducted from Veterans' Allowance. Now I'm told the supplemental will go up \$2.00 in April and I expect that will cut off my Veterans' Allowance, as it will not allow you to go beyond the ceiling of \$271.00 for a married couple.

"True, my medical and drug needs are cared for, but my wife not being old enough yet for Old Age Security, I have to supply her medical and drug needs which have been considerable for the past five years since she had three vertebrae crushed in her spine. I have known veterans who have had to apply for welfare in order to supply the income in order to live respectably and pay their way. This is the way the NDP help the old age pensioners, and I'm getting pretty well fed up with them. I often wonder if Mr. Schreyer and a lot of his Ministers are confirmed liars or if they think the population are a bunch of brainless fools who can't figure out these things for themselves, especially when they go to Saskatchewan to extoll the virtues of Autopac and take up half the news period on CTV extolling their own wonderful government and how they are helping the poor, the aged and the little men. You have my permission to use this letter in the House or elsewhere as I have the facts to back this up. Respectfully yours, Mr. Clark."

Sir, a complete answer to the claims of honourable gentlemen opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. JORGENSEN: If you give me extra time . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Well yes, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to ask the honourable member, seasoned politician that he is, veteran of many years, whether it's normal practice of his to rest his whole case on one letter.

MR. JORGENSEN: Sir, I wasn't intending to do that at all, but the Minister of Finance wanted that letter. I gave it to him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was not prepared to speak tonight, but it is with a lot of regret that I stand up here tonight and find that on all that bench over there they have nobody that's prepared to stand up and defend this Speech from the Throne. Isn't that interesting? Isn't that interesting, Mr. Speaker? This great government, these new saviours of the world that's got all these new ideas and all these new ideologies, in standing up in the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne, they got nobody tonight to put on the floor. -- (Interjections)-- Isn't that funny, Mr. Speaker? Well, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to rise to my feet at this particular time, and bring you greetings. I thought that some member over there would follow the Honourable Member for Morris, and then I would likely get a few minutes in at the last, but regrettably they haven't got the people over there capable of standing up and defending this Speech from the Throne, so I will do my best to help you.

Mr. Speaker, I bring you greetings and best wishes from all the fine people of Roblin constituency, and wish you every success in your deliberations, and I'm sure under your guidance and your wisdom the House will carry on in a steady, pulsing beat and Manitoba will progress. I wish you every success in your office.

I would like to congratulate the new Member from Minnedosa, the new members of Cabinet, and all the various people that have changed office in the past few months that we have been away. I express the regrets of the people of Roblin constituency for the condolences and I support the resolutions of condolence that the First Minister placed before the Order Paper today.

And, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the mover and the seconder, and it's unfortunate that they haven't got anybody else that's got the guts to stand up and talk over there, but we had a mover and seconder - maybe next year there'll only be a mover; they won't be able to find somebody to second the Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

But how can Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity progress with that type of a government and that type of backbench that haven't got the, you know, the talent or the people to stand up and defend this Speech from the Throne. So here is the Honourable Member from Roblin standing up and trying to help you.

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd): . . . . .

I'll very briefly speak just a little about my constituency, the Parkland area. The region's economy basically over the last, well, hundred years, has been based traditionally on agriculture and forestry. Wheat, livestock, lumber, pulpwood and so on have kept the backbone of the economy of that area reasonably good in the last 50 years, and there's been some commercial fishing and some recreation. And slowly, Mr. Speaker, the picture of this parkland region in rural Manitoba has changed considerably. There's been great changes and the changes that we anticipate and did anticipate with this government, we thought that we were going to really move out there; but unfortunately it hasn't happened, although I hope that even with this kind of a government, Mr. Speaker, that agriculture will still continue to provide the dominant economic activity that's so lacking in that part of this province today, and I dare say in all of rural Manitoba today.

The Parkland region's recreation and tourism potential is regarded by many experts, Mr. Speaker, as one with a great future in this province. In fact, almost three quarters of the region that I represent, Roblin constituency, has unlimited tourist potential. All we've got to do is develop it. But how are you going to develop it, Mr. Speaker, with this kind of a government, or, you know, a new Minister now, and of course if he's a new Minister he's got all his political problems that he had over the past four or five years in this House, changing coats, moving around, and now he's the Minister of Tourism taking over a new portfolio, and nothing has happened in that particular department.

But I'm here prepared tonight and all the people of the parkland area are prepared to help this Minister and this government to move, and let's get something going. Let's develop and help the Federal Government develop the Riding Mountain National Park instead of closing it up. I heard this Minister stand up, or the First Minister, and challenge the federal people today. Clear Lake, the biggest tourist attraction we have in rural Manitoba, and we're closing it up. I want to hear this Minister and I want to hear this government challenge the federal people. If they're not provided to, let's take it over ourselves. I said that last year and I say it again. I say let's develop the Duck Mountain National Park, and let's develop it; let's put some money in there and do something. Let's develop Asessippi Provincial Park. Asessippi was approved the same time as Bird's Hill. That's the days of the Weir and the Roblin - - Nothing's happened out there. There's absolutely nothing. The Shellmouth Dam. What's happened there? The dam's been built. Nothing has happened. Absolutely nothing.

The ski slopes around this province. What's happened to the ski slopes around Agassiz. Sure they're there. They're skiing. What has this government done to go in and develop the tourist potential that's so needed in rural Manitoba today, and help these rural people to move, and we can move if we get some guidance and we get a government that will give us some drive and put some bucks in the treasury and let's go and develop this industry. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that's not going to happen.

Let's develop some of the 37 beaches that are out in the Parkland region. There's all kinds of things we can do. Where are the tourist lodges, the museums, or the picnic spots or the roadside parks? And on and on it goes but unfortunately the potential there, Mr. Speaker, is unlimited and I am sure all across this province -- I am only speaking for my own constituency but across this province the potential in tourism must be unlimited, and all we've got to do is get in and get with it, and I'm prepared to help. And I noticed in a recent press release from the Honourable Minister, Mr. Speaker, that he agrees with me in the things that I am saying here tonight. He agrees when I said that the input of government money in this program has been nil - nil - in tourism. He agreed in a press release the other day and he said that - and I'll have to paraphrase it - but he said I think that the money that's required to build a base for future tourism and recreational facilities in this province is unlimited. But unfortunately in the same release, Mr. Speaker, this Honourable Minister goes on to say that funds are very limited, and that's what I am trying to get across to the First Minister and to the Minister. You have missed the boat. You have missed the boat. And the Minister went on further in the press release to state, and he said that any major responsibility for building recreational and tourist facilities in this province rests with the people of the rural community - the responsibility. Now that gives you an idea of the direction and the drive of this government, Mr. Speaker. The direction and the potential must come from the local people.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Does the Honourable Minister have a point of order?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This is a statement I have never made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, when I'm finished speaking, I'll give the Honourable Minister the release that I'm speaking from. The Minister went on and further in his release he said, "Our aim re-stated is to create local interest so that people will be encouraged to do things for themselves," and I'm all for that policy but in rural Manitoba it's pretty damn tough to start building a tourist industry today for yourself, and I'm only, with the best of my ability, trying to help the First Minister and this Minister to move on this and we can do a lot of things and I think that statement, Mr. Speaker, is most worthy. That was a most worthy statement of the Minister. But Mr. Speaker, how can that Minister or that government, at the same time, when you can pick up a daily newspaper and almost every day you say they get \$100,000, they get \$50,000, they get \$70,000, they get \$80,000 - how can he tell the people of rural Manitoba on one hand, "You've got to do it yourselves," and when you walk out the other side of the door they're adding the money out on the other side.

How can you in all sincerity make those kind of statements and expect this province to move ahead and progress? How can this government completely fail the people of this province with that type of policy or that type of direction, and I'm sure the tourist industry is continuing to try and do their best, but as I read from the . . . that came from the meeting that we held here the other day in the city, the package deal, the tourist industry told the Minister and his staff, in no uncertain terms, the same things that I'm trying to get across here tonight, Mr. Speaker; that we are continuing to neglect Manitoba due to the complete lack of leadership in the tourism industry, and that's the statement I think that most people are saying. We're failing to provide the funds that are so necessary and the capital promotion that's so necessary to develop tourism in this province.

And Mr. Speaker, let me just give you some figures. Last year in the estimates of the Tourist portion of the Budget, I think the item was some \$974,000 for that aspect of the Department's budget, of which, as I understand, some \$425,000 was spend on advertising; so that leaves roughly \$500,000 for the tourism facet of the department. Is that progress, Mr. Speaker? Is that progress? Can you in all sincerity give any credit to this government or to this Minister for having provided that much needed leadership and development that we have asked for all the years that I've been in opposition, and ask them to help to promote this industry that needs all this injection of capital and leadership? With \$500,000 it can't be done. It can't be done. It's estimated from figures that the Minister has seen and I'm sure all members opposite have seen that over three million tourists came to this province in 1970 and they spent some \$135 million. In 1971 the figures that I have in my file said that there was an estimated 3 1/4 million dollars spent by some 440,000,000 tourists in this province, and that's big business, Mr. Speaker. That's big business. Big business, but the government, this government has failed to recognize the tremendous potential that the tourist industry can provide to boost our lagging economy with that kind of a budget, and I say, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure the Minister will stand up and tell me and support me, we should have a budget ten times the size of the budget that was presented in this House last year, if we are serious. Nine hundred seventy-four thousand dollars - the tourist facet of the department. -- (Interjection) I got the copy right in my desk. So in all sincerity, Manitoba's got to be lagging behind with that type of a budget and that type of program. What can you do with \$500,000 today when there is that kind of money being spent? It's people that are doing this themselves. But this government said that they were going to move in, they were going to have all the answers. They were going to provide us with the leadership and they were going to provide us with the guidance, but unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it hasn't happened and Manitoba, in its push to gain a full share of the tourist dollars that are up for grabs . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Does the Honourable Minister have a point of order?

MR. DESJARDINS: I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: So Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, due to the fact that they haven't got anybody that's prepared to speak tonight on this Throne Speech Debate, I am standing here, trying to help this government and this Minister on behalf of myself and the people of my constituency, so let's get this province moving and let's get with it, and I want this government and I want this Minister and I want this province to move and stand up; and let's in the debates

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd) . . . . when the estimates do come up, let's insist that there be ten times as much money plowed into the facet of the department to take advantage of these millions of dollars that have been up for grabs year after year. --(Interjection) -- Well, the opportunity -- the Honourable Member for Churchill is as involved in this debate as I am, but the opportunity lies right on our doorstep and it lies on the doorstep of this Minister and this government, and let's get on with the job.

We can, in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, we can expand that \$140 million likely to \$200 million if this government will move and do something. That's \$60 million if the government will provide us with the much needed drive and the leadership that are so necessary to stimulate the lagging economy of this province. And it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, I came across some figures the other day and it said for every \$15,000 that a tourist spends in this province, you can hire one person. For every \$15,000 that's expended in this province, you can hire one person. One man year of employment for every \$15,000 that's expended. Now, a growth rate in the tourist industry of about 15 percent in the figures the way I've calculated them will provide 1,000 additional man year jobs. And those are interesting figures if we move from the 140 million to the 200, and those realities and expectations are likely going to happen because there are people that like to travel across this country and let's take advantage of those things and keep them moving and injecting money into our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I think that of the impact, both directly and indirectly, that full development of the tourist industry can provide, the much needed service -- I happen to be in the service industries out in the country and it's tough running a store out in the country today. But here's the Shellmouth Dam and the Asessippi Provincial Park that's been there now since 1960. Nothing's happened. They still haven't been officially opened. -- (Interjection) -- And so we get an argument with the bureaucracy over where the gate's going to be and they won't even listen to us. To show you the problems: Bird's Hill Park was opened when? Three years ago. Asessippi, Spruce Woods, those parks were all bought on the line by the Roblin government at the same time and the Asessippi Provincial Park is still not open, neither is the Shellmouth Dam. Can you tell me that that's progress and drive and push by this government? No. No way. No way. And Mr. Speaker, the tourist industry is such an interesting type of industry once you start to explore it. Look at the potential of the summer time. Let's say 50 percent of the employment that's generated through the tourists will likely occur in the months of July, August and September or late June - in those months, and most of those jobs are limited to that time period, are suitable for the large numbers of our young people who flood the labour market when school closes. The bulk of those jobs don't require any skills or organization or any previous training, but by expanding the industry and the employment, look at the opportunities that are available for our young people. We expand their ability to continue their education and training that they want to do, and they supplement their incomes and everything moves forward. --(Interjection)-- Right. Right. And it should have been a thousand; it should have been a thousand. In effect, Mr. Speaker, I submit, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a wide availability of summer work to these young people is one of the most effective ways that this government and Manitoba can equalize opportunity for youth, fair and square, and there will be equality and equalization and opportunity for youth, regardless of the economic position of their families.

Another facet of it when you start studying, Mr. Speaker, that it's 25 percent of the employment that's generated under an expansionist program and of course this government doesn't understand what that term means - expansionist program; I don't think that's in their dictionary; but in the dictionary and the one that I'm using, it says that 25 percent of the employment generated under an expansionist program will occur in the five-month period from mid-May until mid-October. And these jobs would be available to students from the universities and the community colleges who get out different than the school terms, and by offering employment insurance, Mr. Speaker, to these young people will vastly again increase their ability to go out and seek jobs and work for themselves.

Another facet, Mr. Speaker, it says that 25 percent of the employment generated by the tourist growth will be permanent employees, largely in the service industries, and if the Minister would go around the province and take a look at some of the problems that the service industries are having today, here is an opportunity for them to pick up this much needed injection of capital and stimulus to help them provide a business that will give them a way of life.

So let's in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, try and impress upon this Minister - and no doubt he may have some problems communicating in that government, it's quite evident, but I hope

(MR. MCKENIZE cont'd) . . . . that when he brings his Estimates in that he will give us an expanded tourism program that will provide wide opportunities to the small, to the medium sized businesses in this province, to the young people, to the lodges, to the camps, to the retail outlets, to the service operations, and if he does I'm sure we will get some of the much needed injection of capital in the tourist industry that's so needed in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that I can't support the motion of the mover and the seconder brought in the reply to the Speech from the Throne.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 9:30, according to our Rule 32 it is incumbent upon me to ask for your pleasure in regard to the amendment to the amendment. Are you ready for the question?

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. PATRICK: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order, please. The call for division is on the amendment to the amendment on the Speech from the Throne.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Blake, Einarson, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Henderson, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Moug, Patrick, Sherman, Watt, and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Borowski, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski, and Walding.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 21; Nays 29.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost. Are you ready for the amendment. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, unless anybody wishes to speak, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if before my honourable friend speaks and as a normal custom which has prevailed in this House would be after he has finished his contribution then that the adjournment will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster. (Agreed) Fine.

MR. SPEAKER: The only problem is the Honourable House Leader places the Chair in difficulty because the speech will not be concluded in 40 minutes. We only have 20 minutes to go. Is that agreeable? All right. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The way everything's worked out I got two rounds of applause for the cost of one. I appreciate that very much and I promise the Minister for Inkster that by 10 o'clock tonight I'll be cleaned up. I'm known as the fastest gun in Charleswood for short speeches, brief, get to the point, and make room for those that --(Interjection) -- fireplace, right, strictly fireplace. Right.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker -- I don't appreciate that, Bud -- at any rate, Mr. Speaker, I would like to along with the rest of our Party extend congratulations to you. I think I'll join some of our other members in the type of congratulations they extended particularly to the mover, I think he did a poor job for himself, the City of St. Vital and for the NDP Party, for the government. I think he did a poor job for everybody. I think that he went in a shotgun fashion after everybody not knowing what he was talking about basically and doing an injustice to the people that he represents. He went after our party, the Liberal Party, every party that's stood in this House over the years, he went after everybody. He's making fun of Izzy Asper who's never been to the polls yet, never put his name on a ballot yet and he says, "this guy can't win". He forgets that in 1969 he didn't win; he had to go back a second time. I don't see anything so bad off about the Leader of the Liberal Party so far, he hasn't lost an election yet. So far he has not lost an election. --(Interjection) -- Maybe, maybe, we'll see. I'm not here to boost Liberals tonight, I'm here basically to speak a little bit on Unicity.

I think with the new Unicity bill that went through last year I think the government failed the people sadly in certain areas. Anybody that's living within the City of Winnipeg should be able to pick up their phone and phone in to let City Hall know they got a tax problem, let the Fire Department know they got a fire; they should be able to contact a doctor, a hospital because they're going to be paying the heavy price in taxes. If they pay as big a tax bill as the

(MR. MOUG cont'd) . . . . people that live at the corner of Portage and Main I think they should have the phone privileges. The taxes are high and heavy at Portage and Main, I agree, but from all reports and everything that's on the way I think that the people in Headingley are going to be paying the same fare; so I think that we have to look at that, particularly in the phone area, and also in the people that's been brought into the Unicity area that are farming, agriculture is going to be a problem.

I know several people that's had to pack up market gardening in the North Kildonan area on account of taxes and assessment. The same things going to happen to those in the range and the bigger farms. We have a farmer out there with 2,600 acres, it's a family farm, the government won't feel sorry for him because they say if he's got 2,600 acres let him pay the taxes. But 2,600 acres with a \$10.00 increase in taxes is \$26,000 and that man can't pay it off that land; he's not making \$26,000 a year on that land now, not with the agriculture economy that he's faced with. So if they don't move in there and do something about the cost these men are going to be forced off the farm, they can't sell it, nobody wants it. It's too far removed from Portage and Main to every be developed in the next 20 years. Some of that farm land is close to 20 miles away from Portage and Main.

When I asked the Minister responsible for Urban Affairs the other day he said he didn't know about it until he read it in the paper. We were informed a day earlier not to trust the paper, and the Member for Morris went into that pretty good tonight. But you wonder how these people out there, they pay this farm tax and they may get an exemption simply because the Minister responsible for Urban Affairs happened to read the paper here some two weeks ago. He didn't let the seconder, the Member for Ste. Rose know about that because the Member for Ste. Rose says, "Ask yourself this question", he points to the press, "are you being honest". And also the Member from Pembina got the same answer when he asked if a copy of the speech was made because it was looking like it was changing the government's attitude to how this aid to schools is going to go, you know. --(Interjection)-- Well we thought it might. We read the paper and we didn't want to have you misinterpret it so we asked for a copy of your speech and No, it's not available, just read the newspaper that's all. --(Interjection)-- Well we were told by the Member for Ste. Rose. You look over your shoulder and tell that fellow behind you. He says, "ask yourself this question", this is what he says to the press and the press is being questioned, it's not to be trusted. --(Interjection)-- Well, you were saying that - you said "I'm speaking to the people in the press gallery". Somebody dig me out that Hansard there, will you? Secunder's speech. It'll only take me a minute to read it.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, to go on to the costs that are going to be created in the several areas I think one of the reasons for these costs could be that we're over administrated in the City of Winnipeg. I did some checking, I was looking in the paper one night, the Tribune of January 4th and it says the cost of the Winnipeg Councils costs is the highest in the west. It says that Vancouver, Calgary and Edmonton run their administration cheaper than what does the City of Winnipeg. So I checked --(Interjection)-- they're talking about everything, because I have something here. My daughter while attending school had a class project and it was . . . Grade 9 - no, pardon me, Grade 10, St. Mary's Academy - and she was asked to do a class project on some urban work and she wrote to the City of Edmonton, Mayor Ivor Dent and he sent her a letter. She wrote to the City of Calgary and a certain Mr. A. J. Hendry, on behalf of Mayor Sykes of the City of Calgary, he wrote her a letter. So getting away from the press, just ask yourselves.

I direct my remarks not only to the members of the opposition but also I cast my eyes to the press gallery where many of my friends sit. I don't know if he's talking about friends when he said this or after or before -- where many of my friends sit. I say, Sir, Mr. Speaker, let them ask this question, let them ask this question, "ask yourself, have I been honest". Ask yourself that question. So after seeing this and after having read this January 14th I said to myself that is garbage. That's garbage because it was in the newspaper, the Member for Ste. Rose, one of the Saints, the Almighty Saints says that that's no good. So I asked my daughter if I could borrow these so it says according to that the City of Edmonton has a mayor who receives \$20,000; 12 aldermen at \$5,400, \$64,800. Calgary has a mayor \$21,900; 12 aldermen \$43,200 --(Interjection)-- No, just a minute. You let me finish. You'll get your chance. I don't know if you have anything to say when you get up but you'll get your chance.

Now Edmonton, their total cost is \$84,800 with a population in the 490,000 bracket, just under the half million. Calgary has 61,500, with a total administration cost of the two cities within the one province is what I'm referring to, of \$145,000. Now somebody across there

(MR. MOUG cont'd) . . . . with all their knowledge could tell me what the population of Calgary is. I think it's around 350,000. So they're administrating two cities one with close to half a million, one with 350,000, they're administrating those two cities in the one province for \$145,000. I'm not going to administrators, commissioners, chief commissioners, nobody, but they all have them and I just tell you - and I can get a copy of this letter for you, because it mentions on here that the Chief Commissioner gets \$30,000. Now that is less than our Chief Commissioner gets here. But what I'm trying to get across is strictly indemnities to the mayors and the councillors. We have one mayor and fifty councillors here for a total of \$303,000. We got 537,000 people. Now if the people in Headingley can afford this, fine, I agree, we'll have it, but I have to say that if they have got to pick up the phone and pay 15 cents to phone into a \$303,000 administration for indemnities alone - not going anywhere near commissioners, etc., etc., I say the government made a mistake.

So I ask you across the way, what happened to common sense. We lost all sense of common sense in the last session when we did this. We went into it, it was one thing that the government could do pass a bill in here where they didn't have to lay taxes on to income tax, they didn't have to add sales tax, they didn't have to do anything except pass the bill and face the music; but you got to face the music and there's an election coming up next year, maybe this. I ask you one favour, I'll speak to the second Deputy Premier in line, don't call the election please until you send out that real property tax bill to these people. Then call the election and see how you make out. Because you'll be on your back fast . . .

The councillors you have, the fifty councillors you have, as much money you're spending on indemnity of \$303,000, they're underpaid. These men won't stay on for \$5,700. It's just a little bit of common sense what I told you when you were setting it up, just about everywhere you look a councillor makes half the amount the mayor makes and it's justified, it's always justified. And one-third of it is tax free. But when you start out with the setup you have got today you're in trouble and you're not going to get out of it. You made some smart moves.

I wish the Premier was here, the Premier's not in his place. I want to put this on record anyways. Because I remember somewhere around the time the election was going on in B.C., the Premier made statements out there. I'll get back to them in a minute. It was in the fall of '69 shortly after our government was elected. But I give the government credit for what they're doing. They take the committee out to the people, they take the Agriculture Committee out, they take the Municipal Affairs Committee out, to get good turnouts. They take 12 people, 15 people out to The Pas. This saves The Pas coming in in numbers of 50 or 60 to see 12 people. And I admire the government for that. They did it with the Agricultural Committee, they went all over the province where it meant anything - it brought that committee out, and I agree with that. It costs less to take this committee of 16 out than it does to bring the several hundred taxpayers in. This way everybody gets a hearing, and I agree with it.

When the Premier went to Vancouver, went out there to do a bit of unsuccessful campaigning, the Social Credits didn't even send Jake out and . . . but the NDP sent out their top level, Premier of the Province of Manitoba, this little guy catches the vote, you see. So he gets out there and he figured he'll put a little bit of cream on top of the cake. He gets out there and he says, there's kickbacks being accepted by the previous administrations, and this is his shotgun fashion, all and sundry accept kickbacks for the past one hundred years. He says this province was 99 years old that day, kickbacks being accepted. He says he knows that when he came back here we'd question him. An architect phoned me in my office, and said: "Where do I send the cheque?" This was the old fashion of how we used to run the government here. We held the committee in 254, went after the people to come to the committee, and this apparently, according to the Premier, this was how the kickbacks were accepted. We stayed in our office and waited for the phone calls, and we got the kickbacks. But now the way the Premier has decided, to send the committee to the people, he sends a bagman to the people.

A cute little guy comes up, phones you first, comes out to your door, wants money. Not money like the previous administration, just give us a couple of thousand bucks, you know. And he sits down, and he says: "I live in Middlechurch on a 15-acre estate". And if the Premier was here, and I wish he was, because I'd give him the advice - if I had a man out collecting money for me and he was living on a 15-acre estate, I wouldn't let him count the money first, I would suspect him. I would want to count the money first; maybe this guy's taking two for the Premier and one for me, I don't know. But this is the situation - I often wondered how the Premier trusts a man in this position, to live on a 15-acre estate. This is



(MR. MOUG cont'd) . . . . the people's government, an open government, it's for the working man. This is the kind of government we got today. They go to the people, not only with their committees . . .

A MEMBER: Also with their hands out.

MR. MOUG: Right. With the bag - they got the bagman. So they ask for a contribution, and to offset - something I saw in the paper here the other day - the Minister of Municipal Affairs said that the only thing he saw on this insurance business was three follow-ups where actually people who were paying more than they were to the private enterprises, to the private industry insurance. Well, I think I know where he got the three names, because I'll bring you three contractors in Charleswood that the bagman hit by phone call first out there and spoke to them and those three people said: "Yeah, well we" - the first one did - he was the only one that trapped them successfully. He said: "We have already given to the NDP government". And they said "Oh, sorry, didn't know that, we didn't mean duplication like this". "Well," he said, "you didn't actually get an out and out cheque, but," he said, "I have a 35 percent increase in my insurance. I paid \$900.00 higher than I usually pay." Well of course, the government wasn't out to try and pacify this man in the first instance to keep his insurance going and collect his vote, because that man's only got one vote, him and his wife maybe and one or two children. He was after the others where all he wanted from this contractor, was not necessarily a vote, he wanted a little money, put it in the bag, get some money in the bag to bring down here and offset that \$72,000 deficit.

But when the Minister of Municipal Affairs responsible for Autopac says he only found three, it's odd that that's all I found too that out and out come to me and said it in that many words. But there were these three contractors in Charleswood, and they're available, I can get them for you any time.

Now briefly - I'm running into nothing but bad luck tonight - I wanted to speak in regards -- to make one or two comments in regards to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation and he's not here. I have to get this on the record, Sir. Our Legion, as I mentioned earlier today, are hosting the Dominion Play-downs for the Royal Canadian Legion and our branch is hosting it. So they wrote a letter on November 11th, the day off when legionnaires have to do their work on the day off, that the secretary looking after this playdown wrote the government a letter on November 11th and she got a reply and it was dated March 13th from the Executive Council, who I thought the Minister of Tourism and Recreation was a member. "The Government Hospitality Committee has been giving consideration to the request that you submitted to the Premier some little time ago" - four months and two days. The Provincial Government's Hospitality Committee recognizes the holding of the National Legion Curling Championships in Manitoba. It's a matter of policy, we don't give it." This is the nuts and bolts of it. I'll just use this for a minute - if anybody wants it tabled, certainly. It's signed by Derek Bedson, Clerk of the Executive Council.

Now, today I was answered by saying, it's still on its way, you know, unbeknown to him that I had this letter in my pocket, a letter of refusal. But on checking around, like we're hosting - I'm not trying to knock the high school curling final, the Dominion final at Rossmere. The government gives them \$175.00 cheque to sponsor a dinner for the girls. Well, it's Rossmere constituency. That's over --(Interjection)-- Premier, it would be in the Premier's constituency.

Well, anyway, digging a little deeper, we held the Briar in Winnipeg in 1970, just two years ago. A friend of mine was on that executive committee. I phoned him up and he said: "Yeah, the government did: they put on a dinner at the Fort Garry; it was restricted to 500 people." Now, I don't know if the cost of that would be five or six dollars, but was I glad what he told me at the last. He said, we had went to Walter Weir, made application for this 12 months before it took place, and Walter Weir made this promise to us, yes, we'll give you a dinner for 600, or for 500 people, and we'll pay the cost. After the change in administration, they come back, the government said no, we don't do that. We don't do that, because I don't know - apparently it was in the wrong constituency or something. But after a certain amount of pressures and prompting they said: "Okay we'll do it". But thank God that it was Walter Weir's administration that said we will put something into something that is coming into our municipality - into our area, Charleswood.

The Member for Morris tonight was reading a letter off - I got to be brief. I wanted to dwell on that for ten minutes, but I see the clock's running out and I don't intend to get up again - I can't be here in the morning. When the Member for Morris was reading off a letter

(MR. MOUG cont'd) . . . . from a man from . . . . and he mentioned that he was a 74-year old, a pensioner and a three-war veteran, and there was a laugh out of every face on that side of the House --(Interjections) -- with the exception, I would say, of Bud Boyce - and I would say that you guys are there by the grace --(Interjection)-- you don't know enough to laugh or keep a straight face at any time, but only by the grace of men like these and God are you guys there, and you don't know enough to stand up and it's typical of this government and they say no, we will not support the Charleswood Legion or anybody there - high schools, that's one thing, cause we want 18 year-old votes. High schools one thing, cause we want 18 year-old votes; veterans, we don't need them. You don't fight wars with men any more. --(Interjections)-- You don't fight wars any more --(Interjections)-- and it makes me ashamed to associate myself, anybody on that side of the House that says that - absolutely ashamed . . .

A MEMBER: Give it to them, Art.

MR. MOUG: And I say it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I take it the adjournment is in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster? Agreed. The hour being 10:00 o'clock, the House is accordingly adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.