

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Friday, March 2, 1973

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the Gallery where we have 30 students of Grade 11 standing of the Garden City Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. A. S. Jorowski. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, the Minister of Colleges and Universities. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here today.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, my first words in keeping with the tradition of this House is to extend to you again, Sir, my congratulations for being able to occupy the position that you have occupied for the last couple of sessions, and the manner in which you are attempting to conduct the affairs of this House. We all know that it's an onerous task and not too many of us make the task much easier for you. But that, Sir, is the business of this place; it is the reason we are here and I suppose one has to accept that sort of thing in a free parliament.

I should also like to extend to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply my congratulations for their contributions, two gentlemen that are not particularly noted for their verbosity in this place, and we always welcome the opportunity to hear their views on subjects that are of concern to them.

My remarks, Sir, about the former House Leader, who unfortunately is not in his seat at the moment, the Minister of Labour, cannot be quite as complimentary as I would like them to be. His contribution the other night was typical of the bombast, over-exaggeration and the manner in which he delivers himself of his vituperation. The Minister as usual allowed himself a great deal of latitude in much of the language that he used, but more particularly in much of the exaggeration that he inflicted upon this House. This morning we heard from the Attorney-General; I always enjoy listening to the Attorney-General and I thought his contribution this morning was somewhat out of his realm. Could not quite understand why he took it upon himself to be the critic for the Opposition in the Province of Alberta and one wonders just what the purpose in making that kind of a speech would be until I came to the conclusion there was a reason behind it. And that reason was to attempt -- and goodness only knows that the members of the government must strive very diligently to disassociate themselves from the Liberals and he chose this particular subject to do that.

We find some rather interesting things going on in the Chamber, Sir. The Member for Osborne, for example, now regularly up on his feet, posing questions which he presumes are of an embarrassing nature to members of the Treasury bench. I suppose that the Member for Osborne has taken a leaf out of a book of the Member for Crescentwood, finds that the greatest way and the best way to get ink from the Press, is to criticize the government of which he is a member. --(Interjection)-- There's no great percentage, Sir, in criticizing the government if you're in the Opposition because that's just like the dog biting the man. But the Member for Osborne is reversing the tables and hoping that he can get ink in that fashion.

One thing that has run quite constant, though, throughout the speeches of honourable gentlemen opposite, and that is that they have zeroed in on the Leader of the Liberal Party. And I, I had a few unkind remarks to make about him myself but I am going to desist, I am going to desist that temptation because I have a feeling for the underdog and he has been aimed at so much in this particular session. The government benches have aimed their artillery ranging from the 20 pounders down to the pea shooters, and have been firing steadily in his direction. Now I don't say that he doesn't deserve it, because he sits there with drooping feathers suffering from a self-inflicted wound. And I find it very difficult to resist making at least one comment on his contribution in the Chamber -- well it was not a contribution, it was a contribution in the form of an interjection when the Minister of Mines and Resources was speaking last night.

He took great exception to the fact that there was not enough debate on a certain subject

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) . . . . and that, Sir, represents a great turn around in the position that he took some time ago, and I went through my files, and I have a pretty substantial file on the Leader of the Liberal Party because some of the things that he had been saying are very interesting and I thought deserved preserving for posterity. And I came across this excerpt from an article that appeared in the Winnipeg Tribune on December 26th - that was the day after Christmas, if you please - in which he said, "The system that exists" - he's speaking of the Legislature, "The system that exists currently in Manitoba makes every MLA a rubber stamp. You can't vote conscience or intellect, party discipline forces him to vote with the party." And then he goes on to say, "It's fundamentally a case of the Cabinet making the decisions and the rest of the party voting along. And, Sir, I am going to have to omit a word that he used in the next sentence because it is an unparliamentary one, but he did go on to say why the - and I'll leave it to your imagination what the next word is - did we have to sit and listen to all that stupid debate, and he was talking about the automobile insurance debate. Now, Sir, some time later he made another foray into the papers and suggested that it wasn't really important to be in this place, that it was more important to be outside the Chamber where the action really was, that nothing really worthwhile went on; no decisions were made here; and that serving his constituents in serving the province from the outside was a far better way of achieving what he seeks to achieve in this province. Well, Sir, I found that rather in contrast with a statement he made last night when he regretted very much that there was not more debate in this Chamber. Well, Sir, I hope he'll have his opportunity to participate in as many debates as opportunities provide, and there will be many.

Now then, we find some, in continuing the remarks of the Attorney-General, in which he sought very, as I said, diligently to disassociate himself from the Liberal Party. And there is a good reason for that, Sir. Recently the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan had occasion to make a speech in Alberta in which he referred to the Liberals in that province as an endangered species. And indeed, indeed they are, Sir. But, Sir, what could you expect? What could you expect with all of the inbreeding that is going on in Ottawa these days? That's enough to endanger any species. And it's for that reason that members opposite -- nobody likes the Liberals. Everybody wants to disassociate themselves from the Liberals, because, I suppose because they feel they can use them any way they like.

A MEMBER: Hear hear!

MR. JORGENSEN: We in this party feel that we stand for a principle in government, the philosophy of free enterprise. That what we stand for. My friends opposite, they stand for Socialism, which means nationalization -- (Interjection)-- Well, you know, it means I suppose whatever interpretation my honourable friends opposite can put on it and every one of them has a different interpretation. But what does my friend the Leader of the Liberal Party stand for? Sir, he stands for whatever he believes the people will fall for. And judging from some of the remarks that he has been making in the past few weeks, one gets the impression that he is certainly looking for some friends.

Sir, we have seen a rather interesting parade of ideologies emanating from the other side of the House. My honourable friend the Minister of Labour now interjects, as is his custom, yet Sir, I can quote on many occasions where my honourable friend has chastised members of this House because they make interjections during the course of remarks made by an honourable member in this Chamber. There is nobody, Sir, that abuses the rules, abuses the rights of this Chamber, more than the former House Leader.

SOME MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JORGENSEN: Something else that intrigues me, Sir, is that shift that took place over there. One wonders who can't stand who in the front bench. It is rather interesting. We all knew that the former Minister of Finance -- and I want to say right now that the former Minister of Finance is one of those people who . . .

A MEMBER: The retired Minister of Finance.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . whose contribution to his party and to this Chamber has been one that is well recognized by the people of this province. He conducted himself, even when under heavy fire, with the kind of dignity that one likes to see a Minister uphold in this Chamber and so much unlike the Minister of Labour. But I wonder, I wonder if on just rare occasion my honourable friend the Minister of Labour might just look over and use him as an example of exemplary conduct in this Chamber.

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.)

The Member for Crescentwood who I am happy to see in his seat this afternoon because I will have a few remarks to make about him in a few moments . . .

MR. ENNS: He's not there that often.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . has begun to see the light and he's beginning to make a few pronouncements that many of us on this side of the House have known for a long time about Socialism. But I want first of all to deal with the Premier himself. Some of the - I regret very much - he was here a few moments ago - but I regret very much now that he has left but --(Interjection)-- Oh fine. But the manner in which this government came to power and the role which they attempted to portray was going to be the role that they as a government were going to fulfil in this province. They have done it all right. They've done it in exactly the fashion that the Premier himself outlined in a speech to the NDP Convention on October 28, 1969 and this is the report from the Winnipeg Free Press of October 29th. When one hears the Member for Crescentwood and then hears another honourable member on another side of the House enunciating a diametrically opposed philosophy, one wonders how can they possibly even meet together in caucus and agree on anything.

A MEMBER: No problem.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well my honourable friend, no problem, and he's perfectly right; there's no problem at all and I'll tell you the reason why, because the Premier gave us the clue to that kind of an operation when he said on that day, at the NDP Convention in Winnipeg, the Manitoba Premier just back in Winnipeg after his three-week trip to Japan . . .

MR. ENNS: Ah ha.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . told a thousand delegates their prime objective should be winning elections, even if it meant bending principles. Well, Sir, bending principles, bending principles, Sir, is a characteristic of this government that we have noted all too well. Whenever it suits their convenience they bend and they twist and they turn to suit the particular occasion. They just have to pick the one member who will enunciate the particular philosophy and he gets up and states it. And we all know the philosophy enunciated by the Member for Crescentwood.

Then he goes on in another article - and this was on October 22nd of 1969 - he says, and I'm not going to deal with the question of Southern Indian Lake because it's been dealt with pretty well during the course of this debate, but there's one comment I can't resist putting on the record. He says "Our decision not to flood Southern Indian Lake reflects the basic social democratic philosophy that planning must take into account, human and natural resources as well as simple cost factors." It goes on to say also, Sir, and this was on March 23, 1970 in Hansard: "We've said for example, Mr. Speaker, in the last campaign that we would do things to improve the quality of government, that we would bring about open government, and that we would let the public in on more of the transactions of government." Well Sir, I'll leave that statement without any comment. The events of the last couple of days speak for themselves. And then on August 21, 1969 he said, "We shall in fact, Mr. Speaker, try much harder. Much much harder."

MR. SPEAKER: Matter of privilege. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Member for Morris is quoting from Hansard --(Interjection)--

A MEMBER: Free Press.

MR. JORGENSEN: No, this is from Hansard.

MR. SCHREYER: He's quoting from Hansard and attempting to leave on the record now the quotation in a way that will leave on the record the impression that I was at that time indicating that we would not be raising the level of Southern Indian Lake. What I was indicating at the time was that we had taken a decision that whatever alternatives were open we would look at closely and we would adopt one of them which would insure that the community of South Indian Lake would not be flooded and, Mr. Speaker, it's not being flooded. Under my honourable friend's proposal it would have been flooded under 20 feet of water or more. The community is not being flooded under the proposal that we are carrying out now. The lake is being raised - Southern Indian Lake is being raised. The community of South Indian Lake is not being flooded. My honourable friend can try but he'll not succeed in distorting that fact.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has a habit, has a habit of trying

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) . . . . to inject himself into everybody's debate in this Chamber. We --(Interjection)-- Well, I quoted from an article, I quoted from an article, Sir, that was in quotation marks and I --(Interjection)-- Well my honourable friends, you know, my honourable friends on occasion they criticize the Free Press but if there is an article in the Free Press that happens to be favourable for them, then, Sir, then, Sir, we see them use it as a means of substantiating their positions. I'm simply quoting from that article. The First Minister, the First Minister can take whatever interpretation he chooses out of it. The impression that was left as a result of this quotation was that the Southern Indian Lake would not be flooded.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. JORGENSEN: Now, Sir, no other interpretation can be placed on those remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order please. I would suggest that an honourable gentleman is entitled to express an opinion but he should make certain that he is not misrepresenting if he is expressing an opinion.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I will quote again from the article. On October 22nd of 1969 the Winnipeg Free Press, and the heading of the article: "Citizen Participation Schreyer Keynote". Then he lists all of the things his government would or would not do, and I'm not going to go through them all . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I find that I have difficulty in understanding to whom the honourable gentleman is referring to. He says "he". Is it Mr. Schreyer? I do not wish to get into the debate but I wish he would choose his words so I could understand whom he is referring to, the writer of the article or the honourable member of this House.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I will make it very clear so that everybody can understand. The man to whom these words are attributed is the Premier of this province, Mr. Schreyer, and this is the comment in quotations, and I ask him to pay particular attention to it. "Our decision not to flood Southern Indian Lake reflects a basic social democratic philosophy that planning must take into account human and natural resources as well as simple cost factor, Mr. Schreyer said." That is the remark, that is the remark. Not to flood Southern Indian Lake.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister on a point of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: No, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the honourable member should table the paper that he is quoting from, the yellow sheet there, so that I can read it with my own eyes. It is of course, it is of course -- the reason I am making this point, Mr. Speaker, is that it is absolutely essential to ensure that the word there is "Southern Indian Lake" or "South Indian Lake" because I know perfectly well what I was stating at the time. I said we took the decision not to flood South Indian Lake, and, Mr. Speaker, it is not being flooded.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: The First Minister, you know, is now becoming desperate, he is now becoming desperate. This is a public document, for God's sake the Premier surely, the Premier surely must know that I have quoted the date, he can look it up. I'll hand it across to him if that will satisfy him, for heaven's sake. I've never seen such a picayune petty little man in all my life.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think that my honourable friend the Member for Morris knows full well that if a person is quoting from any document, newspaper article, magazine article . . . .

A MEMBER: Or a letter.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . or any document whatsoever, it is within the rules of the House, in fact it is a practice of the House that if another honourable member asks that that article or document be tabled it is accordingly tabled or else it cannot be referred to. That is the practice of parliamentary procedure.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Sir, I don't intend to waste my time dwelling on it. I have read the article; the Premier now has it in his hands; he can peruse it and if he wants to question it then he can question the Winnipeg Free Press, not me. I didn't write it. But I shall continue in quoting from the Premier in the Hansard of August 21st, 1969, when he says, "We shall in fact, Mr. Speaker, try much harder, much much harder. We shall try to get away from this

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) . . . . great reliance in secrecy as a crutch for government to take the easy way out." And that, Sir, must come back to haunt them at this moment. "A government must above all else hold itself accountable, and how can it be accountable if it keeps hidden deliberately in the face of a repeated request by democratically elected members of the Assembly refusing to table reports and documents written at the public expense, and that is why we are moving to table in this House those two so-called hidden reports relative to South Indian Lake." And here he says South Indian Lake, in that article it was Southern Indian Lake. Sir, that is the difference between their position today and the position that they took when they first assumed government. It's rather interesting to watch not only the change in the statements that they are making as between now and a few years ago, statements that they are making almost simultaneously which are at cross purposes. It wasn't too long ago at a convention that they held here in Winnipeg that there was a rather interesting discussion taking place, where the Premier took great pains to point out that the economy of this province was in such great shape, he painted it in glowing terms, not only the economy as it existed at that time but the prospects, and I say to him, Sir, the reason for the glowing prospects in the Canadian economy is the improved wheat sales. I have said on repeated occasions that wheat is still the kingpin of the western economy and when it moves freely we don't need all those bandaids that gentlemen opposite are attempting to foist on the agricultural community. It generates its own prosperity and that has been adequately proved from time to time.

There was one omission, Sir, in the Speech from the Throne that I thought rather interesting, and I can't understand how the Premier forgot to put that one in. Last year when he read the Speech from the Throne he took great pains to give to the Hog Marketing Board credit for the improved prices in hogs in . . .

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . Omaha, St. Louis, and all across the North American continent. Now then, Sir, the feed grain prices have improved considerably in the past year too and I can't understand why he missed the opportunity to point out to the farmers of Quebec, Alberta, Saskatchewan that it was the Feed Grain Marketing Commission that was responsible for those increases in prices. He must have been overworked on the day that he wrote that particular speech, Sir.

Well, Sir, he went on to say that there was going to be great days ahead for the people of this province. Investment was at its highest - he didn't quite point out whether it was public or private investment that was so high but we can figure that out for ourselves. But at the same time while he was saying this the Minister of Industry and Commerce was talking about establishing treasury branches in this province to insure that there wasn't a net outflow of capital to make sure that we could corner all the money that was in this province and keep it here. Now who was right? Who was right? Is the investment so good that we don't need any of these artificial props or is it, as the Minister of Industry and Commerce said, so bad that we have to corner it somehow and have to compel it to stay here. Sir, we have listened, we have listened to the assurances of the Minister of Industry and Commerce before, and when he assures us that all is well in the Socialist ship of state it reminds me of the Captain of the Titanic trying to reassure the passengers that they have just stopped to take on a little bit of ice.

Sir, then we come to the Member for Crescentwood, who enunciated a philosophy in Vancouver a short while ago and Mr. Frech of the Free Press wrote an article about it, and he went on to point out that Mr. Gonick had found himself a new philosophy and that he was becoming the great opposition of the government. Well, Sir, it all depends I suppose on how you look at it. But Mr. Gonick's speech is a simple one. He says that Socialism will not work, and of course that's no news to us. We have said that all along so there was no need for us to repeat it in this case. It's a revelation to the Member for Crescentwood, however. —(Interjection)— He said it in Vancouver. Well, Sir, it was reported and he said it again in the House the other day - that socialism will not work. And he said the reason it won't work is because when you impose taxes on people they simply pass them down and they result in increases in costs to the consumer. Well, that was February 17th of 1973:

Now, I am quoting from an article of January, 1972, in which . . . "Government To Blame For Rise in Food Costs." That was a year previous to that that I said taxes have increased rapidly during the past ten years and I was commenting on the increase in food prices and the processors and retailers merely pass on the taxes to the consumer in the form of

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) . . . . higher prices. So what to do about that. The only difference and where I depart company from the Member for Crescentwood is in his answer to the inability of Socialism to deal with the problems of this country. In fact if one were to look over the record one will find that it is the attempted application of socialistic philosophy in all the countries of the world that has ruined the economies. --(Interjection)-- Yes, he says the economies are better than they ever were, and what my honourable friend is doing of course is using the gross national product but when he gets out into the poorer areas of this city then he's going to start talking about the high food costs. Then he's going to start talking about the high food costs, Sir, and he's going to be telling those people that something must be done to help those people. We're on a treadmill and we'll continue to remain on that treadmill as long as socialistic philosophy is applied in this country. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood knows that and he said in this Chamber the other day that the answer to it, an answer in which I disagree with completely, is Communism.

A MEMBER: That's the answer.

MR. JORGENSEN: We must take over the means of production; we must take over the means of production, and that's what they're doing.

A MEMBER: No private ownership.

MR. JORGENSEN: No private ownership in this country. This is what he says. The economic system has cruelly and systematically . . .

A MEMBER: We'll tell you about CFI.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . denied the people of this country their rightful share of the wealth. Sack the native people. Sir, he talks about sacking the native people. If there ever was an example of the failure of Socialism you see it on our Indian reservations, because this is Socialism that has been applied on the Indian reservations for a hundred years, and look at the situation that those people are in.

MR. TOUPIN: What about the Hutterites?

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, my honourable friend the Minister of Health and Social Development has made a statement. He says what about the Hutterites? And I suppose and I can only assume, Sir, that what he is doing is using them as an example of the kind of community that he would like to see in this country. I can only conclude. Then he went on to say -- I'm talking about the Member for Crescentwood again -- he went on to say that automobile insurance has created a great redistribution of wealth. I thought the object of the exercise was to insure automobiles, not redistribute wealth. We're beginning bit by bit to get the pieces of this jigsaw puzzle that these people are putting together over here and it spells up to one thing. It spells up to Communism, Totalitarianism. And notwithstanding all of the pretences of the Premier who attempts to pose as a -- who attempts to pose as a wolf in a sheep's clothing. He says at an NDP convention that we've got to bend our principles a little bit, and by George they're doing it. They're pretending to be something that they're really not. Cy Gonick, Cy Gonick puts his finger on it and he tells us what the ultimate objective is. There's no question in the minds of a good many people in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would ask the honourable member to refer to members in the Chamber by their constituencies.

MR. JORGENSEN: I apologize. I apologize to you, Sir, and to the Member for Crescentwood for referring to him improperly in this Chamber. It was a lapse of memory.

Now then, Sir, we come to the question of -- we come to the question of what was described this morning by the Member for Arthur as nepotism. We find that this is proliferated throughout the entire civil service and I -- you know, Sir, I have had a great deal of close identification with the executive assistants of the government. I find them very helpful in many ways and it saves me the trouble of when I want to get information or when I want assistance for my constituents I can always go to the executive assistants, and they're willing to assist me, take the load off the shoulders of a busy minister. And so it is rather interesting to note a document that came into my hands recently -- and I might tell the members of the House that I intend to table it just as soon as I've got through reading so they don't need to ask me to do that and take up my time for that reason.

But the departmental memorandum that is from Mr. Allan M. Early, Executive Assistant Department of Mines and Resources and Environmental Management and goes to Rene Chartier, Special Assistant to the Premier, goes on to point out -- and the date was January 21st, 1972 --

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) . . . . "Pursuant to our discussions of two weeks ago I am now prepared to present for your consideration a mechanism to streamline and maintain on-going control of appointments to government boards, commissions and agents." Basically, in other words, you know, they're getting the patronage system in high gear. Basically what I am proposing is very simple and doesn't involve much more than a coded card index file with alphabetical filing by department, sub-filed alphabetically by the name of the board, commission or agency and further by month and year, by expiry date of appointment. Each card will have the following information on it. First, the name of the Department, which is reasonable. Secondly, the name of the board, commission or agency. Well, I suppose that if you're going to appoint a relative to a board, commission or agency you've got to have the name. The name of the member, the term of the appointment, and the remuneration if any. Now if there is no remuneration -- and here is a key sentence -- if there is no remuneration the card will be green rather than white. Sir, have you seen any green cards around here lately?

And then No. 6, a miscellaneous information column will provide space for any other relevant data such as source of recommendation, etc. Of course, of course all the above work would be futile if no provision would be made to systemize and partially contemporize regular review of the file. I suggest that an informal committee be established which could perform the following functions. And this is important if you're going to -- if you're going to carry on patronage you might as well do it right. On a regular basis go through the file to find out what vacancies are to be filled and thus provide a month or six-weeks lead, lead time to the Minister responsible. After all, if the Minister is going to find a relative it's going to take him a little while to do it. If new appointments, . . . cases or additions to the board are to be made, this committee could ensure that the proper contacts were made to avoid any problems. We wouldn't want any of those problems would we, Sir? The committee would then compile a list of names of persons who are a likely candidate for appointment and provide them on request. Now, Sir, gentlemen opposite have been talking about -- have been trying to deny that there is such a thing as nepotism, that there is such a thing as patronage in this government. Sir, I want to table this document for the edification of all members of the House so that they know how those appointments are made. I want to tell gentlemen opposite if you have got a relative, a niece, a nephew, a cousin, a father, anybody who might be available for an appointment of this nature, do not hesitate to contact the committee who will refer you to the proper minister and the appointment can be made at the proper time.

A MEMBER: Who issues the green card?

MR. JORGENSEN: I don't know who issues the green cards on that side but we haven't seen any and I doubt very much if there are any, knowing the kind of appointments that my friends opposite have been making.

. . . . . continued on next page.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to examine as my basic text, a statement by the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks to the Assembly when he seemed to say as a central point in his speech that he characterized the thinking of this government as always believing that the government can make decisions better than the individual citizens of Manitoba. That's apparently his assessment of our government. I think that that particular comment can be rephrased in a number of ways, I think it could be rephrased to indicate that the Leader of the Opposition believes that the private corporations can make decisions better than the individual citizens of Manitoba. I don't know if anyone on this side of the House has ever argued that the government knows better than the public. I think that frequently we have argued that the government can do things as well as business but I don't believe we have ever taken the extreme view of the Leader of the Opposition. I wanted to examine in general, some of the thinking of the members of the Liberal and Conservative parties, and to also compare some of their thinking to their associates in the ICEC and the GGG and all these other interesting groups that are springing up - all non-partisan, all above politics, all concerned citizens - working for the best interests of the public only by coincidence associated with and only by coincidence recommending only members of the old line parties.

I have had the privilege of being the first Acting Minister, and then the Minister of Public Works for some 18 months and I wanted to make some observations based on my experience in that portfolio. Frequently we are approached in the Department by private developers who ask us whether they can build for us. We have many offers of floors to be added to buildings, new buildings to be established, and the basic argument is, of course, that we can do it cheaper than you and we can do it better than you.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the question can they? And in my experience there is no way that this is possible. If you have the same design for a building and you establish the kind of materials identical in both instances and you follow the tendering system and you use the same contractors and sub-contractors, the result is the same; it's only if you attempt to build a building of greater quality compared to lesser quality that the expenses or the costs will be higher. There is no way that a private developer can put together a building that has the same specifications as the government and arrive at a lower price.

Mr. Speaker, we ourselves lease a considerable amount of space throughout the province and in the City of Winnipeg and we are now constructing the first new government office building in some fourteen years and I think that that too in some way reflects - it reflects the thinking of my honourable friends who believe and believed in leasing space. They did not believe to a very great extent in building for the needs of government, they believed in simply leasing more and more space where I believe that it is our policy and it is our view that when a certain amount of space is leased, it makes good sense to bring that space together, to rationalize it and to build for those purposes. I don't think we would ever attempt to build for all our needs, I think that the rule of thumb may be somewhat similar to that of the American government, the Federal Government which can hardly be described as socialistic where they follow a policy of building a certain amount of space and leasing approximately 50 percent beyond that which they themselves build. Now I think that that is a fairly good rule of thumb to follow. It is certainly not one that was followed by our predecessors in office.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals and Conservatives on City Council, members of the so-called Independent Citizens Election Committee, many of whom are candidates in the next provincial election, are interested in implementing the recommendations of the Urwich Currie, Underwood-McLellan Report. I don't want to deal with that report in depth but I would like to examine one or two of the main principles in that report and to challenge the basic statement made in that report, I have read the Urwich Currie report through several times, I have read the report of Mr. Houghton who is an engineer in the City of Winnipeg and I believe that one can boil down the Urwich Currie report philosophy in a brief statement, namely that it is a saving of 30 percent, an economy of 30 percent can be effected by turning to private contractors.

I would also argue, Mr. Speaker, that if one takes a statement and reads the logical implication, it is clear that the argument is that public enterprise is inefficient or that private

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. DOERN cont'd) . . . . enterprise is efficient, that that is really the basic thesis. I suppose it was fed in at the beginning of the hopper and then the study went about and then lo and behold out came the surprising recommendations which were consistent with the basic and initial assumptions of the report. But that is the basic thesis; private enterprise, private contractors are more efficient than those in the public sector.

Now I admit, Mr. Speaker, that there are certain advantages that the individual businessman has in relation to his counterpart in government. I think for example, he has greater scope, greater freedom of action and in some cases in the smaller corporations he has less accountability. In the large corporations I suppose there is as much red tape and I suppose there are as many levels of administration and as many meetings to go to as we have; but for an average businessman or smaller businessman he is free to wheel and deal as much as he likes, he doesn't have to account in the same manner and under the same series of conditions that we in government do, and there is no doubt and I will not contend that there is no place for private enterprise. But the statement that the private enterpriser, and in this particular instance, the private contractor is 30 percent more efficient than public enterprise, is false. Mr. Speaker, if you read the report and you attempt -- I have a few friends opposite who are in the municipal government . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): 141 percent better.

MR. DOERN: 141 percent better. Well we are getting higher and higher estimates. When we look at the City of Winnipeg and we look at the comparison there between the kind of wages and the kind of service that is being offered by the garbage collectors in comparison with private contractors in the suburban areas, and the wages paid in the suburban areas, it's very clear where that 30 percent figure came from.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): What about the garbage from the Opposition side?

MR. DOERN: Well there's a lot of garbage over there, there's no doubt about that, We're hearing some of it right now.

Mr. Speaker, the argument is 30 percent and if you consider the wages, the basic wage rate paid in the City of Winnipeg is \$3.32 an hour and the basic wage rate paid by many suburban contractors I am told runs from \$1.75 to \$2.00 and I suppose in some of the more affluent areas goes as high as \$2.25. Now if those figures, if those figures are accurate, and that is my information, then the 30 percent differential, the 30 percent differential can be accounted for alone in the wage differential. If it's a difference of \$2.50 -- well let's take \$2.25 -- take 50 percent of that and you wind up with your \$3.32. So if there's an efficiency, it certainly does not come about by the greater efficiency in operation. It simply comes about in the fact that wages are considerably lower and that wages paid in the public sector are some 50 percent higher.

Mr. Speaker, as well the services offered are not as good. Many of the private companies do not offer the quality and the range of service offered by the public garbage collection service. I listened this morning for a brief time to the morning hot line show and I heard many citizens phoning in who verified this fact, that they were not satisfied with the kind of service that they were getting in the suburban areas or that they were satisfied with the kind of service that they were receiving in the inner city.

A MEMBER: Public.

MR. DOERN: Public service. Mr. Speaker, aren't there -- I listen to them as little as possible but I did hear the honourable member, my friend the Honourable Member from Thompson make his statement on the washrooms, and I listened to it with considerable interest. It gives him another opportunity to lead a crusade.

Mr. Speaker, I say that there are obligations on the part of government, and I include the City of Winnipeg government but I'm thinking in particular of our own level, there are obligations, moral obligations to provide employment, and we have moral obligations to pay a reasonable wage to the people who are employed in government activities, I refer some of my friends opposite to the Barber Report on Welfare where Professor Barber, who is an economist, argued that at a time of high unemployment, society has an obligation to provide employment opportunities to people. If you don't then there will be a downturn in the economy; and if you don't there will be more people on welfare and more people who will have to

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. DOERN cont'd) . . . . receive unemployment insurance. So I think it's up to us, if we want that type of system, if you want the old market place, supply and demand, then don't criticize people who are on welfare and don't criticize people who are taking unemployment insurance. If you want to move toward the goal of full employment, then I think you can do that with government playing a positive role in the economy.

A MEMBER: Just imagine the benevolent attitude that the private companies will be able to . . . .

MR. DOERN: Well my honourable friend will have to decide in some cases, whether he would really spend thousand of dollars in producing works projects, accelerating capital works, spending money as we have done. We've spent some \$12 million on our PEP program to help stimulate the economy, we've accelerated some \$34 million of capital projects. My honourable friend will have to decide whether he approves of that type of policy or whether he approves of the government sitting back and allowing things to take place as they do naturally, whatever that means, or whether he is willing to accept higher numbers of people on welfare and a larger increase in the rate of unemployment. If that doesn't bother my honourable friend it bothers me.

A MEMBER: Apples and Oranges.

MR. DOERN: Apples and oranges. Well I'm looking forward to hearing your comments in that regard. But let us agree on one thing though, that when the Provincial Government of Manitoba has done these things it has helped the private businessman as well, because we have in effect poured millions of dollars into our economy. That increases the purchasing power of the individual, it increases demand and as a result it means more goods purchased and it means higher profits for people who are fortunate enough to own their own business.

Mr. Speaker, I am putting a case that I believe that many government corporations can do as well, or better than private corporations. I cite to you the example, I think one of the most obvious examples in the Province of Manitoba, the Manitoba Telephone System. There are three government telephone systems in Canada and they have the lowest rates,

I would like to go back into history for a moment and remind some of my honourable friends who are less progressive than their historic antecedents as to what the views of the Conservative government of Rodman Roblin were, what his views were and the views of his government in regard to government enterprise and government involvement in the economy. For example, reading back to 1905, in the daily of that day, I would just like to read this particular paragraph about an evening when the government of the day announced that they will take over the telephone system. This paragraph: "The notable event of the evening was the important declaration made by the Premier on the subject of the government policy in the introduction next session of a measure for the establishment of cheap telephones for the masses and of the revision of taxation so as to compel the great corporations to contribute more fairly to the revenue of the country."

-(Interjection)-- No this isn't a socialist, this is Premier Roblin, the first Premier Roblin, who is arguing for the takeover of the Telephone System and for increased corporation taxes. "The cheers of the audience demonstrated the popularity of the new and progressive program outlined by Mr. Roblin for his government and party in Manitoba. The key note had already been struck by W. Sanford Evans a first Speaker when he drew attention to the growing popularity of the principles of public ownership of all public utility. Since the Conservative Party inscribed it on their banner at the last Dominion election the Premier's announcement came therefore with striking effect toward the end of the meeting."

Well there was the Conservative Party in 1905. What's happened to it today, Mr. Speaker. It's simply gone down. In those days they were what we might describe today as "red Tories" and today they're just "blue Tories" and they're blue about many things.

Mr. Speaker, the Telephone System has done extremely well, the publicly-owned Telephone System. Our rates as I say are the lowest in the country. I hope that they will stay that way because, I assume, of the efficient management and also because of the fact that there aren't profits that are siphoned off; the profits are ploughed back into the Corporation and passed on to the consumer and the citizens.

The other reason undoubtedly is that the Member for Osborne is a member of the Board and it is due to his great business ability that the Corporation functions very well. The other reason is that I was a member of the Board previously. Mr. Speaker, I think that the

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. DOERN cont'd) . . . . telephone company will continue to do very well unless, unless we listen to some of the ideas that are put forward by the other side. Numerous speakers including the member for Emerson and the Leader of the Liberal Party to name only a couple, have all sorts of interesting ideas about what should be done with the Telephone company. One of them is of course that we should have free long distance calling in the province. They think this is a really high priority, that the people of Manitoba want to be able to call each other across from town to town and from the south to the north and from the city to the farm and the farm to the north and all over the place, that that's what all of us are burning to do.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the present system as it exists makes a fair amount of sense and the suggestion of the Liberal Leader to simply abolish long distance charges within Manitoba would cost an incredible amount of money. And I am rather shocked at the fact that the Liberal Leader who comes to us as an expert on taxation, as a lawyer, as a hard-headed and successful businessman would simply throw out ideas and have no idea whatsoever, have no notion of what the cost of those programs would be. For example, if we attempted to abolish long distance charges in the Province of Manitoba so that any of us could call anyone else throughout Manitoba at no charge, it would require a capital investment of up to \$200 million just to put in the plant to facilitate that. Now considering that we now have a capital investment of \$300 million which was built up over the last 60 something years, it seems to be an extraordinary amount of capital required for a purpose that is I think at best dubious. In addition to that, it would require each and every Manitoban, each and every Manitoban who owns a phone to pay an additional \$11.00 per month, so that regardless of what your bill is today, if it's \$3.00 a month as some are or \$6.00 or \$7.00 a month as others are, we would each have to pay an additional \$11 per month on top of that for the privilege of calling anywhere in Manitoba. Well I think given that alternative most people would like to stay with the present system. If the people in the rural areas and as many of their spokesmen or some of their spokesmen in this Legislature who are pressing for this idea, if they would like to fund that idea so they could have free calling, we exclude the City of Winnipeg, allow free calling throughout Manitoba but not into or out of the City of Winnipeg, no long distance charges, then each and every one of them would have to pay \$17.00 a month additional. So if your phone bill now in rural Manitoba is \$2.90 a month and you have to pay an additional \$17.00 for that privilege, I wonder how many farmers and residents of small towns throughout Manitoba would like to pay \$20.00 a month for the privilege of calling their neighbours. I suggest very few, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted to read what I consider to be a fairly amusing quote from the President of the Progressive Conservative Party, Graeme Haig. He made a statement that was quoted in the Journal of Commerce, January 29th and he was talking about the fact that businessmen must take a more active part in the political process. He said that businessmen must become involved and participate in the decision-making process of government at every level. You know that strikes me as peculiar. You know, what have they been doing for the last hundred years? Who has been most active in the political arena as representative, as contributors, as decision makers, as people who lobby and make presentations and present briefs? I think that the business community has been highly involved ever since the dawn of Confederation in Canada and still are.

In the old days, in the old days, Mr. Speaker, many times business would challenge the right of government, would challenge government legislation in the courts. Big business corporations have given that up. They have seen that it is more proper and more fitting and more profitable in a general sense to work with and along with political parties and governments rather than to openly challenge them. I think that our party for the first time has given the average citizen and particularly the blue collar worker, the white collar worker, the farmer and some of the professional people a voice in government that has never been felt before in the history of this particular province.

Mr. Speaker, for the final portion of my comments I would like to deal briefly with the statements of the Leader of the Opposition in regard to his so-called urban policy. The Leader of the Opposition presents us with a few random comments on urban policies in his remarks and he describes this as his urban program. Anyone who has read his speech or listened to his speech and studied the text later would realize that it was only a very few remarks indeed, no flesh on those bare bones and no indication of any real thinking or any policy development

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. DOERN cont'd) . . . . on the part of my friends opposite. The Leader of Opposition, for example, has a great policy on rail relocation; that is halt rail relocation or don't support rail relocation, build bridges. Build bridges, that's the Tory policy for transportation in Winnipeg. But you know I have to say to my honourable friends are they prepared to pay the price because there's at least a half a dozen men on this side who want nothing more than to replace that Arlington Bridge. One of the, I think, top priorities of this government and of the men who make it up when we came into office was to do something about the Arlington Bridge which is in a sad state of repair and to either develop something like the McGregor - Sherbrook overpass or wait for the railways to move out --- move the yards. Well, you know, I agree, I am with you on that, I believe that is what will be done, what should be done and what unfortunately we will probably have to wait for. But the Leader of the Opposition, although the Member for Charleswood and I agree, his Leader says proceed with the McGregor-Sherbrook overpass right now. It costs 15 million bucks, it doesn't matter, build it and then worry about all these other things later on.

Mr. Speaker, if we do that at this particular time the Federal Government can only contribute a small amount of money, I think it's a half a million dollars basically for one bridge although under certain formulae, for instance on the Nairn Avenue overpass we were fortunate in getting two \$500,000 contributions out of the Federal Government because of the nature of the structure, the number of tracks and roads, etc. But at the present time the most that we could obtain in the way of federal monies for the McGregor-Sherbrook overpass would be \$500,000 or \$1 million out of 15 million, which would probably mean that the City of Winnipeg would pick up half of the remainder and that the Province of Manitoba would pick up half of the remainder, and so the proposal of my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition would mean that the railways in the case of the McGregor-Sherbrook overpass would pay half a million to a million, the City of Winnipeg would throw in seven million and come to us for a contribution of some seven million. Now if a better formula could be worked out with the Federal Government, if the terms of reference could be changed; or perhaps we could wind up with a one-third, one-third, one-third arrangement which would be much more palatable to me; or perhaps when the CPR moves from that particular site and frees up some 200 acres of land, we won't require that bridge at all. But my honorable friend who has exhibited his youth and his impatience ever since he first entered this House, he wants action now. He's going to build bridges, he's suddenly an engineer, he's a Minister of Public Works, that's the Conservative policy. Put up those bridges, it doesn't matter whether the rivers dry up or whether the railways are taken out underneath, just build them all over the place. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that there is a need for some greater reflection and some greater development there.

Then my honourable friend he has a policy for urban transportation. His urban transportation policy consists of something like more concern for the public. But he doesn't develop it, he doesn't tell us what that means; he doesn't tell us whether he is prepared to support our government's policy of providing funds for the purchase of buses; he doesn't tell us whether he's going to pour millions of dollars into a public transportation system, into a subway; he doesn't tell us whether he is favoring the bus over the car. All he says is he's going to do something. Well, I don't call that a policy, and I don't think the Conservative Party has a policy, I don't think they have an urban policy. They may be thinking about one, they may think that they have one, but in fact they do not.

I would argue, Mr. Speaker, that the best kind of policy is a balance - a balance transportation system. A great deal of more money injected into public transportation and perhaps some moneys as well spent on the development of roads and transportation systems that would benefit the car driver himself. I don't know if my honourable friend thinks that under a policy of supporting only urban transportation, public transportation, everyone will leave their car at home and everyone will ride the bus, or whether my honourable friend thinks it's okay that we don't have any traffic problems now, won't have any for the next 10-20 years. He has a simple solution for all this. Build bridges.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that about concludes my comments. I'm sorry that my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition wasn't here to hear more of them. I directed three-quarters of my speech at him, but I'm sure he'll have the time and take the time to to read them somewhere over the weekend.

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. DOERN: I would like to wish you well, Sir, in your difficult task in the remaining three or four months, and also in the next 15 months which will complete the term of this government before we go to the polls.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and may I at the outset wish you well in your office again for the ensuing session and hope that the members are faithful to the order of the rules and the Assembly and don't become abusive and respect you for the high office that you hold in this Chamber.

May I rise at this time, Mr. Speaker, and congratulate the mover and the seconder in reply to the Speech from the Throne, which is being debated here and will be debated until Tuesday. I rise, Mr. Speaker, in support of the motion that was presented by my leader and which is very important in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I find it rather interesting this session more so than any sessions that I have attended in the Legislature, to listen to the government at this time which seem to be buckling at the seams and waffling all over the place. After four years in office, Mr. Speaker, I had thought that the people of this province would finally see a government that could put its feet on the floor and give the people of this province some direction for the future. But, Mr. Speaker, in reading the speech and reading this NDP manifesto which has been placed in the hands of many people in my constituency, they're running scared, and they're running very scared because if that's the best that this government can offer to the people of this province for the projections for the future, I'm sure they are as alarmed as I am, Mr. Speaker.

Then the other day, Mr. Speaker, we got this document laid on our desks, this report on natural resources' policy in Manitoba. And yes, Mr. Speaker, I have read it. And it's very interesting, Mr. Speaker; before I read a document of this nature I generally check out the credibility of who was the professor that wrote it, because I've read reports of economists til they're coming out of my ears. This man happens to be named Kierans, who was the Postmaster-General in Canada, and I well recall some of the first things that happened with this man, the postage went up four cents; that was the first example of the qualities of the man that prepared this report. I also remember in my constituency he closed up, at least half the post offices were closed in Roblin constituency, and I'm sure that other rural members that are in this Chamber today can back me up and find in their own constituency at least half the post offices were closed in their constituencies as well. So, Mr. Speaker, with that type of credibility of this man who is supposed to be a Liberal, and there are various kinds of Liberals, there are big "L" liberals and there are small "l" liberals and thank the Lord that there are those kind of liberals.

But Mr. Speaker, I suspect, I suspect with this document that the Premier is in trouble with the waffle group. He has really got himself dug into a real corner with the waffle over there and we're now getting them sorted out who they are because, Mr. Speaker, the waffle people are not going to support this government or that caucus on their position on the flooding of Southern Indian Lake. We know it loud and clear, so, Mr. Speaker, he gave them a few crumbs to let them, you know, ride along with this little report in their hand, well the Premier is going to go with us and at least he'll recognize that we are a faction in that government. So here we have this document, and there are certain facets of the document that interest me very much, certain of the policies that I support very much. But, Mr. Speaker the part that I do take issue with is the credibility of the man that created it. I just can't see that that man is credible in Canada today and I don't know, but I'm certain he's not going to be credible to the people in my constituency for two reasons. First one, he doubled the postage from 4 to 8 cents, and secondly, he closed half the post offices in Roblin constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I in this debate, I'm going to take a theme of "Why save?" And it's very interesting, I picked up one of the Winnipeg papers today and find that an editor of one of the Winnipeg papers is thinking along the same lines as I am as we debate this reply to the Speech from the Throne and my leader's resolution. Why save? And I find that this article is a very interesting one and one that deserves the attention and the debate of this House on this issue, and I hope in many other of the issues before we leave this session. And the one that rather interests me, Mr. Speaker, in the column is the fact that the tenor of his comment was that such saving is illusionary especially for younger people in that mounting inflation and mounting

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd)... taxes will eat it up anyway. And, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to pursue that level of debate this afternoon. And, Mr. Speaker, where did this inflation bit start? In my opinion and many of the experts that I have talked to, it started from the business of government spending the taxpayers' money, and we have all kinds of evidence today of big government. Mr. Speaker, I have the evidence of the spending programs of this government from the day they arrived in this Legislature and let me read you some of the facts.

It was slightly over \$342 million in 1968; in 1972 it's \$575 million, and I'll bet you, Mr. Speaker, as sure as you're sitting in that chair it will be \$650 million this session, and this is exactly what I'm talking about in this debate: Government spending the taxpayers' dollars and creating this inflationary bug that's going to destroy our country, in fact destroy our province, in fact destroy the initiative of the ability to save. Why save? Why save when government is going to spend the money anyway?

And, Mr. Speaker, I found it very interesting, the present Minister of Finance in Ottawa made a statement in Calgary - and I had it here a few moments ago - not too long ago, whereby he stood up and made a certain statement in Calgary in 1972. October 1972 the Honourable John Turner in a speech at Calgary said, and I quote, Mr. Speaker; he said: "I suggest to you that the promise to sharply reduce taxes while at the same time substantially increase government spending is not only evidence of political bankruptcy but it is the prescription for putting Canada in bankruptcy as well." Quoted October 19, 1972.

A MEMBER: Who said that?

MR. MCKENZIE: The Honourable John Turner. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, 1972, after he had assumed the portfolio of Minister of Finance in the Federal Government, he said, "I now wish to propose major reductions in personal income tax in Ottawa". Now that is a credible statement for that Minister, who is again backing up the statements that I have before you today. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether in fact this Prime Minister can in fact implement the tax reductions that he's talking about as long as he has to go to bed every night with David Lewis, because David Lewis don't buy that tax reduction policy. He's for the big continual government spending, more welfare programs, more giving away of the taxpayers' dollar, more . . . programs, more PEP programs, more digging in ditches in the winter time with an axe and go back and dig next year - not solving anything, no place for the future. And, Mr. Speaker, you know, when you get back and look at this, this mess that we're in today with the inflationary problem, I recall the Diefenbuck; do you remember the Diefenbuck of the 60's, the Diefenbuck which was criticized across this country that it was a farce for any man such as John Diefenbaker to stand up and talk about the economics of finance and the economics of government spending that he was talking in those days.

But, Mr. Speaker, isn't it interesting, Mr. Speaker, that today this chief, the great chief, this man, this great John Diefenbaker has come back to prove to the economists that he was right. He was right in the 60s and now he's right in the 70s because the Diefenbuck was the right policy for Canada at that time and is the right policy today. And I find that very very interesting, Mr. Speaker. And here's a man, a defeated leader of a party, was working hand in hand with the Leader of the Conservative Party in Canada today. Robert Stanfield, and will in fact prove not only to the Liberals but to the Lewises who are climbing in bed with the Liberals in Ottawa today, that that is the destiny that we should follow in this country in economics and not listen to these men such as our friend Kierans who raised the postage stamp from 4 to 8 cents and closed up half the post offices in this province. Those are not the type of economists that we want in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the Premier will take another look at this document before he starts ramming it down our throats that this is government policy. He better be very careful who the task force is that he's selected to listen to the people of the province on this document and I warn him now.

Mr. Speaker, this NDP manifesto is really a gem. This is the document of all documents that I've ever read. I don't know if the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose has read it or not, but if he hasn't he better take it out to some of his friends in Ste. Rose and let them read it, because this is the one of the future for Manitoba. And I find how it lends itself to the Speech from the Throne and is so interlaced in that document is very very interesting. Maybe the same person wrote both documents. --(Interjection)-- I'm not certain, but I find that the one is very compatible to the other and I have now sent out some 50 copies to the people of my constituency to let them know what their future is as long as this government is guiding our

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . destiny, and it's interesting some of the reactions that are coming back.

There was one phrase in there, Mr. Speaker, that co-ops are redundant. Co-ops are a redundant form of organization. You can imagine how that gets the people out at Roblin constituency. Or the one about the municipal corporations, Mr. Speaker, What a beautiful thing to tell the municipalities of the province today. Or the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who unfortunately is not in his seat today, why doesn't he go and tell the municipalities of this province that they are in fact going to form them into corporations, and that the Minister will have say as to who is going to sit on the corporation. He will even appoint them. That's the future for Manitoba and I find that it's interlaced with their Speech from the Throne so skillfully, so it is very interesting for us to debate that type of philosophy and that type of a future for the people of Manitoba for the next decade, if in fact this government comes back after the election. But I doubt very much if they will, Mr. Speaker, because I was going over our chances the other day with some of my close friends. I think we can win 25 seats. I think we can. So it's going to be a real battle and I welcome the challenge, and I hope the Premier will call the election tomorrow morning if he can afford the time because we're ready, we're waiting, and we're all set to go.

Mr. Speaker, between the years 1966 to 1971, government spending according to the figures that I have before me here, from the three levels of government - the municipal level, the provincial level and the federal level - rose to about 35 percent of the gross national product. And, Mr. Speaker, last year if you looked it's up another 2 - 3 percent - went up from 35 up to about 37 or 38. And this year, Mr. Speaker, in reading this Speech from the Throne, if I can gather the type of expenditures that's going to be involved in that kind of a program, I suspect it will go up another two or three percent so we're up to 40 percent. Forty percent, Mr. Speaker, of the gross national product of Canada with a federal spending programs and the spending programs of the provincial governments and the spending programs of the municipalities. And, Mr. Speaker, I find it very interesting if you compare these figures that I've just given you and compare those with the Economic Council of Canada who said some few months ago that by 1980 all government spending - federally, provincially and municipally - would reach 40 percent by 1980. My gosh, Mr. Speaker, we've reached 40 percent already and how far away are we from 1980? We're almost a decade away - of spending of the gross national product.

And Mr. Speaker, I would hasten a guess that since David Lewis has climbed into bed with Trudeau that that's just going to escalate now, another two or three percent, because anything would be possible with that combination together in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, and I can only see one thing for more government spending. But I don't think that anyone in this Chamber would care to predict what could be possible until we do get a stable government in Ottawa. But I suspect that the politicians down there are just trying to get re-elected, they're trying to convince the people of the country that they have the answers, they're going to spend a lot of money. And, Mr. Speaker, this trend is one which I'm very sure must be of great concern to the municipalities of my constituency, Mr. Speaker, for the simple reason that they're getting squeezed out. The provinces are squeezing them out and the Government of Canada is squeezing them out. It's quite simple why they're getting squeezed out, because they're small; they're only little guys. And if you're going to have big provincial governments, and if you're going to have big federal governments with huge spending programs, where are the municipalities going to be left? They're going to left out in left field with a bunch of I O's in their pockets, no power and no ability to do anything for their people.

Mr. Speaker, I think that these huge spenders, that these governments that continue to grow with the civil servants - the Honourable Member for Morris gave us today, bring your brother in, bring your cousin in, bring your aunt in and bring your uncle, everybody get on the taxpayers of this province, and if we don't stop this type of crazy foolishness we're all going to end up on the dole. We're all going to end up on the dole as recipients of some form of welfare either from the provincial level or the federal level. We cannot continue to spend this kind of money that we're spending today, and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, there's no way that our municipalities can be of any service to their people if they've got no money to spend. And how can they get some money to spend when there's no money left? The provincial government has taken or the Federal Government has taken the tax dollars and there's nothing left

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . .for our municipalities. So maybe, maybe the NDP manifesto was right, Mr. Speaker, that they are going to make them into municipal corporations at a point where they have no power at all, the Minister will direct it all. So it's likely in the works that they are going to become a redundant form of organization the same as the co-ops.

Mr. Speaker, any government that grows faster than the gross national product does so at the expense of who? It does so at the expense of the private sector and everybody that works within that sector. That's simple economics, that's simple mathematics, and surely, surely the economic experts of this government that's sitting over before me here today, surely there's somebody amongst the economic experts of your group or the government in Ottawa today are fully aware of that basic concept of economics. My gosh I'm not an academic but I have a little knowledge of economics and that makes plain sense to me, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't know when, when. Can the Premier ask me, can the Minister of Finance tell me, when are these planners and economists who sit up in their ivory towers today, when are they going to finally join Diefenbaker with his Diefenbuck and join the Conservative Party and take a look at economics from a different level altogether, and get back to the principle as the man skillfully gave before us today, the ability to save a buck? When are there going to be some philosophers today or economists that thought that was a concept of living at one time, the ability to save?

Well, Mr. Speaker, we're in an all out effort today, the way we're going, to spoil that trend, and we're going to destroy this province. Witness the spending examples of this government in the last four years. My of my, and what have you done? You've got some programs today - dig a few ditches. There's guys out in my constituency knocking off willows with an axe. Boy what a future, what a future; and they'll be back next winter because the trees are going to grow, those willows will grow up next summer, and they're back whittling them off next winter. That is one of the great policies that came out from this government in the four years that they've been in office, Mr. Speaker, and I say they've got to turn and revert themselves and provide the taxpayers of this province with some assurance that the combined programs of the municipalities at the provincial level and the federal level will at least give us a chance to save a buck, and that they will not spend more than the gross national product of our country.

Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt that there are some particular reasons for the massive spending programs of this government and I think the one of -- they haven't got a program, that's their first problem. They came in not prepared to hold office in this province so they got here and they grabbed all this philosophy together, the wafflers went over in that corner, the Premier went off here with his soft Liberal Democrat philosophies, and he said, "I don't want no part of those guys, they're too far left for me." So he gave us the big soft sell that he's a Liberal Democrat, I think was -- and away we went. Four years later, Mr. Speaker, we have evidence now of what kind of a government he put together. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I find it very interesting this session that the First Minister now and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources seems to be running the whole show. They've taken over power. They've taken over power of this government. It's not an open government any more, Mr. Speaker, and maybe it's just my imagination, I guess, the way -- but the few days that we've been here it's quite evident that the two power boys now who are going to call the shots are the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. And if that's the example of the open government that they were telling us about three years ago, Mr. Speaker, it almost makes me laugh. Almost makes me laugh, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think government has a responsibility to its people and government has a responsibility to make certain that the massive spending programs that they're forcing on us today will be required not to build in a permanent debt for our sons and our daughters and our grandchildren so that when they came on the scene and become active in the affairs of our tax dollars that they're not facing a burden of debt that they'll never live under. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I heard a man make a speech the other night and he said, "You wonder why babies cry. You know, when a baby is born in the world today he's got a thousand dollar tax label on him the day he's born. No wonder he cries. Who wouldn't cry in that kind of a society? Mr. Speaker, it's my opinion that from the problems in this session, I want some assurance from this government and from this Premier that they're spending on these all various programs that at least we'll get some sensibility back into government and get back

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . down to earth and find that there are ways to do things without government spending all these funds, and not exceed year after year the way we're going today where government is spending more money than the gross national product of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I think that's the most important single step that we can take in Manitoba or in this session to try and reduce the inflationary dangers that we are faced with today and that we're going to face for decades to come unless somebody is prepared to come to grips with that problem. I think it's most unfortunate that the NDP of this province and the Liberals somehow don't see that, that it is a factor today that's creating all this unemployment. Mr. Speaker, I think the way we're going at this makeshift bandaid type of approach to our economy today is worth better attention than we're giving it today, and even though we're only here at the provincial level, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you and I suggest to the members of this Legislature, we can do lots to control the inflationary factor that's so important: cut out the government's spending programs; cut out the government's spending programs, let's get back to reality; let the people spend it, Mr. Speaker, let the people spend the money and take some of the taxes off their backs. And, Mr. Speaker, if we must . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. McKENZIE: I think it's our duty as members of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, to provide an all-out effort to control some of the unemployment problems in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would like to suggest to the honourable members who have to have involuntary echoes into this Chamber which are not necessary, that they exercise some control; otherwise I shall name them. The Honourable Member for Roblin,

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's typical of the members opposite. The truth really hurts them; it always did. From the first day I came in here and sat in front of the members opposite, once you stand up in this Legislature and tell the truth then they start to scream and shout and try and tackle you. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm well acquainted with their tactics and I know it hurts boys, I know it hurts to be told the truth and give you some idea where you should be going, but if you'll bear with me for a few minutes longer, I'm sure that you'll have a good sleep tonight.

Mr. Speaker, let me get back to my remarks, Mr. Speaker. I think that it's the duty of every member of this Legislature and this government in this session to concert our efforts somehow, some way, and you are the government, to try and meet the problems of unemployment that we have in this province today, and it's gotta be met at once; we can't afford to wait much longer, because I think we've got to meet it head on because we're in a dangerous situation today with people who now four and five years have been without a job that's meaningful, a job that gives them any future, a job that gives them any direction, and surely in this Speech from the Throne, - and I failed to read it, - that that is the No. 1 priority of this government. And the bandaid approach that we're using today, as I say the LIP program, the PEP program, the STEP program, the school tax rebate - those are not the answers that are required to solve this problem, Mr. Speaker, nor are they even close to being the right approach to the problem.

Who wants to cut scrub, as I said awhile ago, for the rest of his life? Winter works every year. Is that the future of people in this province under this government? No, Mr. Speaker. Who wants to tear down buildings, old buildings every winter out at Roblin constituency every winter? Is that the best you can offer to the people of this society in this day and age with all these economists that you've got, and your ivory tower boys? Is that all you've got to offer? Mr. Speaker, who wants to be given a job by this government that's got no future? And they're doling them out every day. Who wants to be one of those kind of people? Mr. Speaker, who wants to have a job that's got no challenge? Who wants to have a job that's got no initiative to it? Who wants a job that's got no drive? Mr. Speaker, only those people over there. They want everybody on the dole and they want them all on the welfar rolls. And that's what's wrong with the socialist philosophy, and that's what's wrong with this government. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that job-making policies must be a top priority of this government if they're to get some recognition in this forthcoming election and some recognition of the fact that they are credible.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Wally, you're just too much.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I'm too much, I'm alarmed, Mr. Speaker, that this government has had four years to try and clean up some of our problems, and that's the

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . kind of approach that they're giving us today, some of the real problems in our province. And, Mr. Speaker, they're not the only ones that are victims of this problem; we're dragging along with you guys, and there's a lot of other people that are dragged into this ill-conceived, ill-timed economic policy which I don't even understand, unless this Kierans man maybe has the answer to it, that raised the postage up four cents. That's the answer to the problem? No. Raise the taxes up, Mr. Speaker, that's the answer to it? There's got to be another way. We can't afford those kind of luxuries, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to be a storekeeper, and I'll just give you an example. I'm there marking the goods as they come in; for the last three years there hasn't been an article that's come in that store that isn't up every time. I happened to be marking raisins last Saturday in the store - two pound packages of raisins - they're up 14 cents from the time they came in the shipment before - 14 cents. And that's only one item.

Now what is wrong with that? They don't think there's anything wrong with that, but I do. I think that there's something wrong with our economy when I have to mark up a two-pound package of raisins 14 cents increase.

MR. GREEN: What are raisins in Ontario?

MR. McKENZIE: I don't know what they are in Ontario. I only know what they are in my own store, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, how come today that I have to get my shirts and socks and ties and things like that, that they sell across the counter in my store, how come they all come from Taiwan and Hong Kong? What's wrong with the garment industry in this province, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you what's wrong with the garment industry in this province, they've been taxed out of existence. They've been taxed out of business. So I'm selling shirts from Taiwan and Shanghai and . . . . Mr. Speaker, what has happened to the garment industry in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker? Certainly, they're taxed out of business, taxed out of business by the socialists - you know, taxed on production machinery -- you know the taxes, corporation taxes, income taxes. Mr. Speaker, in fact I'll go even farther and I'll tell you that our competitive system itself is at jeopardy today if you leave those guys in office much longer. They don't know what it is to be competitive. Did you listen to the Member from Crescentwood yesterday? He doesn't want no competition. --(Interjection)-- We had an example of you guys in the Autopac and your car insurance policy; you don't want competition. The Liberals asked you to let the agents compete with them. No dice. They don't want competition, these Socialists. They don't want competition because they can't afford to meet it, and that's the reason, Mr. Speaker, that they're sitting over there with those dreamers and planners that they have up in their ivory tower; and of course they all are dreamers, none of them has very seldom ever went out and worked with his hands or ever got a blister on his hands.

It's wonderful to dream, Mr. Speaker, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to you that the competitive system in this province is at jeopardy today unless we get rid of that government. In fact I'll even go farther, Mr. Speaker, and I'll say we're at the crossroads of a real critical period in the history of this province, and unless we can give some proof to the people of this province to the restoration of the economy that we have once enjoyed, they're going to get out, those that haven't already left, because if you can't give me some assurance that the economy is going to be stable, you're going to take the taxes off my back, even maybe some day, Mr. Speaker, I'll get out --(Interjections)-- I will - look, I can still work, I've still got the ability to do my share, but I don't want to go on the dole with the government policy that we're getting from this government, and that will be the future that we have for the people of our province.

Mr. Speaker, as sure as you're sitting in that chair, Mr. Speaker, if we continue with this type of government and with their type of huge government spending programs that we have in this province today under the guise of this Liberal Democrat Premier, or now - I don't know if he's a Liberal Democrat now but he was when he first came in. When in fact when he takes his coat off -- I don't know what he is now -- when he takes his coat off now he could be a waffler for all I know. In fact I would suspect that maybe he has moved over to the waffle group with the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, because in this session it looks like they're pretty lovey and they're working together as a team. Now Mr. Speaker, that wasn't the case before. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, until the Premier of this province cleans up his political backyard and gives us some proof that there is a government over there that can handle the economics and the problems of government, then I say, let's have the

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd). . . . election tomorrow. Let's have the election tomorrow. I'm ready to go, and I'll bet you I'll win in Roblin constituency. I'll bet you the Conservatives will bring back 25 seats for sure, and let's meet the challenge --(Interjection)--

Mr. Speaker, I'll lay you some proof on the table now of some of the things I'm talking about. Here's a Roblin - Dauphin paper - proposed one-third tax jump in '73 school taxes - one-third up this year. And if you read this little article, he goes on to - he said, "This year's proposed special levy represents another increase of 33 percent." So it was 33 percent last year. Now, can any government be realistic and fair with its people with those kind of policies? Here we got this tax rebate system that we --(Interjection)-- and this tax rebate thing is an interesting thing, Mr. Speaker. I thought, you know, I'd see - I heard the Honourable Attorney-General on that liquor thing at Christmas with his ad, and I thought surely I'm going to see him on television on this, 'cause they had a real soft sell guy on this school . . . thing on my television station - beautiful. Not quite as good as the Attorney-General on the liquor bit, but a very capable person; and they all yelled, they were blasting us morning, noon and night about this. We get it in the morning at 8:00 o'clock, we got it at 10:00 o'clock, we got it at 12:00, we got it at 2:00, 4:00, 6:00, 8:00, all prime time we got it, and for how long. Then we got it for a shot for radio, and we had it with radio. And all of a sudden it stopped. Now, Mr. Speaker, isn't that so interesting. They brain-washed the devil out of us out there, as to what a fantastic thing this, and still the people out there don't know what it's all about. In fact, Mr. Speaker, they're trying to solve this income tax form now that they've got out there -- and I used to do the income tax forms for a lot of my people, Mr. Speaker, and I finally had to tell them, look, I can't solve that tax form. It's so complicated now that you get the NDP part tied on to the Liberal part and you really got a doozer. That's really a doozer, and they had this Fred Davis, you know, you saw him on television, Fred Davis trying to tell what this new income tax form - out of this world, Mr. Speaker. It's simple, you can almost do it blindfolded. I defy anybody that's not skilled in the arts of mathematics to file that tax return, even though he is a genius or a Liberal or an NDP. So what's happened, Mr. Speaker. The old age pensioners out in my constituency have had to go and find an accountant to help them file that tax return. And they cost money. So the old person, he may be going to get 50 bucks back but he's going to have to pay 50 bucks or 40, I don't know what they -- but they're going to charge them, they're not going to do it for nothing.

And Mr. Speaker, I ask you, what does that advertising program cost? Maybe the Minister of Education will tell us some day, because that must be, that must be fantastic. And as one of my good friends asked me the other day, Mr. Speaker, isn't that a wonderful type of a government program: They take the tax dollars here and they put them in the pocket then they take out the political advertising and their television advertising and they take that - that'll take half of it - and the economy is that when I got it out of this end of my pocket I got two cents left. That's about how valuable that school tax reduction program is in my constituency, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)--

No, I'll tell you. There's other reasons, Mr. Speaker. I have a case of a farmer out there that pays \$1,200 in taxes towards school education costs. His net income could be such that the tax credit plan could likely be a total for him, say \$100.00. His friend in town who lives - my neighbour - his salary is about 12, 13,000 bucks. He's paying \$120.00 taxes towards education and school costs. Now he's only paying one-tenth of what the farmer is paying, and yet the person, Mr. Speaker, the person that lives in the village beside me, who has a net income equally as good as a farmer, let's say, or maybe better, he's going to receive a rebate much more than the farmer. Now is that fair . . . ?

MR. DESJARDINS: Is he a businessman?

MR. McKENZIE: No. Is that a fair taxation system? Is that a taxation system, Mr. Speaker, that's built on the ability-to-pay principle? Mr. Speaker, I suggest it's not.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has three minutes.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker - oh, Mr. Speaker, you wouldn't . . . only three minutes. I had so many things I wanted to say. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will no doubt have a chance to - somebody send me a quarter.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal very briefly with the problems of rural transportation, and I - they're closing up the CNR and my constituency are closing up the railway, the station agent, which the . . . commissioner --- is he still railroad commissioner?

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

A MEMBER: No, No.

MR. MCKENZIE: Oh, he's been relieved of that duty. I thought so, because he wasn't at any of the meetings, I'll just give you an example how badly we feel about this, because here's a case in the village of Pine River of a station that's done over \$300,000 gross business in 1969; it did \$300,000 gross business in 1970, and they're closing it up.

MR. PAULLEY: .....economic ...

MR. MCKENZIE: Well, I don't care what - that's the kind of economist that I take into quarrel with, because why would you -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MCKENZIE: Why would you close up a rural station that's doing \$300,000 business and shoot in some kind of a computer? So now we're on the old Sennett telephone line and you gotta phone some place to find out what's going on, when and where. But, Mr. Speaker, I've been involved in this branch line abandonment thing since Day One and I'm well familiar with the quarrels and the battle we've had, and we're going to battle 'em to the end. I thank Canada Grains Council and I thank Dr. Dever for coming to the Brandon meeting this year and now standing up shoulder to shoulder with us people from rural Canada, Manitoba, and we're going to fight this. And we're going to fight it on these grounds, Mr. Speaker. This past year the transportation system that we got in this country has delivered the biggest crop ever to the ports, approximately 900 million bushels, and why scrap that kind of system Mr. Speaker, unless you got a better one? And they haven't got a better one. What's wrong with it? It's been a good business. Sure, it needs some upgrading, it needs some updating, but Mr. Speaker, that's why I challenge the railway commissioner to get out on his horse and help the people of this province to fight these railroads. Why should we abandon a system that's just delivered the biggest crop ever; 900 million bushels went to the port, it arrived there on time; there were some labour problems, but nevertheless the grain was delivered. And now we want to scrap it for something - we don't know what. We don't know what. They're just going to take the lines out in 1975. Surely we can meet - can we buy those lines? Can we rebuild them? Let's not let that transportation system be destroyed, Mr. Speaker, until we've got something equally as good or better. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And by the way, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion of my leader wholeheartedly.

..... continued on next page.

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

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

MR. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to follow the Member for Roblin and to know that he agrees at least in some part with his leader, and for me to be able to answer at least some of the points that he raised. But before that, Mr. Speaker, may I first follow the usual custom of extending my congratulations to the Member for St. John and the Member for Radisson on both moving and seconding respectively the Throne Speech debate. May I join with other members of this Assembly who have extended their condolences to the family of the late Gordon Beard. His presence will be sadly missed in this House, Mr. Speaker.

May I further congratulate you on your continued presence in the Chair, Mr. Speaker; it gives me a sense of reassurance to see you back in that familiar position.

There was one other point that I wish to raise in regard to your area, Mr. Speaker, and that is that I notice that this year for the first time that there have been improvements, changes made in the visitors' gallery, that there are carpets on the floor and more importantly that those hard wooden benches up there have finally been padded. (Hear, Hear) As one who has spent some time in the gallery, Mr. Speaker, I do sympathize with those members of the public who in the past had one end assaulted by members of this Assembly and the other end assaulted by the hardness of the benches.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose it comes as no surprise to the members of the Opposition that I'm speaking in opposition to the amendment brought forward by the Leader of the Opposition and would like to congratulate this government on its Throne Speech, which is of a most comprehensive nature covering most of the areas in which the government has responsibility. I was going to say that it covered the waterfront but my colleague the Member for Ste. Rose mentioned it didn't mention the waterfront at Churchill.

There are three main items of that Throne Speech which are of particular interest to me and to many members of my constituency, Mr. Speaker, and those are the provisions to include the cost of nursing home care under Medicare. Secondly, the exemption of senior citizens from paying medicare and hospital premiums. Thirdly, the partial payment of drugs over approximately \$50 per individual. I have received a number of phone calls and comments on these particular issues and they have met with a great deal of approval. They do follow on from other previous policies of this government which were of great assistance to old age pensioners particularly, and I refer especially to the provision for a ten cent bus fare which was one of the first things that this government brought in in 1969. And also the provision of home owner repairs grants - we're now into the second season of that - which has also been an extremely popular program.

There are other benefits not specifically aimed at pensioners which this government has brought in which have also been much appreciated, Mr. Speaker. First of all, the change in the Medicare premium rate which effectively put over \$100 per family in the pockets of many in my constituency. The fact that this government instituted a property tax rebate scheme last year which returned 50 percent of the education property taxes up to a maximum of \$50.00. The fact that we improved on it this year and instead of a maximum of \$50 it went from a minimum of \$50 to a maximum of \$140.00. Added to that, pensioners in my area and most other areas too enjoy the advantage of cheaper haircuts, special admission to cultural and sports events and some of them were able to take advantage of the City of Winnipeg's tax rebate to senior citizens which was in effect last year. Unfortunately only about 15 percent of those eligible in fact applied for it which might have been satisfactory to the City of Winnipeg but is certainly not satisfactory to this government as a program to help old age pensioners. Added to this, Mr. Speaker, many old age pensioners can take advantage of the Federal Government's guaranteed income supplement, and it is my understanding that over half of the over 65's in Manitoba do presently receive some money under this grant.

I mention this next point not as a criticism of the government but as a suggestion that it might take into consideration for the future, particularly in the area of home owner grants and the paying of medicare and hospital premiums. Is that there is another group in our society some of whom, are receiving pensions, many of whom are in just as much need as the senior citizens of a good deal of help, and I'm referring to those on disabled pensions, particularly those fully disabled who will never work again. I've received several phone calls from people in this predicament, Mr. Speaker, and they are typically men in their fifties or early sixties

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. WALDING cont'd) . . . . who have been injured or more likely have been afflicted with some sickness or disease unable to work. Their wives are too young to receive old age pensions and too old to get a job. They find themselves in the predicament of attempting to keep up a home with a very minimal amount coming into the residence. Some have company pensions, some have pensions from other sources, but many of them, or perhaps most of them are in just as much need as the senior citizens yet they are not entitled to a guaranteed income supplement, nor do they get the government pensioners home owners grants, nor do they get the cheap hair-cuts, nor do they get preferred or cheaper admission to sports and cultural events, and neither were they eligible for the City of Winnipeg's tax rebate. The disabled pensioners in our province, Mr. Speaker, appear to be a neglected group and it seems an area in which this government could take a very serious look. I would refer this government to a resolution that was passed by the New Democratic Party's council dealing with particularly this item and seeking both assistance from the Provincial Government and asking the Provincial Government to make representation to the Federal Government for increased assistance.

I'd like to move on now to another area which particularly affects my constituency and it deals with the proposed bridge, and we're back to bridges again it seems, another bridge over the Red River, this time at Carriere Avenue between St. Vital and St. Boniface to link up with the extension of Grant Avenue. I understand that money has been or is now being delegated by the City of Winnipeg for preliminary studies into this particular scheme and if it goes through it will mean the expropriation and the loss of a number of houses along Carriere Avenue, probably two apartment blocks on the corner of Carriere Avenue at the Red River. The proposed route is further through the St. Boniface Golf Course linking up with the highway 59. If in fact it should go through it will cause a great deal of dislocation to the houses in that particular locality, most of which are older homes, some of which are occupied by pensioners, people who have lived there for many many years and who seek to live out their lives in peace and quiet. They would stand to lose their houses if this project should be proceeded with. However, Mr. Speaker, it may be necessary in fact that this road in fact goes through and that the bridge is built across the Red River. But the whole concept of this particular Grant Avenue extension and the bridge which it includes is a part of the much larger total Winnipeg Watt Study which was completed a few years ago and I believe was paid for by the previous metropolitan government. It's a scheme which envisages a very complex system, of very expensive freeways throughout the metropolitan area and although Metro did not endorse that particular program it has since been handed on to the new City of Winnipeg which also has failed to take a position on this very expensive proposed freeway system. Not only has City Council failed to take a position on it, Mr. Speaker, but the whole study and the whole road system is an integral part of the rail relocation study which is presently before the City Council. Some of the proposals in that rail relocation study are tied in very closely to some of the provisions of that Watt Study report. Surely no one would disagree with the proposal to move those rail lines from the centre of Winnipeg; the only area of disagreement seems to be where in fact they should go around the outskirts of the city. Although City Council has not made a decision one way or the other on these two very far reaching proposals - three if you include the Beltway but that is included really as an integral part of the Watt Study report.

Close examination of a number of construction projects throughout the city throughout the last few years will reveal that those construction projects do in fact tie in very closely with the Watt Study recommendations, and I would call upon the City of Winnipeg to finally come to grips with this study and really let us know that it wants to do. If it can in fact justify the \$700 million for a system of freeways, and if it cannot do that then it should be in a position to justify what other road building and bridge building it can - on an individual basis and not fit in these little pieces here and there like a jigsaw puzzle. We could well find ourselves in a matter of a few years of being so boxed in by placing these pieces of a jigsaw puzzle that we have in fact no alternative but to go ahead with this proposed system of freeways without a specific decision being made by City Council or the people of the city.

I'd like to move on now to the Throne Speech itself and more particularly to the speech given by the Leader of the Opposition, and I note he is not in his seat and although most of my remarks will be referred to him I would presume that most of the Conservative caucus in fact agrees with him although not all have said so.

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. WALDING cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition began his remarks to the House he indicated that he approved of this proposal to include nursing homes under Medicare, and he further indicated that he approved of the government's proposal to exempt old age pensioners from paying medicare and hospital premiums and that his party would vote for these and would help assure their speedy passage through the House. And he further indicated, Mr. Speaker, that he was in favor of this proposal of the government to pay part of the cost of drugs for old age pensioners. Now at this stage, Mr. Speaker, I was becoming somewhat alarmed that the Leader of the Opposition Party was finding so much to agree with with the New Democratic Party government position. However, the Leader of the Opposition soon made it clear to us that the Conservative Party in fact would take a different approach. It reminded me somewhat of that advertisement that Ford has run on the television where they indicate that Ford has a better idea and a little light bulb lights up. The Leader of the Opposition tells us that the Conservative Party has a better idea and its leader lights up.

One of the first points made by the Leader of the Opposition was in fact the amount of money that this government was spending and he went into a long discourse about the amount that was spent, the taxes that were in effect in this province and of his particular concern to put back into the pockets of Manitoba that money which is now handled through the government.

The Member for Roblin who has just joined us said very much the same this afternoon when he commented on the amount of money that this Provincial Government is spending. But is it in fact out of alignment, Mr. Speaker? The Member for Roblin I believe estimated that provincial expenditures this year would be some \$600 million and he gave us to believe that when his government was in office that really they didn't spend too much and he quoted Mr. Diefenbaker and his economic policies, although he didn't point out how much that particular government spent or indeed what the rate of increase of spending was of Mr. Diefenbaker's government.

However, Mr. Speaker, we might gain some indication of what the acceptable rate of Conservative government spending is if we look back on the decade of the 60s when we see the effect of a Conservative Government in office and to study what its spending was. And I'm not suggesting that a rise in government spending along with an increase in the services supplied isn't necessarily a bad thing. Possibly the Leader of the Opposition is, possibly the Member for Roblin is too, but at the time that the Conservative administration came into office the budget for that year was approximately \$80 million. By the time the Conservative regime left office it had increased to an approximately \$400 million per annum - give or take a few million - which accounts for an increase, Mr. Speaker, of some 500 percent in a matter of a little over ten years. Now this apparently is an acceptable rate to the Member for Roblin and is apparently an acceptable rate of increase for the Leader of the Opposition. -- (Interjection) -- The Member for Lakeside points out that his government in fact increased services in that time and I'm not saying that that's a bad thing, in fact it was probably a good thing. But what in fact was that rate of increase of spending for that time? A rate of increase of 500 percent in ten years, Mr. Speaker, is in fact a doubling approximately every four years. So even if this government were to continue at the same rate as the previous government we could expect expenditures by this government to have doubled in the four years in which it has been in office. In other words, we could expect expenditures to have risen from 400 to \$800 million this year. The fact is that it has not risen at anywhere near that rate and by the Member for Roblin's own figures has gone up from 400 - 600 million which represents an increase of 50 percent and not 100 percent. So on the one hand they are telling this government that you are not doing the same as we did, that the increase is not sufficient, yet on the other hand you are spending too much. Now surely, Mr. Speaker, what is good for a Conservative goose should be good for a New Democratic Party gander. Or is it a matter of don't do what we did, do what we say. -- (Interjection) -- I'll come on to taxes in a moment if the Member for Sturgeon Creek can just contain himself for a few minutes. He will have his opportunity, of course, in this debate.

I would like to go on now, Mr. Speaker, to some of the things that the Leader of the Opposition said that he would do at the same time that he would reduce provincial expenditures. Now the first thing that he proposed was to establish a Premier's office in the north and he said "a Premier's office" so I assume that he does not intend to move the present Premier's

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. WALDING cont'd). . . . office but to simply set up another one with more staff and presumably more civil servants somewhere in the north, which would of course cost more money. The Leader of the Opposition also proposes to set up satellite offices of the various ministries in areas where their operations have the greatest effort. Presumably this would also cost more money. The Leader of the Opposition also proposes to appoint a Provincial Auditor-General who would presumably also need a staff and involve us in further expenses. -- (Interjections) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. WALDING: There is more to come, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition says that a Conservative administration would take steps to realign municipal responsibility and municipal revenue. Now what that means is rather unclear but I would gather that it would mean putting more provincial money into municipal pockets, which would of course please the Member for Roblin. And also another quote Mr. Speaker, the first steps . . . yes, he would include revenue-sharing which presumably would also increase the amount spent by the provincial government. Further down the page he says, "We would sit down with the City of Winnipeg and work out a system, a planning development and subsidy for people's first transportation system for Winnipeg." Again, "further expenditures by a provincial government. We would also work out an arrangement for financing the bridges that are required" - and we're back to bridges again. But further expenditures by a provincial government no doubt. "We would support community educational programs" A further expense. "We would favor a rent subsidization program." Further expenditures by the provincial government. And further down on the same page, Mr. Speaker, "home improvement loans and a moratorium on tax increases for specified types of improvement." Further increases in government spending.

"The Progress Conservatives would take part in financing that library," and here he is speaking of the City of Winnipeg. Further expenses. And they would also carefully study the proposals for an ethnic village. Now there is no commitment there to spend further provincial money but no doubt the Tories have a better idea and that light will come on in due course. A Manitoba growth fund is also proposed by the Conservatives which may or may not involve provincial money but we have the Manitoba Development Fund as some sort of an indication of what might happen here and also a City of Winnipeg regional development corporation presumably involving yet further provincial expenditures by a Conservative government. "It is clear that we need a new approach," says the Leader of the Opposition. We recommend that they cut personal income taxes by at least 10 percent.

MR. PAULLEY: The wealthy Conservatives would like that, wouldn't they.

A MEMBER: How about the poor NDPs?

MR. WALDING: Just a couple of other spending proposals by the Leader of the Opposition, where he suggests that a Conservative government would take the family farm from the succession duty provisions altogether and that they would take school taxes off farm and senior citizens' homes owned and leased by them - further increase in provincial expenditures. Furthermore, a Conservative provincial government would provide them with a corridor for the pipeline - further provincial expenditures. Now as well as all these increased expenditures, Mr. Speaker, at the same time that a Conservative government would reduce expenditures, they further propose to reduce income taxes by at least ten percent. Well, Mr. Speaker, -- (Interjections) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, we need only look back a few years to find out just what the Conservative policy is when it comes to taxation, those taxation increases and presumably taxation decreases. The citizens of this province, Mr. Speaker, enjoyed a decade of Conservative administration unequalled in the past for the extent and the scope of taxation increases. And what do we find the most popular tax increases favored by Conservative politicians, Mr. Speaker? Well we find that they favor a premium tax, a tax over everybody, and what could be fairer than to tax everybody the same amount. That surely is to be the philosophy of a Conservative government. And just a matter of a few years before that, we saw another example of Conservative philosophy, the imposition of a sales tax - 5 percent for everybody - again right across the board.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Now, Mr. Speaker, the same Conservative members are now talking

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. WALDING cont'd)... about taxation again. Now could we really expect them to propose any form of selective tax cut for the people of Manitoba when in this very House not one year ago they stood up solidly and voted against the Education Property Tax Credit plan

SOME MEMBERS: That's right.

MR. WALDING: So we have the admission, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. If the two honourable members who want to argue that, I wish they'd go out in the hall and argue it.

MR. WALDING: So we have the admission, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservatives do not favor selective tax cuts. What we could expect them to favor would be the form of a cross-the-board tax reduction such as a reverse premium tax that they brought in in 1968, I believe it was. But however, what they appear to favor and to recommend and to ask this government to do, is to institute a ten percent personal income tax cut, and we might wonder what in fact this would do for the taxpayers of Manitoba. And from the 1972 tax table, Mr. Speaker, I took a few figures the other night just to see what the effect of a ten percent tax cut would in fact mean to the citizens of Manitoba, and I found that on a taxable income of \$9,000 which for a married man with two children would represent probably a gross income of around \$13,000 - the "middle income poor" - that the provincial income tax payable on such a sum would be \$827.20 a year; therefore a ten percent cut as proposed by the Conservatives would put \$82.00 a year in the pockets of such a taxpayer.

A taxable income of \$24,000, which is a pretty good income in any one's terms, a man with a taxable income of \$24,000 would be faced in 1972 with paying provincial income taxes of \$2,850.73. A Conservative government would give that man \$285.00 whereas the poor "middle income poor man" would only get \$82.00.

What would this same ten percent proposal do for so many of our income tax payers in Manitoba, a man with a taxable income of \$2,000. Now for a married man with two children having a taxable income of \$2,000 last year would probably represent a gross income of around \$6,000, and on that \$2,000 taxable income, Mr. Speaker, he would have paid in 1972 a provincial tax of \$155.60, a Conservative government would give to that man \$15.00 a year - \$15.00 a year to a man with a taxable income of \$2,000, \$82.00 a year to a man with a taxable income of \$9,000 and \$285.00 a year to a man with a taxable income of \$24,000. Mr. Speaker, that is Conservative justice for you and Conservative equity. And what would this proposal do to so many of our old age pensioners and so many of our farmers who have no taxable income at all? It would simply give them nothing. So much for Conservative equality, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is generally recognized that this might well be an election year, and the Leader of the Opposition is saying on the one hand that provincial expenditures are too high and that he will reduce them, but on the other hand he will increase expenditures by all these new programs that he wishes to bring in, and not only will he increase services but at the same time he would decrease taxes, Mr. Speaker. Really the only conclusion one can draw from that, Mr. Speaker, is that the Leader of the Opposition and all his cohorts behind him really have a very low impression of the voters' intelligence here in Manitoba. To expect the voters in this province to buy a program like that is to consider them plainly stupid. We on this side of the House have never claimed that the electorate is stupid. We have told them frankly that when we increase services increased expenditure is needed to find it, but the Leader of the Opposition seems to state quite firmly that he considers the voters of Manitoba to be stupid.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now I do want to pay once more a compliment to the Leader of the Opposition at this time, for the Leader of the Opposition has stated quite frankly and quite openly that he was wrong in the past. In fact it comes through in his speech when he said words to the effect that the ideas of 1966 were not those of 1973. And he admitted on a radio program that I heard just recently that he had been wrong as far as the Manitoba Development Fund was concerned and that the secrecy provisions of that fund were a mistake.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the honourable member state his matter of privilege.

MR. SPIVAK: I believe that the honourable member stated that I said that on a radio program. I think I know what I said on the radio program and I do not think I said that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital. Order, please.

MR. WALDING: My recollection, Mr. Speaker, is that it was on a morning open line

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. WALDING con'd) . . . . phone-in program where the moderator asked the Leader of the Opposition about the secrecy provisions of the Manitoba Development Fund, and that the Leader of the Opposition said that he would now not support such a secret arrangement and that he favored a much more open type of arrangement in a fund. And I do admire the Leader of the Opposition for saying that, for admitting that he in fact was wrong to hold that view at that time.

I would also gather, Mr. Speaker, from comments of the Leader of the Opposition, that he now realizes that the position that he and his government took with regard to flooding Southern Indian Lake in 1969 was the wrong decision. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, it's very gratifying to know that the Leader of the Opposition now realizes that he was wrong, because the voters in Manitoba knew he was wrong in 1969 -- (Interjection) -- and it's rather interesting to note that the Leader of the Opposition is presently four years behind the electorate -- (Interjections) -- And it's rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, that on the one hand the Leader of the Opposition apparently thinks the electorate is stupid, yet by the same token that same electorate is that much brighter than the Leader of the Opposition, which doesn't say very much for him. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have one quote just recently by a very prominent Conservative, and I think that it would be possibly fitting to conclude this with a quotation from another prominent Conservative, who might have been a contemporary, Mr. Speaker, or somewhat prophetic in his words looking forward from 130 years ago, when he looks at a political party which at the same time proposes to cut down spending, to spend more on other programs at the same time that it decreases taxes, for Benjamin Disraeli said in 1838 in a speech: "A Conservative government is an organized hypocrisy."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina, Order, please. Order, please. I am having some difficulty because some people are labouring under impulsive problems of having to utter and I cannot hear more than one person, so I would like to now entertain the Honourable Member from Pembina to have the floor.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to start off by congratulating you in being returned to your position as Speaker. I realize the difficulty you have from time to time and how both sides seem to get you in the squeeze. I wouldn't want your job for anything; you've got a tough one.

I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder and I would also like to express my sorrow on the passing of Mr. Gordon Beard, the Member for Churchill. I didn't always see eye to eye with Gordon, but I am sure that he was a very conscientious member and he was the best member I think that Churchill could have had.

I see we have some new faces in the press this year from other years; there's not many of them there now, but I see that they also come under severe criticism too from time to time, whether they're quoting the people rightly or wrongly. So you're just like us. I guess from time to time you're misrepresented or somebody takes it the way they want. I think, however, my experience with the press is that they've always been very fair, and that when people get very critical of them it's probably because they're on shaky ground themselves. -- (Interjection) -- You, know, I believe that's right.

I'd like to express satisfaction with the other side and the other people here. It's probably the last session we'll have together before we go into an election, and I liken it to the poem I learnt when I went to school about the Charge of the Light Brigade, because when this session's over we'll all go out but we won't all come back - so there'll be some go, but we don't know who.

Now I'd like to speak a little bit about the Throne Speech, and to me who is not too experienced in interpreting a Throne Speech, I would say it looks to me very much like one that could be used for an election speech, because it does have several things in it which people will not complain about, even people like myself who probably are more critical than others on some of their give-away programs; because people will not be complaining about getting part of their drugs paid for or partial loans forgiven to local municipalities, encouraging of the beef cattle and the dairy industry, and the reduction in crop insurance and help with the local police.

Now I don't think - I think there's other things in there too which are good, but there's no need of me blowing about their side because they've been doing it and I know they're going to continue to do it. But I think what people aren't realizing is that it is a speech that's probably going to be used as an election speech, and they have to have things in there that are

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) . . . . going to be acceptable to the people, but they're really doing this because they want to keep edging in with their Crown corporations and the government ownership and with more civil servants. And I have read their White Paper proposed by the Planning and Priorities Committee for the 70s and that's just what it points to; and I think that they're wise enough that they know, as the Member from Morris said when he was speaking. He was speaking about Mr. Schreyer when he was talking to his annual meeting when he said, "You only can do what you can -- you know, what's possible at the time." So he's offering these things, but he's got the idea back of it all that he believes more and more in big government. And it's just maybe like trying to catch a rabbit - you don't figure you can overtake him, but if you coax him with lettuce or carrots or something like this you'll be able to trap him, and then you've got him and there's no way out. And I think that this is just what you're doing with your programs that you're offering to people, which are in some cases not too realistic. I'm not just all as happy with them as even some of the members on my side of the House, because I don't believe that the older people in this province are asking for all of the things you're giving them. I don't believe that other groups are asking for all you're giving them. You're offering them things and then they say, well, I'll take it because the others take it. I hear older people saying that I don't think the government should be doing this, but they keep doing it. I'm not as much in favour of this sort of a program at all.

I'd like to talk a little about Hydro, because even though the matter might be pretty much settled, I'm sure it's going to be an election issue, and I believe that -- I'm happy, shall I say, that you're flooding South Indian Lake to some extent. I believe you're making a very serious mistake by not going somewhat higher and leaving the regulation of Lake Winnipeg alone, because by what I've been able to learn about it, if you would just use that extra four feet or so on the diversion, on the dam, so as to cause a diversion, you'd have a lot more power and you'd be selling power, while this other way you're going to spend millions of dollars on the regulation of Lake Winnipeg. And this is not adding any water, as we said before; it's just regulating it, and you're not even going to get enough power out of there to pay for the interest on your debt.

And I have to speak here about the wonderful breakthrough that the Attorney-General told us about last year, how some wise engineer that they'd found, probably one that Cass-Beggs found, found out there was a place out there in the rock that they could dig to and drain the water through, and there was little trouble to it . . . .

A MEMBER: Remember that, Al?

MR. HENDERSON: . . . . that it would be costing less than they had anticipated, not more; last year the thing was froze in the ice, this year it had to be shut down; I'm wondering how it's going to end up.

MR. MOUG: The Conservatives thought there was rock out there.

MR. HENDERSON: Well - it just seemed like as if they had had some superman come in that had found something that nobody else could and they'd had a big breakthrough - a major breakthrough. However, as I watch politics I see how people manoeuvre from when they're in position and out of position whether it's about Hydro or anything else, but there's one position that I'm very shocked at and that's the position of the Liberal leader. And I just can't see the way he's handling this. He looks to me like a person that's jumping in all directions trying to get a policy that he thinks he can get a group of people to follow. He's like a drowning man - he's like a drowning man floundering in the water, and I don't think if he keeps acting the way he has been in the past that we will need to destroy him; I think we'll just let him go wild and he's sure going to destroy himself.

Mr. Speaker, I was hoping for things in the Throne Speech which didn't appear there. I was hoping there would be things in there about the government's position on rail abandonment and strengthening local areas. I was looking for things in there about the equalization of succession duties between provinces, so as we haven't got one province with different rates of succession duties and different rates. And I'd like to have seen a reduction in the personal income tax charged by the province, because I don't think that it's good the way it is.

I was also hoping that the government would have more in there about welfare abuse. Now there has been some improvement and this is what I have been talking about all the time, that they should be working more with the municipalities. I happened to attend the last two meetings of the rural municipalities of Manitoba. First they had the Honourable Minister

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd). . . . Rene Toupin there and he was questioned by local councillors. I wonder how many of you people were there. I'm sure that he was very embarrassed, that he certainly couldn't handle the situation. But who did they bring up this year? Mrs. Una Decter. And it was really pathetic. She thinks that the country people that have been administering welfare have no consideration for anybody at all. She stated things that some municipalities had been so miserable that they'd only given somebody \$40.00 a month to live on. Well, I've been in the rural areas and I know rural councillors; they aren't that mean at all, and if they happened to have given one family \$40.00 to live on for the month it's because they probably knew that that man was quite capable of working and that there was work available for him and that \$40.00 would tide him over; if they give him \$40.00 he would probably get a job and go to work; and if she'd have been looking after him, he'd have been set up for life.

However, now the government is talking about making people get out and work, and I'm all for it, seeing people that can work work, but at the same time we can't have a government that's discouraging thrift and saving; so you can't have it both ways, you see. While you're discouraging the people so as they never try to save or provide for themselves, the very moment that some bit of sickness or something does happen to them, you do have them on your back, as you could say. So this is where the government is wrong.

The government has, both the provincial and the federal government in my opinion, have got too many silly make-work programs which are unproductive - all sorts of them, from your students' aid to your local initiative, even to where you have them running around the streets phoning up people and asking people if they want some washing done, if they want their sidewalks shovelled off -- (Interjection) -- yes, even building ice palaces - there's all sorts of them. You just should talk to some of the people -- (Interjection) -- well, fellows like Nick Ternette is a real example - one of those NDP boys that got into trouble -- (Interjection) -- Do you want me to tell you what he did? Well, when they had the Rock Festival in Winnipeg, and of course I know you know, Larry, and he wanted to get in, and then he wouldn't pay the price to get in, so they had to get the police to handle him and then when they put him out what did he do but lay a charge against the police. Police brutality. And these are the kind of people that seem to be able to get some of these grants to do something. -- (Interjections) -- The people are getting sick of civil servants of all types running around. Do you want to ask a question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: I wonder if the Honourable Member for Pembina would confirm that the projects which are provided under the provincial employment program are each and every one endorsed by the municipal councils for which he expressed such an admiration for their judgment previously.

MR. HENDERSON: Yes, I'll be glad to answer that, because we do find our local municipalities saying that they're accepting it, but they're somewhat reluctant about it. They say, "We really don't want this but this town is getting this low rental housing; they've got a program down there where they've got them on a student aid program or a local initiative program, why should we be paying for theirs and getting nothing?" So this is how you slip your socialistic programs in.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Would the honourable member permit another question? Mr. Speaker, I hold no brief for Nick Ternette, but I don't like to see anybody falsely accused of something. Does the honourable member have any evidence to substantiate the suggestion that Nick Ternette was trying to forcefully go into a Pop Rock concert without paying?

MR. HENDERSON: It's very peculiar now that I have to refer to something that I read in the press -- (Interjections) -- because this is where I read it, I read it in the press -- (Interjections) -- the press -- (Interjections) -- Well, so much for that. But I'm telling you, I'm telling you that the people are getting tired, the working people are getting sick and tired of the number of civil servants and people running around from Hydro trucks to telephone trucks to social workers' trucks to Ag Reps, to school bands and all these other public vehicles that start up in the morning and run all day that never shut off, burning our gas, and everybody else is shutting their vehicles off.

A MEMBER: How about the members that plug their cars in here in 30 above . . . ?

MR. HENDERSON: The number of people that's on the working man's back is too great-- (Interjection) -- Yes, that's right, some of them get spurs. And I think another thing that's

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd). . . . of great concern is the rising cost of education, and particularly at the universities, and I'm surely hoping that this year we'll be able to get more information on how the money at the university is being spent. I remember the article when they had Mr. Sirluck I think it was, on the radio, and then his salary finally did come out. Then we had fellows like Mr. Barber who wrote the Barber Report getting \$29,500 for teaching between 75 and 100 hours a year. So at the time of the last federal election we had Mr. Lewis going around talking about the corporation rip-off. I'm beginning to think that there's an academic rip-off. I'm not going to quote what he's making because I don't know exactly but I heard it at the time and he had the car and the house and all this spending money besides. It sounded awful good. On top of this money that Mr. Barber got for writing this report, I wonder what he got paid for writing - no, for teaching. I wonder what he got for writing the report for the government at the same time. And to me by what I've read of the report, it's a bunch of statistics that he's gathered up that probably some research person could have gathered at a wage of about \$500 a month. It's just a bunch of statistics that he's gathered up, but even then, even then by what little I've looked through it and I want to deal with this more when we get into the Health and Welfare Department, it shows that Manitoba has had a larger increase per population and per capita than the other western provinces, and he says one in four is below the poverty level and it makes it sound like as if we're all suffering. Well that is not so. He's not in touch with reality. Whenever you get -- I shouldn't hit professors in a general way, but usually when you get a group of professors to write a report you're pretty near bound to see that all they can come up with is the idea of spending more money. Probably the reason is that their salaries are so big that maybe they do feel a little bit guilty when they're put on a report if they don't recommend more for others.

Now I would like to speak about some of the things that affect my own local area mentioned by the Member for Gladstone -- (Interjection) -- that's around Manitou but it's a thing that's bothering all southern Manitoba is this here jack-lighting at night and people killing deer and peddling them to other people. I'm sure that the Indian Chiefs don't want their people doing this. I think it's a matter of us getting ready, putting some pressure on the Federal Government. I know it's a federal problem but this is going on and it's not proper and I do wish something could be done about it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Will the honourable member permit a further question? Is the honourable member suggesting that jack-lighting is done only by Indians?

MR. HENDERSON: If I said that I'm sorry.

A MEMBER: No, you didn't say that.

MR. HENDERSON: But it is the Indians that are allowed to do it. They're allowed to do it on road allowances . . . .

A MEMBER: They're legal, the Indians are legal.

MR. HENDERSON: I might stand corrected and maybe the Minister of Mines and Resources can correct me, but I understand it is legal for the Indians to shoot at night killing deer on Crown property.

MR. GREEN: Only if they are searching for food, not for the purpose of selling.

MR. HENDERSON: Okay. Can you find an Indian that gets caught shooting a deer that would say he wasn't shooting it for food? Nor very likely. I think it's a matter though that should be cleared up because I'm sure that the Indian people who are conscientious don't want this to happen. There's been quite an increase in tourists in Manitoba in this last while, 20 percent - talking about all Manitoba - but we have an area in our part which has had far more than its percentage in the increase and that's La Riviere. And we aren't just too satisfied down there with the way that the border crossing is and the road is leading to the crossing. We have an 18-mile stretch of gravel road down there where the people that are coming across are getting their windshields broken by stones. I've been told that some people have had to change three windshields in a year. Now down in La Riviere, this is where they have this ski resort and there's no doubt but what many people from Winnipeg go there and I think this is a road that should have a hard surface when we're trying to promote tourism. I also think that they should have extended time at the border crossings for places like this, in particular on weekends, because I don't think this is bringing tourism to Manitoba and other dollars when the people that want to go to Winnipeg from the southern part of Manitoba from where I live

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) . . . . have to come around by Emerson to come or go if it's after ten at night. Now this even becomes worse in the summertime when we're on the fast time and they're still on standard time. So we have a border crossing there that isn't convenient for tourists at all. It also affects -- did you have a question that you wanted to ask?

MR. DESJARDINS: Are you telling me that this is the control of the Provincial Government - the border station?

MR. HENDERSON: No, but I do find that the Provincial Government has a heck of a lot to say in some of the other programs that has to do with Ottawa so why don't they have something to do with this? And I'm talking about the Road 2 which is the provincial road from La Riviere to Hannah.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker . . . . my honourable friend and tell him that we've made all kinds of representation to the Federal . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

A MEMBER: Hey, hey, now that's not right, Larry.

MR. HENDERSON: The reason why I'm saying this is that just across from my southern area there we have Langdon where they have the missile sites, and they have a \$4 million payroll there every month. Now these are people that are in there and they have lots of money to spend. They're wanting them to come across to La Riviere, Morden and Carman and towns along that area, but there's no crossing to accommodate them. So I think it's quite a thing. And it's all right to say by your traffic count that it's not possible now but if you'd open up that border, at least on a trial basis it might make quite a difference. -- (Interjection) -- Because it's at least 60 miles one way extra if they happen to get caught over here or stay a little too long and they have to be back.

I'd like to speak about No. 3 highway from the east side of La Riviere to the west side because that area there has been surveyed for years and years, in fact the people are beginning to say this is another one of those "make work programs" that the government has for the winter. Now I'm sure that they must have enough, they must have had enough surveys by now. The people are wanting to see them to make up their mind and get on and get the job done. Let's remember that good roads are an investment and that people don't complain about roads. Now I've never heard it said in this House or the people I'm talking about that they're complaining about roads. If there's a good road put in they consider it an investment, and so I hope that they'll get on with that job because the people are thinking-down there that that's a joke.

I'd like to say something about the Department of Industry and Commerce and its work with the local corporations and the general managers. We have only one general manager and one girl with them in each office in most cases, that's all we have, and they're responsible to a very large area and to a lot of different people as well as to the department. I know that these people have a terrific workload, they've got so many things they can do; and I have had it said to me that when people come in to the Norquay Building where they have people which are probably drawing twice the salary and have so much help that they seem to be taking it pretty easy. Now I think that the people at the Norquay Building should get off their seats and do a little bit more for them and quit acting as just consultants; get out and be a little bit on the doing end - a little bit too much consulting in seminars and not enough work.

I was hoping that the Provincial Government could do something about the telephones. I'm not in favour of having free calls all across Manitoba but there was a few meetings in my area and I'm sure that the people in my area are prepared to pay somewhat more and have what you could call groupings of areas, because it's not very nice when you live in a rural area and have to pay long distance if you call the neighbouring town.

I'd like to also mention the Pembina Dam which I have been mentioning for years since I came in here. It's very important to that area for recreation and -- I just keep looking at the time and I'd like to say a little bit more on this dam but I don't know whether -- if I can have a few extra minutes I'll finish it.

A MEMBER: Come on back Monday, don't start the dam now.

MR. HENDERSON: Well, I haven't got too awful much left.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I will call it 5:30. The honourable gentleman will have an opportunity to conclude his speech on Monday. The hour being 5:30 the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 in the afternoon on Monday.