



Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable Peter Fox



Vol. XXIII No. 10 2:30 p.m., Monday, February 23rd, 1976. Third Session, 30th Legislature.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 p.m., Monday, February 23, 1976

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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 28 students of Grade 12 standing of the Sanford Collegiate, under the direction of Mr. Hew. This school is located in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris.

On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister for Education.

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Financial Report for the year ended March 31st, 1975 for the University of Manitoba and the Universities Grants Commission Annual Report for the year ending March 31st, 1975; the Brandon University President's Report for the year 1974-1975 and the Annual Report 1975-1976 for the Department of Colleges and Universities Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Tourism and Recreation.

HON. RENE TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Chief Inspector's Report of the Liquor Control Commission for the year ending December 31st, 1975 and to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Centennial Centre Corporation for the year ending March 31st, 1975.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Milk Control Board of Manitoba for the year ending September 30th, 1975.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Reports? Ministerial Statements; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Minister for Agriculture.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. USKIW introduced Bill 23, The Pesticides and Fertilizers Control Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Highways.

HON. PETER BURTONIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin) introduced Bill 25, an Act to amend The Highways Protection Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon) introduced Bill 27, an Act to amend The Flin Flon Charter.

MR. SPEAKER: Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Leader of the Official Opposition) (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. I wonder if the Minister can advise whether any agreement has been reached with the City of Winnipeg regarding the Fort Garry-St. Vital Bridge and its inter-connections.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Urban Affairs.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister for Urban Affairs) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker,

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MILLER cont'd) when the member asks about an agreement - discussions have taken place; I've met with Chairman of the Works and Operations Committee and conveyed to him the views of the Provincial Government with regard of the funding of the Fort Garry-St. Vital Bridge and that's where it stands today.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister can indicate that if the disagreement or impasse on the amounts involved is not . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is hypothetical.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether the 50 percent portion of the provincial grant will be made to the City of Winnipeg if the City of Winnipeg proceeds with plans other than that which the province has proposed to the city?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the Province has always taken the position that the City of Winnipeg can, of course, do what it wishes. Insofar as the participation of the province is concerned we determine the level of our contribution based on our perception of the need and of the project. If the City wishes to exceed that, of course, they can as they did in the Convention Centre.

MR. CRAIK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can I interpret from the Minister's remarks then that approximately five or six million dollars will be granted and if the city wishes to exceed that they can do so?

MR. MILLER: Without confirming the figures, because I don't recall them off-hand, yes, that's the general understanding.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture and would ask him if he has met with the Federal Minister of Agriculture lately to discuss the dairy quota subsidies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, no. We haven't had any recent meetings on the subject. We did discuss agricultural policy generally including dairy policy at the last conference.

MR. BANMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could assure the dairy producers of Manitoba that the government is employing every avenue open to it to make sure that Manitoba receives as high a quota - butter fat quota - subsidy as possible?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the honourable member does not know all of the history with respect to market shared quota arrangements across Canada. But I would like to advise him that prior to 1969 we lost a great deal of our share of production to Ontario and Quebec which was subsequently renegotiated in the early '70s and which we are now having to cut back somewhat due to the change in Federal policy. But essentially we're away ahead of where we were in 1969.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Attorney-General I wonder if I might direct a question to the First Minister and ask him if he has yet received the information concerning the Crown authorization or wire taps that was raised in this House last week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): No Mr. Speaker. I hope that the Attorney-General will be in a position to reply soon.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister would be prepared to take a further question for notice of the Attorney-General so that he could answer them together. I'd like to have confirmed whether in the authorization of the Crown taps whether in fact, any phones of Crown Attorneys in the Attorney-General's department had conversations taped and whether those tapings were the consequences of taps placed upon their lines or as a consequence of taps placed upon other people's lines with whom the Crown Attorneys were conducting business over the phone.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) Honourable Minister of Labour. I wonder if the Minister of Labour can indicate to the House any progress in the transit strike and can he indicate to the House if he had the negotiators of both sides in his office in the dispute.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Not as yet, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the latter part of the question. It could conceivably be that they may be called in to that emporium that I have across the corridor.

However, in specific answer my honourable friend, I have sent a letter today to the City of Winnipeg and to the Transit Union asking them to get together to consider the appointment of a mediator acceptable to the two parties to consider the dispute and to make recommendations to me as to a possible solution. Failing agreement between the two parties on the person of a mediator I have offered to have a mediator appointed by myself to look into the dispute and further, Mr. Speaker, offered financial back-up for the provision of payment of expenditures incurred by a mediator.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister seriously consider calling the two parties in dispute to his office, and perhaps he could be the biggest mediator in this dispute?

My other question is: also, has he had any discussions with the senior citizen's organizations about the difficulties and problems they are facing not being able to get to medicals and so on?

MR. PAULLEY: If I may reverse the procedure again, Mr. Speaker. My telephone has constantly been ringing all over the weekend by concerned senior citizens in this matter and I am fully cognizant and appreciative of the difficulties being encountered by our senior citizens and others in this dispute.

I did have, according to press releases, some success in another difficult situation respecting industrial relationships between management and labour. My honourable friend may be aware of that particular instance.

I am seriously considering doing as I believe the implied suggestion of my honourable friend, having the parties meet with me personally. I don't think that I am a Bryce Mackasey or anything like that, Mr. Speaker, however, I am prepared to do whatever possible that I personally can do to bring about a resolution and it is for that reason that I first of all made the suggestion of voluntary binding arbitration and now mediation in the dispute. I am hopeful seriously, in reply to my honourable friend that the "disputants", to use that term in a loose manner, will get down to bargaining.

MR. PATRICK: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can we expect in this House any legislation tabled as recommended by the Woods Committee in dealing with public employees?

MR. PAULLEY: Not at the present time, Mr. Speaker. I will say to my honourable friend that the Minister in the Department of Labour is giving serious consideration to the recommendation of the Woods Committee. Whether it's opportune to introduce legislation at this particular session of course is judgmental.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture, a question relating to the question posed by my colleague, the Member for La Verendrye. I wonder if the Minister could tell us by what percent has Manitoba's milk quota increased since 1969?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, in the arrangements entered into with the Government of Canada through the Canadian Dairy Commission a few years back, Manitoba was allocated some 300 million pounds of production rates.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the Minister tell us if the total milk quota for Canada has been increased or decreased since 1969?

MR. USKIW: I believe, Mr. Speaker, there has been a general increase but we have had a recapture from our position prior to that time.

MR. WATT: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the increase in Manitoba since 1969 relative to the total increase in Canada?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the only way one can define that precisely is to ask for an Order to give the precise information that my honourable friend wants. In any event, I will attempt to get something on paper for him to give him a breakdown of it.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, another question. On this side of the House can we then assume that the Minister is giving answers to a situation that he really is not sure of?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should know that if he wants specific information as to the amount, quantities, whatever, that that is not readily available at this point of time during our discussions, but that I am prepared to provide it for him. Surely he doesn't expect the ministry to have that information here, not knowing that the question is going to be put.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON (Wolseley): I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Is he aware that the price of bread has gone up and how much?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Consumer Affairs.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of many things. If I wasn't aware of that, my wife would certainly make me aware of it.

MR. WILSON: I wonder what discussions the Minister has had with the bread companies?

MR. TURNBULL: Following on the series of meetings we had with the bread companies in the summer of 1973, the bread companies have made a practice of advising me, of sending me a letter saying that their bread prices would be going up. I have had some examination made of these price increases and have found generally since '73 that the price increases have not been out of line with the increase in cost components going into the finished product.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation and the question is: I wonder if in the event that he's addressing a letter to Miss Sylvia Burka on the achievement of her World Skating Championship, if he might also include the congratulations of the Official Opposition as well as the government on this achievement which I'm sure that we're all very proud to share at this time.

I would ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not the Minister of the government is carrying on any discussions with the Federal Government to try and rectify what appears to be a well recognized problem of under-financing and under-preparation for many of the international games and particularly the Winter Games that seem to be upon us in Canada despite the fact that we're very fortunate in having Miss Sylvia Burka win the medal this time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Tourism.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I will make it a privilege and an honour to extend best wishes on behalf of all Manitobans including the Official Opposition to Miss Burka for her outstanding performance at the world level.

Yes, for the other part of the question of the Leader of the Opposition, we are discussing with Federal authority pertaining to lack of funds for athletes on the provincial, national and international levels. This is being rectified by all levels of government and by agencies and private individuals contributing to the upkeep and the performance of athletes at all levels. So discussions are taking place between different departments of government on the provincial level with the national government.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether there's any special effort being made now in preparation for the Olympics this summer in Montreal with regards to sponsoring of Canadian athletes and primarily Manitoba athletes for this spectacular.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a formula that is accepted by the athletes themselves, presented by the Federal Government, endorsed and supplemented in part by the Provincial departments implicated in regards to the athletes that will present themselves in Montreal.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I've taken note that the Attorney-General has taken his seat in the House and while I recognize he has questions under notice, I wonder if I might pose some additional questions to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General confirm whether the Law Society of Manitoba requested particulars of the charges that were to be brought against Mr. Pilutik before the Commission of Inquiry and can the Attorney-General indicate whether he supplied any information or particulars of information to the Law Society in reference to those charges?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, the Law Society requested particulars of matters which would relate to Mr. Pilutik's membership in the Law Society, that would be relevant to that membership and a meeting has been held between officials in my own department and officials of the Law Society and I gather that agreement has been now reached insofar as the provision of particulars that would be relevant to the Law Society matter.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate whether the information that is being supplied to the Law Society is information that was drawn from the use of the wire tap that was placed upon Mr. Pilutik at that point?

MR. PAWLEY: I would have to take that question as notice.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Attorney-General indicate whether he has undertaken any investigation to determine whether the police authorities in the City of Winnipeg leaked information to the news media concerning the charges that were to be brought against Mr. Pilutik in the Commission of Inquiry or whether they in fact leaked any evidence that was to be used in support of those charges?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there was an account which did appear in the press some six weeks to two months ago which did cause inquiry to be made as to whether or not there were any unauthorized leaks. We've been assured that there has been no leaks by the news media of the particulars of the evidence which was collected by the police in respect to the Pilutik case.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate to the House what safeguards are being applied to the information that was acquired as a result of the taps placed upon Mr. Pilutik or other people in reference to this case and what assurances can the Attorney-General give to the House that this information would be used only in reference to that case and not to any other?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think all that I could indicate is certainly every effort is being made to physically assure that the information that was obtained by such methods is kept in proper custody. Insofar as the second part of the question, what assurance can the Attorney-General provide that such information would not be utilized in other matters, not relevant, I gather, to the particular reason for the wire tapping; all that I can say to the honourable member that I think that assurance can be best provided by our rules of evidence and by the very fact that courts are most careful that evidence that in fact is adduced in the courtroom is obtained in a proper legal manner. So I think the best assurance is by the very laws of evidence which courts relate to.

MR. AXWORTHY: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney-General. Can the Minister indicate, resorting to a previous question, whether anybody in the Crown Attorneys' office would have had their phone tapped or any information gleaned from conversations they may have had as a result of the tap placed upon Mr. Pilutik or does he have any information whether taps were affixed to phones of Crown Attorneys themselves.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I gather that question was taken as notice on Friday and prior to answering that question I want to be totally satisfied as to the correctness of my answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. BANMAN cont'd) of Highways and would ask him whether his government will be introducing seat belt legislation this session of the Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Highways.

MR. BURNTIAK: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter of policy and I'm sure it will be announced if that happens to be the case, in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wellington and the amendment thereto by the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I'm very surprised that you and your years in the Chair have forgot this wonderful Constituency of Roblin that I represent. I do, Mr. Speaker, today bring you the greetings and the best wishes of all the fine people of Roblin Constituency and wish you every success as you look after our responsibilities, the parliamentary process in this great province. Also I would like to congratulate the Deputy Speaker and the new Page Boys and Girls who are now looking after the menial tasks in the Legislature itself. I'd also like to express the best wishes from the people of Roblin to the two new members who are sitting on our benches and wish them every success in their deliberations.

Mr. Speaker, it would be remiss of me if I did not casually comment on my desk mate, the Honourable Member from Souris-Killarney, who has not been able as yet to take his chair in the Chamber. However, indications that I got on Friday was that he has improved considerably and was able to walk in the halls of the Health Sciences Centre. I'm sure that you and I and the people of the Legislature look forward to the day when he can come back and take part in the debates and bring his geniality and cheerful disposition to the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the motion that is before the House proposed by the Member for Riel. I'm sure Mr. Speaker, before I dwell on the motion that you and the members of this Chamber must be still sort of red-eyed from watching that performance on television as the Progressive-Conservatives at the national level selected a new leader. Mr. Speaker, I don't think in my time in politics that I've ever seen more interest in politics and the democratic process in the election of a leader than was exemplified in that four day performance. As I stand before you this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this Chamber, I can assure you that I and the people of my caucus look forward to working hard and working long to support this young gentleman, Joe Clarke to get rid of the socialists in this country, and the sooner we get back to the job the better. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that the day is near at hand when we will rid this country of this dreadful disease of socialism that has caused all these problems that are before us.

Mr. Speaker, in looking over the Speech from the Throne I find certain things in there that are of great interest to the people that I represent and they have asked me to express my support of. There are other things mentioned in the Speech from the Throne that concern the people of Roblin Constituency and I hope during the days of this session that I will be able to raise those matters and get some answers for the people.

Of course, the first one and the foremost concern of the people I guess not only in Roblin but in the other constituencies - it's a very difficult chair, Mr. Speaker, to speak from it's - is the inflationary factor, Mr. Speaker. Considering that inflation in this province and across Canada has progressed steadily since the days they came to office, this government, under the premiership of the Honourable Edward Schreyer, and since the Trudeau Government took office in Ottawa, we have seen the ideas and the disease of this country, inflation, slowly but surely eroding our economic structure. The idea that the Federal Government or this government in a matter of one, or two, or three years can bring the economy back to this country, it's at a 10 to 12 percent

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) inflationary factor, and the fact that you think you can bring it back where it was in the days of Walter Weir in a space of a short three years, I say it can't be done. Not with you guys at the helm.

I recall those days when Walter Weir went to the people of this province and said, "Let's take a look at where we stand today. Let's pause for a moment and see if the economic resources of this province and Canada can afford another thrust and another spending of government funds." What did the socialists say, Mr. Speaker? They said, "Forget it. Forget it. We are hungry for office. We are going to take office and we're going to open up the treasuries in this province like they were never opened up before." And they sold that bill of goods to the people of this province, and here we are today, Mr. Speaker, wondering how we're going to get out of it.

I say the guidelines are badly needed at this time and possibly more than guidelines are needed to get the economy back on the rails again in this province. The reason that I would say, Mr. Speaker, why they are needed and why they should continue and receive the support of the business community and the public is that the adoption of this - what would you call it, Mr. Speaker? - desperation program, has for the first time, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, forced the Federal Government and this Schreyer Government to admit to the man on the street and to the people all across this great country that they were the main cause of inflation in this country. Mark that in your books, that they were, they are now admitting - the Premier wouldn't admit it last year, the government here wouldn't admit it last year - but now they are admitting, finally, that they, the Federal Government and the government in this province are the main problems of inflation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it took a long time for this government and for the Government of Canada to admit that they led the country and led the people down the garden path inflationwise. The Minister of Industry and Commerce sits there and laughs and I'm sure it's going to take a long long time, Mr. Speaker, for this government and the Government of Canada to inflict back on our people a three to four, or at a maximum of five percent inflationary factor. I ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce as he sits over there right today - he's an economist - how long is it going to take Canada and Manitoba to get back to four percent inflation, or three percent, better still? It's quite evident, Mr. Speaker, when the Estimates were tabled in the House of Commons the other day and the figures came out, even though the Prime Minister of this country has been talking restraints for the last eight to ten months we find that they've expended far more than anybody anticipated if we're going to fight inflation. The figures that were laid in the House of Commons the other day were startling.

Mr. Speaker, this government, how much did this government overspend last year when they were talking restraint to the people of this province? I have an article from the Tribune dated January 9th which says: "The Manitoba Government spent \$47.7 million more than it budgeted for the first nine months of '75." Now Mr. Speaker, who is kidding who? Is this Cabinet over here and this First Minister trying to mislead me and the people of the Roblin Constituency that you were actually sincere and going to do something about inflation when you come out with those kind of overspending programs? Mr. Speaker, I don't think they're sincere at all. In fact, I don't think they mean what they're saying in this budget that they are going to inflict some restraints and help us get back to the days of stable economy in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the old philosopher who said one time that every journey starts with a single step, he must have been pleased with the cuts that Trudeau just recently announced in Ottawa, and the cuts that we're going to listen to in a very short time from this government. What was it the First Minister of this province said, that he would try - I think that is the way it's in here - to hold the line. That's not good enough for me. That's not good enough for the people of this province, to "try". You've got to be more specific than that if you're going to govern and have the right to govern in this province. "Try" is not good enough. We have to have more definitions and more specific answers to the questions of what you are going to do and

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) why can't you, the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the Treasury Bench say, "We are going to do this and we are going to do that," not "try". That's not good enough at this day and age in the province.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, there are certainly important steps and things that this government and the Government of Canada are going to do and things that, no doubt, they are going to move in the right direction. But when you compare what they have to do now with what they've done in the past, Mr. Speaker, and wonder how serious are they as they stand before the people today in this province and across Canada and say that we are in a mess, we're in the most horrendous mess this country has ever seen and what are we going to do?

Mr. Speaker, today, on every hundred dollars in this Canada spent on goods and services, forty dollars - including the transfer payments - is spent by government. Now isn't that a fantastic statement? No wonder we have inflation. The Minister of Industry and Commerce knows that that kind of economics is all wrong; that of every hundred dollars, forty bucks is spent by the government.

Government payrolls, Mr. Speaker, across Canada have swollen to 1.2 million people. That's one in every eight of the Canadian work force are working for the government, working for a government creating a total payroll of some \$10 billion of which 4.8 goes for salaries and wages. Mr. Speaker, do you think that you're going to roll that back in two or three years, that this government is going to roll back their enormous expenditures of money in two or three years? Mr. Speaker, I say and the people of my constituency say that it will take two to three years to just dispose of the federal deficit and the deficit which we have before us in this province, let alone look at the other deficits that's facing the people of this country and Manitoba.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that there can be no real hope of reducing inflation either here or across Canada significantly unless the tax levels can be reduced and reduced and reduced. You can't cut down inflation. The reason for my statement, Mr. Speaker, is that in the total of all forms of taxation which includes the corporate income tax, the standard income tax, those are all key components in the prices of goods and services that you and I have to have every day. The price of any product or any service that you and I are asking for today is made up of labour, taxes, return on investment or interest and a very small profit. There is nothing else. That is what the price of goods and service made up of: labour, taxes, a return on investment or profit and that's it. If any one of those four factors that I just gave you, Mr. Speaker, is out of whack or out of line, then the whole price structure goes out of line. I gave you labour, taxes, return on investment or the profit and the interest and then the profit factor. Therefore, I say that an extensive reduction of government spending is necessary to reduce taxes. They are the ones that put the taxes up and unless we can give the people of Canada and Manitoba assurance that we're going to cut the taxes back and give them a chance to buy these goods and services then we are not going to be able to attack inflation at all.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how long it is going to take for the Federal Government and the governments across Canada at the provincial level to cut taxes. Even, in fact, are they going to cut taxes? I imagine the first thing that would happen if we started cutting taxes is a hundred thousand civil servants will have to go, laid off. Now can you imagine any political government, this government, going into the Civil Service here tomorrow and saying look we're going to cut 2,000; or the Federal government go in and say look we're going to cut 100,000 civil servants to reduce the taxes. They wouldn't do it; they won't do it, Mr. Speaker. They don't have the courage to do it because they're scared to do it politically. While business and labour and the public are prepared to live with controls for three to four to five years - we've already said we're prepared to live with it - and try to make the thing function, it's a very difficult question when you ask the government to abide by it and prove what you're going to do.

Even more difficult, Mr. Speaker, for the government will be the horrendous task of dismantling essential parts of this huge bureaucracy that's built up across this country. Power, large power structures of civil servants, large powers which they have been so busy building. This government and the Trudeau government filled them like

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd) real troopers for the last eight years and now are you now going to dismantle it? Are you going to cut it back? Are you going to reduce the taxes or are you going to do nothing?

So, Mr. Speaker, I say the alternative to doing nothing is the eventual collapse of our economy in this country. I say and the people of my constituency say there is no choice. We've got to cut the taxes back; we've got to do all these things to make the man in the street understand that government is concerned and prepared to do something. If we were the government of this Province today, Mr. Speaker, I would assure you we would do that. Have no fear.

Now Mr. Speaker, I have other concerns that I would like to bring to the attention of the Chamber and the first one is education costs. I have done a poll in my constituency and they want to know what we are going to do about education. I'm talking equality of education. Can the Minister of Education stand up and tell me today that the students in Duck Mountain School Division are getting an equal education to the students in Winnipeg?

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): What are they not getting? Tell me.

MR. MCKENZIE: It would take me all day to tell you all the things they are not getting, Mr. Speaker. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, what's happening to the people in Duck Mountain School Division? They now find out that the 20.8 increase in the cost per pupil in that school over 1974, 20.8. The total cost, Mr. Speaker, of educating at the elementary and at the secondary level as in 1975 was close to 300 million bucks. What is it going to be in '76? It is not going to go down. The Minister can't sit there and swirl in his chair across from me and tell me he's going to cut it back. The student population, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, is down 2 percent and was down 2 percent I think a year ago as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we tie in those expenditures with the benefits then maybe we could put something together and the trustees at the school division level are most concerned about where we are going in this matter. They're concerned that we are moving farther and farther away from equalized education in this province; farther and farther away from the kids in the rural areas having an equal chance for opportunity as those in the city. That was the intent of the Foundation Program that if this government and this Minister had followed the guidelines of the Foundation Program then they would have had a much closer chance to be equal to their city counterparts.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to read some of the comments of the fourth study of MAST and some of the figures that come out of that study and I'm sure that the Minister has read them. It shows there that in 1971 the expenditure, this was raised from a low of 597 to a high of 891 per pupil, a difference of \$294. By 1975 this difference had increased to 633 with cost per pupil ranging from a low of 995 to a high of 1628. Those figures are there in spite of this government's equalization program and if you want to talk about equal education, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't exist. It doesn't exist according to those figures. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that the present system is not working. This is what the people in my constituency are telling me. They're telling me that the problems are real; they are telling me that the Minister knows what these problems are and up to now he has not been prepared to do anything with it.

Duck Mountain School Division this year, Mr. Speaker, is facing an increase of 27 mills, 27 mills. Does that make any sense in this day and age, Mr. Speaker? What has the government got in mind? What are they going to do to them out of that most difficult problem? With 12 or 11 or 10 percent inflationary dollars it becomes a disaster for them to tackle this problem, Mr. Speaker. So I say, Mr. Speaker, there is almost twice as much taxes the property owner is paying than he paid two years ago and 52 percent of the cost in 1975 - I just wonder, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the trustees and the taxpayers are insisting and who insists today that the revenue can't come from the property tax owner. What is it, 20 percent of it comes from the property tax owner today? So I say there are major changes required and I urge the

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) government to come up with a plan that will hopefully once again equalize education in our great province.

Mr. Speaker, there is concern in the area that I represent over the possibilities of rail abandonment. Hearings have been held and I wonder - the Minister of Highways did make a statement in the Dauphin hearings when they were related to some of the branches that were proposed to be abandoned in that area in and around Dauphin. The Minister of Highways said that day, Mr. Speaker, and I paraphrase what he said: that this Province doesn't have enough money to rebuild the highways or to put them in shape so that these areas where the rail lines are going out would have an equal chance to get their products to market. I wonder if the Minister when he brings his estimates before the House will give us some insight into what's going to happen in those areas where the rail lines are going to be abandoned in this province. It is quite clear now since the meetings of the Hall Commission have been held around this province the areas are fairly well spelled out of those communities that are going to lose that method of transportation. It's a difficult time because as I spoke earlier about the inflationary factor but we still have to have a transportation system in this country. We live and survive on our transportation. So I'm sure when we do get to the Minister's estimates he will have some answers to the many questions that are being raised in the areas north of Dauphin. Inglis country, that line likely is going out. I'm not certain about the Rosburn branch in there but I'm sure when we do get to the Minister's Estimates he will come up with something positive along those lines.

Mr. Speaker, I'm also concerned about another policy of this government that has failed the people of my constituency and it relates to the many damaging problems of beavers. I represent a constituency that is part of the Duck Mountains and Riding Mountains and the beaver population are a real pest to the farming people in that area. They come in and they dam up the ditches; they dam up the creeks; the rivers. But the tragedy of it all, Mr. Speaker, is that the beavers belong to this province. The beavers belong to the Crown and it is up to the Crown to look after those beavers and the damages that they are doing to the people of this Province. But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this government said in 1971, we're not going to look after the beavers and the damages that they are doing to the people in this Province. So they are telling the farmers we'll send you out a trap or we will send you out some booklets and stuff, you look after the beavers yourself. Mr. Speaker, I urge - and the Minister is not in his chair today - I urge this government that it is not an expensive program but it is one that is causing all kinds of anxiety and problems to the people of Roblin Constituency. There is crops that are still out and unharvested due to the fact that the beavers have flooded the farm land and the water is still there in the form of ice at the present time. But the beavers I hope the government will recognize - which was the policy of the Roblin Government, was a policy of the Weir Government, that the beavers are the responsibility of the Crown and if the beavers do any damage in this province the Crown should be responsible and compensate people for their losses. I urge this government to change their position and let's get back where we were before and assume - it's not that much of a responsibility because the staff of civil servants that's in my area, Mr. Speaker, would have no problems bringing those pests under control.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak very briefly on the problems of the fishermen.

A MEMBER: What about the bears?

MR. McKENZIE: I think the bears are under control. I've had no complaints since the day, Mr. Speaker, that I rose in my seat in this Chamber and drew it to the attention of the government that there were bears walking down the streets in the town of Grandview. We put a program into work at that time, Mr. Speaker, and the problem was brought under control. Now I am asking for the same consideration with the problem of beavers.

Mr. Speaker, let's talk about the problems of fishermen in the north. There are people in my constituency that make their livelihood by fishing and they are caught

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) in a most embarrassing financial position, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, I quote from the New Nation which was mailed to me here over the weekend and they asked me to read into the record some of the concerns that were expressed at a recent meeting by some of the fishermen when they met with Honourable Judge Buchanan asking for some help to get their fishing industry back on the rails. It looks to me that if there is some way at either the federal level or at the provincial level or jointly that we can assist those people with transportation - I don't know whether it is taxes, why can't we raise the price of the fish? But it is a simple matter: if you can't help these people transport the fish out they're not going to fish and they will have to go on welfare. They want to fish; they have the equipment to fish and why can't we help them get their fish out, Mr. Speaker. So I would say, Mr. Speaker, in the brief that these people presented to the Minister they said there that they cannot keep on producing fish in the face of rising costs of equipment, gas, food and transportation. The article goes on and said: There are only two channels open to solve our problems, the fishermen said. One is to disallow commercial fishing altogether and put the fishermen on welfare and the other alternative is to try and solve it. I don't say I have the answers, Mr. Speaker, but I think it is a serious problem and I think it is time that this Legislature - maybe in this session if we can - let's go to work and see if we can't come up with an answer to that problem, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have other matters that I would like to deal with later on in the session but the matters of educational costs, depressed farm prices and inflation are the three most concerns of the people of Roblin Constituency at this time. Mr. Speaker, I hope that this government is not what I think they are. I hope they will be sincere; I hope they will tell my people that we are going to cut your taxes, we are going to help you solve this problem of inflation. We are going to cut our government spending back and pay at least what we can afford. With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can go through the session and pass laws that will be beneficial to all the people of this great province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gimli.

MR. JOHN C. GOTTFRIED (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your recognition at this time and the opportunity to participate in the debate on the Speech from the Throne. May I first congratulate you, Sir, upon your retention of the highest office in this Assembly and I am sure that all will agree with my conviction that you will continue to preside over the deliberations of the members in the same firm and equitable manner in which we have become accustomed to in the past. I congratulate the Honourable Member for Logan on his re-appointment as your Deputy Speaker, and the Mover and the Seconder of the Throne Speech, the Members from Wellington and Churchill respectively, for the forthright manner in which they endorsed and elaborated upon the principles of social democracy embodied in the document and their practical application as enunciated in the many programs to be implemented.

I welcome to this Chamber the Honourable Members from Wolseley and Crescentwood and express the hope that as they listen to and participate in the debates and measures introduced by my government that their appreciation and understanding of the true meaning of social democracy will increase to encompass something more, much more than just NDP socialism.

I would also at this time like to express the hope that the Honourable Member from Souris-Killarney will experience a speedy and complete recovery and that he will shortly take his place with us in this Assembly.

I welcome back those who were away last Friday and all weekend attending the Progressive Conservative Leadership Convention. I hope that what took place will not go down in history as one of the major events leading up to the second great depression in Canada. Now that the preliminaries are over with I would like to move on to matters of concern to Gimli Constituency, the events of the past year and our hopes for the future.

In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the last year was

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GOTTFRIED cont'd) another year of progress and according to the Inter-lake Development Corporation we can look forward to another banner year in the making. This is so in spite of the fact that the constituency as a whole did suffer some setbacks in the form of the closing of Saunders Aircraft and the layoff of approximately 500 workers; the transfer of Dansforth Estates Winery to the neighbouring Constituency of Selkirk; the announcement that one of our rail lines is slated for disbandment and the flooding of much of our prime farmland last summer and fall leaving a number of our farmers without sufficient feed for their livestock for the coming winter.

At one time, prior to the election of Manitoba's first social democratic government, these events would have placed a severe burden on the farmers and workers of our community. But thanks to a flexible approach to the solution of social and political problems which places the human condition above political ideology, we have managed to come through these setbacks relatively unscathed. Policies set in motion when we first entered office contributed to the overall plus rating in Gimli Constituency and more than offset the negative effects most of which occurred in the northern end of Gimli Constituency.

In the southern end the water and sewer programs introduced by this government reached completion with the anticipated housing boom now in progress or in the planning stages in both Stonewall and Teulon. In addition the first appearance of new industry in these towns took place in Teulon with the opening of the Promo-Wear cap and garment factory employing some 80 workers in a fully modern plant unequalled in this province. Last year saw the addition of senior citizen homes in Winnipeg Beach, Teulon, Stonewall and Gimli. These projects, some completed and others in various stages of construction, are placing approximately 60 more dwellings on the market, that is the houses vacated by those entering the homes. In the area of school construction we have so far this year completed one at Balmoral and another beginning in Gimli with numerous other additions throughout the constituency in recent years.

Our housing repair program instituted again this winter for senior citizens and those in the lower income earning brackets has once again kept the ranks of the unemployed carpenters and labourers down to another year of a record low.

But the manner in which our government moved forward in the area of agriculture is particularly noteworthy. The response to flooding with its resulting feed shortages has been staved off with a government-assisted program to help farmers get the necessary feed for their livestock. Here I cannot help but note the role played by the large packinghouse firms, a particularly distasteful and callous one governed solely by the private enterprise profit motive. Last fall knowing that farmers were likely to find it difficult to carry their livestock over the winter months because of the feed shortages and to find at the same time the cash necessary to pay back cash advances on the cow-calf operation of the previous year, the price for beef fell drastically from the highs of \$40.00 to \$45.00 per hundredweight to lows of \$12.00 to \$15.00 per hundredweight.

It was pitiful to witness the heartless treatment of farmers in my constituency forced to sell at these low prices and left with insufficient cash flow to pay operating expenses. More than one told me that they could not meet their commitments. Some had gasoline bills alone of over \$2,000 which they had to leave unpaid. I could give more instances of this type but I don't think they would impress members on the other side of the Chamber except to state that the farmers more than ever are concerned about the huge discrepancy in prices paid by the packing plants and the prices paid for meat and meat products across the counters of our retail stores. There appears to be no relationship or reflection either in dollars and cents or in the response of the marketplace to fluctuations in the producers' selling price to that of the retail selling price. There is no relationship whatever. Certainly that is the appearance on the surface. Furthermore, there is also a glaring absence of correlation of grades of beef as purchased by the meat packing plants and the complete absence of these low grades in the retail stores where almost all beef is classed as choice or prime cuts. Where do these cuts come from and why doesn't the farmer get paid for the same?

It is for these stated reasons that our government felt obliged to begin its Beef Producers Assurance Program to try to bring a measure of stability to the incomes of

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GOTTFRIED cont'd) farmers engaged in one of our most vital industries. I'm please that this measure was introduced not only because it released another \$20 million to the farmers of Manitoba but the five-year principle contained within it should help stabilize the industry and give beef producers some measure of security in these very unsettled times. The private enterprise packing plants poised like vultures, ready to capitalize on any natural disaster, will have to look elsewhere for easy pickings. Their modus operandi is not admired by our government and if it were possible, it wouldn't be tolerated and I say it shouldn't be tolerated by free men.

In this respect we had the same wasteful private enterprise system operating in the fishing industry. I'm thinking here of the human waste. Lake Winnipeg, before we assumed office, was literally mined for all the years prior to its closure. I think it is quite safe to say that there was little thought given to conservation and the needs of future generations of Canadians. The profit motive and the dog-eat-dog struggle for the riches of this land prevailed. And what about the social aspects? Was there any thought given to that? I have with me a poem which appeared in Saturday Night, the June edition of 1975 and with your kind permission I would like to read it for you. Here it is, it's entitled "Beached" by Sid Stephens.

"The fishermen of Gimli, Manitoba, cast their nets these days across the tables in the White House" (that's the old hotel) "in drinking conversation while the fish weighed down with chemicals are dying in the shallow lake. Some work at unfamiliar labour building houses, pumping gas and the boats are beached along the sandy shoreline, big grey memories beneath the trees. It's midnight, almost closing time, and they are reeling on the wharf across the street the huge smooth water pulls them from the tables out among the boats and boulders till the mounties send them home to crash like waves into their beds so full of beer and memory they thrash the night away like netted fish. Caught out of water, cast ashore between the now and then, they hang in nets of sleep. Silver flashes in the streetlights, old cars parked on the beach at 4 a.m."

This is what our government inherited when it assumed office in 1969. A B.C. packing plant closed with 40 persons laid off. A lake closed with all fishermen deprived of their livelihood. All due to the complete and total absence on the part of old line parties to conserve and regulate one of our most precious natural resources.

This leads me to the statement that another reason why last year was a success is because of measures introduced by this government. I have been informed that now most fishermen have healthy bank accounts, enjoy a new pride in their occupation, are more willing to work co-operatively for the good of the industry as a whole and are not now encouraging their sons to seek employment in other lines of endeavour but are rather seeking ways of preserving and bettering their industry so that hopefully some day their sons will follow in their footsteps and get this - this year saw the formation of two co-operatives in Gimli alone to process and handle the catch so that the benefits of packing can be retained by the workers.

But more than all this is the manner in which the more conscientious and informed citizens of our constituency are now arriving at a deeper appreciation of the implications of social democracy to this province and our great country. I can safely say that my greatest campaigners here have been members of the old line private enterprise parties. In 1969 when I first chose to run against what was then overwhelming odds, in a constituency newly formed and containing three or four major Liberal or Conservative centres or strongholds, it was not by chance that after their 1969 defeat they gathered at Gimli to lick their wounds. In that election, the Conservatives were my best supporters with their complacent attitude and the cold and callous method they slapped a flat monthly premium for Medicare on poor Liberal farmers. We needed that Liberal vote and the Conservatives gave it to us. --(Interjection)-- If you'll bear with me for awhile you'll hear a little more.

At one stage I thought it was deliberate because they were tired of office and had the impending problem of CFI to occupy their attention. But more about CFI later. In 1973, it was the Conservatives again who came to my assistance by consolidating our previous Liberal gains - those same farmers - and adding to it. This was done through the arrangement of a saw-off leaving no doubt in the minds of lukewarm Liberals that

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GOTTFRIED cont'd) there really was no difference between the two parties. By now though our four-year record in government was an additional factor so that the popular vote for our government in Gimli Constituency increased from 37 percent in 1969 to just over 50 percent in 1973. Now this occurred in an area that was considered an old line party stronghold.

Since 1973 - and here's where I come to Saunders Aircraft since some of you want to hear about it. Yes, you guessed it. To date once again this government is my best campaigner for the coming 1977 election. Every time they open their mouths to speak of Saunders Aircraft, which was and still is a private enterprise firm, they in effect are telling my constituents that the plight our area was left in by the Federal Government through the closure of Canadian Forces Base, Gimli, and the efforts my government has put forth to help alleviate that blow through the formation of the Gimli Industrial Park, is a complete waste of public funds. The message comes through to my constituency loud and clear. It goes like this: Where is the profit? How much profit is Saunders making? We're not interested in the sudden loss of income in your area; we are not interested in nor feel obligated to find jobs for those who have found themselves suddenly out of work. In short they are saying that even though they can claim some followers in my area, both they and all the rest can go straight to you know where. This is the message we hear. This message from a group still living in the shadow of a CFI fiasco. Let's get things in their proper perspective.

The money that still eludes accounting for has been variously stated at about \$45 million. This in pre-1969 dollars, a time when a \$12,000 home now cost \$48,000. Or the \$35.00 per ounce gold certificate has now climbed to \$180, \$190, or five times that amount. So that the \$45 million that has disappeared in that deal representing so much of the toil and sweat of our citizens, if converted to gold stocks in the Swiss accounts would now be valued in excess of five times \$45 million, or \$225 million, enough to square accounts and leave a tidy profit.

Now I want to remind you of something my constituents are fully aware of. It was during this period when the price of gold was at its all-time high - and I'm certain that those who had the cash would have converted - it was during this time when it was at its all-time high, that the \$225 million gained as a result of a contract conceived of and entered into by the former Conservative Government; it was while these Canadian dollars representing approximately a quarter of a billion dollars in present day terms, was being used to promote the economies of - well I can only presume - some foreign country. I don't think it was anywhere being used to assist the Canadian economy in any way that the opposition members across the floor complained bitterly about, the waste at Saunders Aircraft every time my government made another advance of one and a half billion dollars, when they knew full well that at least 50 percent of that money was being paid out in wages and the remainder was going in materials and the payment of rents and such other items that are necessary to keep a company going.

At all times, members across the floor rise and state that Saunders is a government owned company. Never have I heard it said that it never was and is not now, government controlled; that it is private enterprise in management, being assisted with public funds to fill a vacuum created by the Federal Liberal Party through its closure of CFI base Gimli.

Now that the Federal Government has reneged on promises, some made publicly and others --(Interjection)-- CFB Gimli - yes, well anyways - now that the Federal Government has reneged on promises, some made public and others made to our Ministers, promises of assistance to Saunders Aircraft totalling in the neighborhood of \$8 million. And now further, that all along we knew that no aircraft industry in Canada can survive without federal money input, not only to manufacture these planes, but we have just discovered in addition, if there is any truth to the allegations made about Loughheed Corporation of America that \$22 million was paid in bribes to sell the finished product, then I say it is best that we withdraw support from this private enterprise, just as we have done. Of this I am certain - and this fact can be reiterated many times and has been in the past few months by people who I am sure were at one time

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GOTTFRIED cont'd) Conservative supporters they have nothing but praise for action taken by this government to help their community. They fault the Liberal government for inaction and they have utter and complete contempt for the brazen and callous manner in which a party that could cause the shifting of approximately \$225 million in present day purchasing power - to some other country I presume - should have the audacity to complain about the expenditure of a much smaller amount for a much more worthy and socially motivated purpose. The training alone given to 60 percent of the working staff who are young people hired from the area is, along with the added employment opportunities given to others, worthy of the expenditure, I feel, of the \$36 million that my government has made over a period of four years.

Another plus was scored last December when Canadian National Railways concluded an agreement to expand its Locomotive Training School. The first Five-Year Plan will see the construction of a number of new training facilities that will eventually enable the school to handle up to 400 trainees. The main feature of this new venture is that it will give to the Gimli Industrial Park a measure of permanency which should make it easier to attract more new industries to replace or to eventually even exceed that through Saunders Aircraft.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would be amiss if I did not refer to the fact that since my last report numerous activities have been held in my constituency to mark the Centennial of the first Icelandic settlement at Gimli. Their contributions to my constituency and to this province and to this great country have been recognized by people in every waik of life, and I believe that it is to a large extent due to their presence in our province that the efforts of the opposition members across the Chamber to frustrate and scuttle measures advanced by my government to better the living conditions of the people will always be doomed to failure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, my first words would be to you, Sir; it seems to be getting a habit now year by year, but I do congratulate you for carrying on your arduous task and trust you will enjoy good health and come out of this successfully.

I'd also like to congratulate the Honourable Member for Logan on his re-appointment as Deputy Speaker. I'd be remiss too, Mr. Speaker, if I didn't congratulate the mover and the seconder for a job well done.

I extend greetings also, Mr. Speaker, to my new friends from Wolseley and Crescentwood. They won, as you know, the by-elections and they overcame in my humble opinion a couple of giant killers. Their contributions, Mr. Speaker, in this debate thus far to me were excellent and I am convinced that in time they will be a credit to this party and they will make an outstanding contribution to the public life of this province. I wish them well in their efforts to maintain and protect the principles of democracy.

It's almost a week now, Mr. Speaker. We've heard some very very important contributions, and to come into the debate at this late date there is a tendency for one to possibly become a little repetitious. I don't intend to be, Mr. Speaker, but if I do I hope you will bear with me.

Mr. Speaker, in commenting on the lack lustre Throne Speech, I believe the Honourable Member for Fort Garry put it well when he indicated in his strong condemnation of the government, that the front bench over there have lost its fire and its punch. And well they might, Mr. Speaker, because in my opinion the chickens are coming home to roost. Some of their hair brained programs have cost the people of Manitoba millions of dollars, and many of them have gone sour. Their efforts to be all things to all problems has brought untold hardships and unknown luxury to many, and I hope the hat fits.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech talks of restraints. If this is well intended bringing on as it possible will, cutbacks, well and good. But, Sir, a quick glance at what has gone before shows that presently the province has in excess of 8,620 civil servants, one half in the receipt of incomes from \$10,000 to 20,000; 646 paid between \$20,000 and \$30,000 annually; and 155 receiving over \$30,000 a year. Surely these figures,

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. BILTON cont'd) Mr. Speaker, these totals are somewhat out of line for the administration of the affairs of a people of less than one million. Added to this, of course, Mr. Speaker, is the high cost of police, civil servants at the municipal level. Mr. Speaker, the time is long past when this government or any other government can say "yes" to almost every demand for an increase in existing programs and many more demands for new ones. I say that such growth in government programs and the parallel growth in government regulations and bureaucracy raises a critical point of a loss - and a tremendous loss - to individual freedom. The people know this in their every day lives, Mr. Speaker, inspectors for this, inspectors for that, and so it goes on.

In my own constituency the small bake shop, Mr. Speaker - he tells me that as of March 1st or March 31st, I forget which, the wrapping on these loaves of bread must be in English and French. If he sells them only in the community he needn't bother with French, but if he sells them in the municipality, French has got to be on them. How ridiculous can we be. Mr. Speaker, this situation and the like situations around this province have created a critical time and they must be arrested.

The Speech indicates stringent limits have been placed on increases in departmental expenditures. This, Mr. Speaker, I'll believe when I see it, particularly in the light of recent press releases to the effect that our people can expect a 10 or 15 percent increase over last year. The expenditures of last year as you will recall, Mr. Speaker, were at an all time high and in excess of a billion dollars.

The Premier has told the people that his government will accept wage and price lines. There is, of course, the usual qualification insofar as this party is concerned, that should it not be to their liking they'll opt out. I ask the Premier, is he talking of 12 months that he is going to co-operate? Is he talking of two years or is he talking of three years, we'd like to know? He hasn't made that statement yet. --(Interjection)-- Accepting this stand, Mr. Speaker, that I have just outlined.

Where has this government been the past year or more when one thousandfold abuses had been evident day by day. Don't take my word for it, Mr. Speaker, talk to the man on the street. Talk to the taxi driver, as I did today. What are we witnessing, Mr. Speaker, a bloodless revolution? In due time if it's allowed to proceed the people will be subservient to the government and the bureaucrats; those faithless ones, Mr. Speaker, of the government who are in control, they're making the bullets, these people are just simply firing them, Mr. Speaker. These people that I'm talking about, these people in pursuit of building their individual empires, Mr. Speaker, cause the people of industry and the individual enterprise - and the wage earner, if you like - to pause and wonder sometimes why their labours and initiative are constantly taxed to provide for an ever-growing, spending government and non-productive programs.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, if this present procedure continues, a society will be created that will be entirely out of balance with reality. Mr. Speaker, please don't misunderstand me, or I don't want anyone to misinterpret me in what I am saying. I believe completely that we have a serious ongoing responsibility to provide for the poor and the needs of the aged and the infirm, the mentally and physically handicapped and all those socially disadvantaged. We all know - we all really know - of the scramble over recent years to feed at the civil service trough - the civil service trough of this province. As I have indicated, the number of civil servants has doubled in the last five years - in fact, Mr. Speaker, there are recent news reports of them tracking back from British Columbia since the recent elections out there. I respect and fully respect career civil servants - career civil servants who are wondering just where they're going. I understand that there is considerable unhappiness due to lack of intended stability in the ranks of the civil service today, and I appeal to the government to bring an end to it, stabilize this situation for the good of these people who are making their contributions to the people of Manitoba. As my colleague from Roblin was saying a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, the total number of civil servants across this country, surely the Province of Manitoba can do something to regulate and reduce this growing financial burden.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Auditor's report for 1974-75, we see that the Travel Agencies in this province were paid \$1,235,830, if I may say so. To go a step

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. BILTON cont'd) further, Mr. Speaker, hotel and motel accommodation cost the taxpayers of this province \$1,148,297.00. Mr. Speaker, that's a lot of lodging, a lot of lodging that the people of Manitoba should not have to pay for. Paid advertising, Mr. Speaker, has risen to the colossal figure of over a half a million dollars. Is this necessary? --(Interjection)--I hear the echo from St. Johns over there, as I've heard it so many times before. You neglect the weekly newspapers in favour of that littleroom you've got downstairs with those people who are sending out bulletins every week. That's the way you're doing it, and you're asking the weekly newspapers to print it gratis.--(Interjection)--Yes, you bet your sweet life.

Mr. Speaker, that cost I just mentioned to you a moment ago does not include this information office, this television office that they've got. The airlines Mr. Speaker, for transportation and the overall services, they were paid \$1,082,000.00. Mr. Speaker, I ask you, is this restraint? Not on your cotton pickin' life. And I shudder to think - I shudder to think what 1975-76 is, Mr. Speaker. We won't get those figures until next March, but I hope they'll remember in bringing in their restraints that we will expect to see cuts in these figures.

I wonder too, Mr. Speaker, what the cost was to the taxpayer for the general operation of the Provincial Air Force which has travelled around this province on scores of useless trips. I happen to live in an area where I see them going over every day. God knows where they're going and God only knows where they're coming back from.

I say again, Mr. Speaker, with all the emphasis in me, it's in these areas and like areas, that the Premier, if he is sincere, can make the cuts and make the trimmings and save the dollars and in turn have a little to pay for other problems that are developing possibly in the health field and likewise. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we're not going to witness again these scandalous expenditures that I've just brought to your attention and there's scores more but why take your time.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, I put forward a resolution on the increase of lawlessness in this province. I appealed for an examination of the entire policing structure. Mr. Speaker, the response on all sides of the House was excellent until, Sir, until it was treated with a death blow by of all people, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Rehabilitation and Corrections. The crime situation, Mr. Speaker, has not improved. In fact it has progressively become worse. Wrongdoers particularly amongst our young people, I'm sorry to say, are increasing in numbers and riding herd on innocent victims. I don't have to relate to you, Mr. Speaker, that on occasion we can pick up our daily newspaper and the front page is covered with wrongdoing. The most serious crimes, Mr. Speaker, the most serious crimes are becoming more prevalent and something has got to be done. Mr. Speaker, in mentioning that, there was no word on that subject so far as I was concerned in the Speech from the Throne. The government hasn't, as far as I know, any plans to cope with this problem. The Attorney-General let it be known the other day that the Provincial Attorney-Generals were becoming alarmed at the withdrawal of the federal contribution in this field of endeavour. Mr. Speaker, this situation has been developing for years and not only this government but other governments have chosen to put up a blind eye and leave it to George to do, so to speak. Now the Federal Government is saying - you want these services? You tax your people; you put them on yourselves. What else can they do, Mr. Speaker? Recent news report from Ottawa, we're told that the cost of the RCMP for this coming year is going to be in excess of \$400 million. That doesn't take into consideration what our province and other provinces are providing as well as municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, on a parochial vein, I would like to acknowledge with appreciation after some seven years of effort that the installation of dial telephones has finally come about in both Cowan and Benito in my constituency.

The Hall Commission which has been mentioned today, Mr. Speaker, met in my community and it was a tremendously good turnout. It was indicated that the Dauphin-Swan River-Hudson Bay route that I've mentioned from year to year is to be retained and upgraded. On behalf of the people that I represent and through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, I'd like to express their appreciation to he and his staff for what they have done in that particular direction.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. BILTON cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, the other day the Acting Leader, my Acting Leader, criticized some of the expensive programs and at the same time outlined the stand of this party and to some degree what it stands for. There's no question now where we stand. One thing he emphasized was that strikes in essential services should not be allowed. This includes, Mr. Speaker, police and health services. I might add telephones and more important, Hydro.

Mr. Speaker, it was a disgrace to witness patients being moved in the dead of winter from the most important provincial hospital in the province simply because some 40 people - 40 people, Mr. Speaker, chose not to go to work. Is this what this social health plan was intended to be? That workers could grab the people by the throat and have them turned out of hospitals like animals because there were no people there to look after them? It's just absolutely ridiculous and some way has got to be found to overcome this.

Look what we have with the bus strike today. Almost a month. The City of Winnipeg with 500,000 people, Mr. Speaker, without transportation for the very people, for the very people that they champion all the time. Where are you? Where were you when the lights went out on the buses? You're still asleep.

Mr. Speaker, it terrifies me as I'm sure it must you, if electrical power was to be cut off in the wintertime in this province. And it could be, it could be. I'm all right, I've got an open fireplace. I can put on a four foot log and burn.--(Interjection)-The swimming pool is coming. Mr. Speaker, it could be cut off to satisfy union demands. There's no question about it. And, Mr. Speaker, it would be a disaster. Will people never realize that this business of inflation is no child's play. We shall have to come out of it, Mr. Speaker, and we won't come out of it without sacrifices on all sides regardless of individuals.

It seems that our province and the nation, Mr. Speaker, has gone soft. Believe me the price of soft living, Mr. Speaker, must be paid for and we must be paying that price and we will be paying it soon whether we like it or not. Surely in these troubled times, Mr. Speaker, the Speech could have included some assurance for the people as to the state of the economy of this province, its debts, the high annual interest payments, the whole story. This medium should have conveyed the whole truth, Mr. Speaker, the unpleasant truth, the dangerous truth, I suggest to you, as well as the comforting truth. All these things were ignored, Mr. Speaker, at a time such as this. It is my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that if the people are truly and told candidly they will never be afraid and they will face up and overcome whatever the problem. Perhaps they need guidance and that guidance I suggest to you is not coming. This government owes it to the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, they should be told the facts as they stand today. They are entitled to positive action by deed and not by promises.

The trade union leaders, Mr. Speaker, to which this government is the god-father, must pause and give a hand in taking the heat out of inflation which today is troubling everyone. To me it's a national crisis never faced before short of war, Mr. Speaker. It's just as serious as that and we must win it fair and square. That is, we will only win it, Mr. Speaker, if we put aside our greed and selfish pride.

I would add, Mr. Speaker, this includes the giant corporations too, particularly those in the retailing of food and clothing. They have a stake in this province of inflation; they have the know-how and the techniques and they better start putting it to work for the good of us all. It's high time they came out of the board rooms. That's not restricted to those people over there to make that kind of a statement, Mr. Speaker. We're all conscious of this. But something has got to be done and done by all as I have tried to indicate for the benefit of the nation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I challenge this government to show the way. Tell the people the truth regardless of the labour affiliation. Quit. Quit it. Quit this pussy-footing around and grapple with the problem. Let's get on with the action. You are more aware of the basic problems than probably many of us in the labour field. But in spite of this, Mr. Speaker, we have it from the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, they will not legislate these strikes back to work. No

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. BILTON cont'd). . . . way. I say to these ministers and I say to this government that by your actions you're saying to hell with the people.--(Interjection)--You have the problem today, that's what we're talking about, not what happened yesterday or last year.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BILTON: I ask the elected representatives of this province to govern it and govern. Or are unions going to be allowed to tie up the economy as they're doing now and hold at bay the people of this province regardless of the misery caused? Is it not obvious to you? It must be. It's obvious on the street; it's obvious to us here in this House. Why aren't you doing something about it instead of frigging around - I've got another word for it too.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BILTON: What a state of affairs we've arrived at in the public services. Public services, Mr. Speaker. This is no longer big companies fighting labour; this is labour fighting the public and this Chamber is going to become nothing but a union hall if this sort of thing is allowed to go on. That's all we'll be talking about.

Should this procedure continue, Mr. Speaker? I say no, definitely no. A way must be found to eliminate this constant anxiety in the minds of the paying public, Mr. Speaker. They want the answers. They want this anxiety brushed from their minds. They want to be able to get up in the morning to know that they can turn on their light; that they can get onto the bus; that they can go down to the store and get a fair deal for a fair price. These are the things the people want. They want a honeymoon from all this strife and strain that is being placed upon their shoulders these days. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

. . . continued on next page

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If my remarks show any lack of preparation it's because I, like a lot of other members, spent a number of hours over the weekend in front of the television set watching the 12-ring circus from Ottawa when the Conservatives gathered nationally to pick out a new leader. I found it most interesting to sit and watch the proceedings and see several hundred thousand dollars worth of parties and posters, banners and bands. You know there's nothing more pathetic than to look around an empty hall after a convention and see the losing banners and posters of candidates lying around. But I believe that they made a good choice; they picked a bright young man, a man who looks like Hugh Gaitskell and sounds like John Diefenbaker. And has been mentioned as being called a Red Tory. It seems rather ironic, Mr. Speaker, that over the weekend the National Conservative Party in their total wisdom had picked to lead them a sitting member of the House who was a Red Tory, someone that they could all unite behind and go forward as a united party. Yet just one month ago in Manitoba the Conservative Party gathered in convention in perhaps the most divisive and bitter convention they've ever had, to turn out of leadership a member, a sitting member, who was in fact a Red Tory. --(Interjections)-- You've forgotten him already. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that the Manitoba Conservative Party seems determined to go against the general trend of its party throughout the country. They seem to have a genius for doing the wrong thing at the right time.

It's interesting too, Mr. Speaker, to see another difference between the two parties and that is that Mr. Clark has said that he intends to have the party look forward, to offer new policies and to tell the people what they are for as opposed to the Manitoba Conservative Party who have decided to look backwards, to offer old policies and tell the people firmly what they are against.

Mr. Speaker, it's reassuring to see you again in the Chair of this Legislature. We have come to have confidence in your handling of the affairs of this Chamber and like other members I will try to abide by the rules and to co-operate with you in your duties. I should also congratulate my colleague from Logan who has again been named as your Deputy and Chairman of committees. I would also like to congratulate the Mover and Seconder of the Speech from the Throne, both of whom did a superb job and are a credit to the back bench.

I would also like to congratulate the new Leader of the Opposition who happens to be from a neighbouring constituency of mine.

I would also like to congratulate the two new members, the Member for Crescentwood and the Member for Wolseley, on their election to this House. The previous members who held those seats had both earned themselves a reputation of being good constituency men in looking after their constituents. I trust that the new members will be able to follow well in their footsteps. Their election to this House follows two very close fought elections which gave rise, as I remember, to a Private Member's Resolution in this House discussing election procedures. I believe the matter was also referred to the Law Reform Commission for their consideration too.

When we consider our present electoral procedures and the state of our present parliamentary system, I believe that we sometimes lose account of the strides that have been made both in the electoral system and the parliamentary system over a number of years. It's rather interesting for instance to look back to the previous Elizabethan age to see there the forms of election and the electoral procedures of those days - I'm talking about the latter half of the sixteenth century. The country in those days was organized on a county basis, there was very little centralized government, very little in the way of a Civil Service - and although it would be inaccurate to term the government of the country a confederacy of counties, nevertheless there was some validity in looking at the local government scene as being organized on a county basis. The Chief Electoral Officer for a county was the sheriff, who was the Chief Administrative Officer and appointed by the central government; there were also a Lord Lieutenant and Assistant Lord Lieutenant plus justices of the peace, all of whom served without pay and were in fact very much prestige appointments. They were appointed solely from the landed gentry of

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. WALDING cont'd) the county and they were considered as measures of the social standing of the individual families involved.

The source of wealth throughout the country was of course the amount of land that was owned; the Crown had very large holdings, the peers of the realm also owned large tracts of land, and the land within the counties was usually divided up between the leading families of the land who looked on it as a matter of social rank and order as to which positions they held at the county level. The House of Commons of those days was composed of somewhere between 400 and 500 members; it expanded rather rapidly during the century, but around 460 seems to be the number in the latter half of the century, and it was made up of two members returned from the county in England one member for each Welsh county, plus either one or two members returned from the citizen towns, that is those which had a charter enabling them to do so.

It seems that elections at that time were quite rare things. Apparently the system of getting together and carving up territory which we see the Mafia families doing these days, had its origin then, when the main families would get together and decide between themselves which would represent the two available seats from the county. It was a common practice in those days to divide the county approximately in half and for one family to have a monopoly in one half and the other family to have a monopoly in the other half. And this was the way that things went along. But things were not quite always that smooth, there were times when another family wished to test its social prestige within a county by putting up a member to contest one of the two seats. And again this was rather a rare occurrence. But what would happen, is that the election writ would go out from the capital, sent to the sheriff, who was then under instructions to call an election for the time of the next county court which was always held on a certain day of each month, and it would be his practice then to announce and make public that there would be a choosing of members at that time. The Candidates would of course attempt to gather their supporters to the place of election. Those who had the privilege of voting were the so-called 40-shilling shareholders, most of whom happened to be tenants of the various families involved, so of course any member of a family wishing to stand for election would gather together his supporters and bring them to the county town for the time of election. It was not unusual for the sheriff himself to seek election or to seek his own relative or even his own son to be returned as the member. He as the Returning Officer for the county had a good deal of authority and power, and it was in fact the Returning Officer himself who nominated the candidates. When they would be called together he would call out the names of those who would be nominated, and apparently what happened then was it became a shouting match; that all of the assembled voters plus those who were not voters, but had come out for the scene, then began to shout the names of their chosen members as loud and as long as possible. This would go on for about 15 minutes, at which time the sheriff would announce which candidates had been elected; how he was to do this from an assembled group of probably several hundred people shouting different names is a little difficult to understand.

Now sometimes that was accepted, but if it was challenged then they had to go on to the next stage. It seems that the tradition of deciding by voices has come down to us today, when a number of matters even in this Chamber are decided by a voice vote. However, if any of the parties were not satisfied at that stage, then they went on to what was called the view, where the opposing candidates were then supposed to move their supporters to one side of the field and the opposition ones to the other side. The sheriff would then climb up to a vantage point and look over the two opposing groups and then make a decision again. If there was still no agreement on what was the correct decision, then finally they went to a poll. Apparently there was a great deal of reluctance to go to this method. To start with, it was very time consuming. It was the custom at that time to list the names of all of the supporters of each of the opposing sides, and with scrutineers to go down the list and add anyone who was properly a freeholder or remove those who were not.

The term 40-shilling freeholder was rather a vague one and apparently was interpreted differently at different elections. The count then apparently went on for hours and

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. WALDING cont'd) hours and indeed into the night, and it really wasn't necessary even to complete the poll, because the sheriff being the Returning Officer was entitled to say that Mr. X was the duly returned member for that constituency, and his was the last word; if he said that Mr. X was the member, then that was it, there was no provision within any of the Acts at the time for disbarring a member even though subsequent court actions were initiated.

Another reason why elections were not too popular at that time is that it was the custom of the day for the candidates to entertain all of their supporters who were gathered for the election procedure. Since the sheriff was also the Returning Officer, the opportunities for fraudulent practice were very widespread. It was solely at the discretion of the sheriff as to which County Court date was used for the election, and certain sherriffs were not above failing to call an election when a certain candidate had brought all his supporters for an election day and simply postponing it to the next one if he felt that the wrong side had too many people there; quite obviously if the local squire had brought in his supporters who would have to walk to the county seat probably for 10, 20, 30 miles away, it was not going to be easy to get them to come in at a later date. There was also the ploy that the voters having walked into the voting place the day before would naturally need accommodation overnight. It often happened that the town involved was simply owned by one of the candidates who had it within his power to reserve all of the inns and lodging houses simply to prevent any of his opponents' voters finding lodging for the night. It was also within the power of the sheriff, if there was a count to begin that count in the areas where his favorite candidate had the most strength; if, for example, they were to count a thousand people and there were approximately, say, 500 from one area and 500 from the other, if the sheriff were to begin with one area, to continue his count all day and even into the night it could well happen that by the next morning the other candidate's supporters had grown tired and weary and returned to their homes. But, as I mentioned before, in the final analysis it was simply what the sheriff said - and although there was recourse through the courts and even through the Court of Star Chamber, there was never an election overturned and the losing candidate given the position. It was technically illegal for the sheriff to involve himself in fraudulent activities. There was a fine of 100 pounds which could be levied against a sheriff indulging in election hanky panky, but since the candidates were all wealthy men it was the usual practice to assure the sheriff that any out-of-pocket expenses such as a fine of 100 pounds would of course be picked up by the candidate.

That was the general form of elections for the counties themselves. Due to the popularity through the Elizabethan era of gentlemen and the younger sons of gentlemen to become members of parliament, many of them turned to the boroughs or the towns and cities to seek election there. Again, it was a common occurrence at the time for those boroughs to decide amongst themselves who they would return to parliament to represent them, and there was nothing like a voter franchise that was involved, it was the borough itself that was given the privilege or the right to return either the one or two members from that area. Again, it was common for boroughs to be owned in some cases by the local squire. We probably think it a little odd these days that one person should own a whole town, although when you look to the north at the mining towns, it's not perhaps so archaic after all. I wonder sometimes how many members would be returned to the New Democratic Party if INCO had the privilege of nominating two members from, say, Thompson.

It was common in those days too for financial reasons, for certain of the landed gentry or even peers of the realm to ask for the nomination from certain boroughs. This they did in the form of a letter to the mayor and council who said, send in your nomination with the name left blank and I will fill it in with my nominee. One reason why this was often acceptable to the town was that members of parliament elected or sent to represent that particular town had a claim on the treasury of the town to the extent of two shillings a day for the time they were sitting in the House. Now this doesn't sound like a lot of money, but over the term of a parliament it could often amount to perhaps 30 or 40 percent of the whole year's budget for some of the smaller towns and cities, so it was obviously in the best interests of the town itself to have one of its members as

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. WALDING cont'd) the patron and nominee of a rich man of the county, or a peer of the realm who would in fact relieve them of this financial responsibility and pay the costs. However, the returning of members from a borough was a matter that became something of a scandal in later centuries up to the time of the Reform Bill in the 1830's. Some of these boroughs which had charters entitling them to send members to parliament were in fact quite small, perhaps the most notorious of all was the town of Gotton which consisted of eight households, none of whom were freeholders, and none of whom had vote. However, the borough was entitled to return two members of parliament, so all that happened was the election writ went to the local lord who owned the area; he put in the names of his nominees and cast the only vote for them - perhaps it's fortunate that a seconder wasn't needed.

Just one other point of interest that comes from accounts of those days, Mr. Speaker, that you might be interested in, is the fact that the Speaker in those days was paid the amount of 100 pounds per year; that was the fixed amount, and it only made up part of his total income because they had somewhat of a problem in those days too of deciding which was a private bill and which was a public bill. They had a very practical way of deciding the difference; a private bill was one in which they could extract a five-pound fee from someone, the petitioner, and a public bill was one that they couldn't get any money from at all. The five pounds per person per bill made up a large part of the Speaker's income from those days.

I wanted too to deal with another matter that was brought up in the House by the Leader of the Opposition and expanded upon to some extent by the member for Fort Garry.

The Opposition had mentioned last year the matter of strikes in essential services following a convention that they had at that time. In speaking to the issue then I tried to get some clarification from members as to what they meant by vital services. The only clarification that I got from them was that it wasn't vital services, it was essential services, which was just as vague. However, it has come up again this year and the reply by the Leader of the Opposition has made it perhaps a little clearer as to what is meant by vital services. In his remarks the Leader of the Opposition says that there must be a clear and uncompromising ban on strikes in vital services. These must include a prohibition of strikes in health care and in police protection as a bare minimum.

I tried to suggest when I discussed this last year that vital services or essential services - and I don't know what the difference is - probably extends to a far greater area than has been mentioned here. I tried to seek some definition from the opposition at that time as to just what vital services meant. The obvious ones you know, doctors, nurses, police protection, fire protection, are the ones that obviously come to mind but on a little reflection there are obviously many many more than this. --(Interjection)-- Farmers of course, have been mentioned. The supply of electricity, the transportation of other essential goods and services and the Member for Fort Garry in his remarks, on Page 58 says: "We are talking about getting down to the nub of the problem of defining vital services." I'm glad that he is apparently giving a little more thought than his Leader is, and he goes on to say: "Where the life and health of Manitobans is concerned." And there are many many services that come into a category that is almost vital, and he mentions police protection, fire protection and health protection.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of concern about strikes and normally when the matter is discussed all of the faults are enumerated, that strikes are costly and that strikes are wasteful, they're unproductive and that some other mechanism must be found and that is usually the end of the remarks, or in letters to the papers. That is always the end of the letter, that some other method must be found. However, that is surely the beginning of discussion of the problem, it's not the end of it. We wait with bated breath to hear from our friends opposite just what that better method could be. They might, for example, look back about forty years to someone else who was concerned about strikes, who recognized that strikes were costly and that they were a waste of productivity.

In the early 1930s, Mr. Speaker, in Germany, Hitler recognized that strikes were costly and that strikes caused a great deal of disruption and that they were unproductive. But he was not prepared to waffle around the way that opposition members were in

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. WALDING cont'd) defining one or two or three, a half a dozen vital services, he recognized quite clearly that all services were vital. So in a couple of very simple strokes he outlawed trade unions; he did away with all sorts of meaningful - or any negotiation at all - and simply did away with strikes. Now that solved the problem of strikes in one simple stroke. That is possibly the road that our friends opposite would like to go down because what Hitler did was to turn all labour negotiations over to what was called a labour front. The labour front was supposed to represent all of the workers and all of the management and to decide on what the terms of employment should be. The negotiations were carried on by this labour front, of course, in the best interests of the state which means all of the people, and the workers were forced to accept what the labour front had decided for them. Usually of course at the rates which the employers had recognized.

But they went one step further than that and issued each worker with a work book which was a form of identity card and listed in it all his qualifications and experience at work. This work book was held by the employer and without it no worker could get another job. Now what this meant was that no worker could simply walk away from his job because he could not be legally employed anywhere else without the production of this work book, which effectively gave the worker job security. But it also of course, prevented him from seeking better employment. It also prevented any organization of workers from going out on strike. It was during those depression years from '32 through to about '38 when the economy really boomed, output reached new highs in the economy and employment figures rose to their maximum, that the share of the national output that was received by the workers actually fell, and in fact their wages themselves actually declined something in the order of 10 percent. At the same time, of course, the businesses that employed them took a larger and larger share of the economy and their profits, even though they were in principal control, increased by leaps and bounds.

So I would suggest that for consideration of members opposite. If they're really serious about banning strikes this is something that they should go to. They should not be wishy-washy about deciding what is vital services because once you start down that road of defining one or two or six or a dozen services as vital, there is no way that you can stop. Not only that, but you are creating two different classes of workers: those that are vital and those that are not. The first class workers and the second class workers. This might be acceptable if the opposition members were prepared to come out and say that all of those first class or vital workers should be paid commensurate with their degree of vitalness to the economy. That doesn't mean that they should be all paid the same. We're not suggesting to you that ministers should be paid the same as doctors, or that other hospital workers should be paid the same as doctors. But are you prepared to accept the fact that there should be a bracket at the top where all vital service workers should come? In other words everybody who was designated as a vital worker should somehow be put in a category that was above, that was paid higher than those in non-vital areas.

If you are prepared to do that, then you should look at areas that you presently do not consider vital. For example, garbage men. Are you prepared to consider that garbage men should be put in the area of vital services? --(Interjection)-- My friend opposite suggests that they are. In which case they should presumably be put in that top bracket of income over and above any other worker who is not considered vital.

But, Mr. Speaker, the basic objection to what the opposition is proposing is that it is the removal of a freedom presently enjoyed by so many of the workers of this province. While it is members of the opposition who say freedom, freedom, freedom, yet they are the ones who are now prepared to take away some of those freedoms that they presently espouse. --(Interjection)-- Freedom from the rich is being suggested. What I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that it is an insult to the intelligence of the people of this province to tell them on the one hand that individual freedom should be extended and to tell them on the other hand that these selfsame freedoms should be restricted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would, too, first

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. BROWN cont'd) of all like to compliment you on your good health. I am sure that you are going to carry out your duties to the best of your ability and we certainly intend to help you along with this. I would also like to congratulate the Deputy Speaker. He has been chosen again. He has been doing a very capable job. I would like to welcome the new Members from Crescentwood and Wolseley. I am sure that they are going to contribute much towards making this province a more suitable place for all of us to live in. I would like to congratulate the Mover and the Seconder and I would just like to make a few comments on the Seconder's views on morality.

He said that morality had to start in one's own heart and carry on through the home and I wholeheartedly agree with that. But he left it at that, Mr. Speaker, and I think that we do have a duty within this government to see that we go just a little bit further as far as morality is concerned. I know that it is difficult to legislate morality, that you cannot do it really. But you certainly can do it in a way, that the textbooks within the schools will be of high moral quality. We can also do it through our television media. I saw a program the other day just before the late news and I was absolutely shocked at what was going on and it is time that governments step in and do away with some of these programs.

I would like to make a few comments on the problems of the Member from Ste. Rose. We sympathize with him. We've had these problems in our area many times ourselves where our crops are flooded and we certainly can sympathize with all the problems that the farmers had in his particular area. I would just like to spend a few minutes of time speaking about my own area and what has been going on before I go into the field of health and social development.

First of all I would like to talk about the drainage program. There was very very little activity in my area on drainage. Now many of the drainage programs are almost completed. They have only two more miles to go on the Dead Horse Creek and then you would be able to save hundreds of thousands of dollars every year in drainage damage. But last year we had absolutely no activity on drainage and I certainly hope that the government is going to put this as their higher priority.

The same went with the Plum River, the South Buffalo, and the Rempel drains, all of which do cause a lot of damage. The people that are living along the Red River are very much concerned with the Roseau River Basin project which is proceeding in the United States. All we really know so far is that this is going to bring water down about 30 percent faster than what it has been heretofore. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is going to create a lot of problems for the people living in Letellier and in the St. Jean areas and something will have to be done over there. We were wondering whether this diversion from the Roseau River to the Red, which is closely built north of Letellier, if that's going to be built - it'll have to be built - and whether improvements will be made on the Marsh River. These are areas that are going to be essential if the Roseau River project is going to be proceeded with and it is being proceeded with. Of course the Pembalier Dam, I've spoken on that many a time, of course this would help to hold back some of this water so that we wouldn't get all this water at the same time.

I would like to go into the field of health and social development at this time, Mr. Speaker. We seem to be having quite a few problems in that area and I would like to, first of all, make a few comments on the conflict between the Minister and the doctors. Now the Minister has behaved in a most atrocious and dictatorial fashion during the negotiations with the MMA and it makes one wonder why the Premier would allow one of his Cabinet Ministers to behave in such an insulting manner when he is dealing with a profession like the Manitoba Medical Association. He has hurled insult after insult at the medical profession. He is supposed to be bargaining for the best interests of all Manitobans and, Mr. Speaker, I think that even a three-year-old child knows that if you want something from somebody you do not insult them first of all. He has hurled insults like there will not be any negotiation. If they don't like what we are ready to offer in our program then they can opt out. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what is happening.

The Minister indicated the other day that 304 doctors have indicated that they are going to opt out of the plan. Now he knows as well as anybody knows that this is going

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. BROWN cont'd) to create utter chaos with the whole health plan delivery system. It's going to cost us a fortune in administration. He has also said that they could jump up buildings. He said that this is the last time the government is going to get sucked in as far as he's concerned. We will not negotiate a fee. Now I say, Mr. Speaker, there is no way he is going to come up with an agreement that is going to be in the best interests of all the people who require to see the doctors or in the interests of the taxpayer.

Furthermore the Minister has served notice that he will terminate the present agreement with the Manitoba Medical Association, the agreement that they have with the Health Services Commission, an agreement where the doctors were consulted before major changes were made in health policy. Now this agreement has terminated as of February 14th. This means, Mr. Speaker, that we are now leaving everything in the capable hands of our Minister of Health and that he is going to see to it that we are going to receive the best health care within this province without consulting the people who are responsible for carrying out this health delivery system. I wish that we all could have that kind of faith in the Minister but unfortunately I am sure that there are very many people in this province that are very concerned about the present situation.

It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister deliberately wants the doctors to opt out. He wants them to opt out and extra bill and have this work as a deterrent fee. He hopes that the doctors are going to be blamed for this rather than the government. Now, Mr. Minister, if there is an over-utilization of our health care in this province then why doesn't the Minister say so. If we have this problem of over-utilization then why doesn't the Minister say so? Then if this is the case we probably would support him if he would say that deterrent fees were necessary. But we have no indication really, Mr. Speaker, that there is over-utilization so why do we have to take this hard road of having the doctors opt out of the plan and try to get them to extra bill and try to put all the blame on the doctors?

Now as I understand it, the doctors are willing to settle for an increase of around \$6 million. This is a 9.15 percent increase. The point of contention is how will this money be distributed? Will the doctors be allowed to distribute this amongst themselves as doctors do in Saskatchewan, in Alberta and in Ontario or will the Minister determine which doctors will receive the increase and how much? Now it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Health is more interested in wielding controls over the doctors than in operating an efficient health plan within this province, a health plan which would be in the best interests of all the people of this province.

If the 300 doctors opt out of the hospital plan, many more tax dollars will be spent in administration. Rather than sending out one cheque per month for all of these 300 doctors the Department of Health will have to send out around 400 cheques for each doctor amounting to about 120,000 cheques a month to wherever these patients are. They'll be scattered all over the province. It's going to be a nightmare to administrate. Now this is going to cost a fortune in administration and all for the sake of wielding power over the medical profession. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the taxpayers of this province are not going to be impressed. Have we arrived at the state in this province where it is more important to exercise controls over the medical profession than to assure that the people of this province get the best health care at the least expense to the taxpayer? The Minister of Health is absolutely and completely disregarding the trust that the people of this province have placed in him and in this government, and all for the sake of exercising control over the medical profession.

The number one problem which is disrupting health care in Manitoba is the problem of the long-term-stay patient in the hospital. To date some 370 patients who should be in nursing homes are occupying acute hospital beds. Now when you consider that there is a turnover of at least five patients to every long-term-stay patient, this means the equivalent of some 1,800 acute beds are tied up by long-term patients. Furthermore, accommodation for these long-term patients in a nursing home is around \$25.00 per day as compared to \$110 to \$120 in a hospital where they are occupying an acute bed. Now, Mr. Speaker, the amount that could be saved over there runs to around \$9,800,000 a

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. BROWN cont'd) year and this has been going on for a long time and we could have built many a nursing home for the amount of money that has been wasted away by keeping these people within the hospitals. Now we have never criticized the government for the nursing home program but we must criticize them for the way that they're implementing it.

For three consecutive years now these long-term patients who have occupied acute beds have created a serious situation in the Winnipeg hospitals whereby people requiring elective surgery have a waiting period of up to three months. Now we must remember when we're talking about elective surgery that we are talking about open heart, or cancer, or almost every operation. Almost every operation is elective surgery. Now many people are in constant pain and suffer mental anguish and are laid off work during this waiting period. When is the government going to supply these extra nursing homes that are so urgently required? Now it's the one item in the Clarkson-Vaida Report that all providers of health care could agree, that extra nursing home beds are urgently required within the province. Now in addition to the 370 long-term patients in hospital we have another 1,200 people that have been panelled and with no place to go. We must have more nursing home beds and we must have them now.

Now the Clarkson-Vaida Report has been a very controversial document and I would just like to read into the record some of the reactions from the various health organizations. I have an appraisal here by the Department of Medicine from the Health Sciences Centre, and it says, "In the opinion of the Department of Medicine the overall attitude of this report and the philosophy it recommends will have a drastic and detrimental effect on the provision of health care in the Health Sciences Centre and in the community." And they go on to say, "It would appear that Doctors Clarkson and Vaida do not comprehend the role of research and the research oriented physician in medical education and in patient care. They have implied that the presence of research orientation alters the educational process so that training for primary care is neglected or ignored. In fact the highest percentage of primary health care in Manitoba is provided by internists and pediatricians emanating from this background. The basic philosophy and goal of undergraduate and graduate medical education is to produce an inquiring physician which necessitates emphasis on the investigative attitude and the scientific basis of medicine. It is through exposure to research oriented physicians or medical scientists that the student develops an inquiring or investigative attitude that would enable him to attack a problem in a systematic fashion and reach justified conclusions, abilities he will use throughout his medical career.

"The same critical scientific approach is applied to the clinical problems as to the intricacies of molecular biology. For example observations of hypothesis, accumulation of data, critical assessment of data, attainment of concept and justified conclusions. With this approach for each patient an optimum standard of care is insured. In addition the medical scientists in promulgating the attitude of the inquiring and the new advances plays a key role in the process of self-education while in practice and in the continuing education of health professionals and therefore contributes significantly to the continual improvements in the standards of health care."

Now we have many, many reports - just about every department that you could think of, they're all saying the same thing. We have one over here from the Health Sciences Centre. It says that there are overtones of socio-political bias apparent throughout the Report. "Our Association views the reduction in patient beds as a major dislocation with the following effects resulting: Part-time physicians will be the doctors displaced from the staff with reduction in beds by definition of geographic full-time positions. Patients and their physicians will have to transfer to another institution with a lesser service base providing diminished anaesthetic, pathological and radiological and intensive care facilities. If equivalent facilities were provided this would involve an impossible and an uneconomic cost."

In other words, Mr. Minister, if we were to build a hospital at Seven Oaks, which seems to be the underlying reason why the Clarkson-Vaida Report was implemented, that the people in that particular area would not have access to nearly as good a facility as

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. BROWN cont'd) what they have access to now. Certainly it would be a lot more difficult for them to achieve this access because they would have to be referred by another physician. I think that we are just talking of a difference of two miles. The Health Sciences Centre will lose a proportion of its teaching staff and its hospital committee personnel as available hospital hours will be necessarily diluted.

"In our opinion medical student education will suffer in losing a substantial number of physicians who provide patient care on a day-to-day basis and this type of care is not that which the geographical full-time physician provides in that it provides a more basic type of fundamental medical education as well as research, which is substantially different.

"No. 5. It is interesting that the map used as a catchment area or the population of utilization of the Health Sciences Centre was actually based on the number of primary school pupils and their needs in each area designated. Now this bears no relation to the population utilization of the Health Sciences Centre and our centre has in its place in the community served a wide and large population base in Greater Winnipeg, Manitoba and even outlying geographical divisions."

Now we could go on and on, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member will allow a question.

MR. BROWN: Not at the present time, Mr. Speaker. If the Honourable Minister wants to ask me some questions when I'm finished I will be only too pleased to answer some of them. If you would like me to table some of these reports that I have over here, I will also be pleased to do that.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the government for deciding to provide more space for research at the Health Sciences Centre. It is my strong opinion that preventative medicine has taken a back seat long enough and preventative medicine really, Mr. Minister, is what research is all about. The benefits of this will be two-fold, Mr. Speaker. Firstly to the patient and secondly a great saving in medical costs should be realized by the taxpayer in the long term. The other benefit of course is that through research we are keeping up-to-date with the newest methods available for treatment of cancer patients, patients with heart ailments, etc., thus ensuring that the people of this province will receive the best in health care that anyone can offer anywhere.

Now this extra space for research at the Health Sciences Centre is urgently required and I hope that the government will be able to start construction in the near future. I understand that one storey is to be added to the existing facility and anyone who is familiar with the situation at the Research Centre will see that this will really only provide space for the existing research facility and will really not give us any room for expansion at all. I would like to see them provide space for expansion, and certainly if this was done now, a substantial saving would be realized than if it was done, let's say, two or three years hence. When they are opening this expansion, Mr. Speaker, I would like them to remember the memory of Elvie Bloom and the valiant fight which she fought for the Cancer Treatment Centre. I would hope that when this new facility is named - I would certainly recommend wholeheartedly - that the government would take this into consideration.

Now, the Clarkson and Vaida report also recommends that space be made available at the Children's Hospital for psychiatric care. Now we are in complete agreement with this, and for the first time the mentally disturbed child will be able to get an even break in this province. But we wonder, Mr. Minister, whether juveniles who get into trouble with the law, who are in need of psychiatric help, will they also be able to make use of this facility? We're thinking now of those two cases that just happened recently in the paper where these two youths who needed treatment had to be sent to jail because we had no treatment facility; and we are thinking of the case of course in the Youth Centre where this girl committed suicide. I think that this is one of the great problems we have within this province, that we have absolutely no place to send these people, and I hope that the Minister is going to give this a lot of consideration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to cover the entire waterfront in health, but I would like to just leave a few recommendations, and that is:

1. Settle the quarrel with the doctors. This is essential.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. BROWN cont'd)

2. Get the nursing home program under control.

3. Proceed with expansion program at the Health Sciences Centre, but do so with the co-operation and the consultation with the health providers at that hospital.

We would ask you to, for at least the present time, until you have all these things under control, to forget about the Seven Oaks Hospital. Get the Nursing Home program under control first. We would like you to forget about dividing Winnipeg --(Interjections)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, we would like the government to forget about dividing Winnipeg into seven health areas. This is only going to fragment the existing health care delivery system, and will harm rather than assist, and is going to create a tremendous cost of extra administration.

I'd just like to make a few comments, Mr. Speaker, on some of the statements that the Deputy Minister of Education made the other day when he referred to the three Rs, that they were not important any more as they used to be. The Minister of Education announced a program of greater participation by schools in physical training. Members of this government have always stated that we must have greater equality of life within this province. Now everything seems to fall in place, Mr. Speaker - what better way of achieving equality than by denying students the opportunity of learning to read or of learning to express themselves in writing or making them dependent on others because they no longer are able to fend for themselves through a lack of knowledge of arithmetic. This means in effect, Mr. Speaker, that we will no longer have to engage in confrontations with the medical profession, because we will have no doctors. This means that we won't have to worry about whether persons with a degree in engineering are professionals or not, because we will have no engineers. This means, Mr. Speaker, that we will all be very athletic, but we'll all run equally fast and jump equally high, because we must remain equal. This means, Mr. Speaker, that we will all be equally ignorant, and the best way equality can be assured is by denying the students the right to the best in education. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I note the hour is very close to 5:30 p.m. I'm sure no one wishes to talk at this time. Would you kindly call it 5:30?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? I am now leaving the Chair for the supper hour. I shall be returning at 8 p.m.