

Friday, February 25, 1977

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the galleries where we have 38 students of grades ten to twelve standing of the R. D. Parker School of Mystery Lake under the direction of Mr. Reimer, Mrs. Brumwell, and Mrs. McDonald. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Thompson. On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. KEN DILLEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like at this time to compliment you on your return to the Chair. I want as well to congratulate both the Mover and the Seconder of the Speech from the Throne and I would also like to welcome into the Chamber the temporary Leader of the Opposition.

I also want to do something that has not been done by any other member of the opposition who has spoken so far. I want to pay a particular tribute to the former Leader of the Opposition for the tremendous contribution that he has made, not only to the Province of Manitoba in his position as Leader of the Opposition, but as leader of the Conservative Party. I don't think that the fortunes of the Conservative Party will be improved one bit. If anything, I believe that their fortunes are going to go down as a result of the change in leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Leader of the Opposition begin the debate on the Speech from the Throne last Monday. I had some difficulty trying to follow just exactly what he was trying to say. The reason had nothing to do with the complexities of his argument or anything like that; in fact, his arguments were, if anything, astonishingly simple. But that shouldn't astonish anybody in this House for from simple people, naturally, simple things flow. It began to dawn on me as he droned on and on that this wasn't the real Leader of the Opposition talking; it couldn't be. The words coming out of the mouth of the Leader of the Opposition were too toned down. They were too conciliatory to belong to the same symbol of "Lyonism" that ganged up on the Honourable Member for River Heights in December of 1975. This couldn't possibly be the same person. Still, the words kept coming out sweet and syrupy, smooth as silk, with all sweetness and light. He even praised programs like Medicare. Medicare! You know I haven't heard it mentioned in this House, but I believe, if my information is correct, that the Conservative Party, while they were in government, were considering the possibility of taking the federal government to court to test the constitutionality of the implementation of Medicare in this province. Now they are saying it is a good thing. They even praised Pharmacare. And they praised, of all things, Autopac. All of the things that they stood up for on that side of the House as a man and voted against, to a man. Voted against.

Many things, I am sure, could account for this abrupt and dramatic change in image presented by the Leader of the Opposition, and for that matter, for the majority of his caucus. I heard the Member yesterday, and every other day for Sturgeon Creek talking in the House word that was coming out I am sure he had difficulty bringing across because he was choking on them. He was choking, not because he was having difficulty with the words; he was choking because he didn't really believe what he was saying. Perhaps the Member for Sturgeon Creek and his leader and other members of the Conservative Party are simply trying to appease that growing number of people in the Conservative Party who are stating publicly, as Gordon Lucas did in the Winnipeg Tribune on February 18th, and I quote: "At a time when the Conservative Party needs sane, rational, common sense leadership, it seems to be led by men who are insanely bent on power at any price". Even if it means saying that Medicare is good, even if it means saying that Autopac is good, even if it means saying that Pharmacare is good, they'll say it.

This may account for the new image or perhaps the scandal of the nomination in Crescentwood is bearing too heavily on the Leader of the Opposition, and his reactionary followers. Remember how Richard Nixon used to smile and talk softly about his family, and praise his fictitious silent majority whenever somebody would bring up the subject of Watergate. Certainly it must be a heavy burden to bear when the President of your own party publicly admits, as Bill Pearson did, that the Tory executive may be holding on to the reins of power in their party in violation of the party's own constitution. That was a direct admission on the part of the President of the Conservative Party.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please.

MR. DILLEN: One has to ask the question. — (Interjection)— Well, I'm going to tell you in a few moments just exactly who wrote your speech. One has to ask the question if people like the Leader of the Opposition, the majority of his own caucus and his own party executive, are willing to abuse the members of their own party in this fashion what would they do to the rest of the people of Manitoba — those who are not members of the Conservative Party — if they ever got the chance.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. DILLEN: Also, I suppose we should be charitable and attempt to understand the strain and embarrassment felt by the Leader of the Opposition when some of the favourites in his caucus seem to naturally gravitate to picking up and receiving quotations from Nazi agents like Edward Rumley as the Honourable Member from Wolseley has been doing. —(Interjection)— Now, you know, the Member for Wolseley got up in his place in this House and asked questions about the extent to which garbage was being thrown out in the construction camps of Northern Manitoba. And he made particular reference to the crying need for the underdeveloped countries and the people who are starving there.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this House should take it upon themselves to pack that garbage and send it to the developing countries in the name of the Member for Wolseley, because that would be the extent of the kind of assistance that would be provided to third world countries by the likes of the Conservative Party in this province.

Little incidents like the foregoing, plus of course the Leader of the Opposition's own public image and past record. . . I've been asked, "Who is wasting the food?" Mr. Speaker, the contractor who has a contract with Manitoba Hydro to provide food for the people who are working on the construction sites has a direct responsibility for the distribution of food to those people and if there is any wastage it must surely be placed on his shoulders. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. DILLEN: Little incidents — and the name of the company, by the way, that's involved on all of the hydro construction sites is Crawley McCracken — little incidents like the foregoing, plus of course the Leader of the Opposition's own public image and past record, are things that have to be glossed over if the Conservatives hope to hold on to any support in the months ahead. — (Interjection)— anywhere, including Minnedosa. The magic answer for them, therefore, is to change the packaging, not the contents of the package mind you, just the stuff it is wrapped in. I can recall when this was done before, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan — no reflection on the Liberal Party in Manitoba but I'll get to them later — used the MacLaren Advertising Agency to dress up Ross Thatcher, who is now deceased — and this is not intended in disrespect, I would say the same thing for him if he were living. They dressed him up on the basis of a changed public image and they won the 1964 election. Then they used their power — which the Conservative Party is bent on acquiring at any price — they used their power to gerrymander constituency boundaries in such a flagrant way that they were able to win the '67 election without a majority of the popular vote. Now, we all know that the Leader of the Opposition is a student of political activities and that he knows, perhaps better than any of us, how public opinion is manipulated.

So, what the hell, for . . . the \$40,000 per year ad man lent to them there isn't anybody on that side of the House with the intelligence to prepare anything without the assistance of some high priced help; lent to him by Great West Life. He is attempting to present himself and his party to the people of Manitoba as something he most definitely is not.

That shouldn't be too surprising to anyone. It shouldn't bother the Leader of the Opposition nor the majority of his caucus. After all Leonard Saunders pointed out in a recent article in the Winnipeg Free Press, your Federal Leader, the Honourable Joe Clark, maintains and I quote: "Power is more essential than morality in the political process." That's your Federal Leader talking. Power, he says, is more essential than morality in the political process. That came directly from Joe Clark.

I hate to say this in this House and I'm sure that people on this side are going to beat me all the way to the caucus room when I say it, but I have a great admiration for Joe Clark.

A MEMBER: Why?

MR. DILLEN: Because he has the guts to say publicly what is on the mind of every Conservative in the country, including the people who sit on that side of the House, but they have not had the guts to stand up in this House and say, or say anywhere publicly, that power is more essential than morality.

But even this process is preferable to using high-priced ad men provided by insurance companies to disguise your immorality as Manitoba's Conservative Party seems to be bent on doing. You are disguising Conservatism with the use of high-priced, slick, oily ad men.

You know, I'm told that one of the members of the opposition don't know about this guy yet. Talk to your Leader, he'll tell you all about him. But I'm not surprised that he would not tell you. I'll get you that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

A MEMBER: Who writes all your letters to your constituents, or your literature?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. DILLEN: So, Mr. Speaker, if one is set on the course of achieving power at any price one simply has to attempt to pretend that you agree with policies which, in fact, you oppose and have opposed consistently in this House since you have been sitting in the opposition and some of them you even opposed while you were the government.

Hence the Leader of the Opposition is able to stand before this Assembly and attempt to convince us that he isn't even opposed to Autopac anymore, that Autopac is, in fact, in harmony with

Conservative ideology. Just who is he trying to kid? Who is he trying to kid? It's an insult to the intelligence of the people of this province to have the Conservative Party stand up in this House and be praising something that they have been ideologically opposed to since they have been in existence.

I have pointed out that the Leader of the Opposition's remarks were totally out of character for him and I have given the reasons for his bland performance but I want to draw attention to the fact that in spite of his bland performance and in spite of his expensive coaching, the Leader of the Opposition was not able to totally conceal his reactionary instincts. One facet of the new Lyonism that stands out above everything is the hucksterism that is so apparent in his appeal. Statements like and I'll quote directly from the Leader of the Opposition: "There is no clarion call for the '70s and the '80s." Or that the government is "not able to divine what the challenges are." Plain and simple huckster statements. They may be fine for selling insurance but surely this is not the way to deal with political issues. The notion that we can delve into mysticism as a means of divining challenges in some sort of pagan ritual is something that went out with the dark ages. The notion that clarion calls will solve problems is really part of the same kind of thinking that says that symbolism sells insurance. To the Leader of the Opposition and the majority of his caucus, I can only say that it is an abuse of your Legislative responsibilities to treat the matter of governing this province in such a cavalier fashion.

Mr. Speaker, those who know the Leader of the Opposition and the majority of his caucus, knew well in advance of his address to this Assembly that he simply could not be restrained from expressing his reactionary views regarding how the wealth produced in this province should be shared by the people of this province. So it was therefore no surprise that he singled out for special attack the statement by my leader, the Premier of Manitoba, that indicated we should be working towards more equal distribution of our wealth. As an example, the Premier stated his belief that the wages of low income workers should be raised and, in some instances at least, higher incomes may have to be lowered so that the highest income earners are not taking home more than two and one-half times as much as the lowest paid worker. — (Interjection) — I hope that you go out to the people of the province and make that a position of the Conservative Party.

All the efforts of the image-maker simply couldn't prevent the Leader of the Opposition from exposing himself on this issue, as though he had some knowledge of the way the people of this province actually feel and think, the Member for Souris-Killarney asserted and I quote: "Manitobans believe with us that hard work and ability should be rewarded. We believe" he went on, Mr. Speaker, "that the chance to excel and to receive material rewards for excelling are an important part of our tradition and of our heritage and will continue to be in this province." Mr. Speaker, this statement directly contradicts other parts of the Leader of the Opposition's address when he pays lip-service in support of programs like Critical Home Repairs, Autopac, Pharmacare, Day Care and so on. What he and most of the members of his caucus are ideologically opposed to is the willingness to recognize the fact that many people in our system have a great deal of ability and they work very hard, but are not materially rewarded for doing so.

This, I want to point out to my honourable friends opposite, is what happens in a society where the decisions that determine how that society operates are made by those in the privileged class, in the interests of the privileged class. In this respect I would challenge the Leader of the Opposition to conduct the next election campaign of the Conservative Party on the basis of the statement I quoted earlier. Let him try! Forget the hucksterism and the coaching from your ad men and make your real political ideology apparent to people.

Go to the fishermen who freeze their butts off for starvation wages in Manitoba and tell them the reason they are not getting paid as well as the people who act as fish brokers is that do not work hard enough. They do not work hard enough. Come and tell them up there in the Northern Manitoba lakes that they don't work hard enough and also try to tell them that they don't have any ability.

Go to the miners in Northern Manitoba and tell them as they scrub the sweat and garbage off themselves in the showers, that the reason they don't get materially rewarded as well as Inco's, or HBM & S or Falconbridge management, is because they don't have management or the stockholder's ability and they don't work hard enough. Come and tell them that they don't work hard enough.

Go to the small Northern businessman in Manitoba or anywhere else in this province, as he spends his Sundays catching up on his work

that the reason he isn't as well rewarded is that he doesn't have the ability and doesn't work as hard as the executives and owners of Great West Life. Come and tell the small businessman that his rewards are small because he doesn't work hard enough.

Go to the farmers, tell them that they are not working hard enough and that's why they are in the position that they are in today, and that they don't have the ability to produce. Don't change your stance.

Go to the wives, or some of the women who work in places like the Bay or Eaton's, and tell them the reason that they don't have all the conveniences of the owners and their families is that they don't have the ability and they don't work hard enough. Tell them that.

If the Leader of the Opposition is ideologically opposed to the concept of working towards a more egalitarian society, as he stated in his speech to this Assembly last Monday, it logically follows that he wants to maintain the present make-up of our society where a few have vast power and privilege and wealth, while the majority work mainly for the benefit of the privileged few.

I say to those on the other side of this House that this is a fact of life in our society. It will not go away simply because you refuse to talk about it, nor will other people refrain from talking about it simply because you insist on assuming an ostrich-like stance with your head in the sand, due to the fact that there is something out there that you don't want to see. The fact is, my friends, that we live in a society composed of social classes but these classes are being broken down whether you want to recognize it or not. That, I submit, is really what this debate is all about, but central to this point, however, is the fact that the Leader of the Opposition, the majority of their caucus, and a few powerful interest groups they represent in this Assembly, want to obscure this aspect of the debate. In order to do this, it is essential that they pay lip service to programs like Home Repair, Day Care, Pharmacare and so on, simple lip service. Furthermore, even though programs like these are not in harmony with Conservative philosophy, the opposition and the forces backing them outside this House are willing to say: "Okay, we'll accept these programs but progress stops here." They are willing to compromise their own beliefs; they are willing to accept the things that they have dedicated their lives to providing they gain power to protect the remaining privileges of those who command the heights of power and privilege in our society.

I find it interesting that the Leader of the Opposition attempts to frighten people away from the issue of class relationships in our society by referring to government programs which propose to deal with problems of the less privileged, as institutional envy. Those were the exact two words that he used. This is an old trick from the McCarthy era, Mr. Speaker. When you want people to stop talking and thinking about a certain concept, you attempt to blemish it with a socially unacceptable phrase. I may as well serve notice on you, temporary Leader, or temporary Member for Souris-Killarney, right now that I and the people of Northern Manitoba will not be put off by these kinds of foolish ploys.

Let's examine some programs that fall in the category of what the Leader of the Opposition sneeringly refers to as "government administered institutional envy." Certainly a program like the Brandon University Northern Teacher Educational Program must fall in that category. Our program to subsidize the freight costs of Northern Manitoba fishermen, a first for Canada's inland fishermen, must also fall in that category.

The Landlord and Tenants Act which prevents landlords from discriminating against tenants which the Steelworkers' Union and other groups from Thompson, and other centres petitioned the Member for Souris-Killarney for when he was a Cabinet Minister; the program to train northern native nurses must also fall in this category of institutionalized envy. The Special Mature Student Program at Brandon University and the University of Manitoba, in his view, must also fall into that category of institutionalized envy.

In fact, frankly, every new program brought in by this government since 1969 is based on the Lyonist concept of institutionalized envy. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to use those terms, it's fine with me, but I am telling you now that I and the people who are affected by those programs will back those programs and fight to maintain and expand them, and to develop other programs needed by the less privileged class of people in Manitoba, regardless of what they are called by the Conservative Party or anybody else.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not a farmer but I have a good acquaintance with rural Manitoba and as a northern resident representing a large group of fishermen, wood workers, miners and other workers in Northern Manitoba, I would like to say that many of us in the north are concerned about the attitude of the Conservative Party towards the agricultural situation in southern Manitoba. We are concerned about it; we are concerned about your attitude. —(Interjection)— That is right. I am glad the Member for Wolseley recognizes that the people in the north are concerned about the Conservative attitude towards agriculture in the Province of Manitoba. You see, little do they know or want to know, that the majority of the people who are presently employed in Northern Manitoba came from the agricultural areas of this province and other provinces as well. Why did they have to go to Thompson? Why did they have to go to Lynn Lake? Why did they have to go to Leaf Rapids? Why did they have to go to Snow Lake? Because they wanted to and because the agricultural sector in the southern part of the Province of Manitoba did not provide employment for all of the people that it is intended to serve. That is why. To my constituents and to myself it is disconcerting, to put it mildly, to hear the Leader of the Opposition say, as he did last Monday (and I quote again), "The NDP state farm program has now swollen to the point where more than 175,000 acres of farm land creates a whole new unwanted class of tenant farmers."

Mr. Speaker, to call people who are using the programs adopted by this government to help young men and women to establish themselves on farms and become productive members of rural

Friday, February 25, 1977

victory which was ours. We have been lied to. We have been cheated and robbed of a victory that was ours. Those are the words of an official of the Conservative Party. I suggest at this point, Mr. Speaker, that the biggest lie and the biggest cheat has been going on in the Conservative ranks long before that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I congratulate you on being chosen the Speaker again and I would like to welcome the new Member for Souris-Killarney to the Chair. I thought he gave a very great speech. I would like to congratulate the seconder and the mover whom I listened to. They had some very interesting comments.

Of course, I was also very pleased to see that the Speech from the Throne contained some confessions by the Premier, such as the worsening unemployment and the 20-odd percent increase in the gross provincial product because now we can compare it to the expenditures of the '70s and we come up with the fact that the NDP team has placed this province in a serious financial condition, and I say that sincerely, with little hope for the next generation of taxpayers. It seems that there are only two things that can take away your friends, and that seems to be a war and a lousy economy.

The members opposite, of course, must take some blame for this latter event in Manitoba history. I remember last session when the First Minister held up my election material, my predictions for the future, and he called me an idiot and a liar but it is all right for the Minister of Public Works to stand up and quote a fortune teller against our particular leader. Our leader said that the figure of \$3,400 per capita and I wonder if the First Minister would dare to label our leader the same as he did the writer. The First Minister, of course, claimed that I was 250 percent wrong. Of course the Minister also, under the Hydro issue of food, claimed I didn't know what I was talking about. But obviously the answer he gave proved that he doesn't even know what is happening in his own department. I never heard of any backtracking by the First Minister about those questionable remarks he made about myself and maybe it is a first, but I have yet to be welcomed to this Chamber by the First Minister. It seems that his government cannot take being found out. —(Interjections)— Well I simply said to the people, I told them what I felt was the truth. I said: What costs more than the cost of food? What costs more than the cost of houses? What costs more than the cost of clothing? And I said: You can find out the answer on communities by first renting and then purchasing farm land, to refer to those people as an unwanted class is something that is too galling to be tolerated in this Assembly. In the name of common courtesy, I am requesting the Leader of the Opposition to use some of the next portion of time allotted to his party during this session to publicly apologize to the people of rural Manitoba for this gross indecency.

No one would dispute the Opposition Leader's statement that agriculture is tremendously important to the economy of this province. Nobody has ever saying anything otherwise on this side of the House. Certainly this is recognized all too well by my constituents in Northern Manitoba as well.

But part of the discussion underway in Northern Manitoba now is: How can we operate our economy in such a way that there will be more convergence between the things we produce and the things we require? This discussion has led many of our people to understand that they will always be subject to the whims and power plays of others until they have more control over what they produce and what they consume. I would suggest that if the Conservative Party is really interested in rural Manitoba, they could begin by engaging in discussions of this kind even though it is totally alien to Conservative ideology. The convergent strategy, of course, is designed to halt the flow of wealth from Manitoba to the bank accounts of large corporations throughout North America and other parts of the world. In order to work effectively, people must participate in decision-making. They must develop a greater degree of self reliance and self sufficiency and they must recognize the cooperative and democratic relationships that are an integral part of this process.

Nobody wants to talk about that. Nobody want to wants to understand it. It is just foreign to any thinking that goes on in the Conservative Party. This is of course why the Conservative Party cannot support a strategy of this kind. Their benefactors and their backers in the seats of the mighty simply would not stand for it.

I am not making this statement without the goods to back it up, either. Throughout his speech, the temporary Meer for talks Souris-Killarney of the need to attract and hold foreign capital in Manitoba, but never once does he get into discussing what Manitoba should be prepared to do to attract and hold capital, nor does he talk about the possibility of capital being retained in Manitoba for reinvestment. Instead, he uses an example from Saskatchewan. I will quote directly from his speech. "Government cannot replace the private sector as the creator of jobs and opportunities. We had thought that the NDP in Saskatchewan had perhaps learned that lesson until Mr. Blakeney involved himself in his latest folly to take over the potash industry and his debt is going to skyrocket up very shortly."

Mr. Speaker, I know that you are checking me because I am running out of time but I want to just end within the minute that I have left for me with a quotation from a person within the Conservative ranks who asked not to be named who says that we have been lied to. We have been robbed of a

page three. And they found out the answer. It was the cost of you big NDP spenders opposite. And if you don't think I'm kidding. I get my information out of the newspapers and if they tell 80 percent of the truth, that's fine, because they said, "What's a billion?" Because they said that an individual who makes \$6,000 in 1969 has to make \$21,000 today and I say this to the Dodge City man over there: \$21,000 today he has to make in 1976. Schreyer's mind, according to this article, is boggled by Wilson and the candidate hurts the Premier. Yet he can put out an article called "Your Moneys' Worth." You know, it is interesting. is interesting. The Premier in the papers lately has indicated he may be leaving. Yet he hasn't answered our charges about the two-and-a-half times one. You're very silent over there about that comment. —(Interjection)— The Member for Thompson is going to wrap up the food that can feed the hungry people of the world; he is going to wrap it up and send it to Wolseley. One of his political hacks in Thompson has the nerve to write and say that Wilson... Roosevelt. I never asked to be compared to anyone.

In a lesser vein, Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about tourism. It's an area in which I am interested. I think tourism probably went up because all the ex-Manitoba people were returning home for a holiday after their successful careers elsewhere. However, I have a responsibility, as every member in this Chamber has, to promote tourism whenever and wherever possible. The fresh new dollars that tourism brings to our otherwise sick economy is a must. The spin-off benefits to the Convention Centre alone, which I don't know if the new Minister supports, as well as the trophy fishing in the north, which I don't know if the new Minister supports, as well as camping and sightseeing, create a very viable economy.

This government has not done enough to promote and educate travelers in Manitoba to put together post and pre-convention activities, because our new Progressive Conservative government next year will actively support the different regions, to help them promote the facilities in their local regions and their local events, to make promotional material available delivered on time, Mr. Minister — and you're the new Minister — delivered on time, remember that. And travel films that tell a story, not have water flowing and cost \$62,000 and made by some Eastern firm. We must seek the support of the travel industry and the federal government to make Manitoba the place to visit in Canada. There is no need for taxpayers' dollars to pay for promotional material. I can assure you the airlines will pay for it but you people over there have gone it alone and you've been making a mistake going it alone. You've been tinkering with staff changes; you have all these political appointments and you've been ignoring the interests of the Manitoba taxpayers. Popular resorts like Grand Beach are being ignored, instead the Minister — the former Minister — what does he do? He builds a monument to himself, in a hard to get region. The Gull Harbour complex is an example of poor government planning which will result in taxpayers' losses for several years to come, taxpayers' losses for several years to come. And what does the new Minister do? He sits and dreams of a 50 mile park in Churchill. He ignores the upgrading needs of the former successful resort areas and camps. When the Public Works Minister was taken to task by our party, he responded by improving the Legislative grounds and the riverbank path because of our suggestion, despite the protests of the Member from Wellington who said that no one on this side, especially the speaker now who didn't know what he was talking about. The new Minister of Tourism had better put his house in order and demand that the First Minister be made aware of tourism in the Manitoba economy because you know, the new Minister could be the biggest draw-back to tourism in Manitoba, because economists, despite himself, economists are predicting a boom for tourism based on several factors and one is the devaluation of the Canadian dollar. The Minister has to be prepared to consult with the industry; he can't take as gospel truth what his inefficient staff says. Remember this was one department which was wrought by transfers, resignations and giving key positions in the tourism department and especially the head position to an NDP candidate in Fort Rouge. I think taxpayers in this province got questionable value for their money. We can go back to that monument again — \$4.5 million — and the media has predicted that there is going to be a \$700,000 increase. I think the media was very generous to you because there's 125 miles of questionable road and somewhere in the Highways Department is going to be hidden another sum of money.

A MEMBER: You've got it, Bob.

MR. WILSON: That's right. And any fool in the tourist business would know you've got to start promoting a new hotel two years in advance but what does the new Minister do? He delays the opening because he found out maybe they started advertising two or three months ahead and when an MLA tries to find something out about Gull Harbour, there is no material available. no road. Well, I think the planning was wrong. Obviously, there's a parks person influence there because the hotel itself has no view of the beautiful lake. It was built over a former swamp and while this monument stands to lose the taxpayers' money and, yes, Mr. Minister, I have been there. Popular resorts like Grand Beach are wasting away with age and little sign of reconstruction and now you have one of your supporters so mad about the lack of development in Grand Beach, he's going to run against your member for Public Works, your Minister of Public Works. Tourism in 1975 was a \$325 million industry.

I would like to read into the record if I could, some interesting developments because in 1976 we had 190 conventions with 67,036 delegates spending an average of \$180 per delegate and all this because of the efforts of volunteer help and people who cared. It brought in \$12 million in fresh new dollars to this province and this is only the start of it. Here is a nine dollar bill and it says \$325 million industry.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WILSON: Lodging is \$84.5 million. That means all the hotels and innkeepers prosper. Food is \$68 million in food chain drive-ins, candy, butchers and everything. — (Interjection) — You're only jealous, for the Minister of Mines, because there's no legal fees in this industry. Travel is \$71.5 million; shopping \$65 million and entertainment \$19.5 million. And that's an industry that can grow. — (Interjection)— Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before I make additional suggestions and observations to the members opposite, I would like to take a few minutes to speak seriously of the area in Winnipeg which sent the NDP a message. Its boundaries are the Assiniboine River on the south, Portage Avenue on the north; my constituency starts with the beautiful setting of the Legislative Buildings and runs to the St. James underpass. While Wolseley is the location of the Union Centre, if you didn't know that, and the location of the NDP headquarters, if you didn't know that, its residence voted for a truly working candidate who was born in Wolseley, who lives in Wolseley and who works in Wolseley. They have chosen a candidate because as intelligent men and women they know socialism, the creeping style of the First Minister or the take-over style of the Minister of Mines and he'll take over everything — they're no friends of labour. This has been demonstrated by events in Britain and elsewhere and, of course, the Member from Thompson would like to drive away business and drive away jobs and I think the union workers deserve some freedom from NDP dictatorship.

In my constituency it is also very interesting — and I wish the Minister of Labour was here — because the NDP candidate who was the election winner, and listen for a minute, the NDP candidate who was the election winner — (Interjection)— no, the NDP candidate seems to make more money than the election winner between elections because he has all these government appointments. When I asked the Minister of Labour what his salary was, he couldn't tell me because he was so anxious to give his friend a job. But what happens? This doesn't stop at the candidate getting all these jobs between elections and making \$30,000 to \$40,000 a year . . .

A MEMBER: It's closer to \$50,000.

MR. WILSON: Well, he probably does. But you don't have an open government over there. I would like to talk about . . . Ah, but the president of the Wolseley NDP Association, what does she do? She comes in from Thompson and gets a job on the non-political Civil Service Commission — (Interjection)— Yes, she does.

A MEMBER: She works in Thompson.

MR. WILSON: Yes, she does. And during the election the Union Centre is virtually empty as salaried executives take the days off. They refuse to put up my signs, they take this stand even though they are paid and supported — yes, you think that's a joke — it was reported by the media, but the union dues are paid by all the members of the labour movement. Is this labour freedom? Since when does a labour executive dictate to the rank and file? I think it's time there was freedom in the labour movement. You know, the NDP government of Manitoba is the Canadian champion for hiring relative's friend — and I'm sorry Dr. Wonderful isn't here. Other qualified people, they ignore talent, they really ignore talent.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the new Minister of Tourism's comments are not taking away from my time. It's obvious, nepotism is obvious.

Mr. Speaker, because I have a life in Winnipeg degree I deplore the government waste and mismanagement. Well I'll tell you why I have a life in Winnipeg degree . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WILSON: . . . because I was born here. My background as a CNR employee and Union Local treasurer . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Continuing Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The honourable member made some reference to nepotism on my part. I certainly would appreciate it if he would explain that.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that Hansard will bear me out that I mentioned the NDP government as the Canadian champion of nepotism. Because now, as a small businessman . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, because I have a background as a small businessman, and the other backgrounds that I mentioned before which are important in the life in Winnipeg degree, I carried thrift forward to my City of Winnipeg council days and, unlike the member of Thompson, I am not jealous of pioneer families and mining executives. I do not brag that The Bay has been "turfed out", from the newspaper article. However, the new Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and

Internal Services should be prepared to explain his programs, and I say what value they are, if any, and if not I think he should change his portfolio out of boredom. I am sure he will not display the same —(Interjection)— Well, the Girl Guide cookies can wait. But I am sure that the same Minister, before, the one who is not here today, who displayed so much power and arrogance that I would really appreciate if the new Minister would listen to suggestions, and I am sure he will.

Mr. Speaker, I do not agree, on the serious side, with the cablevision takeover, and I know that the companies across Canada would bid to supply cablevision to all the smaller communities with 500 or less, if the NDP telephone system would supply the microwave. I am worried that the NDP would use these new powers of communication to attempt to improve their elected position. They would like to put their faces in every farmhouse throughout the province under the guise of education in public affairs. I am sure they would be able to buy this — at least I feel to the Minister that I would like to be able to buy the same phone attachments in Montreal, New York, or Winnipeg, and I deplore the suggested NDP monopoly in this area. And under the Consumers Bureau, the income tax return free services and the bill and debt counselling — they seem to be poorly run, and they must be exposed. Many problems are solved in different cities via the marketplace, but the marketplace . . . you people don't understand the marketplace. And many civil servants are in a dictatorial position without any background or any formality or any knowledge of what they're talking about.

This government is knowingly encouraging dishonesty by government interference in the credit industry. Landlord and Tenants Act and the crumbling court system of Manitoba. Manitoba has become a "getters" haven which only a few years ago was applauded by the Member from St. Matthews — who is not in his Chair. He is the signer, of course, of those senior citizens and he presses for senior citizens to join the NDP Party, the membership man.

And bankruptcies were up 57 percent to 191. In fact, these particular pamphlets say: "Behind in your payments? See the NDP. Overburdened with debts? See the NDP. Buying on credit? See the NDP. Can we help? 947 6561."

And the NDP, they have an income tax return service. For \$7.50, if you make over \$9,000.00. But obviously the chartered accountants aren't worried because they know who's going to form the next government. Interference in their industry will be quickly gone over. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. WILSON: But, on an important issue — Fire Safety. Fire safety, Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to be able to read my —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Will the Honourable Minister state his point of order.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member was quoting from some publication. Would he be good enough to identify and table the document from which he was quoting and identify the author of it.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, this document is too large to table, in fact it's the size of the table. It's the Community Income Tax Service pamphlet at 536½ Main Street. Mr. Speaker, I hope that doesn't take away from my time because they know I usually save the best for the last.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. Johns state his . . .

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C.: . . . provide that when there is some document from which there is reading that it should be tabled. There was a request made. Now I add to that request, not the blue document, but rather that mauve one that the member was waving from which he read. I request that he table both documents.

MR. WILSON: I would be glad to table them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Morris on the same point of order.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON: . . . has been in this House long enough he should know that if it's a public document, it is not necessary to table it. He can obtain it just like my honourable friend got it. If it is a private document, then he has a perfect legitimate right to request it being tabled. —(Interjection)—

A MEMBER: How do you get it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader. Order, please, one at a time.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I take it that the House Leader is advising us that it is a public document and that it is available, I presume, from the community income tax service. I would like the honourable member to tell us whether he properly quoted it, saying "reading, see the NDP" on the community income tax document.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, that is his opinion. I was reading from my speech. I merely have documents beside me.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for St. Johns have another point of order?

MR. CHERNIACK: No, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I understand that the Member for Morris stated the rule as I understood it to be, but that mauve document from which the member was reading was a document which I believe the Honourable Minister asked to be tabled. If he now says that was not a document which he was reading purporting it to be a true document, then let him say so. I agree with the Honourable Member for Morris. I didn't know that was a public document, that mauve-

colored sheet which has just been in the hands of the Member of Wolseley. It seems to me that it is a printed document and I ask that it be tabled because he read from it. Now, if it is a public document, then of course, if we are informed where it is available, that's fine, I will look it up in the library, the Legislative Library.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, these documents are available at 536 ½ Main Street and this is one of their programs and if they don't know where 536 ½ Main Street is, that's not my problem. I was reading from my speech which is in front of me and I can refer to that document any time I want to as an example of the type of program that they have.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about fire safety if I could. —(Interjection)—

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have clarification that the document referred to by the Honourable, the Member for Wolseley, which he waved in his hand, which is now in the hands of the Member for Morris, a pink document — pink-coloured, not the blue one — is a document produced from some address on Main Street which is now on the record and which is obtainable there. If that is the truth I accept that statement.

A MEMBER: It is.

MR. CHERNIACK: That's fine. The one about "see the NDP if you're in any trouble". That's fine.

MR. JORGENSON: I hope we can clear this matter up. The document that the Member for Wolseley was quoting from is a public document. However, in reading from that document, he was adding his own comments.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Wolseley, carry on.

MR. WILSON: Before I get to public fire safety problems, I think it is incumbent on me to suggest to the members opposite that this group is funded by the members opposite. It is an NDP program. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader on another point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there are limits to what a gentleman can say and I think that both the House Leader and the Leader of the Conservative Party would have to agree that that document, the funds for that document were voted by the members of the legislative assembly, not by the members of this party.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, the only way I want to mislead this House is that we have got to get rid of the members opposite. But I would also like to put some positive suggestions under fire safety because from the Minister who is not here today, who doesn't even know what he pays his political appointments, I would like to see that heat and smoke detectors become mandatory in the older suites in Manitoba since 70 percent of the fires start in suites.

Succession Duty should be abolished as a dumb tax which will never work and simply drive successful people to other provinces because these are usually taxes on income for which taxes have been paid during a working lifetime, and a hard-working lifetime. These have a burden on the small businessmen and farmers the most — they really hurt the farmers the most. Large corporate heads have already left for Alberta and B.C. You could pick up almost any document and see that all of a sudden a particular member of a board is living in Banff or Calgary. These areas abolished the tax. And Manitoba Socialists must admit their blunder and as Edmund Burke, the parliamentarian, once said, "The duty of government is to give people what they should have, whether or not they like it at first sight, and accept the judgement at the polls when they have the end results clearly before them." And to the members opposite, your failures in business and high taxes will not be accepted.

The Member from St. Vital is doing Manitoba disservice when he says "tax somebody else's work" and the Member of St. Matthews probably whispered it to him. He said "tax somebody else's work" — it was right in Letters to the Editor.

According to the articles, Manitoba is a bad place to die, Manitoba is a bad place to live under socialism but I predict, and I look to the skies, that we will be saved. —(Interjection)— That's right and under the northern development policies they seem to be floundering because they're attempting to politicize every dollar they give away. They are not fooling the Native and northern people at all. You'll only buy a few votes with your give-aways. They only want a say in their future and a say in government plans.

Dangerous comments about takeovers from the Member for Thompson quoting the . . . left and the CEDF Loans of fifty dollars. Oh, the Government is so generous. Can you imagine the paperwork involved in a fifty dollar loan? The bureaucrats would have a field day with 500 fifty dollar loans. It would keep the staff going for a year. But the media should examine this list and determine, say even six months later what the recovery rate is. It would be surprising, it would be shocking! And also under Public Accounts to the members opposite what I happen to read and you'll be found out — because the media doesn't read the Public Accounts but I do. Public Accounts he are alarming! You take page 205 alone — and don't forget the Public Accounts are over a year old by the time we get them — Outboard Marine has over \$118,000 for outboard motors and this isn't even an election year.

Friday, February 25, 1977

And how about taxi bills in the northern communities? Taxi bills have always been real vote getters. — (Interjection) — Yeah, well I'll tell you about one because Yellow Cab trading as Associate Taxis — they've got \$79,360 in the Public Accounts. . Very conveniently one of the directors donated \$1,500 to the NDP campaign for Murdoch MacKay.

Mr. Speaker, on Hydro I do not intend to talk about pages 193 of the 1975 Public Accounts which says \$505,458,000 because the people in Wolseley don't seem to understand millions of dollars in losses so I have to get down to the grass roots and I have to talk to them about the Premier when he says that the rates will go up thirty to forty-five percent in the next four years. Let me read this scandalous comparison. 300 kilowatt hours in 1974 - \$4.63; in 1977 - \$10.20; a 120 percent increase. 700,000 kilowatt hours - - - \$17.80, \$8.43; in 1977 111 percent increase. And the average of 1,000 kilowatt hours is \$11.28/\$23.58; an increase of 108 percent. And our wages have not gone up that high.

But we must talk, Mr. Speaker, about the Attorney-General's department because he's good enough to sit and listen which I appreciate, because I have some ideas on law and order. I'm sorry the Minister of Corrections isn't here because the fight against crime is not very encouraging. It seems we cannot build cells and prisons fast enough. The revolving - door justice is in the paper every day and violent crime offenders are released by storting the judges. The Crown Attorneys seem to lack the zest under their new surroundings to fight bail in these cases. These violent offenders get light sentences and the jails seem to be filled by and large by drug offense people who are more of a threat to themselves than to society while these violent people who are a threat to society seem to get out without too much trouble and the half-way supervision under the Ministers of Corrections needs beefing up with a change in policy to go back to a rural setting instead of dumping them into residential areas like Wolseley which is fine if they are supervised but this Government has a sorry record of lack of

I'll supervision. one that read I discovered at 79 Maryland in which the man was posing as a minister because one of the terms of references to getting these convicts in the high *per diem* was, if you were a minister you were obviously a person of knowledge. So they sent away for three dollars to the United States and became a minister — a man of the cloth. But Dr. Wonderful, , the Minister of Health and Social Development, when I at least brought it to his attention responded by revoking this man's ability to perform marriages and ability to supervise convicts and the Minister of Corrections pulled the convicts out of that surrounding and back into a properly supervised unit. But I haven't got the time of day to be walking around looking at all these particular half-way houses.

On the ABC News on February 15th the President of the United States, Mr. Carter, gave a message and I would hope the Attorney-General would follow in President Carter's steps. He said, "There are too many complex laws and these complex laws reap large profits for governments and lawyers in large." see on page 187 of the Public Accounts that the taxpayers of Manitoba paid \$338,000 plus — this was a year ago — to the Law Society of and I Manitoba think it is high time that we got something from them. We got advice to repeal some of these vague laws, which the Attorney-General's staff doesn't seem to have the time or the ability to do — and worded in such a way that the average citizen is not told to hire a lawyer to figure them out. The Attorney-General's staff should be taken to task for farming out so much work and by shuffling paper around to keep their job, because if they shuffle paper around they avoid controversy and stay in the favour of the Minister. You just have to turn to page 169 of Public Accounts and you see his favourite, Gallagher - Greenberg gets \$66,000, and Richardson & Company \$23,000, Arpin Company \$26,000 and the list goes on and on. Then you add \$2 million in legal fees for CFI expenses to date in 1976 which are really a boon to the Leader of the Liberal Party and all the other society friends of the Minister.

If the case load was \$47,000 plus in 1975, I think the public deserves an explanation. Why can't we stop the expansion of Legal Aid. What did our forefathers do before these Legal Aid salesmen flooded the land looking for problems to solve for fees. Each consumer problem involves legal aid, each family breakdown involves two lawyers. The debt counsellors I spoke about before recommend legal aid. The courts are blocked because of legal aid lawyers delaying cases in the name of justice. Te Chief of the City of Winnipeg Police says he has to hire thirty-nine more constables because of the expanding, growing legal aid. That's costing the taxpayers money. They're experts, legal aid lawyers, in demanding adjournments. The court system costs taxpayers money and I think the Minister, at some time, has to explain his hopes for the future. The NDP should be held accountable for not examining this obvious waste of money which the NDP hope will get them votes from users of the system. Need and merit should be the qualifiers, not demand, without penalty for false affidavits. There never seems to be anyone brought to task for false affidavits. Recovery from successes is almost non-existent and should be paid for in civil cases.

Mr. Speaker, The Minister of Health, Dr. Wonderful, is something the doctors of this province wish had never arrived on the scene. His fights with the medical profession across North America, in the

name of socialism — he attempts to take over the duties for abused children from the Children's Aid Society; his lack of support for the core area day care centres; his dreams of a future universal day care program, regardless of the cost; his poor fee structure for the care of the post psychiatric patient and the lack of programming, his list of shortcomings is so alarming that he is bound to be found out. I don't know how he has not been found out to date. Somebody is being silent. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Five minutes.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, Dr. Wonderful specializes in dictatorship in the health area but he has also a unique thing. He is the hoarder. He is the hoarder of legal aid fees and lottery funds. . . In his other area the lottery funds — in Public Accounts it said that he was hanging on to 1.4 million in 1975. And I'd like somebody to ask the question, "What is he hoarding now?" This seems to be our money; the taxpayer's money. If I could quote, "in 1973 1.2 million; in 1974 2.2 million; in 1975 2.5 million." Why doesn't the public demand that these funds that are supposed to support sports and cultural problems in the province . . . the minister is attempting a power trip by politicizing these dollars given out. If each community club, rich or poor, was given \$5,000 right away; if the arts group were given additional support and the University of Winnipeg need a field house right away, why doesn't somebody say to the Minister, "Give us our money. We bought the lottery tickets. You're sitting on it."

Well, the Member from St. Matthews has finally arrived. He probably signed up some more senior citizens but the NDP should stop taxing churches and stop taxing non-profit organization because the Manitoba Telephone System raised the telephone bill from \$5.00 to \$11.65 plus tax.

—Interjection— They certainly did. Mr. Speaker, I'll probably run out of time but I would like to say that the Government should stop buying new businesses and if I didn't have these interruptions I would have talked to the Minister of Mines about Flyer Coach Industries because . . . **MR.**

SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WILSON: . . . we could take two companies which started at the same time. Both plants are similar and I'm told that Flyer and American Motors General have an engineering agreement that could obtain the drawings for the invalid attachments. The problem at Flyer Coach seems to be management and government decision. American General produces thirty-five buses a week. Flyer produces nine a week with almost the identical staff. And Flyer has a bigger painting department. Something is wrong because the buses are similar. Where are our sales? And, listen, why did we blow the Edmonton deal? Why are we not bidding on 600 buses in Montreal? And, what about all the Commonwealth purchases by the American companies? Should the Minister of Mines not pull up his socks and ask the Federal Government why Nigeria can purchase 300 buses, not from Manitoba, but from the United States. Let's have some answers. Let's have some answers.

Mr. Speaker, I say that \$1.2 billion budget contains losses because of mismanagement and waste. Free programs have a price tag on them and I predict and I wish he was here, that the First Minister and I should be allowed to crystal-ball the future, that the First Minister will go down at the polls. The Member from Thompson will go down at the polls. The Member from Transcona will quit. The Member from Osborne will finish dead last. This will be done because the media, for once, will stop reading those government news releases and write their own.

In the history of this province, the province I have chosen to live in, our fathers fought two wars in the name of freedom and we must avoid becoming servants and farmers of the state. **MR.**

SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP M. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a hard act to follow but it was entertaining. The thought struck me as I listened to the last speaker that he should have been here in the legislature while the Conservative Party was in power. He would have been the ideal model for the "Drummer Boy" and could have walked down the streets waving the flag "Going to Beat '70" which really got nowhere.

I didn't know quite what he was talking about when he made the reference to my having accused him of not knowing what he was talking about, then it came to me, it was at a Committee meeting in Room 254. He was talking about the Riel Statue and about the upgrading of the river bank and he thought the Riel Statue was too close to the river bank and that it might fall in. I didn't think that my remark, simple as it was, had cut quite so deeply, nor that it had drawn any blood.

There's a story about a man who rose one time — he was running for the presidency of the United States — in a large convention hall in Chicago, William Jennings Bryant. There are a few here who will recall that, I don't remember the exact occasion myself but I have read of it. He preached a message that was more than an election speech, but he preached the message that was called "The Cross of Gold" and there was a difference between the gold standard and some other standard in the United States at that time. He spoke loud and he spoke long and appeared to be saying a great deal. Women fainted and strong men wept, but the next day when the speech in its complete form appeared in print in the newspapers and people read it, they wondered what he had been saying. He hadn't really, in their opinion, known what he was but talking about. I'm going to let that drop, Mr. Speaker, and proceed with other things more useful and I hope a little more important.

I wish first to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment to yet another year in your post.

That appointment is a recognition of your able conduct of the legislative sessions and a recognition given not only by your political colleagues but by the honourable members on all sides of the House. I look forward with pleasure to the present session already underway, under your able direction and control.

I wish also to direct my congratulations to the Sergeant-at-Arms, Ragnar Gislason, on this present term in that important post, giving dignity and preserve as he does to that office.

I wish also to give a nod to the man who looks after the recording of every word, every syllable, every sentence that is spoken in this Chamber. Every statement, however garbled, which is later checked and double-checked and appears on our desks the following morning, with the help of the ladies in the nether regions of this building. The man of course that I refer to is Ray Sly. And the reason I mention him, Mr. Speaker, at this time, is that he has not completed, but he has entered upon his 25th year in that same job. His tenure has been longer than that of any member of this House, longer even than that of the Honourable Minister of Labour. Mr. Sly took over his duties in January, 1953. He has seen members come and members go and there is now not a single member now sitting who was here when he first came. Therefore I wish to, at this time, convey my congratulations to him and do it now inasmuch as the opportunity may not offer to me again and I express the hope that he will be able to continue yet for a number of years to come, so I say congratulations to him.

Having said that, I turn my attentions to the new Leader, the most recent Leader that is of the Opposition Party, on his finally having won his legislative seat after a long time trying, but the farmers in Souris-Killarney took him in, maybe it was he that took them in, I don't know for sure which it was. I've heard it said that the decision to nominate him in Souris-Killarney had been made at a meeting held to discuss that matter on one occasion. There was some uncertainty for awhile until one hard-bitten old farmer stood up and said, "What the hell, boys, it's only for one year" and so he was nominated. Now, whether the MLAs seated beside him and behind him are equally philosophical about his leadership or not I don't know, but I have heard an ominous rumour that the few who are friendly to him are even now taking precautions and are inviting contributions to buy him a rear-view mirror to set on his desk so that he can keep his eye on what goes on behind. But in any event I wish him well, as a humane gesture I wish him well and I do hope that if anything does happen to him, it won't at least be in this Chamber because the sight of blood always makes me a little faint.

But now on to other things. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition in his opening address on the Speech to the Throne, spoke loud and long, he spoke for two hours and a little bit in addition and, of course, that's his prerogative if he wishes to take that much time, but I had began to wonder what his plans were for the rest of the session. All he can do now, it seems to me, after having spoken for that length of time and about so many things, is to repeat himself each time he gets up, but one thing he could do to save himself time and trouble, he could borrow the tape from Mr. Sly and re-run it say, once a week or so to save himself from having to do it all over again. He reminded me somewhat of a young theologian who had been stationed in a rural area to do a sort of a circuit riding job during the summer, travelling among country churches and preaching to the faithful. One Sunday, at the appointed time, he arrived at a small church and found only one man waiting, a farmer from nearby and they waited awhile to see whether the rest of the congregation would come, they talked about the crops and the weather and so on until finally the young student said to the farmer, "Well, it looks as though nobody else is going to come, what do you think we should do?" So the farmer replied and said, "Well, I'm not sure, but I know that when I go out to feed my cattle, even if only one cow turns up I feed her." So the young student took the hint, he handed the farmer a hymn book and they sat down in the church, the student played an opening number on the old organ and he read the opening lesson, he read the opening prayer, he announced the hymn and they both sang. He read another passage from Scriptures, took up the collection, he passed the plate to the farmer and the farmer contributed accordingly. He then preached his sermon, it was a long sermon and a dreary sermon, somewhat similar to what we've been listening to, they sang another hymn and finally there was a closing prayer and the benediction and then the service was over. The young man then stepped down from the pulpit and he said to the farmer, "Well, what did you think of it?" and the farmer replied and said, "I said at the beginning, when I go out to feed my cattle, if only one cow turns up, I feed her, but I didn't say that I would give her the whole damn load." Well, on Monday, we seem to have been given the whole damn load in the reply to the Address from the Throne and I wonder what the Honourable Member from Souris-Killarney is going to, as I said, regale us with for the next three months?

A MEMBER: Another load.

MR. PETURSSON: Or will it be the same load all over again. I'm reminded somewhat of Oliver Goldsmith's poem, The Deserted Village, where he described the village parson, and I think this is an apt description Goldsmith said

"In arguing too, the parson owned his skill, for e'en though vanquished, he could argue still. While words of learned length and thundering sound amazed the gazing rustics ranged around, and still they gazed and still the wonder grew, that one small head could carry all he knew. Yet was he kind, or if severe in ought, the love he bore to

learning was in fault. The village all declared how much he knew, 'twas certain that he could write and cipher too."

But on to other things. There are enough of them in the Honourable Leader's two hour statement but 90 percent of it is criticism, fault-finding accusation and simple vaporizing. I was perversely, perhaps, reminded of the man on the West coast not too long ago who proposed to make a record-breaking flight across the continent from coast-to-coast, from the Pacific coast to the Atlantic coast, in a hot air balloon. He made the trip in 30 hours and established a record but I'm sure that my friend across the aisle would have been able to make a round-trip in the same length of time in the same kind of a hot air balloon and then, by doing that, get his name inscribed in that famous book, book of records that we keep hearing about from time to time.

However, in spite of his carping criticism of the government he does make some concessions to the wisdom and the effectiveness and the capability of the government in its policies. However grudgingly he does seem to approve the universal Hospital and Medical Care Insurance Plan, instituted by this government. He says he would vote for that plan and he said so in so many words. He also approves of Pharmacare, he says he would support that. He may have reservations about Autopac, but he feels that he couldn't do anything about it because it's something like the moon, it's there in its place and he doesn't plan to disturb it and perhaps, maybe, he has found it to be so far superior to any privately operated insurance plan, that he can't picture the possibility or the advisability of even trying to make a change. don't know whether he has experienced first-hand the manner in which the Autopac operates, whether he has taken time or made the effort to see how it goes, in all likelihood he has and has come to the conclusion that it is the best and safest not to disturb it and even to make the suggestion of changing it back to the so-called free enterprise manner of operation is against his better judgement and so he expresses himself as not wishing to make any change or he may have found so many favourable responses to it that he dares not suggest a reversion to the bad old days.

For myself, I can attest to the effectiveness of Autopac, its methods of dealing with car accidents and its customers, I can attest to that from personal experience. It was on the 15th of this month that I became the victim of a side-on collision with my car, one front fender was crumpled and both side doors on the same side were dented, and so on. In the bad old days we all know what I would have had to do, I would have been required to get estimates from three different repair shops, to submit these estimates — (Interjection) — from our point of view, they're the bad old days, we are living in the good old days — to submit these estimates to the insurance adjuster, who would then select the shop that we should have the work done in, then I would go to the one that was selected and I would get the work done. I would be presented with a bill, I would have to submit that bill to the insurance company or to the adjuster, I would have to pay whatever difference was decided upon and then get my car after about, lucky if I could get it within three weeks.

A MEMBER: Is that right?

MR. Yes, PETURSSON: that's true. I had experience in that too. I had, by comparison, when I had this accident that I mentioned that I was involved in, I reported first to the police which is a requirement and then I went to Autopac and that operation, being interviewed at the Police Department and by Autopac, took about a total of two hours. I then took my car to the garage of my choice, the damage was estimated at \$600 by Autopac and they conveyed that information to the garage. It ncluded a new fender, some repair work on the doors, wiring, a wheel cover and a few other items and then, in three days and a half from the time of the accident, not from the time of taking the car in but from the time of the accident, the car was ready again and I was back on, as they say, on wheels. With that kind of expeditious service, who would really want to go back to the bad old days? I'm not surprised that the Honourable Leader of the Conservative party is content to leave things as they are.

A MEMBER: I don't believe it.

MR. PETURSSON: He says it's true.

A MEMBER: I don't believe it.

MR. PETURSSON: As a matter of fact, if he was only willing to recognize, rather than complain and criticize and find fault and scold, he could find a considerable number of other policies instituted by this government about which he could very easily and with clear conscience say, as he is on record as having said about this matter and other matters, it is not an issue. He would be willing to accept a great number of things if he dared to. . . because of some of his more conservative friends he were allowed to.

But from that, Mr. Speaker, I move on, not forgetting how wide-ranging the address was that the Honourable Leader of the Conservative Party gave and I call to mind what was once said on, perhaps, a similar occasion, in a small poem about another, "His thought was like a stream which runs with rapid change from rocks to roses, it slipped from politics to puns, it passed from Mohammed to Moses." And with that I finish with the

honourable member except to say that in his address he charged the government with ignoring

the traditional values of family and community and I wish to quote from the Tribune of November 16th, this past November, in a report of the Honourable Leader's address at a nominating meeting in St. Matthews. He thumped himself proudly on the back, if you can imagine him doing that, and he proclaimed, and these are his words as quoted in the paper, "With a government that understands human nature, there is no limit to hope," and he continued in that vein and charged the present government with — and again quoted from the article, and I have it here, "We're flying in the face of human nature, it is killing and dampening down initiative, ambition and the desire of anyone who wants to get ahead by hard work."

And so, by comparison, to this assessment made by the Progressive Conservative Party at a time when the honourable member was still sitting as a member of government in 1968, I have other quotations. I know that as he indicated the other day in his reply to the Speech from the Throne, that the Member for Riel derives any looking back or the recalling of old sins, any references to shortcomings in earlier times, but the slate can never be wiped clean. The record stands as it must stand because by past acts, past policies, we are best able to determine what the future would be under that leadership. Promises about the future are not enough, even by the present attitudes do we judge the members of the other side of the House.

Their past sins follow them to condemn them and so I read from a statement that appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press in March 1968, it was March 8th to be specific and that statement made reference to an assessment of the economic situation of the Province of Manitoba at the time. The opening words of the statement were, and keep in mind always that this is 1968, while the Conservatives were still in power and the honourable present Leader was the Attorney-General of that day. The article opened with the words, "Manitoba's economy is not only stagnant, it is the only province whose relative position has been steadily, though slowly, worsening over the past 50 years." Then the article goes on quoting Professor H. C. Pentland, professor of Economics at the University of Manitoba. He was addressing the Manitoba Conference on Technological Change that was held at the Fort Garry Hotel and he said at that time in this article, "This province's economic starvation is due not to any lack of resources but to an inclination to put off change as long as possible and a reluctance to fight for a leading position" and so on and so on. But I had decided at this point that I should read the article as a whole so that the members could hear just exactly what it was that was being said and I believe that Professor Pentland was non political, he wasn't preaching for a call as it were, he was simply stating facts as he saw them. As I say this was given at the Manitoba Conference on Technological Change and the conference was held in the Fort Garry Hotel.

Professor Pentland says, "My general point is that reasons offered for Manitoba's limited growth are often only excuses for inaction. We do not so much lack opportunity as inclination on the part of those with decision-making power, to disturb their comfort, and Manitoba can indeed be very comfortable by taking steps to check the reverse decline."

Professor Pentland's picture of Manitoba's economy included the following points, and there are several that are listed. He says, "In the early 1900's Manitoba's per capita income was the second highest after British Columbia. It now ranks," and that is 1968 under Conservative government, he says, "It now ranks fifth and lowest among the provinces west of Quebec." And the next point he makes is, "Manitoba ranks sixth among provinces in average weekly wages and salaries." He says in the next point, "In growth and income Manitoba increasingly resembles eastern Quebec and the Atlantic provinces, areas of stagnation and poverty. Indeed the eastern areas show rather more signs of growth than Manitoba in an era during which major growth has been concentrated in cities, Winnipeg has the smallest growth rate in the country."

And then the next point he gives is, "Although the educational qualifications of Manitoba's labour force are well above the Canadian average, a considerable part of the educational investment of Manitoba, and of several other provinces, goes to produce educated people who move elsewhere, they don't stay in the province." He says, "They move because Manitoba's growth rate is not high enough to attract them." He said, "Manitoba's economic difficulties are reflected, not in high unemployment rates, but in the high rate of emigration from the province." And Professor Pentland stressed that Manitoba need not fear technological change. "The current problem", he says, "is that there aren't enough skilled people to fill the many new technological positions available, while there is an overabundance of low skilled people who can perform only lesser jobs. To solve this problem Manitoba will have to double the proportion of workers with certifiable skills by 1975." And he was speaking in 1968 during the term of a Conservative government.

He goes on and he says, "However, with the current low wages and salaries prevailing in Manitoba, Manitoba's average per capita salaries and wages," he said, "is trailing Quebec by more than ten percent. There is no guarantee that the more highly skilled workers will not leave the province." And he said, "Manitoba's income position with per capita income, 20 percent lower than in Ontario, makes it unattractive to investors." And there is still more to come. Professor Pentland said, "It means that higher tax rates in Manitoba will still produce less revenue per head, it means therefore, that expenditures to improve the situation are both more necessary than elsewhere and

harder to come by. Manitoba's economic future is in development of its agricultural resource and manufacturing industries and a proportion of trade and financial services." And then he says, "Some of them are contracting and not many are expanding." Manitoba agriculture has a very solid base in the province's fertility, but agricultural employment has been contracting everywhere. Fishing is a very sick industry in Manitoba," that's in 1968. "So is trapping. Forestry may have potential for important growth but has yet to prove it. Among Manitoba's resource industries," he said, "only mining has shown substantial growth, but there was the problem of creating mining towns where workers would want to live. Manitoba's chief economic cornerstone is manufacturing," he said, "but much of the province's manufacturing and industries are marked by small and sometimes outmoded plants."

Replying to those who claim the province hasn't sufficient resources Professor Pentland said, "They just don't care to look." And that is taken from the newspaper that was published during the term of the Conservative Party and they can deny it as they wish, or if they wish, but it stands there as a record of what the observers judge to be the truth. This was the assessment of the economic position when the Conservative Party was in power. And the man who is now Leader of the party that led the province into this kind of a condition is now the Leader of that party in Opposition, and dares to think that the present government with a long record of achievement in every field has, as he says, shown a total blindness to human nature. The arrogance, the blindness, the audacity of that man is almost beyond belief. And, with that sorry record, with the sorry record that his government made while it was in power and while he was a member of the Cabinet, how can he dare to say, as he is quoted as saying in the Tribune last November, that his party is "the party of hope", and that by it the young people can look forward to the future. It is, as I say, beyond belief that he should dare to make a statement of that kind, with that kind of a record behind him. Even in our wildest imagination it is unthinkable that that party should at any time take over the reins of power in this province. They may carp and they may criticize this government as much as they wish, but our memories are not that short; we know, and the people know, what a sorry record they, the Conservative Party when it was in power, left behind it.

A MEMBER: What about now?

MR. PETURSSON: Somebody asks how about now? They are showing the same ineptitude in Opposition as they did in government and have no expectation ever of being able to form the government, and the people won't accept them.

The present government, on its record and on the basis of its policy for the future, will long prevail for the benefit of the people of Manitoba and in the interest of their well-being in the days to come.

It is true as the Honourable Leader of the Conservative Party says, "With a government that understand human nature there is no limit to hope." A good statement, but it will not be his government that can extend such a promise because it is the present government that understands human nature to a far greater degree than any Conservative ever could envisage. Under our government there is not only no limit to hope, but also there is no limit to the realization of a great future for this province in which we live. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I find it very interesting. I don't think there is a member in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, that has spoken at the hour of 4:30 in the afternoon on the Throne Speech and the Budget Debate more than the Member for Roblin. And I know why, Mr. Speaker, it's because I come from a constituency that's a way out, or was it because of my character, or whether because I don't understand the system, or whether I can't get your eye.

Mr. Speaker, I would like this afternoon to congratulate you on behalf of all the fine people of Roblin Constituency that you are back in the Chair again, and that you will be able to look after the deliberations of this House which looks like it is going to be one of the dirtiest sessions that I will see in my years in this Chamber. And may I, Mr. Speaker, congratulate you and your good wife for all the good things that you have done in your Chamber . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. McKENZIE: . . . inviting members like myself, the Member for Portage, over the years to break bread with you and fraternize with you and your good wife, and so may I again, on behalf of the people of Roblin Constituency, wish her good health from the little accident that you were involved with, and we hope that she is around and amongst us again and circulating real soon.

Mr. Speaker, may I also congratulate the Lieutenant-Governor who presented this document which we are supposed to be debating at this time, but I haven't heard a member over there yet speak on this document that's supposed to be, and I am very surprised, Mr. Speaker, that you in your wisdom and your years of experience in the Chair, do not draw the members of the government to order, that this is what we are supposed to be debating, not the history of twenty years ago, or thirty years ago, or forty years ago. Mr. Speaker, this is the document that we are supposed to be debating in this Assembly at this time under the rules, the orders that we've lived by, but unfortunately those wide-eyed socialists over there don't understand this because they can't manage anything, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, may I on behalf of the people of Roblin Constituency congratulate His Honour for the presentation that he made here that day, the first one, and maybe he was a little gummed-up in his French like I am at all times, but I do congratulate him for trying and I wish him well in all his deliberations.

And, Mr. Speaker, Her Majesty, this is the 25th year of her reign, and my deskmate now the Honourable Member for Swan River, in his absence in case he doesn't get into the debate on this particular subject matter, has asked me to extend to you and maybe to the Lieutenant-Governor the greetings of this Chamber on her 25 years as a reigning monarch of the British Commonwealth, and the system that we believe in and could we go as far, Mr. Speaker, to ask you and the Lieutenant-Governor to ask her son to come and visit Manitoba while he is a resident of this great country of Canada. Would that be possible, Mr. Speaker, for you and the Lieutenant . . . on some weekend, because I understand this charming young Prince is available, and he has now been visiting in other provinces in Canada, so would you in your usual wisdom Mr. Speaker, contact the Lieutenant-Governor and see if we could have that charming young Prince to adorn this great province some time during this session, if at all possible.

Mr. Speaker, I find it — Oh, he's gone, the member that just spoke, this great clergyman. One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I could never be a Socialist is on behalf of the member that just spoke, that's one reason; and the second reason I could never be a Socialist, Mr. Speaker, is because of that great parable in the Bible, the story of the great Samaritan. Do you remember that story, Mr. Speaker, the Great Samaritan, where all the bureaucrats and the socialists walked by and left that man lying there? Who picked him up out of his problems and with his bleeding wounds? It was the free enterpriser, Mr. Speaker, the free enterpriser. That parable always brings me back to my senses when I read, "Where do I stand politically?" And how can I justify that I am what I am when I read that great book.

I just wonder and I've stood here and listened to the great Member from Wellington deliver of himself from time to time, and I just can't understand how he can, in his wildest wisdom, sit over there and be comfortable with that crowd. And the other gentleman we have over here wearing the cloth, I just wonder again how he, in his wildest imagination, can feel comfortable standing up with the principles, the mismanagement, the misjudgment, the misvotes, the misguided destiny of the people of this province and wear the cloth, wear the cloth. Because I am sure, Mr. Speaker' when he goes home at night his conscience must really bother him, but it doesn't bother me, Mr. Speaker, or the people of my constituency because we don't believe in that way to run this country or run this province.

Mr. Speaker, let's get back to this swan song of the NDP, their last Speech from the Throne, and it is quite evident, Mr. Speaker, they know it is their swan song because they don't want to talk about it, they don't want to discuss it, they don't want to debate it, they don't want to even mention it in this debate, and how long has the debate been going now? So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, while this is the swan song Throne Speech Debate of the NDP, this Speech from the Throne is being debated as if it is my Leader's Speech from the Throne. Now isn't that funny? All the years that I've sat in this Chamber I have never ever heard a bunch of Cabinet Ministers, top paid men that's supposed to be the people that is guiding the destiny of this country, supposed to show us the future for the next ten years or the next twenty years where this province is going, And what are they doing? They're standing up and talking about Sterling Lyon as if this was his Speech from the Throne. Is that an indication to you, Mr. Speaker, of a sick government, of a sick bunch of politicians, of a bunch of guys wasting taxpayers dollars, Mr. Speaker? Who don't know where they are going, Mr. speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews state his point of order?

MR. JOHANNSON: Yes, the honourable member has been long enough in this House to know that it is not proper to refer to a member by his name, but by his constituency.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I just noticed the honourable member is mailing out the mail to the old age pensioners and that is what got me to make that misjudgment. I see the envelopes are all on his desk, and I understand he is the only one that can sign those directives that go to all the senior citizens in the province, and that's what shook me up and that's why I made that midjudgment and I apologize, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let's get back to this swan song, as I called it, of the NDP, the last Throne Speech that they are going to put in this Chamber for some time to come. Not for a year, for a long time to come because you only have to go to my constituency and to see the new enthusiasm, the new drive that I've never seen in all my time, to get rid of this crowd, to get rid of these guys that couldn't even run a little wheelbarrow let alone run Hydro, CFI, Flyer Coach, Saunders and the list goes on, the list now is about sixteen pages. And the reason, Mr. Speaker, that I am making my judgment, of how weak and how senile this government is, because they don't want to debate it, they don't want to debate it. Not one Cabinet Minister, not one, the backbencher that just spoke, is scared to talk about this document. Not a word mentioned of the Throne Speech. Why? Why, Mr. Speaker? Because they are sick, they are tired, they are worn out and they've run out of ideas and they're scared to let us go and look at the

books and see what they have done. So' Mr. Speaker, . . .

A MEMBER: Open government, come on.

MR. MCKENZIE: We see the Cabinet, the Member for St. Johns drags out those old yellow Hansards, my Gosh I've been through that debate dozens of times, dusting off that old stuff in the back rooms and attacking my Leader. And this is supposed to be the government that's running this province, Mr. Speaker, that is supposed to lead us into the next century, they couldn't lead us around the corner, Mr. Speaker, with that kind of debate or with that kind of decision-making, or they haven't got the guts to stand up and tell . ' us what you've got in your path for the next year. No, they say, we're going to get it in the Budget. Well I bet you, when we see the Budget, I know what kind of a budget we're going to get because there's no money left. They don't know where they're going . . . running around, and Mr. Speaker, again in praise of my leader, and you, Mr. Speaker, have sat here all the years that I've sat here, and I just ask you in your wildest imagination, have you ever heard a better reply to the Speech from the Throne or any member ever deliver himself of the speech better than my leader did the other day. I doubt it. I can recall a couple of times the Honourable Member for Inkster has got himself up to a level that maybe was comparable, but I would say it was no better. And I was thinking in the wildest measures of my mind, Mr. Speaker, that finally we're getting the level of debate up where it should be in this Chamber as we're going to look after this province and its people and move them into the year 2000. What happens from this gang over here? They clambered right down into the gutter.

And in my wildest imagination of a First Minister of this province, did you hear what he said in this Chamber this morning, Mr. Speaker? He said, "I will vomit over my desk. I will vomit over another member's head." Have you ever heard that in this Chamber from a First Minister, Mr. Speaker. I never have and if for no other reason, if the First Minister of this province hasn't got any better principles or morals than that, he should be removed from office at the earliest possible date.

If he can't bring his level of debate up to the level of my leader or to the other members of this House, and no member ever from my bench, Mr. Speaker, has went down into the gutter in that kind of debate in this Chamber. And I say to the First Minister and I say to this bunch of gangsters over here, if you can't get your tone of quality of voice or your words up to a level better than that, you don't deserve the right to rule in this province and I'm going to spell that around and you shall go. You shall go. Not only for that reason. Well the First Minister, he's made some allegations in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not going to relate them again because they're all well known — the Member for Birtle-Russell — which is away down below the level of a First Minister of a province, you don't get into the gutter if you're a First Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the First Minister today in this House, I will never forget as long as I live. Coming from his lips, saying, in that debate, "I will vomit across my desk" or words in that kind of a paraphrase, but "I will vomit across the head of another member." That's the sign, Mr. Speaker, that the rats are heading now for their holes. They're leaving. Mr. Speaker, we don't have to go very far because the press releases are already out. Schreyer is keeping his options open. And who is he ganging up with? He's ganging up with Trudeau.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MCKENZIE: A most interesting judgment

that the First Minister has made, that somehow, he feels he can be more comfortable with the Prime Minister of this country than he can with this gang that he's gathered around over here. These weak, these senile guys that run out of ideas, don't know how to run a government, can't manage funds, can't manage programs, so he said he's packing it up, and he's likely going to go with the Federal scene. And what would happen to that bunch over there if he left? Just in your wildest imagination, Mr. Speaker, what would happen over there. if he does this. And he must be going to do it if he's saying it. Would you see them all scurrying for the bushes? Who would be their leader? Would it be the Mines Minister? No, I can imagine how he gets along with the Member for St. Boniface. Well of course if the First Minister goes, the Member for St. Boniface goes, because that's automatic. And then what happens. So the Mines Minister, likely and of course the Labour Minister, he's gone now, he's leaving. Could you, Mr. Speaker, ask the people of this province to let them form a government and they don't know they're going to have a leader for a month, for six weeks, six months or a year, and ask the people of this province to give them a mandate to rule when they don't know how long the leader is going to stay. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, our leader is going to be here for a long time to come.

I'm just asking you to refer to his reply to the Speech from the Throne Mr. Speaker, and reply to all these guys coming out and attacking my leader, as if he was the one that made the Speech from the Throne. They're running scared, Mr. Speaker, and well they should, because half of them ain't going to come back. Half of them ain't going to come back. And I could name them today, Mr. Speaker, if you really press me. But I wouldn't want to do that in the Chamber because most of them know

themselves. They know that they're not going to come back and that we're going to have more than we have now and that we'll clean up the mess. At least we'll try to clean up this mess that you've left this province in.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is very important that we have an election this year. And I hope the First Minister doesn't delay it very long. I would hope maybe he'll pull the pin next week, or the week after. Well, Jack gets excited because he's not ready. He hasn't got the ballot box ready. But we're ready. We're ready in Roblin. And the longer he delays it, the worse it's going to be. Because not only of this reason but there are more and more reasons . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. McKENZIE: I imagine if we let the and this chap Lee, his civil servant to be . . . Minister of Agriculture be the returning officer we will all be able to put our own pictures and our own lunches like they did the last election in the ballot box and then one guy took the ballot box to bed with him, didn't he? That will be a Uskiw election. That's the typical NDP election. Ballots don't mean that much, or ballot boxes or locks on ballot boxes, that's . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, that's how the Socialists recognize authority. They don't understand what authority means. They don't understand what "to govern" means, Mr. Speaker. They don't understand what it means to have the Mace sitting on the table and they're responsible for it. Not only for the Mace but the well-being and the justice and the goodwill of the people of this province. And that's why the Member for St. John's and all the rest must go. They must go, Mr. Speaker. And we're going to make sure that they go, especially now, after we see how weak they are, when they, in their wildest imaginations, cannot find one member that's prepared to stand up in this debate and speak on this Throne Speech Debate. All they're doing, Mr. Speaker, is attacking my leader as if it was his Throne Speech Debate. Now, isn't that a sick government, Mr. Speaker? Weak, senile; it's time, Mr. Speaker, time that they go. I hope you don't go, Mr. Speaker. I hope you don't go. Mr. Speaker, we likely will get to the day we'll have this permanent ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. McKENZIE: But over there, Mr. Speaker, they must go. And they're going to go. Because if in their wildest imagination, Mr. Speaker, they're prepared to stand up, to meet the issues of the day and debate that document, then I would say they had a fair chance. But I'm satisfied now, beyond my wildest imagination, and the people in my constituency are satisfied, they are not prepared to stand up and vote the Throne Speech Debate, nor are they prepared to stand up and give me or the members of my caucus or this House the destiny of this province for next year, for the year after and to the year 2000. And that's what they were elected to do. They can't do it because they don't know how. Well let me tell the First Minister that gives words "vomiting over the desks and over member's heads", we have the ability to govern this province, we have the ability to lead the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, and we have the message to put the economy back in place and give the people a chance in this province again. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, they don't have that ability. They don't have that. — (Interjection) — I'll tell you the first thing that'll happen, you'll be off that Hydro Board so fast it will make your head swim. And we'll get that hydro back down to earth where it belongs.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. McKENZIE: The Honourable Member for Radisson wants my second choice of what will happen, you'll be the first one to go off the Hydro Board, no doubt about that. Second thing, I suspect that we'll get rid of Mackling with all his corporate structure. What kind of money is Mackling making today? \$100,000?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. McKENZIE: He's making about 100 grand. He should go. Let's talk about some of your other high priced NDP friends, Harry. The list is pages and pages and pages. Mr. Speaker, let us and let me try and see if I can't tell you where this province should go.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm going to say it for the last time to every member of this House. I will not tolerate this kind of interference. If the members can't contain themselves, let them take leave and have a coffee. But I'm going to name names after this. I cannot hear the man that is speaking on the floor because of the interference. Those who want to have a ball game, let them get a ball and go outside or do something else, but not interfere with the business of this House. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I thank you. You exemplified a quality there, that you should be the permanent Speaker of this House.

Mr. Speaker, socialism. Look across the world. Look across this country and see what happens about this terrible disease that erodes and destroys and tears countries apart. I have in my hand a document here of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Dennis Healey, great left-wing labour man, hard-nosed socialist, who has tried with his wildest imagination and the trust of government in the old country, in England, to drag that philosophy through that country, tear it apart, we get to the level of the day, Mrs. Churchill has to sell her pictures, Mr. Speaker, to pay the price of socialism in England.

Now isn't that a tragedy. A well known statesman from around this world who had the judgment and the courage to stand up and fight for his country and guide the British parliamentary in the Commonwealth through that last world war and through the dirt and the tragedy of socialism, in your wildest imagination, Mr. Speaker, she has to sell the art — six pictures of that family — to live through this tragedy of socialism in Britain, to survive. Oh, they laugh over there. Mr. Speaker, in my figures, and your books may be the same, when the late Winston Churchill died, he left a pretty substantial estate to his widow and to his family, in the tune of 700,000 or 800,000 pounds, Mr. Speaker.

Well anyway, let's go back and see what the Chancellor of the Exchequer of that group, that socialist crowd says today, and I quote to you from the Free Press of October 9, 1976, where Healey said, naturally he received both hissing and applause in Blackpool when he told the Labour Party conference "that further socialist measures will have to be curbed in order to promote economic recovery." He warned that demands for more nationalization of industry, more government spending, could knock millions of pounds off Britain's reserves in a minute.

Now how many more examples, Mr. Speaker, over the years, do members like me or members from my bench, or people off the street, have to stand up and document, time and time again, that the socialist philosophy will not work in a modern world' in a modern society, in a province such as Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. Healey said it in England, we've said it here, we've proved it now. We've got the Hydro example, we've got the Flyer example, it just goes on, the CFI example, they can't manage nothing, Mr. Speaker, because they don't have a businessman in the crowd that first of all knows anything about the business community or how you function in business, and they hate them all, because listen, when you raise the Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Speaker, you get boos and catcalls, and they resent people that work hard like a businessman. They hate them. They don't like them. Mr. Speaker, you show me in your wildest imagination how you're going to build an economy in this province without Chamber of Commerce people, without bankers, without guys that work, without labour. Unless we all work together, it will never happen. The system will fail and our economy will go down and that's what's happened since this gang took office in this province. But I tell you, when we take office after the next election, we will walk hand in hand with the Chamber of Commerce we'll walk hand in hand with the Labour people, we'll walk hand in hand with the man on the street, the guy that hasn't got a buck and those that can't look after themselves, we will look after them as we have in the past. And this province will be much better for it after the votes are counted.

Why is Healey standing up and pleading now after that country's gone down the drain? It's too late now. England is broke. England is destroyed, which was the bulwark of all the western world and the British Commonwealth. The core of the British Commonwealth. What broke it, Mr. Speaker? Socialism. Socialism of the worst kind.

And we've got it in this province right here today. Can't manage anything, their accounting system leaves lots to be desired. They don't know because they can't understand what the business community is all about. Mr. Speaker, we represent that element. We can also stand up and say we've got a lot of support in the labour unions of this province, and we're for them in all their struggles to make this province and Canada better. If they think that they inherit all the labour vote in this country, Mr. Speaker, they've got another think coming. They've got another think coming Mr. Speaker. Just look at some of the things that are happening in the labour union meetings in this province today. And see the way that the labour people are now saying, look, those guys can't handle our affairs. We thought they could, we thought we would go over and join them and go hand in hand with them and we'd get a better deal but they're finding out real quick, Mr. Speaker, it's not very good over there with that left-wing crowd. It's not very good. They're not very comfortable over there. And we're seeing more and more evidence every day. Mr. Speaker, would you believe some of the candidates that are coming and joining the Conservative Party today are card carrying union men? Would you believe that, Mr. Speaker? Offering their names, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, does that give you some more evidence of a weak government, a sick government who come in here and present us with a Throne Speech and they're supposed to guide us into the next century with that and in the debate, all they're prepared to do is stand up and attack my leader. And for the First Minister to stand up and say he vomits over his desk or he's going to vomit over the head of an honourable member, that's the best they could do, Mr. Speaker? That's the best they could lead this country, that's the drive and the thrust they've got after being in office for eight years, that's the leadership we are going to get from the First Minister. Mr. Speaker, he must go, he must go exactly where he says he is going to go — down and join Pierre Elliott Trudeau. And I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what's your vision of that man?

Let's talk about nationalism. Let's talk about Canada. Let's talk about what are some of the problems in Canada today. Mr. Speaker, I lay most of the problems of this country today and our economic problems to the desk of that man. I substantiate and support the Mines Minister in his opinion of our leader in this country today, Pierre Elliott Trudeau. And I in my wildest imagination — I'm not sure if he has done it deliberately or not because he is a brilliant, and I dare say the most brilliant Prime Minister we have ever had in this country. —(Interjection)—

A MEMBER: Be careful now, Wally, be careful.

MR. McKENZIE: But again, the First Minister says he is leaving and he is going down to join Pierre. He's keeping all his options open so he can work at the Federal scene. So he's already made his mind up and maybe that's why he committed himself this morning by saying those horrible things that he said.

A MEMBER: Who said them?

MR. McKENZIE: The First Minister.

A MEMBER: Where.

MR. McKENZIE: Right in this Chamber.

A MEMBER: When?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I know how difficult it is when you have the respect of the people and you are an MLA or you are a Cabinet Minister and you would like to get out of office because you're getting like me, you're getting old and maybe getting kind of tired, Mr. Speaker. It is not very easy to back off, Mr. Speaker, because you maintain the principles, the honour, the dedication of this province and thrust to make it better, but there is a simple way — if you violate some of the principles of debate or something, you might be able to sneak out the back door. It looks to me, Mr. Speaker, that that's where the First Minister wants to go. I recognized it in Roblin and in Birtle-Russell. I couldn't understand the First Minister, all of it, the words, of ..., but here we got it again today in this Chamber. He's either tired or he needs a rest or he should be removed from office. There is nothing in that debate, Mr. Speaker, that called him to make those remarks in this House today, "that he would vomit across his desk, or he would vomit across the head of another member." Nothing in the debate should have asked him to get to that level of debate, to drag this Chamber down into the gutter, Mr. Speaker, which is the lowest of the low. I can't understand why the First Minister would want to do that, unless he's tired, he's played out, he's run out of ideas, he can't govern no more, he's lost control of his Cabinet, he has no control of the it up where my First Leader's speech came across the floor the other day, up there. And let's talk about the destiny of this province and let's Bill it into tomorrow, into the year 2025. But Mr. Speaker, I want these Cabinet Ministers and that First Minister to stand up in this Throne Speech Debate and tell me, and tell the members of my caucus — where are we going, how are you going to do it, what is your plan? — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. McKENZIE: It is not in that Throne Speech Debate. Mr. Speaker, there's only a couple of days left, and unless they can give me assurance that they have that thrust, they have that ability to show us in the Throne Speech and in their speeches that we have a message for the people, we have a plan. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, they must go. Mr. Speaker, I am arming my forces, and all the people in Roblin constituency, to hasten the end of that bunch of socialists and that government from this province in the coming

. election. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

REVEREND DONALD MALINOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to remind the Honourable Member for Roblin that I am a Christian and I am proud to be, and I will help all the time those who are in need, not according to his idea. And also, I would like to ensure him that I will not be going to the Chamber of the ... It's hard for me to believe, like he starts his speech with, "Let's debate about the Speech from the Throne," and he was talking around and around and finally I didn't get anything from it. But this is his privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will not call me to order if I say I am very glad to see you in the Speaker's chair again. It always gives me assurance that we can count on fair treatment in our deliberations. The Mover and Seconder for the Throne Speech have both made interesting contributions to the debate and I sincerely commend them for it. I also want to congratulate the Honourable Leader of the Opposition for having succeeded in making it inside this Chamber. I welcome him here. It is much easier to deal with him inside this House, rather than outside through press statements.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention first of all a few matters about my own constituency of Point Douglas. For me, this is after all the most important part of the province. I am happy to report that my constituency has benefited greatly from the government's efforts, and especially about improving housing.

Another very important development underway is the new facilities for the Mount Carmel Clinic. These new facilities will be established west of Main Street and will be considerably larger than the old clinic. The Mount Carmel Clinic has for many years been an important health centre for the people in that area. This improved and much larger health facility will be greatly appreciated by the people of my constituency and other parts of north Winnipeg.

I have mentioned before, Mr. Speaker, how greatly the people of Point Douglas have benefited from the government's efforts in establishing senior citizens homes. Five such senior citizens homes we have completed and another is under construction.

I could mention at this point many things this government has done from which many people in this province have greatly benefited, including of course, Liberals and Conservatives. Everybody has benefited.

I listened carefully to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. I was glad to hear that he approves or seemed to approve of many of the things this government has done.

But rather I would like to speak more about Winnipeg itself. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to talk about a Winnipeg that many people look at and few people really see. The inner core of the city has suffered from private sector intervention and public sector neglect since the beginning of this century. The city planning movement, initiated by J. S. Woodsworth and others in 1910, was concerned with doing something to prevent the great waste of human lives that was occurring daily because of the lack of public sector planning. Not enough progress has been made since, there is still a great waste of human life in this city's inner core. There are the kids who aren't getting the educational opportunities they deserve. There are many kids who come from broken homes who need special programs. There are the kids who have ended up in a correctional institution and who will, in many cases, end up in our prisons, and what a waste of life that will be.

There are the wasted lives of abandoned mothers who need more opportunities for themselves and their families. There are the isolated senior citizens, and the homeless men and women of all ages, who are living only a hand-to-mouth existence without adequate shelter, food and other essential things. This waste of life is the result of not years, but decades of neglect by successive city government and governments Liberal and Tory provincial and federal governments. It isn't to be wondered that in eight years of progressive government, all the problems haven't been solved. In our shoes I would suggest that other parts would be paralyzed because they don't really believe that government should act for the disadvantaged, that so-called poor people should have the same educational opportunities, the same basic social rights, including their rights to housing and everything else.

The Liberals and Tories believe that the problems of the inner core will be solved by so-called "market forces", if we only give these forces enough time. Well, Mr. Speaker, the free enterprise market forces have had 70 years and more to prove that they can provide housing and jobs and all the rest and they haven't done it. Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, the inner core of Manitoba's largest city needs more public intervention, more public sector planning, more and better programs to deal with some very urgent and very fundamental human needs.

I would like to talk about what is needed in my area of the inner core, the Point Douglas area. It is an area with a lot of single-parent families, often female household heads, all kinds of problems. Families with many children. Senior citizens who have grown up in that area, many of whom are now isolated. The elderly in my area have been caught by the inflationary spiral pension schemes, like national pension plans are certainly a step forward but they have not enabled senior citizens to keep up. homes, other Many need support services in their present need housing.

Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation has gone a long way towards satisfying some of these needs with its efforts in bringing about such excellent projects as Elgin and Isabel, St. Andrews Place, Jarvis and Main, Powers and Selkirk, and the Canadian Polish Manor, and another is under construction. But these projects alone are not enough, a great deal more remains to be done.

Because my constituency has many abandoned mothers, kids from those broken homes need special programs and the ability to have, or at least afford, what many other kids in Winnipeg have, even things like a pair of skates and hockey sticks or something to this effect.

My information shows that the City of Winnipeg in 1971 had a high juvenile delinquency rate. A number of those very same kids now live or used to live in my area. My information also shows that one-third of the Manitoba Youth Centre population comes from the core area of the city. Even more serious are the statistics for arrests versus warnings. Police statistics show that more children were arrested, and fewer were released with a warning, in my area than in the suburbs. Now I know that the police are trying to do the best job they can, but the answer to the problem, as they know and I know, is not that we should be charging kids, but that we should be providing more community services and programs and in particular, more effective programs and services for our children. Settlement houses or 24-hour hostels are needed to provide kids with the attention and assistance they must have if they are to avoid the kind of future which many of the present inmates of our prisons are now experiencing because of the past policies and the neglect of former governments.

It is to be expected that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will attack the New Democratic government for problems in the inner core, but he was Attorney-General under the first Tory government, he knows about the juvenile arrests and broken homes, and he knows that these social problems don't just happen overnight or yesterday. They have come from decades of continuous and sustained irresponsibility and neglect by successive Liberal and Tory governments at all levels.

We have to develop programs to ease the pressure of people like abandoned, self support mothers with four or five children to raise, have to help them gain skills and to seek gainful employment. This means we also have to expand our school program so that children are cared for in the early morning,

Friday, February 25, 1977

at noon hour and after four until mother gets back from work. Only in this way so called support mothers become economically independent and break the title of welfare dependents. To win this fight we need the cooperation of the community and the private agencies, we must get at the problem of unemployment which in the inner city is many times higher than the provincial average. New careers and other special unemployment programs are excellent and they are helping but they don't go far enough. For example, too few self support mothers are able to take advantage of that project, we must begin to help these people who have poor housing, no skills and can't get out of the rut in which they are forced to exist. We also have to get another at other problems of hard-core unemployment.

It would like be a great day for Point Douglas and for the inner core if we could also get the support of the City Council and the Opposition in these programs, but we know why we won't get their support. We know for example that the ICEC dominated City Council and their Liberal and Tory backers have a lot at stake in the present real estate game. These people believe that it is all right to make a lot of money speculating in private real estate while ignoring adequate housing as a social necessity and a basic right of all citizens, in fact they reject any moral or ethical responsibility for ensuring decent shelter for all Winnipeggers. Meanwhile, they spend their time and the public's money playing the high stakes development game as loser, of course, with giveaways to CPR, Richardson, Trizec and the banks. There is, for example, in the underpass at Portage and Main or a sweetheart deal with developers at the St. Pauls College yet in spite of all these giveaways the rich and powerful interest, the City refuses to make land available quickly for housing where it is needed the most, even when the senior government stands ready to pay for it.

In north St. Boniface, for example, the city has the gall to propose to remove 34 families from their homes to make way for a park and a road at the same future date when the City Councillors well know that alternative housing is unavailable because they have, by their actions, assured that it will be unavailable. In the

In corridor NIP area the City has moved like snails in providing land for housing. In the Midland corridor land has been available for over five years and now 50 units of housing are just being started at this land. How bad does the crisis have to get before its irresponsible ICEC City Council takes upon itself the moral responsibility to act in the interest of those who need shelter?

Perhaps Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we must say enough of this irresponsible shirk of the municipality controlled housing. NIP and others need public services and programs and allow the agencies which are able to get on with the job and move ahead, with or without City Council approvals or initiatives, perhaps. Also we need to legislate the necessary authorities to enable the province to expropriate land away from the City, land that the City is sitting on, hundreds of acres of land which are vacant or direct it so that these lands can be developed for needed housing quickly and effectively.

Traditional agencies in their present form are no longer serving the people they want to serve adequately, so studies like the Social Service Agencies may point that out they can, they are too inefficient, but we must develop more efficient methods for delivery of social services. Efforts must be made by the community, by the respective agencies themselves and by government to provide, in a more rational way, a system of better services for the money we are now spending.

At a time when available housing for low income families is in an increasingly short supply, it is urgent that we discourage an unnecessary demolition of family housing and find constructive ways to rehabilitate as much as housing as we can for family needs. My area of north Point Douglas has been a model of residential rehabilitation, but much more remains to be done. For example, the old Vulcan Iron Works site has remained empty for at least two or three years and should have long ago been occupied by adequate housing and recreation that is needed in that area. I would certainly hope to see Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation moving ahead soon or to development of additional lands it acquired in the vicinity of Jarvis and Main. There are a great many other opportunities for housing development in the inner city if we want to take better advantage of them. There are scrapyards, waste paper storage yards, parking lots and railway tracks, many of which we do not really need as urgently as housing, and jobs and parking lots don't generate many many many productive jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the City is probably losing millions of dollars in taxes by permitting so many areas of the inner city to be used so inefficiently. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, it is no longer the question of half-baked solutions or some kind of private sector subsidies. The New Democratic Party Government was elected just in time. A few more years of Tory neglect and areas like north Point Douglas would have been destroyed for all time.

I would urge the Minister of Housing and the Minister of Finance to press ahead resolutely, in ensuring that a tremendous housing momentum of the early 70's when we were able to develop some 4,000 housing units in Manitoba we start it once again for the present 2,500 and 4,000 units per year. Certainly this is the direction we must move even before controls can be responsibly taken off.

Mr. Speaker, I have made no reference to the matters contained in the Throne Speech. I'm leaving

this to the Opposition. For my part, I believe the measures outlined in the speech are good and deserve the support of all.

In conclusion I want to say that I believe this government has an outstanding record in housing, in social legislation and in every way I feel confident that when the people of Manitoba will be asked to render a verdict they will agree that the government's record is a good one. I am convinced the majority of Manitobans prefer free Medicare rather than pay \$384 a year in premiums as Conservative Ontario does. Manitobans consider themselves lucky to have Autopac rather than pay the much higher private insurance rates in effect in Conservative provinces. A majority of people, Mr. Speaker, in this province would rather stay with the five percent sales tax rather than pay ten percent sales tax or —(Interjection)— or wait a minute or the same Conservative provinces seven percent, which we have in Ontario.

Intelligent Manitoba voters will remember that every piece of legislation which has greatly improved their the living conditions of the people of this province and this country, every piece of social legislation from Old Age Pensions to Medicare, was first proposed and introduced by our party or successors of the CCF, but was opposed by the Liberals and Conservatives. I am convinced the voters of this province will vote to continue to go forward with a New Democratic Party Government. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and honourable members.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina, but I'm prepared to call it 5:30 if he wishes. The other thing I'd like to say is the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie is standing has been standing up. I can't recognize him because he has already spoken on this motion. —(Interjection)— Yes he has. He spoke on it when he spoke to make the amendment. Now, as I said I'm prepared to call it 5:30 unless the House wishes to go till 5:30.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Sir, if it's all right with you I'll carry on until 5:30 because I realize there's a lot of people would like to speak and I think we should use up the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by congratulating you on being returned to your office and the Mover and Seconder of the Throne Speech. I know that I'm one of the ones that won't give you any trouble and you know this.

I would like to also congratulate our Leader, the Member from Souris-Killarney now for being in the house. I feel that it's going to add a great deal to the debate and I can see by the way things have been going this week that it's really going to make a difference in the House and it looks like as if the news media has recognized this besides.

I'd like to outline the farmers position just at this particular time because, over this last year and a half or two, we haven't been, as I could say, protected by the Anti-Inflation Board like other people are. They say it hurt them, but it actually just limited them in their amount of increase. And the farmers, we weren't protected by it and actually our prices went down. So, while other people were having what they called a poor increase, we actually lost money, which is a very different thing and I think in the year ahead, even though they say the prices of livestock might be better, I'm still sceptical about it because many of the cattle have gone to market and there isn't that many cattle in the country right now. It's just about, to my opinion, getting to the turning point and I would think that probably in the next year there's going to be better prices. I think it's a bad outlook for the farmer because machinery and fertilizer and everything else has gone up so much and grain prices have gone down and I don't really foresee any big improvement in the year ahead, so farmers are in for harder times in this coming year. I don't think you have to be a professor to say that because every so often a professor comes along and he'll say anything and it gets recognized by the news media. In fact, if it hasn't rained for a long time, he says if it doesn't rain for a long time it's going to turn out to be a dry year and the media will pick that up and put it in the paper because some professor said it. It's just like last year when our honourable friend from Fort Rouge was speaking, he asked before seeding time, a couple of weeks, what were the government going to do about the farmers due to the dry year, because it was dry before seeding last year and do you know something, the media picked it up and he got about this many headlines in it, for something about a crop that had failed before it was planted. It was somebody who is recognized in the professional world and there they get the recognition like that. I say that you don't have to be a professor to make proper judgements on some of these things.

I would like to speak about the government and its Mineral Acreage Tax Act, it's something that nobody else has spoke about, it's one of the things that farmers don't like, it's one of the ones that's hurting the NDP all the time. It's hurting the farmers too and they don't like it a bit. And there's one thing about it, even a farmer who's retired off his farm and living in town, I thought he could at least turn his oil rights back to his son who was working the farm. He can do it, but he has still has to pay the oil rights because the fellow that is working the land also has to own the land, so in this case, even the farmer that's moved off has to pay the oil rights right to the last until he divides up his estate. So it just seems as if the government's out for their last ounce of flesh, like in that story about Shylock, where he wanted every last ounce of flesh. I am advising farmers, whether rightly or wrongly, and I wouldn't be paying my Mineral Acreage Tax just at the present time because it's the policy of this government

Friday, February 25, 1977

that, after so many years if they haven't paid them, that they'll take over the Mineral Acreage Tax, the land that's included in this. However, they can't do it for a certain time but, on the other hand, if you thought well I'm not going to pay them and you wrote the government a letter, they'd change it over right away and they'd have those mineral rights, they'd have it. So I would advise farmers to hold off and I wouldn't give any government the authority to have my mineral rights because the government may change next year and if that happens why, then we'll maybe be able to change that back so it won't be hurting the farm people.

The government is still continuing to buy land and, even though they talk about the foreign buyers, they're right in there too buying up everything they can. And we know that they had this Commission go around the country having hearings and although they were told at every meeting that people didn't want to see the government purchasing land, they still went ahead with this thing, buying up everything they can. And we know that they had this Commission go around the country having hearings and although they were told at every meeting that the people didn't want to see the government purchasing land, they still went ahead with this thing. So actually they went out and held hearings to justify their position, but even though it didn't justify their position they went ahead with it. I don't know why they don't have a policy that encourages ownership of the land. They say they believe in private ownership, but they don't do anything to encourage it, they don't give lower interest rates or they don't give loans on it, so this thing is saying that they believe it's the best and this is what they'd like to see. They aren't encouraging it and they aren't trying to help it.

I'd like to speak a little bit about Succession dues being raised and I heard the Member from St. John's talking yesterday as if, you know, who's going to feel sorry for some farmer or small businessman with an estate of \$250,000. Well I'm telling you that there's an awful lot of people that are pretty important with an awful lot of jobs and they're paying an awful lot of income tax to this here provincial government by being in that bracket and if they're going to keep this Succession due rate like it is in Manitoba and these people keep moving out of Manitoba into Alberta and other provinces that haven't got them, they're going to move out there before they die and they're going to re-invest their money there and they're going to be doing good for that country and also this province here will not be getting their income tax each year. I don't know how we can figure it out but I'll bet you if you had some way of figuring it out right today that the small amount that we're collecting on this, we're losing more than it. And we're going to lose more in the years to come. On top of that we're actually losing the calibre of people that are very necessary in any country.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member will have an opportunity to carry on the next day. The Honourable House Leader.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to indicate the order of proceedings for next week. I expect that the estimates will be distributed at the conclusion of the Throne Speech debate on Tuesday. I'm also indicating that the Department of Education will be the first department in the Legislative Assembly dealing with the Committee of the Whole House. I would request the House Leader of the Opposition to let me know when and which department would go into committee of the outside House. Also the Committee on Public Utilities to consider the report of Manitoba Hydro would be on March 15th. Well that's not next week but I give you notice that that meeting has been scheduled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Monday next.