

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 p.m., Thursday, February 19, 1976

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 30 students, Grade 11 standing of the West Kildonan Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. J.H. Klassen. This school is located in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, the Minister of Urban Affairs.

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

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

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Water Services Board for the year ending March 31st, 1975.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table in the House the copies of Returns under The Controverted Elections Act for the period January 1st, 1975 to December 31st, 1975, Court of Appeal and the Court of Queen's Bench. Eight copies are delivered to the Clerk.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Attorney-General.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. PAWLEY introduced Bill 11, an Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act and Bill 12, an Act to amend The Country Court Act. (Bill 12 recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona) introduced Bill 16, an Act to amend The Workers' Compensation Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge) introduced Bill 21, an Act to amend The Condominium Act (2).

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Leader of the Official Opposition) (Riel): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. My question is really to do with what I thought may have shown up as Ministerial Statement. Could he confirm that the office of the Lieutenant-Governor has been filled in the Province of Manitoba as we hear from the media?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, yes it has. However I believe it is to be announced officially from Ottawa some time today. I wouldn't presume to encroach upon that terrain.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the Minister of

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. BROWN cont'd) Health confirm that some 300 doctors have opted out of the Medicare Plan?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Health.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I haven't the exact number at this time. I can check and let my honourable friend know.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. DESJARDINS: While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak on a point of personal privilege. One of the newspapers reported yesterday that I stated that all two million dollars worth of prizes in the lottery would be paid. I did not make that statement, I made the statement that all prizes would be paid. I didn't give any amount.

ORAL QUESTIONS cont'd

MR. DESJARDINS: Some information that I was asked yesterday, I'd like to give it at this time. I'd like to say my honourable friends - I don't recall who asked me the question - that there is two prizes of \$250,000 each; one of \$100,000; one of \$50,000; eight of \$25,000; seven of \$10,000 and ten of \$1,000. Those absolutely will be paid as soon as they're claimed and I wish to say that after that it is a question of series. There's no sinister motive; there's nothing held back. There is at least four prizes for each - besides the main prizes that I have mentioned - for each thousand tickets sold and a \$5,000 prize for at least any \$25,000 sold.

Now in the Conservative province of Ontario, Wintario operates exactly like that; in the Liberal province of Quebec, the Quebec Loto does the same thing; the Democrats and Republicans in the States do the same thing, and even the Socialists in Sweden and the Nationalists here in Canada.

I wish to say to my honourable friend that there is certainly - the average on the other lottery of the prizes was 11 to 12 percent of the tickets and it is now 35 percent and even on the great success that they had there was never more than a half a million dollars in prizes. Now there's 1.8.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. DESJARDINS: I don't know if you're calling me to order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The reason I stood up because the Honourable Minister had asked for permission first of all on a matter of personal privilege and he had replied to that. Then he started to make a statement. I waited until he finished making his sentence. If he wishes to make a statement, I'll allow him to have that but otherwise the answer was getting too long.

The Honourable Minister for Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: I don't know if you can classify that as a statement or answers to some of the questions that were asked yesterday. If I may then, I think there was a statement made that there was money lost. There definitely is no money lost at all. The prizes will be paid as I stated. The wholesaler, distributors and retailers will all be paid. There will be the full . . . in the Minister's fund and if you're talking about a loss there will be less revenue for instance in Manitoba, in the province. Instead of getting 65 cents at this time we'll get about 50 cents. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, again on a point of privilege or point of order that the Free Press should try to be a little bit more factual or I'm told that they might find themselves in the middle of a lawsuit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister tell this House whether further negotiations with the MMA are planned in the near future?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'll always be willing to discuss with the MMA. I believe that a meeting is now being organized with the president of the MMA and a colleague of his, and the First Minister and myself for some time next week.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. BROWN: Can the Minister tell this House whether in 1967 he guided a resolution through this House giving the doctors the right to opt out of the Medicare Plan?

MR. DESJARDINS: My honourable friend is asking me if I remember in 1967. Yes, I certainly fought for the right of doctors to opt out. I did so in 1968, '69, '70, '71, '72, '73, '74 and '75 and again this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. I wonder if the Minister can inform the House if the Manitoba Health Commission has arranged for a special home care program by doctors and the medical staff for people that have been evacuated from the hospital.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'll have to take this question and reply to my honourable friend tomorrow.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Perhaps the Minister can take another question as notice. Is it correct that some 700 patients were evacuated from the hospital and 600 more are on the waiting list. Can that be confirmed?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, waiting list. You know the waiting list these days doesn't mean that much. People are on the waiting list of about three or four different hospitals. I know that certainly some people were evacuated; some of them went with staff to Deer Lodge; others went to, I think it was Grace and there were some people that were sent home. There were some people that were sent home that are being monitored every day, that are receiving home care and as soon as this thing is settled out there they will be brought in. There is some space for emergencies that will be kept at Misericordia Hospital until the whole situation is cleared up.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister receiving or has he received a report on the patients that have been evacuated from the hospital and what is the social and financial burden on the patients and their families.

MR. DESJARDINS: I don't know if they are all Socialists, I don't know whether they're . . . oh I see. No, this is something my honourable friend knows, that I haven't got this information. I can tell him that we have the Manitoba Health Services Commission; there are responsible people in hospitals; we have people that are in charge of our home care program who are responsible and everything is done to ease the problem. Something was brought to my attention today about something at St. Boniface Hospital and I have been told that the union at no time would do anything that would endanger people that are real sick. They've cooperated in every respect and it is a hardship, there is no doubt about that. All strikes are hardships but we're managing and we're doing the best we can.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture and it pertains to the question I asked previously in connection with Crocus Foods and other dairy processing plants that have requested licencing for processing facilities in Manitoba. Would he confirm to the House if Section 7 of The Dairy Act will be adhered to in all of these applications when they are considered.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should know that the Act is there for a specific purpose and yes we do have to utilize the section provided in the allocation of licences.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development in connection with his capacity as Minister responsible for the Manitoba Lotteries Commission. Would the Minister undertake to make a statement as early as possible to the House clarifying, for the sake of the House, clarifying the use and meaning of the term "loss" as it is applied by Western Canada Lottery Foundation officials in referring to the present situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, not only that, but I will be very pleased to make a statement fairly soon or take advantage of one of the debates to clarify the whole situation of lottery and what has been done and what is contemplated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Corrections. In view of the comments made by members of the judiciary and members of the legal profession about the lack of proper care facilities and treatment facilities at the Youth Center, can the Minister indicate whether in fact he is planning any investigations or inquiries into the adequacy of those psychiatric care services at the Center.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

HON. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE (Minister responsible for Corrections and Rehabilitation) (Winnipeg Center): Mr. Speaker, since I was asked to assume this responsible there has been an ongoing discussion with the judiciary, with the legal profession, with all people that are involved in the criminal justice system and it is an ongoing thing. In fact this morning we were meeting with my counterparts in the Federal Government and we are moving as best we can in this field. The opinions expressed by the judiciary are always given serious consideration.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Can the Minister indicate whether these discussions are going to lead to any practical, tangible actions, or are they just sort of an ongoing set of discussions. Can he indicate to the House when there might be some direct investigations into the specific problems that have been encountered at the Youth Center in the past week?

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm rather adverse to using the expression of the Prime Minister of Canada but I, for one, don't intend to be involved in the "paralysis by analysis" situation. I move step by step every day to improve it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General. Order please. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge have a supplementary?

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary to the same Minister. Can the Minister indicate whether it is not a practice of his Department or his officials to inquire into specific problems at the Youth Centre such as the suicide of the young girl this past week and could the Minister not make reports into the House on the basis of such investigations?

MR. BOYCE: Of course the case that the member is referring to is under serious investigation specifically. But he asked a general question. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, in cooperation with the Solicitor-General, we're carrying it out on a day-by-day step to improve the situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable Member for La Verendrye requested information in connection with the guidelines and correspondence which I had forwarded to the mayors, reeves and secretary-treasurers. I wish to table that and there is also copies here for yourself, Mr. Speaker, and party leaders.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Honourable Minister for the Public Insurance Corporation.

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Minister for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation) (St. George): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The other day the Member for St. James asked me an electrified question regarding the electric cars. I can indicate to him that the cars take - in order not to shock him, those cars take a rating group #9.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition directed a question to the Premier dealing with superannuation that the Premier asked me to field. I hope that I am on the right track in answer to my honourable friend. I've checked through the records to find that most of the Crown corporations under the MDC may not have their own pension plans. Churchill Forest Resources do have a pension plan through Confederation Life; the Flyer Industries has an optional plan with the North American Life; the Workers Compensation Board have their own pension

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) plan through the Great West Life and the chairman of the Workers Compensation Board, Mr. Johnston, a former Attorney-General is still a member of the Civil Service Superannuation Fund and continues to make his contributions into that. Outside of that I'm not aware of any other individuals who have special arrangements for pension plans unless they are within the Civil Service.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for answering yesterday's question in part. The question was more directed as to whether or not there had been any special arrangements made for pension plans for any employees of the Provincial Government or the Crown corporations that come under the Civil Service Superannuation Act. Have there been any special pension funds set up by Order-in-Council where there have been arrangements made, other than what they would receive through their own Crown corporation proceedings and plans which do come under Civil Service Superannuation. I wasn't specifically asking the question directed towards Crown corporations under the MDC. I'm asking whether there are any pension plans set up of civil servants or those that normally come under Civil Service superannuation, apart from what is normal.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my answer to my honourable friend is no, I'm not aware of any. I did attempt to have an assessment made between yesterday and today. The answer is still no. If my honourable friend has any suggestion of an area where I might explore I would be more than pleased to receive it from him and do the exploring.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Labour. I would like to ask him whether he can advise the House whether all reasonable initiatives - and I emphasize the term "reasonable" - from his department have been exhausted with respect to attempting to get the two sides together in the Winnipeg transit strike or whether further initiatives are under consideration?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Well sometimes, Mr. Speaker, when my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, used the term "reasonable", I don't know how to approach it because, of course, there is different interpretations that can be placed as to what is meant by "reasonable". May I assure my honourable friend, the members of the House and the public that the Minister, the Department of Labour and the conciliation officers have done everything within their power, short of compulsion, to get the parties back together at the bargaining table.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for his information and I would ask him then whether that means, for the information of the House and the people of Manitoba, that in the spirit of preservation of the free collective bargaining process that nothing further therefore can be done by the Provincial Department of Labour to try to resolve that issue.

MR. PAULLEY: Again then, Mr. Speaker, it's a matter of interpretation and I suggest that reasonable people would not interpret my remarks as being construed that we are finished. We are not finished, we're never finished when there is an industrial dispute and continue to bring about a resolution of the same.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Urban Affairs. In light of the tabling last night of the tri-level report on downtown development which had provincial involvement, does the Minister intend to table a similar report for members of this Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Urban Affairs.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister for Urban Affairs) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the tabling that the member is referring to. I'm wondering if he would clarify where that was tabled.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I'd be very glad to clarify for the Minister that last evening in the Winnipeg City Council a report was tabled, a tri-level task force

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) report that, as I understand, had the involvement of provincial officials in it concerning proposed plans for the downtown. I want to know whether the Minister would be prepared to secure copies of that report and table it for members of this House.

MR. MILLER: I'll look into whether or not enough copies are available and if there aren't enough copies for everyone in the Chamber, perhaps I could advise members who are interested where a copy can be obtained.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate to the House what the commitment or involvement of the Province of Manitoba is in these assessments and plans for downtown development. Are there any financial commitments or is it simply a matter of a study team at this present time.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this is simply a study, a tri-level task force of officials who studied the matter and have some recommendations which are contained in the report. The city has now made that available, or is now looking at it; the province is in the same position. There's not commitments, there's no determination as to what will or will not be done.

MR. AXWORTHY: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate whether the terms of reference of that study include the provision of any provincial plans for new office buildings or structures in the downtown area as part of the projects or proposals that would be contained in a development program?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the buildings referred to by the member were conceived and decisions made regarding them some time ago, I think even before this task force came into being. However, I don't see any conflict between the provincial and City of Winnipeg plans in this regard and the task force report itself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. I believe in his answer to the Member for Rhineland in relation to the doctors opting out he didn't know whether or not there was 300 doctors that had opted out, 300 or more. I wonder in view of the importance of the question whether he couldn't advise the House that this information should be available, or might be available, on fairly short notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: This is something that could change so often, Mr. Speaker, that I'd hesitate to say what the exact number is. But, fine, I think I told my honourable friend that I would look into it and that I will give him the amount - the number I should say. There's something else that should be remembered, that a period of three months is needed for people to tell us they're going to opt out and only a period of one month for them to inform us that they will opt in. There's a possibility that doctors can tell us now that they are opting out; in two months from now tell us they're back in and therefore they would never leave the plan. So I think that we will know more meaningful information some time around April, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister's answer then in replying to the Member for Rhineland's question, I wonder if he would also include then not only those that are opted out but those who have indicated an intention to opt out at this point.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, that information that they had opted out would be very few because this movement is fairly recent. I thought you meant those that have signified that they will be opting out. That's how I understood it and the number that I'll give you is those that have informed the Commission that they are opting out. But in effect they will opt out only in three months.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): I would like to direct this to the Minister of Tourism. Where is the tourism centre on No. 1 Highway which was announced on February 6th, 1974 - announced at a cost in excess of a million dollars.

A supplementary. What is the reason of this holdup? Is it Manitoba; is it Saskatchewan or has the plan been scrapped altogether?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Tourism.

ORAL QUESTIONS

HON. RENE TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism) (Springfield): Well, Mr. Speaker, the reception centre the honourable member is mentioning at the border of Saskatchewan and Manitoba has been held in abeyance. We haven't reached an agreement with the Government of Saskatchewan and we don't intend to construct the facility on our own on a permanent basis. We will have a facility during the summer, 1976, but it will be a temporary facility.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works and ask him if his Department has received approval from the Liquor Commission for a dining room liquor licence in this building?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Has he received approval for any kind of liquor or wines for the dining room?

MR. DOERN: Not yet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: I would like to direct this question to the Minister in charge of lotteries. Will the Minister consider using agencies used for the Golden Sweepstakes such as the Canadian Legions, St. Paul's High School and Chambers of Commerce. Because, Mr. Speaker, they were successful and popular and I am speaking locally and rural on that point of view.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: It's been announced quite a few months ago, Mr. Speaker, that a second corporation comprising of all these agencies will be formed. They've had a few meetings now and I understand by the Acting Chairman that they should be ready to operate fairly soon. Contrary to what we had before, all the profits will go to that corporation; they will be in charge of distribution and retailing. They probably will have three draws every year.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wellington amended thereto by the Leader of the Opposition and sub-amended by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. WARREN STEEN (Crescentwood): Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise for the first time in this House after having observed the tone of debate for the past seven days.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that I will make a constructive contribution to this House and that I will conduct myself according to the rules.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the other members who have already stated their best wishes to you as you carry out your difficult duties. I would also like to offer my congratulations to the Mover and Seconder of the Speech from the Throne, the Members from Wellington and from Churchill. The other day when we heard the Member from Wellington speak in the House he gave us quite an interesting and complete account of the Icelandic community of Manitoba observing their 100th Anniversary of their settlement in Manitoba. The Member for Churchill spoke extensively of Northern Manitoba and one could not help but gather that he has a great love for that territory.

I would also at this time like to express my sincere thanks to all members of the House who have expressed words of welcome to my colleague, the Member from Wolseley and myself. I did note that the Member from Emerson said the other day, Mr. Speaker, that with me joining the members of this House that we have strengthened our hockey team and perhaps we could take on the City Fathers and do a little better this year.

I join the other members, Mr. Speaker, who have mentioned a word about the absence of my colleague, the Member from Souris-Killarney. I have had the pleasure of knowing this member for some 14 or 15 years and I do wish that he was back with us

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. STEEN cont'd) having convalesced completely because he has vast experience in this House and could be a great asset to me.

I would like to make special mention at this time of the length of service of what I consider one of my favorite members on the other side of the House, and that is Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour. The Minister of Labour has been a member of this House for 23 years and he's witnessed 28 Throne Speeches. Back in 1963 when I first met the Minister of Labour - at that time he was the Leader of the New Democratic Party, and I was serving in the role of Executive Assistant to the then Minister of Agriculture - I often listened and heard many speeches by the honourable member and at that time he took great delight in wailing away at the members of the Progressive Conservative Party. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that some 14 years later - and he has moved from your left to the right - he is still wailing away at the members of the Conservative Party. One thing he is consistent in, Mr. Speaker, is that the content of his speeches haven't changed much in 14 years; he has only changed his pew.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments about the constituency I represent, Crescentwood. This constituency was founded in 1969 under the last redistribution. Prior to 1969 the area that is now within the Constituency of Crescentwood was represented in this House by the former Minister of Finance, Gurney Evans. Since 1969 we have had two other members other than myself represent this area, Mr. Cy Gonick and Mr. Harvey Patterson.

The area in question has a variety of different types of persons. Last June in the by-election it was my privilege to win a close three-way battle between Mr. Patterson, whom I've mentioned earlier, and the Liberal Party Leader, Mr. Huband. This gives me my second opportunity to represent the people of this area as I served that area in the years of 1970 and '71 as a City of Winnipeg alderman for the then Ward 1 under the former City of Winnipeg.

My roots go very deep in Crescentwood. My family has lived in the area for many years. My father started his practice of dentistry on Corydon Avenue near Lilac Street some 51 years ago, in 1925. I'm pleased and very proud to say that my father is still in the practice of dentistry and enjoying excellent health.

Crescentwood, like many other inner city constituencies contains a mixture of people, people from various ethnic groups and various income levels. The boundaries of Crescentwood are as follows: on the east it's bounded by the main line of the CNR which runs parallel to Pembina Highway; on the south it's bounded by the streets of Carter Avenue and Taylor Avenue and on the west by Waverley between Taylor and Grant and then Cambridge Street from Grant through to the Assiniboine River. On the east again, Harrow Street is the centre line from the Assiniboine River down to McMillan Avenue. Then when we get to Stafford and Corydon the riding projects eastward to that famous intersection of Corydon, Osborne and Pembina Highway. The constituency is an L-shaped figure and I like to say that the base of the constituency is the apartment blocks on Grant Avenue and Taylor Avenue which make up some 1,500 suites that comprise the Constituency of Crescentwood.

Some of the concerns, Mr. Speaker, of the people in Crescentwood, as I travelled through it very extensively last May and June and have done so since, are: the high municipal taxes that the people are being faced with. There's a great deal of concern, Mr. Speaker, both within the residential homeowners and the persons occupying suites about the high taxes, consequently the high rates of rent. Another great concern of the people of the people in Crescentwood, Mr. Speaker, is government involvement in business. People constantly were asking me: is the government the best manager of business? Do politicians make the best businessmen? Government automobile insurance, Mr. Speaker, is constantly on the tongue of people in my constituency and particularly at this time of the year. A great concern during these times of inflation is the rapidly increasing Provincial Government budget, a budget that has gone from in the area of \$400 million in 1969 to well in excess of a billion. People ask, is this sound fiscal management?

I'd like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to speak on a few issues that were raised

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. STEEN cont'd) during the Throne Speech. The proposed legislation which will restrain excessive rent increases will be of great interest to the some 1,500 apartment dwellers in the Crescentwood area. Persons are very concerned as to the ever-increasing rents that they're being faced with. Just the other day, Mr. Speaker, I received a call from a retired gentleman of the age of 71 who has resided in his particular suite for the last seven years and his rent today is doubled what it was seven years ago. So he's naturally very concerned.

I'm pleased, Mr. Speaker, to see that the Provincial Government has intended to attempt to cooperate with the Government of Canada in its anti-inflation program. Although I deplore the confusion which has accompanied the introduction of price and income controls I fully support the controls at this time. My immediate concern is that they be applied firmly and impartially. I support controls not because they are desirable in themselves but because the Canadian economy has reached a position where the alternatives are far worse. It is essential that inflationary . . . be broken. Wage demands at their present level each perhaps understandable and even justifiable in isolation, would, if allowed to continue, have disastrous consequences on our economy.

Mr. Speaker, as a person who has spent the past 13 years associated with the life insurance and pension field, I was pleased to see that the government is establishing a pension commission to administer the new Pension Benefits Act. I believe in Manitoba that this Pension Act is long overdue and we in the pension business have been relying on the Act from the Province of Ontario to date.

I note with interest, Mr. Speaker, that the three levels of Government - the Federal Government, the Provincial Government and the City of Winnipeg - have arrived at an agreement to review The Greater Winnipeg Development Act during the next two years. I welcome that. I am very pleased to see that the Government intends to permit such bodies as municipalities to accept full responsibility for environmental problems within their own jurisdiction. As a member of the city council I just dreaded the days last summer and prior to that that I used to receive numerous calls from residents complaining about our short summers and the fact that they couldn't sit out in their back yards because of mosquitoes. Surely if the Province in the past wouldn't do anything about it, now that they have turned the jurisdiction over to the municipalities, surely the City of Winnipeg will have the wisdom to do something.

Speaking of municipal governments having greater control of their destiny, I was pleased to hear the Member for Churchill say the other day when he was the Seconder for the Throne Speech, and I quote, "Maybe I should say I went up to preach the gospel, mostly the gospel of local government, whereby we would start developing more and more authority, responsibility at the mayor and council level." I hope that the other members that share the same side of the House as the Honourable Member for Churchill share his views.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend a few moments reviewing the difficulties and the problems of the City of Winnipeg. The City of Winnipeg, like all municipalities in this day and age of high inflation, faces three very difficult problems: the degree of service that they are to supply for their citizens and how are they going to answer the demands of the various residents as to the degree of service that is required and necessary; the high cost of these services and thirdly, who is to pay for these services?

Speaking of services being in demand, the City of Winnipeg has just received a report recently from the Winnipeg Police Department which has a caricature of a policeman on the front cover with his long drawn face with a big sign, hexagon sign, with the word "Help" on it. In this report which was delivered to the City of Winnipeg recently, the Winnipeg Police Department claims that they are very critically short of police officers and they go on to justify their case by saying that the crime rate in the City of Winnipeg is increasing at a rate of almost 16 percent per year. The Winnipeg Police Department claims that they need 266 new constables in the year 1976. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, 266 new constables. That's just about 25 percent of the existing force. To complement the new constables that they are looking for, they are

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. STEEN cont'd) asking for eight new cadets and 12 additional employees to work in the clerical and caretaking field to back up these employees. The total new employees sought by the Police Department is 286 persons at an approximate cost of \$4- $\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars per year. We all know that the City of Winnipeg Council will never be able to hire or even find men and women to fulfil those vacancies if they were created within this calendar year. We all know that the City of Winnipeg will never find \$4- $\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars to pay for these people unless there is some help.

I would like to say something, Mr. Speaker, at this time about the proposed budget for 1976 for the City of Winnipeg. As it stands today the City of Winnipeg is showing a deficit of some \$16.7 million. The city budget has yet to go to the community committees. When the City budget does go to the community committees - and I emphasize that, that the budget has not been finalized but it is at the stage now that it is prepared sufficiently to go to the community committees. It has gone through the standing committees, the council and through the Board of Commissioners. When it gets to the community committees this is the area that things are not deleted from the budget or chopped out; this is the area that things are put back in, as one councillor tries to scratch the back of another one to get his favorite pet project back in. From my experience the budget will never be reduced at the community committee level. If anything it will be increased.

The city mill rate today stands at 70.3 or an increase of 10.1 mills over last year, and we're going to have rent controls. To a home assessed at \$8,000, Mr. Speaker, the new mill rate increase will add another \$80.90 of taxes this year not including the school tax increase.

One area of hope for the City is that the Manitoba Hydro goes through with its plans of raising its rates by 20 percent on April 1st of 1976. The City of Winnipeg has already taken into account for this coming year that such an increase will go through and therefore they expect a \$4 million profit on their Hydro operation, providing the increase goes through. They have already added that anticipated profit into this year's budget.

The City of Winnipeg, after raising many of its licensing fees and its small business taxes to the maximum and, as was quoted on one of the radio talk shows the other day, they have raised these fees beyond the 10 percent limit by the wage guidelines, Prices and Income Review Board. But they have done so in trying to look for new areas of revenue. Like all municipalities the City of Winnipeg is starving for new areas of revenue. The City this year expects to have revenue in the area of \$160 million but their present budget now stands at \$188 million. So that leaves a deficit of \$18 million. So what I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that the municipal tax base that exists today isn't sufficient and the Provincial and Federal Governments are going to have to come to the aid of municipalities and agree to either give them larger shares of growth tax areas or increase their grants.

I would like to mention the City of Winnipeg payroll to the members of this House. It is of great interest to most persons that live in Winnipeg or do business in Winnipeg, particularly at this time when the Transit Union is on strike. The city payroll is a total of \$114.2 million as of 1975 and that is made up of transit people \$13.2 million; CUPE - Canadian Union of Public Employees - at \$50 million; the Fire Department at \$14.3 million; Police at \$16.6 and WATS and others at \$20.1 for a total of \$114.2 million. Last year the City of Winnipeg's total budget was \$156 million. So as you can see, Mr. Speaker, the largest share of the City of Winnipeg's budget is eaten up in straight wages to persons performing duties to the citizens of the City of Winnipeg. That is why municipalities, including the City of Winnipeg, are strapped. They have very limited areas that they can reduce their budget unless the city makes some drastic changes.

The City of Winnipeg has yet to settle 1976 or beyond contracts with any of the five groups I have mentioned. We all know from our day to day hearing about the Transit Union strike and the city has yet to settle with the other groups.

Inflation is magnifying the severe inequities between the City of Winnipeg and the Provincial Government. With respect to the revenues raised and the cost of

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. STEEN cont'd) providing government services the City can attempt to overcome the current budget deficit by reducing civic services or perhaps laying people off. Winnipeg, in my opinion, is not too far away from the problems that faced the City of New York. Unless there is Provincial Government assistance in the offing, Winnipeg is going to be in trouble. So the three options that are open to the city, Mr. Speaker are: reduce the services and perhaps lay people off; increase property taxes this year by 18 percent going from 60 mills to 71 or obtain increased Provincial Government grant payments.

Rather than having the Provincial Government increase their grant payments I would much rather see them give the City of Winnipeg independence and let them share some of the points of their tax base, their growth tax areas. But if the Provincial Government does not take steps to move in this direction, Mr. Speaker, by 1980 the City of Winnipeg will be dependent upon this Provincial Government or its successor - I hope it will be its successor - for 43 percent of their operating revenues. At present the City of Winnipeg received 10 percent of their operating revenues from the Provincial Government, but within four short years that 10 percent is going to grow to 43 percent if help isn't coming forward. The City of Winnipeg is the creature of the Provincial Government as all cities are creatures of their Provincial Governments. The BNA Act doesn't call for municipal governments. The definition of "creature", according to the Collin's New English Dictionary is "anything created", also "a term of endearment or pity, a person used as a tool by another, a dependent." So the City of Winnipeg is any one of those things: a dependent, a person used as a tool by another.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I ask my friends opposite - particularly the Minister of Urban Affairs - if he would listen to the words of the Member of Churchill from last Friday morning when he stated, "Give more and more authority and responsibility to local government." The City of Winnipeg is your dependent. Let's someday stop having them come to beg for assistance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I at this time again welcome you back to your august position at the head of this Assembly. I know that you have done a good job in the preceding sessions and I am sure you will do the same in the future. I would also at this time like to give my congratulations to the Mover and Second of the Speech from the Throne, the Honourable Members for Wellington and Churchill and congratulate them on the fine job that they did. I would also at this time, Mr. Speaker, like to congratulate and welcome to the Chamber the two new members, the Member for Wolseley and the Member for Crescentwood. I'm sure that they will find their deliberations in this House of great interest and I am sure they will represent their constituents well. I would also at this time, Sir, like to comment on my very good friend, the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney. I'm very sorry that he is not here; I wish him speedy good health and good recovery. I can wish him no better than what happened to myself a good and complete recovery and I certainly hope that this is in store for him as it was for me.

I also at this time, Mr. Speaker, would like to say that I wish to thank the Assembly for again electing me as your Deputy Speaker and Chairman of House Committees. I want to thank the members for their good cooperation that they gave me last year under the new rules which were new to the members of the Assembly and they were also new to me. I thought that they worked very well and I want to thank the members for their cooperation during last Session.

Mr. Speaker, as Deputy Speaker there is not too many times that I get an opportunity to speak and I can either take part now in this debate or I can take part in the Budget Debate. But I thought I would exercise my right to make a speech at this time in this Assembly.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we are living in some very troubled times and it is with deep misgivings that I have any hope of the success of the legislation that has been introduced in Ottawa and is now law under Bill C-73. Deep misgivings, Mr. Speaker, because the unfortunate thing is that the message that seems to be coming across: there

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JENKINS cont'd) is one segment of society, the wage earners and salaried people are the greedy ones in society. There are others who also cause the misery of inflation that we are suffering today. I would caution the First Minister and members of the treasury bench to be very chary of the support that is being given by certain segments of society to the proposal that Manitoba I guess in due course will sign, the agreement with Ottawa for anti-inflation guidelines. But I think of the old proverb, beware of Greeks bearing strange gifts. When you get Chambers of Commerce, presidents of life insurance companies coming along and telling you that what you are doing is a good thing then I would say for a government that is of a social democratic philosophy, I kind of wonder just what these chaps have in mind.

You know with the election of the Liberal Government of Pierre Trudeau, we have seen one of the greatest back flips in political history that I have ever seen in this country. I will give credit to the retiring leader, who will be retiring tomorrow, I think, from the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada for at least having the honesty to come forward and present a platform. Unfortunately for him it was rejected by the people of Canada. But that is not the case of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister said, "Those controls that were proposed by the Right Honourable Robert Stanfield were to control your wages and mine." Now, lo and behold less than a year - I believe we got a Thanksgiving gift, Thanksgiving evening I believe it was - the Prime Minister of Canada delivered us a White Paper on the so-called anti-inflation guidelines that we have now seen in the finished bill that was passed in the House of Commons in Ottawa.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I really don't like speaking on matters that are of a federal nature, but because of the fact that these anti-inflation guidelines go to the heart and root of the matter in all provinces, I hope that you will forgive me, Sir, if I keep on this topic because it is one that disturbs me greatly. The regulations we got after the bill was passed in December. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that with the appointment of the Anti-Inflation Board with a former Liberal Minister of the Crown, and the former Chairman of the Prices Review Board, this certainly didn't lend too much credibility to this board to start with.

This board if it had had any integrity at all after its first decision - its first decision, if you cast your minds back, was after the recent postal strike which was of great consequence to the people of Canada. But a settlement was reached, it was agreed to by the Treasury Board in Ottawa and the Canadian Postal Union Workers. The board ruled that this settlement was out of line. I know at that time that the Federal Government had not appointed an administrator - and I'll speak more about him later. They did not appoint an administrator at that time but by Cabinet Order-in-Council they overturned the ruling of the Anti-Inflation Board. Now if they had been worth their mustard - and I don't say that I agree with that board, in fact I don't agree with that board being set up in the context that it is - but if they'd been worth their mustard at all they would have resigned there and then. Because, we have set up -and Lord knows how long it's going to last, because during the musings of the Prime Minister he sometimes says three years, sometimes more than that, and I don't know what he's thinking about because in three years' time or less than three years' time I imagine he's going to have to go to the polls for a re-election. I don't think that he's going to be fighting the election on wage and price control in that election unless he perhaps has something else in mind. Maybe he intends to postpone that election, perhaps indefinitely.

These are some of the things that really disturb me, Mr. Speaker. I can tell you quite honestly that I do not believe in controls. I don't think controls are going to work. If they had wanted this thing to work I think that at least they should have established a price and wage freeze for a certain length of time; set up the machinery and then presented it to the House. But what we have had happen in this country is a piece of legislation that seems to have been built as it goes along. And the regulations, the Board seems to make new regulations all the time. In fact, I think the Honourable Jean Luc Pepin, President of the Commission, has indicated that in turn the committee

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JENKINS cont'd) would be strict, and in turn it would be tolerant, indulgent, and it would be inflexible and then it would be flexible. Now just how is anyone going to deal with such a board. I don't blame the board because maybe that's the terms of reference that they've been given by the Liberal Government in Ottawa. But surely if the Board is going to do a job it has to make either some ruling, one way or the other.

Now when the Prime Minister brought his legislation in and it was introduced by the Minister of Finance, the thing that has come through very strong and clear is that wages and salaries would be checked. It was very vague in its specifics in controlling other factors that cause the cost of living to rise such as housing, interest rates, profits, etc. Very very sketchy, practically non-existent, and they are still to this day. There's very little, or no control over the cost of basics such as food. In fact they've almost said that they can't control the cost of food. These are some of the necessities of life. Energy costs. They've already told you that energy costs are going to rise. I believe the price of oil is going to increase to the international level which I think would raise it either two or two and a half dollars per barrel.

I see that the Province of Alberta has already signed the anti-inflation legislation, or to co-operate for an 18 month period. But they've put in a very nice escape clause, that if they don't get their way on the cost of natural gas and oil that they're going to drop out. I would very honestly urge the First Minister and other provinces that have not signed to the present time that they make sure before they sign this agreement. Especially in view of what has happened with the Irving Pulp and Paper Company in New Brunswick and the workers involved there where it is almost tantamount that you have to be fined and then make an appeal afterwards because there is no appeal mechanism within the law. That is tantamount to being fined in court. You pay your fine and then make your appeal afterwards. By paying your fine you've almost said that you're guilty to start with. So I would say that when the First Ministers of the various provinces do meet with the Prime Minister and people down in Ottawa that they bring this point very strongly, very strongly to the fore and see that there is appeal mechanism within the wage guidelines and the controls.

You know, we are now seeing here in the Province of Manitoba labour unrest. In the main I would say that the cause of it is the fact that management on one hand is hiding behind the wage guidelines, making interpretations and the chairman of the commission has told them that it is not their responsibility to make interpretations of what the wage guidelines will be. That is the responsibility of the Anti-Inflation Board. If you think this is just an isolated case here with the transit workers in the City of Winnipeg, and the unrest that we have at the hospitals is just a passing phase, well then I think you can dismiss that from your minds, because I predict to you, Sir, that we are going to see a summer of discontent in management-labour relations across this country such as the like of we've never seen before.

MR. AXWORTHY: Who's causing it?

MR. JENKINS: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge says, "Who's causing it?" It's the guidelines the way that they have been set up; it is the interpretations that management groups are making on this. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood is not here right now. He stated that they haven't the money to pay them, that the cost of city taxes are going to increase by approximately 16 or 17 million dollars.

But I see within that deficit that they're predicting there's \$11 million for the expansion of the Winnipeg Stadium and the Winnipeg Arena. There's an \$11 million cut that you can make which will reduce the deficit. Again I say that it seems to be the "in" think to hide behind the wage guidelines even though the chairman and their representative here have said to management and unions, "Go out and negotiate with a union as if the Anti-Inflation Board Guidelines did not exist and then we'll make the decision." Not the union, not the management. They will make the decision.

I think that you find certain members of the City Council - and I'll name them. The Deputy Mayor, he's a well-known Liberal, Councillor Bill Norrie - I sat

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JENKINS cont'd) with him on the Winnipeg School Board - he's a well-known Liberal, unless he's changed his affiliations then. When I was on the Winnipeg School Board he was a member of the Liberal Party. I can't help it if he's changed colours, I don't know about that. But when I was on the Winnipeg School Board and a member of it, he was a member of it, he was a member of the Liberal Party.

A MEMBER: They swapped Huband for Norrie.

MR. JENKINS: They swapped Huband for Norrie. Well, perhaps they did, I don't know. But anyways these are the people that control the Independent Civic Election Committee, is that what they call themselves, the ICEC on the City of Winnipeg Council. These are the people who are hiding behind the wage guidelines. It was unnecessary to have a work stoppage on the transit system here in Winnipeg. I think the motion that the Mayor suggested was about 14 percent which was in excess of the guidelines they agreed. But it would have gone to the guidelines and both parties would have had to accept whatever it was. But, no. So now you have the fourth week practically finished and the fifth week coming up in non-bus service in the City of Winnipeg.

We also have at the Health Sciences Centre quite a ludicrous situation. Misericordia Hospital settled with its employees. The same employees are on withdrawal of services at the Manitoba Health Sciences Centre, and lo and behold, one group can pay a certain amount and let it go to the guidelines and the other group won't. Again we have a case of them hiding behind the wage guidelines that are in effect in Canada.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, this is going to be our summer of discontent. It certainly is. We have 950,000 employees from last year who are still negotiating, have not come under contract, plus perhaps another 750,000 this year across Canada. Not in the Province of Manitoba, that's more people than we have. This is what's going to happen. We are going to see strike after strike after strike, and the only thing that I could advise the Federal Government - and I know that Pierre Elliott Trudeau is not going to take any notice of what I say - but if he had any intellectual honesty he would dissolve the House of Commons - call in the Governor-General to do so - go out and fight an election on his wage and price guidelines. Fight it on those grounds. Because a year and a half ago he stomped this country up and down saying that he would under no circumstances bring in price and wage controls. He hasn't brought in price controls, that's true, but he has brought in wage controls.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on this much longer but I really think, Mr. Speaker, that what disturbs me most is the media and the members of the opposition party, their belief that labour - and I believe the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, he's not in the Chamber right now, but the other day he stated the tremendous power that these people have, tremendous power. I don't know if he figures that they meet in secret to plot the downfall of this country, well I can assure him that they don't.

I think that I'd just like to read to you a little item here from the Winnipeg Tribune of yesterday, where Mr. Williams, who is the Vice-President of the Canadian Labour Congress, stated that despite the lack of evidence that wages are an ingredient in inflation, we have a declaration that collective bargaining is the culprit, that the workers' incomes must be controlled. And yet three weeks before the Prime Minister brought in his Thanksgiving speech on Thanksgiving evening the Governor of the Bank of Canada said it wasn't the trade unions that were at fault.

As I said last year, much of our inflation is important, there's no doubt of that. You go to your supermarkets, fresh fruits, all those things are not grown in Manitoba at this time of year or anywhere in Canada, except in hot houses, and there's very few of them that are supplying the market. We have no control over those products. As Mr. Williams said, the power of labour is vastly overrated. The producers, the producers, these are the people with the power, and I am not just referring to farmers, but I'm talking to people in the production field of manufacturing, mining, these are the people - these are the people that have the power to make jobs, move the economy, to invest, to shut down, start up, set prices, production, and no union - no union in Canada has that kind of power. --(Interjection)-- Well I don't class them as a union. Much as the Honourable Member for Lakeside may think that the Egg Marketing Board is a union, I

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JENKINS cont'd) don't know that it's been certified under the Manitoba Labour Relations Act, perhaps I'd better check with the Minister of Labour.

Well, we hear that it's worse than unions. Perhaps that is what many members on the other side of the House think of unions, that they are the bogey men of the Canadian scene of society as it is today, and I could assure you that they are not the bogey men. They are fighting for the rights of individuals. I dare say that trade unions as such, those that are well organized, will not suffer too badly, they would have at least a bit of clout. But the poor people who are not organized, those are the people - and don't let the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge pretend that a very sorry owner of a business is going to say, "Well, look my friend, you are sadly underpaid. We are going to pay you in excess of the guidelines," because that is rubbish, utter rubbish. --(Interjection)-- True. My honourable friend says that they weren't getting it, but at least we have put legislation into this province, that it is there for them if they wish to organize. Perhaps my honourable friend wishes we should go maybe a step further, maybe we should go out and organize them. If he is so inclined, I wish he would say so. But we have made it possible for people to join an organization of their choice, and if people do not take advantage of these things there is nothing that we as legislators can do. It is unfortunate, and I feel for these people, and I think their wage gap will continue to diminish in size to others.

You know, one of the most silly things that we have ever got involved in in this country ever since World War II, and it's one that I on various occasions with members of my own union and other unions have been in disagreement with. I have always said the silliest thing that we ever got involved in was percentage increases, that was the silliest thing we ever got involved with. The union I belong to has - yes I guess it still has, but eventually it will only have three classes - but we had four classes - we had Tradesmen A, Tradesmen B, we had helpers and coach cleaners. It cost those people just as much to go to the store and buy butter and eggs as it cost me. I was very fortunate, I have always been in an "A" Trade classification. But I argued on many occasions and many times that we should have gone for across-the-board wage hikes when we went for them. Unfortunately we didn't because management didn't want them; in fact it was a good thing for management personnel. You know, ten percent of \$1,000 and ten percent of \$10,000 are vastly different, and if we hadn't have been involved in such a scheme over many many years we wouldn't have the vast discrepancies that we have today. We are able, I agree that we are able under certain circumstances to raise the minimum wage. But the minimum wage when we raised it, that is the pay in many industries in Manitoba. It's unfortunate, and it's unfortunate that these people have not taken advantage of the fact that they can organize. I wish that they would.

I would just like to leave that for now, Mr. Speaker. I think I have made my point. Again I would say very seriously before I leave it, how deeply disturbed I am with the state of affairs as we see them in this country. We are seeing losses of freedom; we are seeing Rights of Appeal only after you pay the fine; these are dangerous to our democratic rights in Canada and in Manitoba. These are rights that we have fought for - all citizens of all political faiths in this country have fought for. For many many years - and I say to the members of this Assembly - that beware that you do not give these rights away lightly. That when you force people to do things that they don't want to do, that they have a legal right to do, then I say we're in deep trouble.

Now the Honourable Member for Wolseley wasn't here the other day - or he's not here today I mean, I wasn't here the other day when he made his speech - but I just happened to pick up yesterday's paper and I see that he made his maiden speech in the House. I'm sorry that I missed it, but I had a bit of the flu so that's why I wasn't here. But in making his maiden speech on the fourth day of the session, Mr. Wilson said, "The government is drunk with money and wasting it on foolish things and no longer is concerned with people's problems." Well, you know it was very interesting. The other day we had people visiting us from the Province of New Brunswick. I believe it's a Progressive Conservative Party in power there, a population of about 680,000 - 700,000, and a provincial budget, would you believe of \$500,000? No. \$600,000? No. Would you believe a million? Well that's what it was, a million. --(Interjection)-- A billion.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JENKINS cont'd) Pardon me, not a million, a billion. --(Interjection)-- Yes, I made them sound an awful lot better than they were. I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, I was speaking of --(Interjection)-- a billion dollar budget. And here in Manitoba we're in excess of a million. A billion dollar budget. I believe Ontario has a billion dollar deficit last year - a billion dollar deficit. They have a bigger deficit than we have a budget. These are the Tory managers who tell us socialists or Social Democrats, or whatever they want to call us - and I don't worry too much what they call me because I say "Sticks and stones will break my bones, but names will never hurt me," so you may call me what you like. But there are the great managers of the provincial economy of Ontario - a billion dollar deficit, how about that? --(Interjection)-- Oh, yes, they have six million people, but they have a deficit in their budget bigger than ours, and we didn't have any deficit. --(Interjection)--

Well, now my friend likes to talk about Autopac. --(Interjection)-- And you know, Mr. Speaker, I had my first experience with Autopac. I'm glad that the honourable member brought that up. --(Interjection)-- Pardon? Well, it's part of government, it was created by government, and it's a Crown Corporation. I've heard many things pro and con about Autopac, but I backed up and hit a steel post, buried in a snow bank, and did some damage to my car. --(Interjection)-- Yes, I admit it was my fault, I should have seen that the steel post was there. But anyway, I decided since this was done on December 29th, I thought well it wouldn't be much use going there on a Monday morning right after a long weekend. So I didn't go the Monday or the Tuesday, but I went Wednesday about 20 minutes to 12 and drove down to St. James Street, drove into the Autopac Centre, and I was out of there in 25 minutes. --(Interjection)-- No, they didn't know who I was until I left. I shook hands with the adjuster and told him who I was and thanked him for the service, and I thought it was very good. --(Interjection)-- No, I didn't get no overly generous settlement, I can assure the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that I can get the file for him. I paid my \$50.00 deductible as well as anyone else.--(Interjection)-- Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In fact I received a letter the other day from Autopac which told me that if I had another one of these things that I might get an increase in my driver's licence next year. But anyway, I think that the point is well taken, and I think that I should drive with care, and I agree that perhaps I couldn't see into that snow bank but I shouldn't have backed up as far as I did. So I really think that Autopac has done a great job. The costs of labour are high, there's no doubt about it. --(Interjection)--

You know, my friend from Lakeside, I don't know if he knows what auto body shops are charging per hour these days. --(Interjection)-- Right. But you know, 14, 15, 16, whatever it is, somewhere in that vicinity. --(Interjection)-- I don't know if they're organized. I couldn't tell you. But that is not all labour. That is overhead, that is everything else. --(Interjection)-- I'll give my honourable friend just an example. I work for the railway, I do foreign billing. These are cars that are damaged by foreign lines that we repair them on defect cars. And do you know what the labour costs are set at? \$16.77. That includes shop overhead, gas, heat, wages, a foreman, office staff, workmen's compensation, pension, taxes, everything, \$16.77 per hour. So at \$14.00 or \$15.00 here in Manitoba, I guess that is just about what is par for the course anywhere in the North American continent. These rules, I might add, are agreed to and abided by railways in the Republic of Mexico, the Republic of the United States and the Dominion of Canada. So all those rates are fairly average, and I don't think that at \$14.00 or \$15.00 we are over expending here in the Province of Manitoba.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that you're getting up to call me to order. I haven't too much more to say, except I thank the House for their attention, and this is something I've wanted to get off my chest and I feel a lot better for it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to rise to my feet in this Throne Speech debate. It's a little longer in the Session than I would normally leave it, but that's given me the opportunity to therefore listen more carefully and more attentively to the full scale and range of debate and I must confess, Mr. Speaker, to being somewhat mystified by all I have listened over the past four days. As some of you may know, I spend some moments in my other life in the corridors of the universities which are normally considered to be places where there is the kindly contemplation of philosophical disputation and meanderings of logical precise points, and I was anticipating somewhat coming to this arena which is normally considered to be the place where there is hard-headed tough-nosed realistic assessment of people's problems. But I must confess, Mr. Speaker, to being totally surprised, puzzled perhaps, where the theme so far in this Session has in fact turned those two worlds on their heads; that rather than, as I would have expected, addressing ourselves to some of the kinds of real considerations that are bothering people, that we arrive in the Chamber, and I think were greeted by the mover and seconder of the Speech and the response of the Leader of the Opposition, where they used as the text for their particular presentations the venerable words of J. S. Woodsworth and Arthur Meighen, to give two examples, and then followed up by long and lengthy quotes from scriptural texts.

We then had, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources digging back into the historical records of this House to find clean delineations of meanings of words of socialism. And then to my other surprise, the Member from Lakeside, who is more normally considered as a man who is better able to judge the shape of a side of beef or any other kind of bovine character that he may come across, find himself digging deep into the tracks of other people's parties. It began to remind me so much, Mr. Speaker, less of a legislative arena and more as a lurid society of classical antiquarians, each trying to find the philosophers on the head of a pin. I was somewhat intrigued, even when the Member for Lakeside was having to find himself asking for assistance from the other scribes and Pharisees of the Tory bench to find that ultimate definition of the word socialism. We have spent now four full days, Mr. Speaker, trying to find out the exact posture and positioning, and you would think, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps if the budgets of the universities weren't so restrained as they were now, that members of this House were in fact applying for membership in the academic society so that they could pursue this line of intriguing and interesting common room disputation.

It was really quite fascinating, Mr. Speaker, to find the gentlemen in this House were so interested in the, perhaps Archaean and perhaps archaic issues. I think, Mr. Speaker, that there probably may be good reason for it, I suppose that those who now make decisions in the upper board rooms and law offices and editorial chambers of the city, decide that that is the way in which we should pursue politics now; that we must find these clear-cut definitions between one side or the other and make sure that the people of Manitoba as we've been told now, will have a clear option between the forces of socialism and those of free enterprise. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting set of propositions and I commend and provide my respects for the scholarly way in which that particular position has been attacked. But I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps it's not too germane to what's going on in the Province of Manitoba, and at this time of - as we have all said - serious economic and social concern, that the people of Manitoba would have a right to expect other kinds of options and other kinds of debates, and rather than spending our time musing over the mythologies of the past and digging deeply into the historical tracks and records of bygone and mainly obsolescent philosophies; that the people of the province might have expected more in the way of a hard and realistic assessment of the nature of our problems and certainly a much more precise definition of how we can go about solving them, not based upon cloistering or philosophical meandering or musing but in fact based upon a very singularly critical assessment of the way in which our society is out of joint and is going wrong.

So I must confess, Mr. Speaker, to my surprise - and if you'll allow me the slight metaphor in saying that I am trying to find some explanation for it, I searched back in

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) my memory to an old fable - seeing that we have been dealing in fables and fantasies for the last four days - of the wise men searching out the meaning of what is an elephant. And if you recall, I came across a little jingle from my childhood, Mr. Speaker, which I would like to read in the House, because I think perhaps it aptly describes the kind of disputation that has been taking place between the PCP's as they are now called and the NDP's, I suppose we're called the LP's or something. It says, "And so these men of Hindustan, disputed loud and long, each in his own opinion exceeding stiff and strong, though each was partly in the right and all were in the wrong. So often in theologic wars the disputants I have seen rail along in utter ignorance of what each other means, and prate about an elephant that not any of them has seen." Well the moral of that particular jingle, Mr. Speaker, is simply that those kinds of blind gropings to find some philosophical purity to establish the clear catechism of the true believer that has seemed to be the aspiration and objection of so many in this Throne Speech simply makes little sense and provides little real instruction about what we should be doing in the Province of Manitoba in the year 1976.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the position taken by our group in our Party is that we would like to offer the people in this province a third option, not one based upon these posturings or these philosophical meanderings, but one that is based simply on a debunking and an exercising of old myths in an attempt to come to grips with new realities. I think that is the particular kind of formula that we would prefer to follow. And while I am sure that it is much more satisfactory to the minds and intents of other members that they acquire this clinical pristine positioning, that again it is simply not of much use. The kinds of myths that we would like to attack, Mr. Speaker, I think are many in number and I expect that you will be hearing on many occasions of what they are, as well as some attempt to define what the new realities of our community and our society are. We have just gone through, Mr. Speaker, I suppose an example of some kinds of myths as we have listened to previous members this afternoon. Because certainly one of the most blatant and high blown kind of mythology and fantasy that is dealing in the minds of people - at least some people in this Chamber - is this interesting distinction between what some have called the world of free enterprise, that little society of shopkeepers dealing on the corner grocery store, in the marketplace, with free competition, and a mechanism of price adjusting the allocation of resources, never talking, Mr. Speaker, never mentioning that there are things in the world called International Nickel or General Motors or six oil companies that completely and totally dominate the production marketing and allocation of energy resources in this world on an administered price basis; and for members on this side to my right to somehow pretend that the economic world of 1976 is a world of shopkeepers, is pure and sheer fantasy, because the fact of the matter is that the economic giant, the concentration of power that is exercised in terms of determining how things are bought and sold and how the allocation of resources - that's the reality of the economy of this day and age. That is the way the world is working. And while there is some remnants left where the market system can work, the fact of the matter is, that most crises in this society, the ones that really count in the areas of energy and manufacturing and finance are determined by oligopolies and large concentrations of economic power which quickly translates into political power; and to try to deny somehow that government has no responsibility for doing the best simply shows the kind of senility I think that is going into much of our political discourse.

But on the other side, Mr. Speaker, we have also heard certain kinds of mythologies expressed on the other side; we have heard from the Member of Logan just recently about this kind of benign inner sense of the trade unions gaily going off to the work place simply interested in defending the rights of the working man. Well, I take some issue with that, Mr. Speaker, I think that certainly there are many working people in this province and in this country who are not organized and should be, and have advocated it in the past. But to try to pretend that the large international unions that are run out of Pittsburgh and New York and Chicago have the best interests of Canadians in mind again is sheer hypocrisy, because the fact of the matter is they are no more interested in the pensioner who has to face an inflationary problem in their food prices, they are simply

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) interested in what is it that they get from the union, defending their power. And when he says that we are going to have a summer of discontent, I hope that it will be no worse than the summer of discontent we had last year before we had guidelines; when this country had the second worst industrial record in the world and where we were having wage settlements of 18 and 20 and 25 percent, and we're pricing ourselves out of the market; and the productivity of those large unions that you are prepared to defend were simply pricing the Canadians, the ability of Canada, to sell its goods abroad was being destroyed and eroded by those benign unions that you are talking about.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's get back to reality, let's talk about the way the world works; let's not talk about the way we would like it to work or the way that it used to work, let's talk about the way it works now. One of the real issues that should be faced in this House and will be faced in this House is how do we come to grips with updating our attitudes and our feelings about the process of collective bargaining. We have had a report in this House, Mr. Speaker, for two years. I think of the Woods Committee report which dealt with the basic problem, where they said collective bargaining of public servants no longer works, or only works in moderation; that it is not the way in which we can adjust prices and wages because government is not like a private manufacturer, it doesn't work on the same economic equations because we can make money, we can tax more, and we don't have the option of closing down hospitals or closing down those kinds of things. So the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, what we have been trying to say is, let's simply come to grips with the fact that collective bargaining and this notion that it is somehow the only answer has got to be revised and looked at in light of today's realities, and that's the kind of option that we have been arguing for and will continue to argue for, is to find out what is going on, not by reading some sort of editorial in a union magazine or a Chamber of Commerce . . . but simply pointing out how does the world really work, that is the point that we are trying to assess.

So, Mr. Speaker, one of the real critical questions at this time and place is how do we come to grips with some of the economic programs. I think what the people of the Province of Manitoba are asking, what is the role of government in all this? We can all stand here and all beat our breasts as I'm sure we have and will continue to do, about, let's cut back in government expenditures. All right, but let's find out where we're going to cut back, and I listened with some interest when the Leader of the Opposition got to his feet and said, let's cut back, and I said, well now we're going to hear where we're going to cut back - oh no, we passed by that one very quickly. The real question is - what we have to look at is - how does government operate, and how does it define its programs and where does it put its priorities; and it does come down, Mr. Speaker, to the question of the allocation of money and of capital, and that is where this government fails because it doesn't have a set of priorities any longer; it has lost its will to govern; it's lost its set of priority; it doesn't know where to put its money any more.

So all it simply does is, it sort of reverts to some sort of fetal position, as it was expressed in that Throne Speech, in the hope that no one will notice them for the next couple of years, so that either they get to see it or someone passes them by or hope a miracle will strike and they can redefine some purpose and some ambitions for this Province. Because the fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is we don't have a set of priorities in this province any more; we don't have a set of programs. The adventuresome statements in the Throne Speech - the most adventuresome was to build a Provincial Park, and the rest would simply fall into leads of other people. And yet at the same time we face excruciatingly painful difficulties in various sectors of this province which are not in any way being given leadership or being addressed by this government, and I think that's far more than listening to some disputation on Olympics about the merits and virtues of socialism versus free enterprise. I think what the Manitobans are asking, is sort of saying, when do we get some leadership in the province; when does government settle down and start doing the job that has to be done; and when do we stop fooling around in these kinds of silly prattlings about who is on the wrong end of the egg or whatever other kinds of philosophical formula is being applied.

Let me point to some of those areas, Mr. Speaker, because I think some of them

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) are very important. One of them, of course, is the issue of education. We've heard in this speech again this sort of dichotomy between the 3 R's versus the feckless experimentation in education - which I think is the phrase coined by the new Leader of the Tory Party. And yet, Mr. Speaker, when you begin looking at what the real issue in education is I don't think it comes down to that kind of issue at all. The issue that I kind of see is the one that I heard last night as I was talking to groups of parents who are in the downtown area of the city, who find that the things that are important to them in their education, of keeping their schools open and providing for proper nursery school and nutrition programs for many of the immigrant children and native children, is important; providing alternatives in the educational school system for those who can't make it in our fancy suburban high schools. That was the issue that was being faced; that was the issue where they were asking for answers and when they started asking for answers they came up against the Provincial Government which has not in any way adapted itself to the fiscal requirements of the educational system; where the foundation grant has eroded year after year to where it now pays only about 50 percent of school costs; where when they look at the special problems being faced by the City of Winnipeg because it becomes the settling area of large numbers of native people coming in from the outside world, people coming in from the north, from the rural areas, immigrant groups and needing special income needs, special educational needs, and when you ask who's going to pay for it there was nothing but silence from that government.

That's the kind of issue that should be in this province, is how do we provide for a proper program of assistance and support for a decent educational system in our cities, in our municipalities - rather than laying on all these varieties of curriculum options and fancy brochures and so on, what we should really be asking is, how do we provide a consistent cohesive program of education to deal with special needs? And that wasn't being addressed in the Throne Speech. We didn't hear any words of wisdom about that and yet that is an issue and an issue that's got to be joint.

We did hear, Mr. Speaker, in another area of concern, in the area of housing. The Government said, "We are now going to undertake the most massive undertaking of public housing construction the province has ever seen." What they didn't mention, Mr. Speaker, is that we are one of the few provinces, I think one of only two provinces, which built fewer housing units in this province last year than we had the year before. That we weren't able to take the basic financial support provided by the Federal Government and build upon it through some form of imaginative provincial program. It simply lay there and sat there and as a result we fell further behind than we ever have been before. Because what it didn't mention is that we built fewer houses in 1975 than we built in 1974, and we built fewer in 1974 than we built in 1973, and we built fewer in 1973 than we built in 1972. And so what we should have been talking about is not a massive undertaking but a catch-up game; a game that was simply trying to compensate for the deficiencies that have been created over the past several years.

So, Mr. Speaker, I also want to raise the question saying: all right, let's recognize that the Government has come to the realization that it needs to provide for a catch-up program to bring up some proper supply of low and moderate income housing. Let's ask the question about how are they doing it? Well again we fall back to what has been the answer of this government from the start, an answer which is an incomplete answer, a singular answer, and that is we're going to build public housing. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker - let's not talk about all the other problems associated with it, let's simply talk about it as a matter of cost and a matter of what benefit accrues - I think what comes through very clear is that the amount of subsidies that must be built to support a public housing unit could probably provide two or three other units of low cost housing if it would have been diverted into other forms.

I've been interested, Mr. Speaker, in a report that comes from the Housing Committee of the Canadian Council of Social Development which has been probably the longest term group and organization in this country analyzing the problems of social housing. What they point out is that the net operating loss for a public housing unit is about \$1,130.00. That's the difference between what the economic rent might be and what

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) the actual receipts of rent would be in one of those units. It said, "If we consider the subsidy as the difference between what the units would rent for on the private market and the actual rents paid, the unit subsidy would be \$431.00." And, in fact, Mr. Speaker, when they go on to add up even further than that, the kinds of things that when you start building in the interest rates and the amortization and the capital for land, they go even further and they say that the financial loss of each public housing unit per year is \$4,303.00. That is the kind of subsidy that has to be supported. So I am not arguing, Mr. Speaker, against subsidy. But I am saying we can certainly get far more, far more housing units for low or moderate income people through alternative programs than we can by putting all our eggs in the one basket of public housing.

We need some public housing for senior citizens; we need some for families. But it must be spread on a much wider base. We should be using the amount of provincial money not just to build public housing but to make sure that there are more building lots in the City of Winnipeg so we could build lots in that area; that there was proper servicing of those lots and we provided other ways of trying to turn over and provide for proper use of existing home lots. That's what is called a housing policy. All we have is once more a recall back to the basic position that this government has taken from the very time it came in, that what we need is more public housing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what we need is an awful lot more housing but we need it finely tuned and we need it adjusted and adapted to different kinds of needs for different kinds of people at different income levels. We need a housing program that is not singular and one dimensional and tied into its particular blindness. We need the kind of program that uses a wide variety. When the Government says, well now we're making some concessions, we're going to do a little bit in co-op, well that again is not a total answer, Mr. Speaker. Because the kinds of arguments we've been making in this House for two or three years is the requirement to set up a form of lending on a provincial level for existing homes, for repair of homes, for alternative forms of low income housing, for the development of land projects. Not storing up land in banks but putting land available for housing right now, of assisting the municipalities with the servicing of storm sewers and roads and utilities so they can put land on the market. There is no provision in this province for that kind of program. We simply don't have a housing policy, Mr. Speaker, we have a singular housing program and that simply is not good enough. The reason is, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we've bothered to take a look at the realities of what's going on in the housing market. If we begin doing that then we may get a proper program.

I come, Mr. Speaker, then to a topic which has provided some interest at least to me and other members of our group, and that is the position that the government has taken in its so-called Urban Renewal Program in the central part of Winnipeg. We've looked around and said, now how do we go about dealing with an area which has deteriorated, which is in decline, and where people are on lowest incomes, and in fact, Mr. Speaker, where the discrepancy of position between those in the core area and those in the other areas of Winnipeg is growing, not being reduced, but in fact growing. The position, as members of this House will know, that we have taken for the past two years is the way to do that is attacking the problems of people; attacking the problems of jobs; education, and of individual housing units; providing the economic wherewithal to set up new economic enterprises in that area. Different kinds of manpower programs, the kind of resolutions we brought forward last year to give some incentive to the development of new community economic development corporations and new manpower training programs and enlisting the support of private industry in those efforts.

We have persisted, however, in this Legislature, in this Government, Mr. Speaker, in pursuing what the Premier said from his seat the other day was "good urban renewal". Well, I simply want to ask the Minister of Urban Affairs and perhaps the Minister of Public Works and perhaps the Premier to show how \$40 million being spent for an Autopac garage and office building and an environmental laboratory, will add one single job for core area residents, will provide any improvement in their income, will deal at all with

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) their educational requirements, will deal with the need for better policing and better fire protection and better servicing. The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is we don't have urban renewal going on in the core area; we have a form of urban colonialism, of groups moving from the outside in and insisting that their view of things - it's a form of urban imperialism where they are simply taking over. They will decide what's right; they will decide what the priorities are; they will spend the money according to what are their needs. I'm sure it will give some members of this House great satisfaction to realize that the officials of Autopac will now have more commodious accommodation, that we will now have a more distinguished courthouse in which to hear the cases. But the fact of the matter is that every single bit of evidence that has been acquired in this country for the past 15 years shows that they'll spend valuable capital, \$40 million worth, in the building of public edifices, of monuments to government public works, is in no way at all going to affect the lives of people in that area.

If you want to talk about how to deal with proper priorities - and the Member from Logan said earlier he was very critical of the fact that the City of Winnipeg was going to spend \$11 million for an arena. Well I would suggest that the Province of Manitoba is its full partner in many of those decisions. Who would agree to cost-share the Convention Centre when it escalated \$26 million and is having to cost-share a deficit of close to a million dollars this year. I'll tell you something, Mr. Speaker, that money would have gone a long way to providing text books for people in the central part of the city or programs dealing with their education or their jobs.

So I suggest that there might be more value speaking in your caucus about the kind of extravagant expenditures of capital that could be put to much better purposes in the City of Winnipeg than building provincial office buildings. That is simply not a way of aiding and assisting. It may be a way of adding to the particular public works empire of the Honourable Minister and it may be a way of again burnishing the historical memories of certain other members of that side as to the way things used to be. But we must begin learning from past mistakes and begin acquiring some reality of what's going on in the areas of our city.

A MEMBER: Does the Federal Liberal Party . . .

MR. AXWORTHY: That's right, Mr. Speaker. I fully agree. I fully agree with that. But the point that we're trying to make is that the investment of public capital must be done particularly in terms of what does it do either to create a better sense of equity or in fact becomes a good economic investment. The point I'm trying to make is that government can affect the economics. I think the Leader of the Opposition said before, "Government spending no way affects economic development." He is totally wrong. Government investment does affect it because government investment can affect it in terms of building the services that are required to provide a framework within which an economy can grow. But the experience in urban renewal in downtown cores is that government expenditures in those areas in capital works has no impact at all on the economic development of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the Honourable Leader of the Opposition have a point of privilege.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe the member said that I had suggested that government spending didn't affect economic development. I didn't of course say anything of the kind. I said that of total investment in the province last year, 33.4 percent was through utilities and primarily through the Manitoba Hydro. I suggested that the economic development in that case occupied over a quarter of our total economic development in capital investments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I stand corrected till the opportunity I have to see in Hansard what the correct definition was. But I believe that I had heard the Leader of the Opposition make that statement and we can refer to Hansard to see whose interpretation is the correct one.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE Cont'd

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the point I'm trying to make is, this Provincial Government has a very direct responsibility to aid the City of Winnipeg in its economic growth and its development, its ability to provide for future jobs and future economic business goals. It doesn't do it by the kind of forced growth methods that they have adapted to the core area the same way that other provincial governments have built CFIs and heavy water plants and Saunders Aircraft. That same kind of notion that you can make it quick if you only dump a lot of dough in real quick, that somehow you're going to sort of magnify things and it has nothing to do with ideology, it just has to do with obsolescence - obsolescence in thought and attitude. Where the kind of role the government can play, can be effective, is in ensuring that there are the basic services that go to stimulating economic growth: things like a good educational system and good transportation systems and good service systems and good research that is being supported in these areas. Those are the things that over the years have proven time and time again that's what creates growth; that's what creates development. Not these kind of will-o'-the-wisp searches for the pot at the end of the rainbow which has become so much a part of government expenditure of all kinds. Mr. Lougheed, sort of, in his investments and in Syncrude and Pacific West, and Mr. Regan who is a Liberal and his heavy water plants in Nova Scotia, I don't think there is a provincial government or in fact a federal government which is free of that kind of extravagant and abusive use of public money in investment. What we're trying to say, Mr. Speaker - to get back to the reality of things - there are things that government can do and do well to promote and develop economic health and stability in the community. But it is not the kind of extravagances that have been perpetrated time and time and time again in this province and in other provinces over the past couple of decades. I think that's the kind of reality the people want to hear about. That is the kind of options they want to look at. As I say, what works and what doesn't work, not the kind of divisions that we've been hearing time and time again in the debates of this House so far.

I would also like to say Mr. Speaker, a final point, that there are things the government itself can be doing even to put its financial house in order. We have become awfully sloppy in the way we go about dealing with money. By this I don't mean that we're necessarily trying to cut back on the numbers of civil servants but, I am saying that we've let an awful lot of money slip through our hands unnecessarily. I came across one example which I find disturbing; that while the school boards of this city and right across the province have in fact, been finding themselves strapped for funds - we have a system of grants in this province, Mr. Speaker, where the interest the Winnipeg schools must pay on bank loans simply to maintain operating grants in between the times that the province gives them money is close to \$6 million or \$7 million dollars. That would buy an awful lot of textbooks and hire an awful lot of teachers. Simply because the province isn't prepared, for whatever rationale it may have, to hold its money back or not to set up a reserve fund or to provide any way in which school boards can have some sort of bridge financing in order to pay their salaries and pay their costs; they must go to the commercial bank and simply add to the profit margin of private banks simply because of the way we manage money. It is those kinds of aberrations, those kinds of deficiencies I think people are interested in hearing about. That's the kind of thing that they want cleared up in the system. That's the kind of better management of government fiscal affairs that they're beginning to look at.

How do we in fact make the best use of the money that we invest? Not simply sort of trundle around and trickle it away simply because it's convenient or because, God knows what this government wants to do about it. The same thing that we saw last year in the administration of the Lotteries Commission, and by Gawd what we are going to see further this year. But here again is a way that the administration and management of substantial sources of money again is frittered away, where in fact when we went to Estimates last year, we couldn't even get answers to where it was going and who had it. We asked: where is the dividends from the Lotteries Commission and where is it being spent? Everyone would say, well I think it's in this fund and I think it's in that fund, but we can't tell you for sure. It's that kind of absence of mind and that kind of lack of

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) application of techniques of management and administration which I think again people in this province are much more concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, those are the kinds of options that this group is interested in. We will leave the kind of the grappling of the prehistoric syndrome of the coming of the death grapple, the sort of . . . of trying to establish who has a more precise definition of their particular philosophical concerns. Our group has been much more interested in this Session to provide an option to the people which attempts to examine problems as they are, to try to clear away the cobwebs and the fantasy and the fables and to continue, Mr. Speaker, offering alternative solutions. Trying to suggest that while the role of the prophet may not always be the most popular one, accepted one, if I go back to the opening statements of the Member from Wellington where he was quoting the Phrophet Isaiah as the man whom we should all listen to, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it may be well for other groups in this party which are now sort of content and smug about their own positions to begin listening to a few prophets and begin understanding that there are things being said that have some urgency and we have enough records and historical examples of people who began telling the emperor that they had no clothes. They finally began to discover that there is some merit and some virtue in being prepared to look in a very discerning way at what is going on and being prepared to say it with some conviction and some courage. While, Mr. Speaker, we recognize some of our own limitations, both of numbers at this time, to be able to fully pursue that particular role, we can still say to you, Mr. Speaker, that as the Session continues, we will attempt to the utmost of our efforts to try and provide that third option to the people in this province. So that when they grow tired - as I know they will - of the philosophical debate and the common room lectures that we're now beginning to hear from these so-called hard-nosed politicians who seem to have acquired a great academic sense of frivolousness lately, then I think that we will provide an option that will be listened to. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to begin by joining with the other members on extending our best wishes to the Member for Souris-Killarney. I have sat with him in this House for the past ten years and I must say quite sincerely that I miss him and that I wish him the best. I think he's one of the best natured and most likable members in the Assembly and I know that all of us wish him well and hope for his early return.

I would also like to congratulate the two new members, the Member for Wolseley and the Member for Crescentwood. I'm sure we're going to see some very different contributions from these two members, one being more radical on the right and the other one being more conservative on the right. It should be interesting to see whether there's going to be any improvement or growth, especially on the part of my old friend, the Member for Wolseley, whom I've known for a number of years, to see whether he's going to maintain a far right posture throughout the years in this House, or whether he might be improved like vintage wine by the comments of the members on this side. My colleagues say that he has only a year and a half to go, so we have our work cut out for us.

Mr. Speaker, I can't help but just making a brief comment or two on the remarks of the Member for Fort Rouge. I could speak at some length on his mental block in regard to public works buildings in regard to the urban core, but I'll leave most of that heavy work to my colleague, the Minister of Urban Affairs. I would simply say this, that the Federal Government which is strongly supported by the Liberal members in the House, they build a sufficient number of buildings throughout the country. I don't hear any particular hue and cry from the Liberal members of Manitoba about those policies. I hear only silence which I assume is tantamount to agreement. I also know that if we don't ourselves construct these facilities there are two alternatives: one is to not be able to operate the programs properly, not be able to service the public, or the alternative is to get the private sector to do it, have the private sector build the buildings and then the government would occupy the buildings. I assume that that kind of policy is more in tune with the thinking of the Liberal members and some of the Conservative members. They want the free enterprise sector to build the buildings and they want the Provincial Government to

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. DOERN cont'd) rent or lease. The net result would be the same though. You'd still have those buildings. You probably wouldn't have them located where some of the public representatives thought they would go; you'd probably have them where the business communities thought they would be best located.

In this particular instance we have had discussions with city council and we have come to an agreement that it would probably be in the best interests of the City of Winnipeg to locate those buildings in an older section of the city. The province certainly had the option of building them right downtown close to this building - we have property - or we could have gone into one of the suburban areas. But it was decided I think in the wisdom of all those representatives that it would be most helpful and most beneficial to the city as a whole - I don't say necessarily to the benefit of the people who live on that property that we wish to acquire - but for the benefit of most people. The old utilitarian slogan of Jeremy Bentham, etc. would probably be best in the interests of most people if they were built in those particular areas.

When the government in Ottawa decided that they were going to put up a new program, they were going to develop their new anti-inflation program, what's the first thing that they required Mr. Speaker? In addition to staff they had to go out and get 100,000 square feet of space. Well would my honourable friend deny them that? Would he say that they should not build or lease that kind of space? Would he have the civil servants running around the Parliament Buildings outside or operating out of a closet or a hallway? I don't think that that's a very feasible or desirable policy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Member for Riel on his ascension to power. This surely must be the high point in his political career because in fact he is not the Acting Leader in the Legislature he is in fact the Leader of the Opposition in this Assembly. I want to congratulate him on his achievement.

But I also have to ask him one favour. There's one thing that I would caution him on and one thing that I hope for, although I'm not too optimistic, and that is that I hope he doesn't adopt the rhetoric of the man on the chesterfield. Because I sat in this House for three years with the Leader of the Conservative Party of Manitoba outside the House and I listened to him many times in debate from the other side, and I must say that I heard the same vocabulary over and over and over again for three consecutive years and now it's coming back to me again. It certainly is haunting me. It's the same old words, Mr. Speaker, that have a wearing effect on a person and those words are something like this, the non-member of this Legislature continually says, he refers to "hoary old socialist marxist dogma". Those are the words. It's got to be hoary, has to be old, has to be either socialist or marxist and of course it's dogma. I submit that if those words were taken away from that man that he would have nothing to say. I really believe that if we took away those particular words which come again and again and again and again, that the man on the chesterfield would have nothing to say. He'd be speechless. You know, Mr. Speaker, when I think of his position, here we are the elected members sitting in the Legislature, representatives of the people, and there we have the other Leader of the Conservative Party sitting outside the Chamber as if we have a two-party - well not a two-party system, a two-Chamber system like in Britain. This is the Commons and there are the Lords and there's the representative from the House of Lords who's coming down to advise the Leader in the Commons. I sort of think of him in that particular way. Here he is, well Lord Lyon. I think of him as Lord Chesterfield who represents other people and represents other forces, I think, in our society, even in some ways different than the members on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, we have watched with considerable interest the developments concerning the Liberal Party over the past year. We are expert Conservative watchers and we have watched the evolution and shift of various people who have come and gone. I was elected first in the Roblin era. That was sort of a moderate or slightly left of right. They in the history of the Conservative Party of Manitoba right of this party of course but left relatively in the Conservative Party. Then there was a swing in the pendulum to the former Premier, Walter Weir. That had certain disastrous consequences. Then we had a sort of a shift back to the moderate right policies of the Member for River Heights,

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. DOERN cont'd) and now we have another swing back to the right with the present Leader of the Conservative Party. I predict personally that that is going to be with disastrous consequences. I personally welcome this shift and I know that in listening to the members they say they're going to make their policies crystal clear; they're going to set out the differences between their party and this party and I welcome that opportunity and I welcome the development of two clear-cut alternatives for the people of Manitoba to decide.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the fatal flaw in the opposition is the fact that they too accurately reflect the business interests of this province and there's no question that the present Leader is in fact a spokesman for "big business" in Manitoba. We know very well that he received a considerable amount of money and apparently still does receive a substantial amount of money, to the tune of \$3,000 per month.

A MEMBER: Is he earning it?

MR. DOERN: Well, is he earning it? I think that if I were one of the contributors I think I'd probably cut my contribution significantly. I would like to know incidentally about that amount, whether in fact that is the real amount. I know my friends don't know, they have a political party system which we don't have. I suppose we have people who go around collecting money, I know the Liberals do; it's an old practice, but they have a double bagman, he goes around with two bags, one bag is for the Party and one bag is for the Leader and nobody knows how much goes into that second bag.

A MEMBER: It's a big bag Russ.

MR. DOERN: Well I'll trade those bags any time, we'll give you the New Democratic Party money in exchange for the Conservative Party any time, any place. I give you a fixed offer in that regard.

So, Mr. Chairman, it would be interesting to know how much money is collected in that fund, and also whether that really is in fact the complete amount. I would be curious to know whether that's a "before" or "after" tax dollar; whether that's a gross figure or whether that in fact is a net figure, that would be interesting to see.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to improve some of the services in the House for the members of this House; this is something that I personally believe in, this is something that I've had support on. In regard to the Conservative Party, I think I'd have to point out that we have provided them with a larger office for their Leader, we are now attempting to provide them with additional space in which they can relocate their secretaries and provide additional space for their caucus, which somehow or other keeps getting larger every few years but doesn't quite have enough to creep over the government line.

MR. JORGENSEN: All you're doing is buying insurance for the next election.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of this House for a number of terms and I would like to focus on two areas in my speech: first, briefly on the importance of attracting and maintaining the best people in politics; and secondly, I would like to deal with what I regard as an outstanding - meaning, still to be achieved - an outstanding requirement, a major reform in political life, and that is the public funding of elections.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's an old saying that you don't get something for nothing, and this is one thing that has always concerned me in regard to political life. I maintain - and I have never backed down on this point, nor will I ever - that if you want to attract and retain good people you must be prepared to pay for them, and I believe that you must have good wages and good working conditions for people in political life just as you have to in the private sector.

On the first point, I would say that the MLAs are certainly not overpaid; they may be reasonably paid, they may be paid a fair amount, but they're certainly not overpaid, and I would also say that the Ministers haven't had a raise in eight years. Now I know I can't appeal to the members on the other side, but I'd simply point that out as a fact, that there has been no change in that regard for a number of years.

One of the things that has attracted some interest in the last few weeks is the fact that in the provision of amenities or the improvement of working conditions, finally after two years or longer we are finally about to open a decent members' dining room with an

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. DOERN cont'd) adjacent lounge area. It was some two years ago that we received approval in Cabinet for such a project, which was not only the provision of a space for MLAs but it was a combination, a new cafeteria for the civil service, a kitchen which would be larger than the two by six-foot operation downstairs. If you want to see an interesting kitchen, stick your head in that door sometime, you'll see under what a handicap the people who work there work under. And then in addition to that which is now completed, the third portion, which has been worked on for a number of months, which will be in effect a lounge area - not a cocktail lounge as some people mistakenly understood it, but a lounge similar to the one we had across the hall, only larger, where people will be able to come and relax and meet with people; and then a small dining room which will seat some 24 people, which will be in effect open to MLAs and their guests during the Session, possibly to the press, and inbetween Sessions will be open to everyone in effect, but it will be I think a proper facility which is found in a number of other provinces and found in the Federal Government.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I wonder if the gentleman would permit a question on that subject. I wonder if he could tell us what portion of his plans were recently scrapped by the Acting Minister of Public Works.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'll clarify that later. I think that these changes were long overdue. The cafeteria that we're providing serves some three to four hundred people in this building; the kitchen was completely inadequate from every standard or level that one could imagine, and the lounge that has been provided for MLAs for a number of years I think really proved to be inadequate for a member of the Legislature, to have an opportunity of eating a bag of potato chips and a chocolate bar for dinner seems to me to be a little below standard. There were times when we did provide cold sandwiches for those who wanted to go first class, but I hope that in a few weeks we'll be able to eat in relatively decent quarters.

Mr. Speaker, another fond wish of mine, which I'll mention only in passing, is for ten years I have spoken in favour of air conditioning this building. I've still not been able to fight that plank or program through my own government, but I recall ten years ago standing up and asking for decent air conditioning in this building. The Conservative Government of the day didn't feel they could hazard that policy; our government still is reluctant to implement it, but some day in the future I think those of us who work in this building will be able to survive the hot Manitoba summers.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn to the question that I most want to focus on, and that is the need as I see it, the long overdue need of providing some public funding of elections. It wasn't too long ago that I read an editorial in the Free Press - in fact I must say the Free Press certainly does provide some amusement for us at times, as does the Tribune. I just couldn't believe this article from yesterday's paper. This was an article on Page 3 of the Free Press. "Liberals Display Harmony". And do you know that this article should have really been on the editorial page. It said that although the Conservatives were patching up their differences, there was no doubt that the Liberal Party was in complete harmony between their Leader, Mr. Huband, and their House Leader. And they said that this was demonstrated crystal clear by the fact that when Mr. Huband delivered a speech one day, a few days later when Mr. Johnston spoke, he repeated that speech word for word.

A MEMBER: That's performance.

MR. DOERN: That's performance. They said that, would you believe that on a word for word basis the House Leader completely agreed with his true Leader. I don't call that harmony, I call that an ability to read.

A MEMBER: Great minds think alike.

MR. DOERN: Now we know that the former House Leader has problems a few years ago when he used to read the speeches drafted by I. H. Asper, he had a hard time. I think his low point in that regard, the problem of reading a speech prepared for you - either by someone else, sometimes maybe even reading your own writing - but the

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. DOERN cont'd) problem there was sometimes the words are not your words and sometimes you can trip over them. And I'll always remember the member talking about some exaggerated point and finally slanning his fist down and saying, "That, Sir, is hyper bole!" And for a moment there I thought he was talking about saniflush or something, I couldn't quite put the two together, but apparently he meant "hyperbole" and should have had a dictionary with him at that time.

Mr. Speaker, the Free Press said a few weeks ago in January, I think January 21st, that they were against any system whereby the public purse would provide funds for candidates, they went with the old system. And you know, Mr. Speaker, it's a fact that I think all of us are aware of, that there are times, there are times when money can swing an election; there are times when it can't, but there's a crucial period in elections when I think an influx of money to buy TV time, radio time, full page ads, and a distribution of pamphlets can have a substantial effect on an election. And I think that it's imperative that the democratic process which says one man one vote is not undermined by the dollar; that the people who are deciding who they should vote for should not be unduly influenced because one candidate has a great deal of money and another candidate has very little. Now I myself do not think that private contributions should be ruled out from election periods. I believe in the role of an individual who wants to involve himself in a political campaign. I believe that a person who wants to contribute money, either in addition to working or in lieu of working, should have a right to do so. But I believe in a floor and the need for a minimum floor based on a Party's record or based on the outcome on the basis of number of votes achieved in an election.

Now why do I say this? Well, I think all you have to do is read a few stories that appear in the papers. For example, a lot of us have been reading about the Lockheed Corporation recently. They have been spreading millions of dollars around through various countries and are now having a meeting with the Minister of Defence to explain how really their contracts shouldn't be taken away from them. You know, I found it very interesting. I saw a reporter talking to a top Lockheed official and he said, "Wouldn't you say that this was a bribe?" And he said - let me see, how did he word this now. He asked him, I think, whether it was a bribe, and he said well, his understanding was a bribe is where you sort of gave money in advance and then expected a favour. He said, what they were doing is, I think, giving money after they had received a contract. They preferred to call it a kickback rather than a bribe.

Gulf Oil in an article in Time magazine of December 1975, an article called, "Gulf Oils Misplaced Gifts". They apparently had a \$10 million slush fund which one medium executive used to give out. They didn't know anything about it, they didn't know where this money went, no sir. It's just like some of these trust funds that the Liberals and Conservatives have. They have these trust funds and they don't know anything about it, Mr. Speaker; they don't know who gave the money, they don't know where the money came from, they don't know why it was given, they're just completely ignorant. And this is the same thing with Gulf Oil. Would you believe that the top executives haven't got the faintest idea who gets that money or for what purpose, they just give that \$10 million to somebody, some clerk in the mailing room, and he just runs around and gives it to whoever he thinks, hopefully in the best interests of the corporation. Well, that's pretty hard to believe, but that's what they said.

I also have an article here from a respectable business publication, "Fortune Magazine", from December 1973 on election financing, and they have a list of people here who gave to - in those days - the Nixon campaigns and the McGovern campaigns. It's interesting to note the amounts of money that they gave. A gentleman named Clement Stone gave \$2 million to Richard Nixon, just out of the goodness of his heart; Richard Melon gave a million, someone else gave \$300,000, 262,000. The Democrats weren't quite as well off but they did get 400,000 from one gentleman; 284,000 from another; 206,000 from another; 133,000 from another; and 126,000 from a third. Why do they give this money? Well, there's various explanations given. One man said that they didn't give the money because they expected favours, they gave the money to protect themselves from having something done to them. It was kind of a little protection money there to make

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. DOERN cont'd) sure that legislation wasn't too unfavourable.

Well we've had, Mr. Speaker, legislation on the books that asks for disclosure, and what is the result? Well, Frances Russell in December 1974 said that she dug into it and the Conservatives said that they only had a single donor. There was only one source of Conservative Party funds and you know, surprise, surprise, it was the Conservative Party of Canada. That's it, they got all their money from them. The Liberals, they had a single donor too, just one donor, it was a trust fund. So there's no way, you know, that we would want to delve into a trust fund. And obviously the idea is that - I would say if that doesn't violate the letter of the law of Manitoba, it certainly violates the spirit to establish a trust fund and to use that to block any public inquiries or any public disclosure.

Mr. Speaker, the program that I want to put before you has the support of a number of people in the Assembly. The Premier of Manitoba has gone on record as favouring a program of election funding; and no less a member than I. H. Asper said two years ago that he was calling for a number of major reforms, he listed 14 electoral reforms. You know, he was even more radical than I am, he was even more left wing than the Premier, more radical than the New Democratic Party that just had a convention. I just want to show you how conservative we are in this issue. He said this, "Financing of elections should be taken out of private hands"; he said two years ago in November, "Instead an independent electoral commission headed by the Chief Justice of Manitoba should determine how much money each candidate requires to inform voters about himself, his objectives, his Party and its policies, and that that should be then doled out or brought about by tapping the general revenues of the province - and he also said there should be publicly financed constituency offices. Well, I don't know if I could go that far, but I would certainly consider it. I would like to see whether the present members of the Liberal Party would even go half-way, because that is only as far as I am asking them to go, to go for a program whereby half of the funding in an election would come from the public purse and the other half would come from private contributions. You know some . . . Sure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, just in reference to the statement made by the Minister, could he inform us as a member of the government what has happened to the resolution that was put forward and passed by this Assembly two years ago, put forward by this Liberal group asking for those very same things and referred to the Law Reform Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Sorry, I did not understand the question. Could you repeat it?

MR. AXWORTHY: Let me repeat the question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister. As a member of the government could he tell us what has been the result of the resolution that was put forward by Liberal members of this House two years ago asking for those very same reforms, which was passed by this House and referred to the Law Reform Commission. Could he tell us when we might expect some results from that resolution.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what's happening in the Law Reform Commission, but I am hopeful that the government might bring forward some legislation in that regard this Session. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

MR. SPEAKER: Eight minutes.

MR. DOERN: Thanks. I would now like to attempt to outline a sort of general program which could be considered for a policy of public funding. As I said, I believe that there should be a maximum which we now have, but I also believe that there should be a floor, and I would say that's easily arrived at. You take the maximum money allowed in each constituency per voter, which we now have, I think 50% of that should be provided by the public and 50% should be raised by the constituency or the candidate or the money put up by himself. Now some people I know are going to say, you know this is going to provide money for some people that we don't like. For instance, I know that Conservatives when they realize that some public money is going to the New Democratic Party will find that hard to swallow, and I know that certain taxpayers who realize that they are funding the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party they'll find that hard to swallow. But, you know, it's just like income tax I guess, all of us contribute to income

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. DOERN cont'd) tax and I don't think there is any way that any one in this House would say he agrees entirely with all the policies of the Federal Liberal government. I don't know, maybe the Liberal MLA's would, but most of us looking at the Federal scene would say, you know, there are some programs that we don't like; we don't withhold on that basis, we contribute our taxes and the government in its wisdom decides the policies and we just have to go along with it.

I also know, Mr. Speaker, that this would not be an expensive program. Some people would say, well it's going to cost money, and I can think of programs that would cost I guess anywhere from about three or four hundred thousand dollars to programs that might cost three quarters of a million or as much as a million, but that strikes me as a very small amount of money indeed. When you consider that there is a million people in this province, if the public purse provided a half a million or a million dollars to the political parties of Manitoba once every four years or whatever the system was that was arrived at, that is not a great deal of money. One dollar per capita over four years is 25¢ a year and I think that that would be money extremely well spent. I think it would limit the amount of influence, the unfair influence, the undue influence that some big contributors have to political parties. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that some of the members on the other side would agree with me on that, that they themselves might feel that there's an unhealthy influence when large contributions are made by individuals or indirectly from corporations or trade unions or whatever; that they feel that there is something a little too catchy in that regard, too binding perhaps on the political party, and that this would provide more freedom and more scope.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I could go on at length and explain a variety of proposals that I have in that regard, but I think I'll save some of my comments for members of my own caucus and my own Party, and I hope to persuade them, persuade them as I am hoping to persuade you at the same time, convince some of those old veterans, anyone who might have a rigidity in their thinking. I would simply sum it up by saying that I think it's important that people realize that you don't get something for nothing, and although--(Interjection)--and that this kind of a program, Mr. Speaker, is found in one form or another in part in the United States of America where candidates for President get part of their funds now, matching funds from the public purse. Apparently in Italy and Argentina, in West Germany and Sweden, they have a program of public funding; and in our country the Federal Government provides some monies as we do provide some monies for mailing, etc., which is very helpful and I think a good step forward. Nova Scotia provides funds to people, 25¢ per registered elector if you get 15 percent of the total votes in your riding. Quebec, they have 20 percent of the total votes cast as the minimum. In Saskatchewan, you need 15 percent of the total votes in your riding, I assume you get money. And in Ontario - Ontario, the bastion of free enterprise, the crumbling bastion, but nevertheless the bastion of free enterprise in Canada - they are going to have a 2-dollar check-off per taxpayer. So I think, Mr. Speaker, if this variety of the Federal Liberal Government, the Conservative Province of Ontario; Nova Scotia - what's their government again, what Party is that? - Liberal; and Saskatchewan which is New Democratic; Quebec which is Liberal, if all these provinces of different political views can have a program of public funding, so can Manitoba, and I would ask some of the members opposite to support this program because I believe that they too would benefit from it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, for the convenience of the House, I know my honourable friend would not want to be interrupted, you may call it at 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The hour for the Supper Hour being now agreed to, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m.