

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, February 7, 1974

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. McKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise tonight in support of the subamendment which was raised by the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party, and also rise in support of the amendment which was presented to the Legislature on behalf of my Leader and the Party, in reply to the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker. And may I first of all, Mr. Speaker, which is the tradition in this House, congratulate you on being elected to the highest office which we can bestow on any member of this House and wish you every success as you try to guide us through this thirtieth Session of the Manitoba Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I read many of the parliamentary debates that have gone on in the role of a speaker and I wonder from time to time what is the complete role of a Speaker, and you have fulfilled the duties of this House most adequately. But, Mr. Speaker, the government has the money and they have the power, and I think as long as you let us, the Opposition, voice our sentiments from time to time we'll have a good session.

Mr. Speaker, may I at this time congratulate the mover and the seconder in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I recognize their nervousness and the tension, every member when he comes into this Chamber and makes his first speech indicates some nervousness or traits, because you must remember that we're only 57 people here representing all the people of Manitoba. It's not as you will sit here a little longer find out that it is a political arena and it's survival of the fittest in this Chamber and while there's a sort of an unwritten rule that we don't, we don't attack the new members, we let them get their feet on the ground, but after that it's fair game and let me warn you new members that when you stand up in this Chamber try and prepare yourselves. I'm one of the poorest members of the Legislature. --(Interjection)--Well the First Minister in the election campaign said I was the worst. Well we'll leave that, that's history and I'll not dwell on it.

Let me also congratulate the new Ministers that were elevated to the portfolios of Cabinet. May I on behalf of the people of Roblin constituency wish you every success and I hope that you will guide the people not only of Manitoba and my constituency in the many requests for your services that are required from time to time as we try to deal with the many problems that surround us from day to day.

Mr. Speaker, my speech tonight is going to be one in dealing with two aspects of the Speech from the Throne. The one is the neglect of this government to talk about inflation. There's one little remark I believe in the second paragraph where he mentions something here, "even after discounting for the effects of inflation." That's the only mention of inflation in this great document. My second quarrel with the government and the First Minister will be the cost of living is not mentioned in this document in any shape or form. So, Mr. Speaker, with your permission I will try to pursue those two endeavours.

There are certain aspects of the speech, Mr. Speaker, that I support and I am sure that I speak on behalf of the people of Roblin constituency where we are certainly pleased about the extension of legal aid in this province. We're also happy to note certain changes are mentioned in structure and administration of certain social allowance formula that will be indexed to the allowances and these people that are caught in the bind will not be trying to survive on some of the social allowances that are being provided to some of the people in this province that can't make it by themselves. I think this is long overdue, and in fact I would even go further, Mr. Speaker, and suggest that we should have a complete new structure and a complete review of that formula.

Mr. Speaker, I also support and the people of Roblin support the theme in the speech urging welfare recipients to search out full employment. I think every member of the Legislature would be happy if we could find some way that those that are not able to shift for themselves today and have problems economically and otherwise that we would be able to gain full employment for them.

I would also support the denticare concept for children 16 or 12, I don't know where the bill's going to be or the formula, but we have one problem on that concept in rural Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, we haven't got no dentists. That's gone on in Roblin constituency for days and years on end and I don't know how we're going to resolve that one. We'll meet that when we arrive at it, Mr. Speaker.

## THRONE SPEECH

(MR. McKENZIE Con't)

I also support the pleas that are noted in the Speech from the Throne regarding the care of the mentally ill and I'm sure that when my speech is over that I will prove of the tax dollars that this government has collected by rip-off, the theme of the great leader of the New Democratic Party, the national Leader, he alleges that the Corporations are ripping off the taxpayers, I in my speech tonight will be suggesting and trying to prove to you that this government is ripping off tax dollars due to inflation in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would move into that theme very quickly. There's a complete neglect in this speech for inflation and the cost of living in this province which in my opinion and the people of my constituency are the two great issues that are facing this province and Canada today. And I would say to you tonight, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of this Legislature which is a speech that I made last year, this is something that we've got to attack. We've got to stand up as members of this Legislature and people in this province, somebody's got to attack inflation. We're not going to let it run rampant forever. What's the future for your children or your grandchildren if we support a 9 percent concept on the cost of living index for inflation. Is that going to go on forever? My God. Just imagine the heritage that you're passing over, but nobody wants to talk about it. Government doesn't want to talk about it. No, No. And the Federal Government doesn't want to talk about it, because why? First of all, in the Federal set-up Lewis is in bed with Trudeau and he's talking about corporate rip-offs and with this 9 percent inflationary factor, Mr. Speaker, who's ripping the country off today on tax dollars? Who are the corporate rip-off people? This government that's sitting right over here today, Mr. Speaker; who a few years ago on sales tax, their revenue from sales tax was x numbers of dollars. How many dollars are they ripping off the public today on sales tax, on gasoline tax. And let's lay it on the table and be fair to the people.

Mr. Speaker; do you find in this document any tax relief for the people of this province? It's not even mentioned, Mr. Speaker. No tax relief. With the corporate rip-off that this government is taking today, the NDP corporate government rip-off 9 percent tax dollars and there's no mention of tax relief. Mr. Speaker, it alarms me, it alarms me that this government with all their wisdom and all their ability and all the economists that they got over there, and here's the little sentence that's mentioned in the Speech from the Throne: "Even after discounting for the effects of inflation" and its. . . set in agriculture, the only mention. The only mention, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I ask the First Minister of this province, and I ask the government of this province who are the treasury boys, the guys that have the purse, can you pass over or discount the inflationary factor in this province today? Is it a serious problem in your minds? --(Interjection)-- If so why wasn't it mentioned? It's not mentioned, Mr. Speaker, for the simple reason that the rip-off, the corporate rip-off, the government rip-off that they're getting through inflation of tax dollars in this province, they don't want to talk about it. They don't want to even put the figures on the table. No way. Sure blame me. Mr. Speaker, the extremely high cost of living that the people of this province are having to face today -- I'm a storekeeper and I know what I'm talking about -- that's a serious matter. That's a serious matter. And when there's such a brief, you know, a brief mention of inflation and nothing about cost of living at all in that document, Mr. Speaker, I become very unhappy with this government. Because they don't know, I guess, that the people of this province have a, they got a problem. How is a guy that comes into my store he's only got five bucks gonna live today? A loaf of bread and a pound of butter is how much money today? Eighty-four cents for a pound of butter and 31 cents for a loaf of bread; 84 cents for a pound of butter in a store in Inglis and 31 cents for a loaf of bread: A buck and a quarter and how long will that last him? Now they oh, I can see right away, Mr. Speaker, they know what I'm talking about because they live in this illusion of socialism and dreamers and philosophy, but let's get back to the hard-nosed business of economics and common sense, Mr. Speaker. And they haven't got it. They're not even mentioning inflation or the high cost of living in this province anywhere in this Speech from the Throne. And Mr. Speaker, the seriousness of this implication which is slowly but surely strangling and destroying the people's ability to pay their own bills and to provide for themselves is something that every member in this Legislature must be serious about because if we're not, we're not good MLA's. Unless we can stand up in this Legislature,

## THRONE SPEECH

(MR. McKENZIE Con't). . . Mr. Speaker, and make that an issue, and make the cost of living an issue we shouldn't be here. We don't deserve to be elected to represent our people and talk about these other matters because those are the number one and two priorities in this province today. I'm really upset about the First Minister and his government and the lack of mention of those factors in that document.

Mr. Speaker, are the people of this province to assume -- are we to assume from reading that speech from the Throne that the 9 percent inflationary factor is part and parcel of our everyday life forever? Are we going to transfer that factor to our children and our grandchildren? Mr. Speaker, surely somebody in this great Dominion of Canada has got the guts and courage to stand up and fight it. And I'm offering my service tonight to this government and I ask the First Minister to get his government and let's fight inflation and the cost of living until we've got no more breath. (Applause) Are we going to sit back and saddle our children with that tax load forever, and let this government rip-off those tax dollars which they're getting and you never deserve them.

A MEMBER: And never earned them.

MR. McKENZIE: No. But their great leader, Lewis, the great leader of the NDP, he stormed this country from coast to coast in the last election -- corporate rip-off, corporate rip-off, NDP talking about corporate rip-off. Who is ripping more tax dollars off this province than anybody? That government that's sitting right over there. And, Mr. Speaker, show me any mention of it in that document. None whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I know you will sympathize with me. They don't over there. But, Mr. Speaker, I again repeat to the members of this Legislature the cost of living index and the inflationary factor deserves the full attention of this House for all the days that we're here sitting, and let me remind you if we don't assume those responsibilities and duties we shouldn't be here. Because that's the thing that's number one on the tongue of every citizen in this province. Oh, Mr. Speaker, they still don't believe me, but let me put the facts on the table, Mr. Speaker, and maybe they will believe what I'm talking about.

Let me remind them, Mr. Speaker, through you, three years ago, three years ago, the consumer price index in this province, and across Canada, was increasing at an annual rate of three and one-third percent, and I think those figures are factual and they're accurate. But by the first of November, 1974, Mr. Speaker, it had increased to almost nine percent --(Interjection)-- or '73. Pardon me, '73. Nine percent. Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, even that rate that I'm quoting which on the consumer index was wild, look at the rate of the wholesale level. In nineteen hundred -- three years ago, 1970, the rate at the wholesale level was 1.3 percent. Where was it last November? Twenty-seven percent at the wholesale level. Now what caused those problems? Rip-off of tax dollars. Over-taxing the people. Not listening to what the people are telling you. This government is to blame the same as the one in Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Federal Government because you can't go on spending people's tax dollars forever. --(Interjection)-- I'll get to that in my speech, give me time, and I'll prove it. But, Mr. Speaker, imagine that credible increase from 1970 to 1973 at the wholesale level, from 1.3 to 27 percent. Mr. Speaker, I say that the worst is yet to come. The worst is yet to come, Mr. Speaker. We're only starting to get - this ball is really getting bigger and bigger and do you mean to tell me we're not going to stand up and attack it? That this government hasn't got the guts and courage to put it in the Speech from the Throne that it is a concern of the people of this province? Cost of living and inflation is not a concern. Mr. Speaker, it's a very serious matter. I think we're at a stage in our history in this province, and Canadians are at a stage when I think governments at all level, provincial and federal, have got to stand up and meet it head on. Sure we may say, as the honourable member from Logan said the other day that it's a world problem. Are we going to stay with it forever and just agree that that's never going to change? Somebody somewhere has got to stand up and say we're going to deflate it --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, I just ask the honourable members opposite because they're the government, they've got the purse and their tax - they're the ones that take this corporate rip-off or this government rip-off of our taxpayers, because I bet you, Mr. Speaker, this year their treasury is just loaded with money.

Just imagine on sales tax. In my store two years ago I used to sell a pair of bluejeans to an ordinary guy like me for \$5.95. Do you know what they are today? Sixteen bucks. A

## THRONE SPEECH

(MR. McKENZIE Con't). . . pair of cotton --(Interjection)-- No, no Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, look at the rip-off that they got off that pair of overalls. Let me tell you about a pair of combination, GWG combination which I sell in my store. They were \$9.95 in 1970. Do you know what they are today, Mr. Speaker? They're twenty bucks. Look at the rip-off; look at the corporate rip-off that they're getting on the sales tax on those overalls. The government rip-off of tax dollars. And that's only a few items that I sell. And the First Minister sits over there with his mouth wide open in awe and doesn't realize that his treasury is bulging with those tax dollars that they're taking off the people of this province.

A MEMBER: You tell him, Wally.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, are we going to continue to allow this inflationary factor or this high cost of living in this province to just run rampant and let the whole world destroy itself? Or are we going to be honest to God, members and citizens of this province and Canadians and stand up and fight it. I'm prepared and the people of Roblin constituency are prepared to stand behind me and we'll give you all the resources we've got to fight it. Every day. Mr. Speaker, you know, some days, Mr. Speaker, I have confidence in government --(Interjection)-- No, this government here has done a lot of good for the people of Manitoba and I congratulate them for it and I've done it every time. I also congratulate the government before the government because any government has moved this province and I congratulate -- I always have and I always will. But other days, Mr. Speaker, after crisis such as Watergate, England's disaster today, the Middle East oil crisis, violence, revolution, kidnapping, bombings, my gosh, wild strikes, you know, there are days that were not very happy in the Roblin constituency, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that most of the members of the Legislature can sympathize with our feelings. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that if we get back to make common sense to make this province, Manitoba, a great place where people are going to come here and live and take part in this province's development, we must attack those two problems, the inflationary factor and the cost of living, and not let this government get away with the rip-off of tax dollars that they are charging the people of this province today.

Mr. Speaker, I just wonder. . .

A MEMBER: Oh, keep quiet and listen to the man.

MR. McKENZIE: Does the honourable member want to speak?

A MEMBER: Oh keep quiet, sit down.

MR. TURNBULL: . . . increase in the cost of blue jeans which results in increased profits for a company and a five percent increase in the tax yield on that increase is a corporate rip-off or a government tax rip-off.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, as you can recognize, I'm always willing to yield to a Minister of the Crown. I've always done that, Mr. Speaker, and I always will. Let me remind the honourable member first to come out and spend a weekend with me in my store and I'll explain it to him in great length what (applause). Mr. Speaker, I'll also explain to him that I'm still selling those blue jeans in my store at \$6.95 that I bought three years ago, they're not at \$15.95 like a lot of people. . .

SOME MEMBERS: Ohhhhhh. . . . .

MR. McKENZIE: They are not.

A MEMBER: Careful.

MR. McKENZIE: . . . and I ask you to come and check my stock any day. But nevertheless let me remind you that that same package of jeans today are 15 - and who are you, you're the one that's ripping the people of this province on those tax dollars with a sales tax, and --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member of Consumer Affairs wants to be fair, why not just lower the sales tax and let's take it as it was three years ago on the \$6.95; it's 16 bucks today. Let's drop the sales tax. . . increase of \$10.00 and go back to where we were, and I'll support that resolution if you'll bring it in, Mr. Minister. And so a lot of people in this province. In fact I think everybody'll support it, and that's what I'm talking about. You're the government that's getting the rip-off, the government rip-off. . . stormed this country from coast to coast talking about this corporate rip-off. My God, Mr. Speaker, who's the worst rip-off people, the NDP themselves in this Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, to answer -- I hope the Minister got his answer.

## THRONE SPEECH

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. McKENZIE: But, Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter, you know, they're laughing and chuckling away as though it isn't happening. It's real, Mr. Speaker, it's real, and it's a real problem, it's a real problem. I happen to be a merchant that sells goods and services across the counter, and I can see people who used to get a bag of groceries like that for five bucks. You know what it is today? Twelve and 15 for that same bag of groceries. And do you know what? I have to take stuff out of those bags today because they haven't got the money in their pockets -- a few years back they had it. But they can't - the average citizen today can't afford an ordinary living under this tremendous cost of living increase that we've had in the past three years. What these other things -- what I'm trying to appeal to the government, let's quit ripping off these people with all those tax dollars that you're draining off them - gasoline tax, sales tax, tobacco tax, and let's name a whole bunch more --(Interjection) -- No, I'm not speaking about sugar. Mr. Speaker, did I raise the subject of sugar?

A MEMBER: Just groceries. Just groceries.

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

MR. McKENZIE: But Mr. Speaker, as I stand in this Legislature tonight in this 30th session of the Legislature, I say that in the United States, in Canada, the USA and France, I'm willing to admit that rising inflation with all its perils is essentially a problem, but the people that I talk to and the information that I get, it's basically government made. Government are the people that created this, this disease. Government are the people.

The last two decades of our history, Mr. Speaker, have seen an unarrested acceleration in the growth of government spending, and I don't think we--this Legislature here, Mr. Speaker, proves that. Enormous growth of bureaucracy. We have that right here in Manitoba, Mr. -- it doesn't only happen in France, it's happening right here; and government assuming more and more power and control over its people. Now, what kind of people do you think is the average citizen in this province? Is he not able to look after himself or does he have this. . . to be this great big NDP government come and say, we'll look after you, we'll take all your dollars, we'll rip off your tax dollars and clean out your hip pocket, then we'll look after you.

Mr. Speaker, the end result of that kind of growth can be evidenced all across this province today, because it doesn't matter where you go, there's people being taxed and taxed and taxed and taxed, and they're all unhappy. And are they living any better than they did 20 years ago?

A MEMBER: No way.

MR. McKENZIE: We've got evidence, Mr. Speaker, since this government took over of more and more labour legislation, promoting the growth of unions and wage demands. And, Mr. Speaker, I support -- Mr. Speaker, let me finish my argument. I support all those demands of labour as long as they can meet the productivity that has to go with it, because I'm a businessman. And, Mr. Speaker, I'll provide the labour people any man today that wants to go out on strike, if he can produce, tell me, or satisfy me that if I give him an increase his salary he can produce more dollars so I can pay him, I'm all for it. And we of the Conservative Party have never quarreled with that concept, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, these may not be the only factors, Mr. Speaker, in this monetary and economic crisis. Well, here's the great Minister of Autopac that's standing up. Now there's the classic example of a Minister that's really . . . this province, and has made--(Interjection)--no, this is the one over here--and I'll deal with that at a later day in the House, Mr. Speaker, And I'm going to read that Minister back some of his speeches about Autopac, where he stormed this province about this great -- we'll deal with that another day, Mr. Speaker. But who's paying the 14 million bucks? You? The Premier? No sir, it comes right out of the taxpayers of this province, and there--that's part of the inflationary problem; that's part of the disease where a bunch of bureaucrats or Ministers can stand up and spend taxpayers' dollars just like that, and they don't even know what they're spending them for. That dollar never earned one tax dollar in this province; it cost somebody, and that's why some people that come to my store are short of money today because that Minister -- cost the taxpayers of this province 14 million bucks. And it can go on and on, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: It will. It will.

## THRONE SPEECH

MR. McKENZIE: It will. And of course as I said earlier for the past 20 years we've been spending a larger and larger share of our dollars -- into what? Services. And this started in the post war period, Mr. Speaker, where we're spending dollars today for services, and that as distinguished from things is two different worlds, two different worlds. Food now, Mr. Speaker, in this province of Canada only requires 17 percent of the total expenditures of our people, 17 percent. And do you know what, Mr. Speaker? That's the lowest rate of civilization all across the world, right here in this country of Canada. And it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, when you delve into the subject, our most rapidly rising categories for these huge expenditures what these guys are spending and the Federal Government has been spending for the last 20 years have been education and social services, health services. Categories that put little, relatively little pressure on our resources, except on the taxpayers. It doesn't tax -- those services don't tax their resources, they tax the taxpayers.

And, Mr. Speaker, I read several reports on economists that today are blaming this terrible social housing and economic problems and all this blundering of our urban society and our rural society, they're blaming it on the capitalistic system and free enterprise. And, you know, these guys do -- they all joined that club. But, Mr. Speaker, I can't buy that argument -- no way, because if you check out the areas, Mr. Speaker, in which people are facing problems economically or socially, all across Manitoba and all across Canada, and to our neighbors across the border to the south, you know what you'll find, that those people that are facing those problems, they got cars, they got television sets, they got a refrigerator, they got a stove, they got a lawn mower, they got a skidoo likely, and those are all goods and services which the free enterprise system has provided those people right in their backyards. The part that hasn't been delivered are these dreamers over here, these socialists that are supposed to deliver the social services and the education. The free enterprise system has delivered. You go and check your ghettos and check the people that are having problems socially today, they've got cars, they've got TV, but the problem is because those dreamers across there, Mr. Speaker, have not been able to deliver all this educational dream that we've got today. And look at the money and the health and social services, you have not been able to deliver, and it's costing the people of this country \$16.5 billion a year, and you still haven't been able to deliver. But I say it's the free enterprise, and I've always been a free enterpriser; we have delivered those people the goods and services which the free enterprise system was set up for it; it's right in their backyard today.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, tonight in this debate and reply to the Speech from the Throne, that the private sector of the free enterprise system has worked well in those areas, and it is in my opinion the distribution system for its public service, health service, and those other services, which has broken down, and therefore those that are the creators and believers in that system must assume the blame for the whole serious matter and the problem. And where does all that problem -- it goes back to the high cost of living and the inflationary factor. And, Mr. Speaker, they again, of course, they're dreaming over there. I don't think there's a businessman in the whole gang over there... Is there anybody across there's ever been into -- no. Oh yeah, Pete says he has -- once. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine how they can have a caucus and deal with business matters when there's only one guy that's ever been into business field? Can you imagine how they're going to deal with the problems of this province when they've only got one man that's had experience in business in their caucus, and he's not even in the Cabinet. Mr. Speaker, there is exactly what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, that they don't know, those people don't know that there's a cost of living problem in this province today, nor basically are they concerned about that in inflation. Of course I say, Mr. Speaker, as I stand here tonight, the expectations of the people of this province and Canada can be translated quite easily into things. We all want to be clean; we want clean water; we want clean air; we all want good standards of health; we want the structure of a more equitable, social structure in this province, we want a better quality of education for our kids. There's no quarrel with that at all, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, to satisfy the demands and the aspirations, we need enormous funds of money, 16.5, can you believe that? We fought the last World War.

A MEMBER: We did?

MR. McKENZIE: Yes. What was Canada's budget in the dying days of the war? I just

## THRONE SPEECH

(MR. McKENZIE Con't). . . ask you. It wasn't 16.5 billion bucks, but here we are living -- supposed to be in a quiet, easy day, rich country in the world, and that \$16.5 billion budget for two items which the socialists say that they can deliver, but they never have been able -- and less now with the inflationary factor, Mr. Speaker. They can do it because they can get the rip-off. The government rip-off of those tax dollars which they're not entitled to, and I ask this government, let's lower the sales tax, let's get some of these taxes off the people's back in this province because they can't survive otherwise.

The Honourable Minister from Autopac who created that dream, and we'll talk about that one again another day.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, the only way that I know, and that most of the people in my constituency that I've talked with in Roblin know, that we can continue to stimulate such a structure for our future is to combine our wealth through growth and expand industrial development, especially in rural Manitoba where it's nil, and all across the rural areas of western Canada with a built-in system to put on the brakes on inflation. And I think if we attack that and move in that direction, we will solve some of those problems.

I think, Mr. Speaker, also, and the people of my constituency tell me, that governments at the federal and provincial level are going to have to provide Canadians with increased social benefits. And that's some way, but Mr. Speaker, to do this, how are we going to do it? We face an enormous tax load. Aw, the Premier's chuckling away, but let me finish my statement, because we face a -- but if we continue to let inflation run wild and we're not willing to attack the cost of living index, what's the use? What's the use? Are we going to continue to let this government rip-off sales tax, income tax, gas tax, tobacco tax? I would just like to know, since the price of tobacco's gone up, what your increase in taxation is on tobacco? What's your increased tax on gasoline? What's your increased tax on sales tax. What's on building materials? The increase on the share dollars back and forth from Ottawa to Canada - 12 percent building tax today in this province is ridiculous; it makes me sick. A guy today wants to build a house and the first thing he faces is a 12 percent building tax, a federal tax on materials, and that should have been off long ago. And if it isn't taken off, we don't deserve to be in this Legislature, at least we should fight for it and make damn sure it's taken off, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, I know I've only two minutes, but in closing my remarks, may I ask the members of this Legislature to join me and the people of Roblin constituency in our caucus in an all out effort to fight till they have no more breath those two diseases that we have in this province today -- the high cost of living and inflation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me at this point. I would like to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that we have about 50 minutes until the vote is taken on the motion of the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Liberal Party, who is not present in his seat but presumably will be back when the time comes for a vote on his sub-amendment. --(Interjection)-- I merely indicate that that is the case, Mr. Speaker. I indicated the time length because in view of the fact that there is just a few minutes over the time the Premier has indicated that I could use his time on this particular sub-amendment so that I will probably be speaking through till 9:30.

In taking the floor, Mr. Speaker, I would first of all wish to pay my respects to your having assumed the office of Speaker once again and I'm sure that the fact that the honourable members and yourself have had some relationship with each other for the last two years will probably mean that the future will be -- will have absent from it some of the adjustments which inevitably take place when there has to be a new relationship established, and therefore I think that we can look very well forward to deliberations in the House which can be as calm and as collected as can reasonably be expected from a group of enthusiastic legislators.

I would also, Mr. Speaker, like to welcome, a special welcome, to the new MLA's who are entering the Chamber. I have had occasion of course to become acquainted with those who are elected to the government side. I know some of the members who are elected to the opposition benches. I can only repeat what I have said on past occasions with regards to people who are elected to public office, that it is the rare exception, indeed I will make a

## THRONE SPEECH

(MR. GREEN Con't). . . concession to myself and say that without exception I have always recognized those people who have been elected to office as having some quality which has attracted the support of the constituents in their respective constituencies to enable them to represent them in this Chamber. I do not believe that there is a single member who I've ever sat with of whatever party and in whatever elected function that has not at one time or another demonstrated that the people in that constituency had good reason for selecting that person to elect them as a representative. And I repeat, it matters not which party they are representing and it matters not which constituency they represent. I have no doubt that that particular quality will show itself with regard to the newly elected members to this Chamber.

I did have opportunity to hear from the Member from LaVerendrye who already demonstrated some qualities which I think are important, namely a quality to represent a political position which we sometimes find lacking as time goes on, but I did find that in the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, who replaced by the way an honourable member who was as fine a gentleman as I have ever sat with, which proves, Mr. Speaker, that not only those who are elected are fine gentlemen but that many of those who are defeated are fine gentlemen as well.

We heard earlier today from the Honourable Member for St. James. I'm quite certain that his particular experience and his own effectiveness will prove him to be an effective member of the House and one who will also make a contribution to our deliberations. He said one thing for which I would with great respect to him like to indicate at least a difference and at least a desire that he be tolerant with us. He indicated that people went into the last war, they fought for democracy and they fought for freedom of choice and that that is what he is going to stick up for. I have to tell the honourable member that there are people of New Democratic persuasion who went into the last war and fought for this country and fought on the basis of principles that they believe in, and they believe that the deaths that have been experienced in their immediate families, and there is hardly a member who has not had that experience, and indeed there are members here who not only had deaths in their immediate families but who were in the war themselves, and they thought that they were fighting for something for which they are now fighting in this Legislature. And let us respect the fact that our differences of opinion do not represent a position that somebody had fought in the war and that they are the ones who are defending democracy and those who on this side fought in the war were somehow doing something else. Because indeed the nations that we fought against which were Fascist Germany and Fascist Italy were defending some of the things that I hear expounded from time to time within our society from those who say that they fought for democracy. So it becomes, Mr. Speaker, a very subtle, a very subtle argument and it's not the first time that it has occurred in this House, but it becomes a very subtle argument for one to suggest that that last war was fought for the principles that are represented by one side of this House or the other side.

I believe that everybody in this House believes that this country participated in a struggle to perpetuate the freedoms, the aspirations, the ideals for which we sit here on both sides of the House, and that the people on this side no less who were engaged in that struggle or whose close ones were engaged in that struggle, are also fighting for the ideals which those who participated in that war gave their lives for, maimed their limbs for or fought for and were lucky enough to return alive and unmaimed, and I would ask for that bit of tolerance from the Honourable Member for St. James to respect the positions of members on all sides of the House in that connection. The member, Mr. Speaker, for Fort Rouge started on an interesting point which I . . .

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

MR. MINAKER: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Minister indicated or made innuendoes that in my speech today that I sort of inferred that the people were not fighting for democracy. I did not make any indication whether the veterans who fought for the freedom of choice and standing up for freedom and so on, I did not make any indication whether they were of New Democratic faith or Liberal faith or Conservative faith. I just made a statement that there were many veterans in our area and I did not state that the NDP supporters were not fighting for democracy. So I'd like to make that clear.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.



## THRONE SPEECH

MR. GREEN: I'm very happy to hear that, Mr. Speaker, and I'm very happy to hear that the slogan that the honourable member used which they were fighting for, namely freedom of choice, and its identification with the slogan of the insurance agents when they fought against the government's position vis-a-vis public automobile insurance was entirely coincidental. I am very happy to hear that that is the case and that the member was not making a position as between that particular slogan and the slogan that was used by the insurance agents and the attack which they made on the government and the honourable member's speech were in no way related to one another. I am so pleased to hear that that is the situation and that the honourable member has explained it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me then continue, let me then continue with my remarks because I don't want to waste the small time that I have with these matters. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge when it was indicated to him by the Honourable Member for Elmwood that he was a member of the SDA I think he indicated that he was a member of the SDA and I am completely unaware of the organization. I want to indicate that to my honourable friend.

The honourable member wanted to assure the House that membership in that organization should in no way be construed as being a radical organization because all that that organization stood for was the furtherance of democracy, I think words to that effect, although I certainly don't have them listed before me and I could not really repeat them, but I think that the words that he used were to the effect that the organization was dedicated to pursuing the ideals of the democratic system which I entirely concur with. I would only want to indicate to the honourable member that that kind of ideal that he is referring to is indeed a very very radical idea and it's not an ideal which anyone should wish to back away from; that there should be nobody who wishes to disassociate himself with being a radical because he believes in the furtherance of democracy which I believe, happen to believe is a very radical position. And my best demonstration to my honourable friend who I'd like to almost talk to on a one to one basis at this point, is a statement in a book which I would refer him to, The Autobiography of Lincoln Steffens which I have referred to on several occasions in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the occasion takes place when Steffens, a reporter, is being cross-examined on the witness stand by a lawyer. And the lawyer approached him in the usual lawyer style, and the book goes on to say, "Mr. Steffens," he said, as he walked slowly, forcefully toward me with hand high in the air and step by step, word by word, he threatened, "are not you an avowed anarchist?" His play acting really amused me. There was the typical lawyer, the conceited unfair prosecutor whom I had seen abusing his power over weak witnesses all my life. I smiled and slowly, very quietly, I answered, "oh I am worse than that!" He staggered as if I had struck him. "Worse than that, he muttered? Yes. I believe in Christianity. He stepped back flustered and it was minutes before he could go on. He did not know what an anarchist was; a man that is opposed to all force, including government. Fredericks thought an anarchist was the opposite, a bomb thrower; and as for Christianity, Fredericks was a churchman. By and by when he recovered he came at me again on that point. What did I mean by calling myself a Christian? I hadn't - that is called myself a Christian - but I let it go at that. I swept my hand around the audience of labormen, socialists, anarchists and dumb morons and said, well you see Captain Fredericks those people out there they are anarchists, socialists, labormen and they believe like you in justice, but I am a muckraker and I tell you that things are so bad in this world that justice won't fix them. It's too late for that. I believe that nothing but love will do the job. That's Christianity. That's the teaching that we must love our neighbours. And that's worse than anarchy he was muttering? Yes, I smiled affectionately as I could. That means that, for example, you and I should love each other, and you will admit won't you that that is going some."

And I suggest to the honourable member that anybody who really believes in the brotherhood of man; anybody who really believes, not by listening to it or saying in a church that one must love they neighbour as himself and one who will do everything, sacrifice everything, do whatever he has to do in politics to achieve those ideals is the worst radical and will be treated as such by all of society, and I say to you that nobody on that basis should back away from being a radical. And what my honourable friend, the Member for Elmwood was doing I think in identifying you in this way was to identify you in a very complimentary way. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that people who are identified in that way, as they are from time to time by all of the establishment in society, are the ones who are the real radicals and the ones who are really trying to do something which is only spouted as wrote by people who are professing

## THRONE SPEECH

(MR. GREEN Con't). . . the ideals but are not willing to go ahead and advance. And therefore I say that to the three honourable members who spoke - I don't think that we have yet heard from the Honourable Member for Rhineland but I expect that he too will be making a very fine contribution to this House.

Now having welcomed the honourable members, Mr. Speaker, in the probably extra time that is available to me I will now proceed to deal with the subject at hand, namely the Throne Speech Debate. I had intended to make some remarks as honourable members know that I'm almost irresistibly tempted to do vis-a-vis the contribution of the Honourable Member for Wolseley, the Leader of the Liberal Party. He is not in the House. If there is time after I have discussed the Leader of the Opposition's remarks I will address my remarks to his colleagues. I think that the characterization of the Throne Speech has been the most interesting feature of the debate thus far because the Throne Speech has been characterized as a do-nothing speech, as a bland speech, as a demonstration of lethargy, as a demonstration of lack of impetus, lack of initiative, lack of direction, a Throne Speech that is presented by a government that has run out of ideas, run out of initiative and is not doing anything. And I appreciate that I am paraphrasing but I am trying to paraphrase what the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party had said with regard to the Throne Speech. Indeed I think the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party said that it was the death rattle of the New Democratic Party. Well Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party he knows very well the sound of the death rattle, Mr. Speaker. He has heard it from his own lips and has only had life breathed back into him by the courts of this province, so he is very well aware of what the death rattle sounds like and should speak as an expert in that regard.

The Leader of the Opposition sort of, you know, got to me who feel that I, and as other members, that we are here for the purpose of advancing in some way the aims of our society, the aims of the people in our community by being in government and when he says, do nothing, are the people ready for a do nothing speech, are the people ready for a bland speech, I admit that I became a little bit introspective and said now what are the government benches doing that does justify our existence here, and I started to look for what I considered to be some of the highlights of the Throne Speech as presented by His Honour on the first day. And, I found that this government which is characterized as a do nothing government is first of all taking the citizens of this community and embarking on a plan whereby these citizens can provide themselves with what they expected others to provide for them for years and years, namely that they are feeling the confidence to enter the field of general automobile insurance.

I also read in the Throne Speech that the citizens of Manitoba have said that for many years our resources have been developed. True, But we have depended on others to develop them and as a result we have not received as great a share in the wealth that these resources generate as could be done by the people of the province and therefore we indicated several of the things that we are going to do with regard to our resources. Are we going to have the people through their elected representatives first of all gain a greater degree of wealth through a bold taxation policy. Secondly, that the people of this province through their elected representatives are --(Interjection)-- you see the one thing that has troubled the Honourable Member from Swan River is he has never been able to regard the government as being the elected representatives of the people. He, Mr. Speaker --(Interjection)-- well then why, Mr. Speaker, when I have said the people of this province through their elected representatives he says, you mean the government. And I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I repeat, Mr. Speaker. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: . . . people of this province through their elected representatives have said that they are going to be bold enough, they are going to take the initiative to explore and develop those resources for the benefit of the people of this province. The people of this province, Mr. Speaker, have said through their elected representatives that they are going to take a step forward in the most difficult of all areas of the economy, that is the financial institutions of this economy, and that they are going to, Mr. Speaker, involve themselves in those financial institutions by moving into a treasury branch system which will give them a slight degree of public involvement in those financial institutions.

And, Mr. Speaker, lastly and it's only a highlight, I have left out a great many things,

## THRONE SPEECH

(MR. GREEN Con't). . . the Throne Speech says that the people of this province are going to move forwards towards a plan which will see to it that all children up to a certain age will in a progressive manner, and this is a universal program, will be provided with dental care at social rather than individual responsibility. The Member for Swan River says very good.

Now Mr. Speaker, those are just four highlights. I haven't dealt with many of the other things that were mentioned in the Throne Speech and I will admit that some of it are recitals of things that have been done; some of them are administrative changes, but I take those four highlights, Mr. Speaker. General insurance - the Leader of the Liberal Party is back. I may not have time to get to him.

I ask you to put yourself into perspective and say that four years ago, or five years ago, there was a party in this province that said that if elected to power it was going to move into the banking system, move into the area of general insurance, move into the field of exploration and development of mineral resources and have a denticare program for all of the people under the age of sixteen. Mr. Speaker, five years ago there would have been screams of socialism, Bolshevism, you're moving too fast, you're destroying our society, you're doing things which cannot be done by any government in a short period of time. Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased. Mr. Speaker, I am very very pleased, I am very very pleased that the character of our times and some of the honourable members of what I consider genuine Conservative persuasion which I have great respect for, had better take note that general automobile insurance, public exploration and developing of mining, government involvement in banking, universal denticare, is now do nothing, lackadaisical - let me get a word - bland, innocuous government? It's very quiet.

A MEMBER: You'll find out.

MR. GREEN: Now, Mr. Speaker, that speech bore the temper of the times. You know and if anything, if anything shows an achievement - I see the Member for Lakeside is smiling - if anything shows an achievement by the New Democratic Party in our society, an achievement of what this government is doing, is to have those four highlights described as innocuous, bland and meaning nothing --(Interjection)-- Well at least now, Mr. Speaker, at least now we have the voice of Conservatism coming out. You know now it is not do-nothingism. Now it is not do-nothingism. Now it is dictatorship. Some of the members are opening their eyes as to what their leader has described as do-nothingism. And he is now telling the people of Manitoba, he is now telling the people of Manitoba that as far as the Conservative Party is concerned involvement of the public, general automobile insurance, banking, mining exploration and development, universal denticare - do nothing. Well I'm very happy, Mr. Speaker, that we have made this progress in the short space of six years that I have been involved in this Legislature, because I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that six years ago if I would have moved - I told this to the Member for Rock Lake - that the Legislature adjourn and go to City Park for a picnic there would have been screams of Bolshevism on the other side of the House. That that would have happened seven years ago. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says that they would have been right. So I really, Mr. Speaker, I really think that that speaks for progress and I am quite happy when I know that the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition, goes out on the hustings and describes the conflict between the government and the opposition as one of competence I know that I have won. Because, Mr. Speaker, I agree.

The honourable member, Leader of the Opposition says we would continue Morden Foods, we would operate it better; we would continue Saunders Aircraft, we would operate it better. He said that in Gimli, Mr. Speaker. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that if he will do that and if that is the issue on which he goes to the people then I say that he deserves whatever support that he can get on that program, and I know that I am safe from any philosophical or ideological argument which used to come from the Conservative Party that these people, the people of Manitoba, are incapable of governing their own affairs, that now it can be done, it can be done -- (Interjection) -- You know, I'll get to you. Just be patient. Be patient. Mr. Speaker, I'll get to you. And when the honourable member says that we are not arguing ideology I am pleased because I say that the ideological argument has won, and there are men on that side of the House who agree with me. You know when the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition is seeking, seeking to create some kind of an internal argument, says who speaks for the New Democratic Party, we all know who speaks for the New Democratic Party. There is absolutely no doubt about that question.

## THRONE SPEECH

(MR. GREEN Cont'd)

The honourable member seems to think that it is somehow wrong, somehow wrong, somehow difficult, somehow unfair for a party to have a popular Premier and to go to the people on that basis. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's probably because he is looking at his own position and he says that it's wrong for a party to have a popular Premier or a popular leader. But, Mr. Speaker, who speaks for Conservatism? Who speaks for the philosophy that I know to make a great deal of sense, which I don't happen to agree with, which I think has to be the philosophy that is argued between people who debate on principle, I say who speaks? And, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that anybody there -- (Interjection) -- Is that what the honourable member's speech said? Is that what his Throne Speech depicts, because I looked through his speech and, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't find -- (Interjection) -- Just give me a chance. Just give me a chance.

The honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition, posed some real questions. He said, what are you doing about the natives, what are you doing about inflation, what are you doing about the cost of living, what are you doing about all of these things? And then he gave us the rules of reply. Please do not compare with previous administrations. Please do not compare with other provinces. Now the honourable member is making it kind of tough. What do we compare with? Do we compare with what is said by the Leader of the Opposition? Let us not look to what the previous administration of the Conservative Party did when he says, what are you doing about inflation? Let's look to the ten governments in this country, the ten provinces in this country. Let us look to the Federal Government and let him show that any of those governments have done a better job with inflation than has the Government of the Province of Manitoba. Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows that he cannot do that. He knows that he cannot hold up tax relief as has been indicated by the Member for Roblin, he really can't be serious that this is the way, that this is the way that you deal with inflation. And then go to the Province of Ontario and see that the Province of Ontario did not give tax relief with the great rip-off that they have been getting out of the sales tax. What did they do with that great rip-off? They moved from five percent to seven percent of the sales tax. Mr. Speaker, the honourable--and it's not only the Province of Ontario. You know, it is not only the Province--there hasn't, Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, been a single province that has reduced taxes as a result of inflation with the exception of the Province of Manitoba. --(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, they didn't reduce taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what it says in today's paper but I know that Mr. Lougheed levied some heavy taxes on the resource industries in his province. Well he now has abolished all education taxes I presume on the basis that the price of oil has gone up from \$3.50 a barrel to \$6.00 a barrel, or \$5.00 a barrel as sanctioned by the Federal Government. But nevertheless - all right up until the time - let's be entirely accurate then because I did not know about this and I'm glad to be corrected. But the only province that reduced taxes was the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)-- Well that is a fact. And the provinces which are led by Progressive Conservative governments did not reduce taxes. But the honourable member --(Interjection) -- If I've made a mistake I'd like to . . .

MR. MCKENZIE: Would the Honourable Minister explain in this document where we can expect taxation relief?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I didn't say that there was going to be a tax reduction in this budget or in this Throne Speech. As a matter of fact it's indicated that there will be a tax increase. I said that until this point there hasn't been a single province that has reduced taxes to do what the honourable member, particularly the Leader of the Liberal Party, it's not so much specified or spelt out in the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, it was reduce taxes as a measure to deal with inflation. The Federal Government did some notching of taxes and indicated that they're going to give some money to the lower income groups, and I'm not really suggesting that you should or you shouldn't. All I know is that every economist that I have ever read--and I will admit that I have not read them all--but they say that in a period of inflation you collect taxes; in a period of a depressed economy you reduce taxes. --(Interjection)-- Well that is old fashioned. Now the honourable member, he's come out with the new fashion. He says that there is an inflation, therefore you give the people--listen to this. I want to know what economist he's referring to. That there is an inflation therefore you give the people more money to buy the inflated goods.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I used to have a deskmate, the deskmate was the Honourable Member

## THRONE SPEECH

(MR. GREEN Cont'd) . . . . for Rhineland. He believed in Social Credit. Social Credit is not all wrong. It's not all right either, but it's not all wrong. And I offered, Mr. Speaker, unconditionally to become a member of the Social Credit Party and I'm now offering the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party the same unconditional offer --(Interjection)-- All right. Fine. You are not interested in extra members, as obvious from the number of members that you got. That's right. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Rhineland used to say, with his Social Credit doctrine, that the problem of our society is simple. You have the level of productive goods and services available at this point--and he'd take a point on a scale let's say resembling my hand. On the other hand you have the level of consumptive power at this level--and he'd put his hand out and show a level some six inches below the level of productive capacity. And then he said it is a very simple solution. You give the people the difference between the level of productive capacity and the level of consumptive power. The two are then equal and then the consumers are able to buy everything that is produced and society rolls along. And that is in effect the theory of Social Credit. So I told the Honourable Member for Rhineland if you will show me with any degree of reason how when you give this increased money to the people of the population to reach the level of productive capacity, the price of the produced goods will not then rise six inches higher. I will then be a member of the Social Credit Party. Now the honourable member sat with me for three years and sat in this House for four years afterwards and was never able ever to tell me how he will see to it that the level of consumptive power when once it is given to the people, which is the remedy --(Interjection)-- the new remedy, the honourable member says the new remedy. I tell you that it is not a new remedy. It is the remedy of Social Credit. And, Mr. Speaker, if he will indicate when this new money becomes available, putting money on the market, becomes available to the old age pensioner, to the welfare recipient, to the MLA, or anybody else, how then, the landlord will say, that I'm not going to get a piece of it, and the supermarket will say that I'm not going to get a piece of it, and everybody who sells these people anything are going to say that they are not going to get a piece of it, then the honourable member can talk about using a tax reduction as a means of solving the problems of inflation. And I suggest to you that if this is a new system that the honourable member should then lay down the grounds for how he has derived this new system.

But I want really to deal with the problem of inflation as referred to by the honourable member because he says, what are they doing about inflation? What are they doing about these problems? And I suggest to you that inflation is a very serious problem, that it is not going to be attacked in a single province in a way which will win the war. But I say, Mr. Speaker, that a single province can do certain things and the things where the people of Manitoba have been most protected from inflationary effects are where they have had public utilities; that it is true that Manitoba Hydro costs more than hydro electricity that is provided by a private system. It is true that Manitoba Telephone System does provide a hedge against inflation as against utilities that are provided by a private system. And, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that a minimal entry, a minimal entry into the financial institutions of our system constitutes a major step in the people of our community ultimately being able to handle inflation.

Mr. Speaker, we all grew up in this society. Where was the important place to go to? You know I remember my father was in business, he was a fuel dealer. When he was in trouble he didn't go see his MLA, he went to a bank. And when I grew up, Mr. Speaker, when I was in trouble or had to do something I didn't go and see my MLA, I went to a mortgage company or to a bank. And I thought where oh where is there a place where somebody doesn't have to come to a bank. Surely when you're elected to the government that's power. So I came to government and said we have to do certain things, and my colleague over here says, well we have to go to a bank. And it seems to me that that should say something to the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition, who isn't able to point to a single jurisdiction in this country, whether it be New Democrat, whether it be Liberal, whether it be Conservative, who has been able to really remedy the people of our society significantly against inflation, and then said that we have not said or done anything about inflation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the causes of inflation are far more deep, far more subtle, far more fundamental to the economics of any political system than can be cured by the non-measures that have been referred to by the Leader of the Opposition. And when he says that moving into the area of the financial institution is a do-nothing attitude, he actually demonstrates a real, either

## THRONE SPEECH

(MR. GREEN Cont'd) . . . . ignorance or unwillingness to be frank about what the inflationary system - how it is created or how it comes about.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows that it is a fact that in the middle 1800s and in the late 1700s when England needed to fight a war they went to the House of Rothschild; and when Germany needed to fight a war against England that they went to the House of Rothschild, and both governments got money from the House of Rothschild to fight a war. --(Interjection)-- Pardon me? --(Interjection)-- I'm sorry. He is also going to a bank. Now, Mr. Speaker, I said that earlier, I said that earlier, and the honourable member - that is the only difference between the Minister of Finance and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is that he says that forever and a day I am going to be beholden to the banks. And the members on this side of the House say that we are going to have the people somehow involved to some extent in their financial institutions, and that we think that that is in some way--Mr. Speaker, how important is it? You know, they've given me, Mr. Speaker, they've given me a table of credit la consommation, consumer credit outstanding in the country; this is only consumer credit, it does not involve, it does not involve - to the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition, it does not involve mortgages, it does not involve business credit, it does not involve government credit. Do you know what that figure is in one year? It is \$14, 848, 000, 000, \$15 billion. Do you know what that means if the interest rates are raised by one percent, just for consumer credit? It means \$150 million across this country. One percent. That's what they can do in terms of inflation. Do you know what that means if we add to it the mortgage credit and the business credit? I would say, you know - and here I'm guessing and I will admit it - that it must go to \$30 billion. And one percent in interest means \$300 million; two percent means \$600 million, compounded by the retail price, the manufacturer's price, the wholesale price - and, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says--(Interjection)-- Pardon me? How are you going to stop it? The honourable member says, how are you going to stop it?

Mr. Speaker, I am going to be on this planet for only a limited period of time and so is my honourable friend, but when I leave the planet I will hope that to some extent the people through their elected democratic representatives will have some involvement in those institutions to which they are now slaves. The honourable member says that he is not going to try and stop them, he is not going to do anything. The Honourable, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, talks about these problems and then says that my salvation lies in methods that have been tried and found to be unproven for a hundred years and more, says that he is going to continue those methods and not going to do anything to change them, then I know, Mr. Speaker, I know as we are standing here that he is going to do nothing towards stopping them; whereas the members on this side, quite properly in my opinion, say, Mr. Speaker, we don't know whether we can stop them, we have tried to ascertain what their root causes are, we are not going to settle for non-measures, we are going to move towards measures which go to the root of the problem to see whether they are going to be dealt with and we're going to make an honest try to put the people of the province into the seats of power where decisions are actually made. And if, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province through the participation of the New Democratic government, have a little more role in those decisions than they had before we came in, then I will feel--well you say that we will go backwards, I feel that we will --(Interjection)-- Well the honourable member says that they will go bankrupt. You know, the societies that went bankrupt in this world and the one that we know most about was the society that went bankrupt in the United States in 1929. It was based on the principle that the Leader of the Opposition is now trying to sell us. --(Interjection)-- No, Mr. Speaker, economics do not change, economics is a science, and those things do not change. Various factors of the economic system change but the economics do not change. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition would have us play no role in those efforts, and he says, Mr. Speaker, that he will go, he will go to the private mining companies, he will go to the private banks, he will go to the private industries and he will crawl, Mr. Speaker, from place to place, he will crawl asking these people to do something for the people of Manitoba. He will crawl to the bank, saying please do not raise your interest rates; he will crawl to the people who are administering prices in private industry and he will say, please keep your prices lower, we'll set up a regulatory agency that says that you can keep them lower; he will crawl to the mining companies and he will say, please develop mines in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, he gave a little parable. He said,

## THRONE SPEECH

(MR. GEEN Cont'd) . . . . Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition - I see he is talking to one of his honourable members, he's lost interest, nevertheless . . . Mr. Speaker, he has said that if there were - I believe he put it this way, that if there were two - what do you call it, two flats, two cow flats in a field, that this government would step on both of them. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that if the honourable member was in a field, there would have to be four cow flats and he would step on all of them because he would be crawling through that field the same way as he wants the people of Manitoba to crawl from agency to agency trying to get something from them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's quite obvious that I am not going to be able to deal with the speech that was made by the Leader of the Liberal Party. I hope that there will be occasion when I do have the opportunity to do so. I want to use the remaining time available to me to try to describe as best I can what I think is happening in the Province of Manitoba vis-a-vis politics. We do have, I believe, a Leader of the Opposition and a Leader of the Liberal Party who are both of the opinion that somehow we have got to sell the people of Manitoba on a program, that that program has to sound as good as possible, it has to sound - that without regard to any of the principles of conservatism, to any of the principles upon which we have asked for support or on the basis of which we have gone into politics, the main job is to achieve power. And therefore if we have to talk about social progress, if we have to talk about humanitarianism, if we have to talk about tax reductions, if we have to talk about any of these things which somebody somewhere has indicated sound good, we will talk about them, we will get elected to power and then we will involve ourselves in our philosophy, and we can always say when we come in that we didn't know how bad things were and it's impossible in view of the state of affairs to accomplish anything that we have said could be accomplished, we'll have to wait until we generate the economy and get some money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that that is a political kind of a program that some people think will do some good. I have never believed that that is the way of achieving electoral success. I think that when we sought electoral success in 1969 we made pretty plain what we wanted and we made pretty plain that each of the programs that we advocated were consistent with where we wanted to go.

Now I heard the Member for La Verendrye, and I've heard other Member members on that side of the House, and I believe that it is a reasonable position of a government to say that he who governs least governs best, that what society should do is have protection for property, such as a police force, a fire brigade, rules which govern the commercial intercourse between one society and another, that essentially if we leave people to their initiative and give them incentives that the results of that initiative can produce, that these people will produce a great deal, that the best will come forward, that industry will flourish, that society will produce wealth and that wealth will be produced amongst those people who wish to work for it and take part in producing it. And we recognize that certain people for one reason or another, whether it be sickness, whether it be mental disability, whether it be misfortune, will be in trouble and society has an obligation to help those people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that that is essential conservatism. I believe that that is a sensible position, it is a position that is well documented by political economists, by philosophers, by sociologists, and by political parties. I don't happen to agree with it and I'll make my reasons plain. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is not the case that a people working together to provide their own security will thereby create disincentive on the part of those citizens. I believe that people work best when they are secure and produce most when they are secure, and that is where I disagree with the Member for La Verendrye, and where he pursues his position that our society is creating people who will not produce, who will become lazy people because they are too well done by. I want to read him an interesting statistic.

In the 1800s, in the good old days when what I have described took place, when there wasn't the kind of social security which we now know - and I'm reading from Rousseau and Revolution by Durant, the census of England showed that at that time, 1801, the days when we had laws against trade unions - that must have been good times, eh, the Member for Rock Lake Great Britain had a population of nine million souls, 1,300,000 were paupers receiving public relief -- 1,300,000. That is over 11 percent of the population who were on direct public relief. In the good old days when we were making sure that there were low wages, that there was no social security, that we were operating within the period of the industrial revolution - 1,300,000 out of 9,000,000 were on public relief.

## THRONE SPEECH

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has said that my time is up and I'm going to conclude my remarks by saying that I still believe, and if I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if I believed that human dignity was so fragile that security resulted in it becoming non-productive, I would become a Conservative, I could never become a Liberal, but I would become a Conservative, and that is a good position. But, Mr. Speaker, I ask you - we heard the Leader of the Opposition, who speaks conservative in this province, who is pursuing that philosophy, who is trying to make people rally to the support of a Party that will take a firm position on it and seek election on it and implement it? Nobody. Not the Leader of the Opposition and not his followers who are saying, we will have to wait until the next convention--(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, we have indicated and it has been indicated by the Premier, it has been indicated by the Premier, that I take the firm position, Mr. Speaker, that while I am in politics I will move every moment, every day, every year, to try to give the people of this province a bigger and bigger role in its social and economic decision making. I move in that direction. Who moves for conservatism? Mr. Speaker, nobody . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: . . . that policy is dead as long as we are faced with the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 9:30, according to our Rule 35 now I must put the sub-amendment.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the amendment and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. ASPER: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The motion before the House is the amendment by the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Asper, Axworthy, Banman, Bilton, Blake, Brown, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Graham, Henderson, F. Johnston (Stur. Cr.), Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Marion, Minaker, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak, and Watt.

NAYS: Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Bostrom, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Derewianchuk, Dillen, Doern, Evans, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, Malinowski, Miller, Osland, Patterson, Paulley (Transcona), Pawley (Selkirk), Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uruski, Uskiw and Walding.

MR. CLERK: Ayes 24; Nays 28.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the amendment lost.

. . . . . continued on next page



## THRONE SPEECH

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, contrary to procedures at some times I would like to proceed with the debate to a large extent because I always find myself ready, willing, not always able but at this time I'll attempt to follow the Minister of Mines and Resources because he has a peculiar ability to first of all attract the attention of this House, to then drive home his point very forcefully and to of course in the course of doing that to arouse the adrenalin of many in this House and of course to arouse the support of many others on his own side of the benches.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start of course and deal with this aspect of it and if I do run out of time I would like the right to continue it if my time runs out tomorrow. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't help but sit here and listen with an incredulous reaction to the First Minister first of all abdicate responsibility to the Minister of Mines and Resources to speak on this debate; and secondly for the Minister of Mines and Resources to get up and outline the four great achievements of this government since they took office and to therefore, to therefore justify the Throne Speech that's now before us. Mr. Speaker, let me take one example ...

MR. SCHREYER: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister state his point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that the Honourable Member for Riel is now attempting to argue that under the rules that I am not able to speak in this debate, because I would like to have that clear since I fully intend to speak on this debate before the vote on the main motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, the motion in question is now passed, we're on to the next one and I presume the First Minister can now speak. Mr. Speaker, let me continue on beyond the technicality raised. The four objectives the Minister of Mines and Resources has raised, has said that the New Democratic Party had achieved, and if they had told the people before they arrived - no you haven't yet achieved a treasury bank system but you have yet to bring that into being. You can yet do that. But he says if we had told the people before we came in it would have been unbelievable. Well, Mr. Speaker, let's just take one example of their achievements. Let's just take one example of their achievement to show how the exact reverse happened. Mr. Speaker, he said we could not have told the people - they would not have believed how we would have become involved in the extraction of our natural resources. Well, Mr. Speaker, let's tell you and let the First - let the Minister of Mines and Resources--and pardon my Freudian slip in calling him the First Minister--let him yet explain how they did tell the people they were going to become involved in the extraction of the non-renewable natural resources of this province.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if honourable members, if honourable members do not wish--(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you what I'll do--if I said what the honourable member said that I said, I will apologize profusely to him tomorrow. I did not make the remarks attributed to me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, let the Minister of Mines and Resources explain his position on another occasion, he can still debate this. Let him convince us that his achievements were not innocuous, let him convince us of his arguments, because, Mr. Speaker, the performance of the Minister of Mines and Resources justifying the Throne Speech of the government tonight is the weakest performance, Mr. Speaker, despite his eloquence at any time it was the weakest performance that he has given in this House.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at how the government achieves their objective on one example. They didn't tell the people they were going into the mining industry. No they didn't. They brought in Bill 17 in 1970. Mr. Speaker, Bill 17 was brought in, was identified immediately as a carte blanc to go into all natural resource extraction and processing. They didn't say that, no. Mr. Speaker, they said, the government of the day said the purpose of this bill is for us to set up a corporation for the Moose Lake loggers. Mr. Speaker, that's why Bill 17 was brought in. Mr. Speaker, they have now used that legislation as their vehicle to move into any field they want to move into. And, Mr. Speaker, let's admit. He says, who will stand up and

## THRONE SPEECH

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . speak as a Conservative in this House? Well, Mr. Speaker, there's nobody that is ill prepared to stand up and speak as a Conservative of this House and we may even have to go back to Bill 17 of 1970 to actually show it. Because we had the guts and the intestinal fortitude and whatever you want to call it to--integrity to say where we stood on it. And we didn't stand on Bill 17, Mr. Speaker, because we were opposed or in favour of the Moose Lake Logging Corporation. We stood on it because we told the government this is your vehicle to go into every natural resource industry, renewable or non-renewable in this province that you want to. And they did. And he says do you think that what we have done in the natural resource field is innocuous? The people wouldn't have believed us. And the reason, Mr. Speaker, they wouldn't have believed him is just like the Minister of Finance who says in his bill, we're not going to tax individuals, he says we're not going to go into other fields of natural resource extraction. Mr. Speaker, now he tries to say who is going to stand up as a Conservative, who is going to stand up as a socialist?

Last year the Minister of Mines and Resources took the Liberal Leader and said you contradicted yourself three times on one page, here it is, one, two, three. He contradicted himself only twice tonight. He stood up in the first instance and he said, we're not afraid to admit that Mr. Schreyer is our Leader and that we gained power on his coattails. He turned around 30 minutes later and he said, who will call himself a Conservative? Who over there will call himself a Socialist? Because in the first ten minutes he effectively told us, Mr. Speaker, that there is nobody prepared to call themselves a Socialist. He said effectively, we're here because Mr. Schreyer put us here. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the first time I got exposed - and I have to make a self-admission here - the first time I was ever exposed to the Minister of Mines and Resources was --(Interjection)-- Oh I know. That's a favourite hang-up. The first time I was exposed to him was many more years ago than I would like to admit, when his great pursuit was to win the McGowan Cup Debate, and he stood up, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have never been involved in a McGowan Cup.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I didn't say he was a McGowan Cup debator.

MR. GREEN: I never participated. Never.

MR. CRAIK: He's a great artisan at the profession and that was surely his desire.

A MEMBER: No.

MR. CRAIK: It wasn't his desire?

MR. GREEN: I never was involved.

MR. CRAIK: And they're watching him--well it's only because, Mr. Speaker, at that time he didn't get the vote. And like all people that were greatly interested in this procedure, because in those days we didn't have television, all we had was the Manitoban at the university, we went out to listen to the McGowan Cup Debate and the most interesting part was as the debate started the referee went out on the stage and effectively flipped a coin and he said the team here is debating pro, the one in Saskatoon is debating con, we have that agreed upon. All lawyers of course. All set up. But they didn't know which way they were going to debate when they got up. But you see, Mr. Speaker the Minister of Mines and Resources exemplifies that characteristic to a tee. The only thing he forgot tonight was that when he stood up and said we are here because Mr. Schreyer put us here. I'm paraphrasing now, you know. Mr. Schreyer put us here. We're not here because we're anything at all, we don't stand for anything. As a matter of fact we have achieved four things but it's only, you know, people wouldn't have believed it that, you know, it's innocuous and all the rest of it; and there's nobody over here can call themselves Conservatives. That man who stood here for the last four years as a Minister and before that stood more paramount than that as a member of the opposition, stood here tonight and contradicted himself more exclusively than the Leader of the Liberal Party did last year when he contradicted himself three times on one page. And he stood here and said, you know, our four achievements, we're now you know, treasury branches, the whole works. We're going into the treasury business because we lost \$250 million on Hydro, we lost \$28 million in MDC and although we fooled the people we lost \$8 million on Autopac and wrote off close to \$6 million of start-up costs and showed it as an asset, we're great. We can go into the treasury business in this province. And that is what they're going to do. They have the absolute credentials, absolute credentials, Mr. Speaker, and some of us just as incredulously sat and listened to the Minister of Autopac in his initial opening statement

## THRONE SPEECH

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . for the losses, who said, we had bad hailstorms in 1973. Bad hailstorms.

A MEMBER: Never happened before.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, do you know what a hail storm hits first? Well, it hits them all, but it hits the damage to which they're going into first, and that is fire and general insurance. But they don't care, and they don't know, and they don't give a damn. That's what's worse, they don't. You don't know the experience of the people that are in that business. You think they're rip-off artists, and you're just as much a rip-off artist, only more so, just like he pointed out. You don't know that the mutuals of this province and the co-ops of this province have lost money this year and you've never asked a question. You've never asked a question, because they happened to be in the fire and general insurance business in this province . . .

A MEMBER: They're not government, they can't lose money.

MR. CRAIK: But they repeat. Well let me explain to you, Sir --(Interjections)-- You want to spend more money. You see the problem is, Mr. Speaker, and this comes down to the basic problem that occurred in this province, and basic problem that occurs between the two different philosophies, whether, Mr. Speaker, if there is no difference in the philosophical approaches, whether it results from two groups, one which had a reasonably satisfactory childhood and the other that didn't have an unsatisfactory childhood, or vice versa. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, because the arguments that we get going here I often wonder really; you know, and I've listened to the Minister of Mines and Resources, I really excuse myself for picking on him but he's such an interesting target because he at times displays a degree of intellectual honesty that's hard to find on the other side. I say that, Mr. Speaker, that he does it at times. But I once heard him demonstrate an argument to the long, lost brethren from Rhineland, Mr. Froese, who used to be here, where he explained it's like a great circle, Jake, you start out here and the left and the right go round and they end up here. Mr. Speaker, you know, at that point, at that point we all left the coffee room and said, well the Minister of Mines and Resources has just given us the explanation of the right and the left but they always end up in the same place.

But, Mr. Speaker, tonight what the Minister of Mines and Resources demonstrated was in fact for those of us that have sat here for the last several years, that the government has in fact run out of steam. The first year I entered this House, Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Minister of Finance who was a member of the Opposition, and being very inarticulate I didn't understand everything he said. I haven't changed. But he said, the government is jaded, and he built a whole case on this fact; the government is now jaded - so I ran out to the library which was open till late hours and I got out the dictionary - I gotta find out what this is all about, you know, what kind of an outfit have I joined up here with. So I went out, and I read it, and you know, Mr. Speaker, it's five years later and I suddenly am going to have the same accusation, and I didn't think I'd ever have to make it, because I didn't ever really think that the Minister of Mines and Resources could stand up in this House and contradict himself all in the same speech, and he's done that tonight, which he's finally proved is that the circle has finally closed, the right he doesn't know from the left and the elbow he doesn't know from somewhere else of the anatomy, and that's exactly what he's proven. And furthermore, he said, that to achieve your objectives you don't tell the people what you're going to do, you just innocuously do it. You bring in Bill 17 on the Moose Lake Logging Corporation and then you go into the mining business. That, Mr. Speaker, is essentially the message that he has given us tonight, and it's a sorry state of affairs when that's the sort of thing we have to listen to.

Mr. Speaker, I've stood here tonight and I basically said very little more than what else has been said tonight, but I thought that I should be in character with what else has happened tonight and I would like to continue tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 10:00 o'clock, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.

MR. MARION'S French Speech, 2:30, February 7, 1974:

Monsieur l'Orateur, il va de soi que les premières paroles que je profère dans cette Chambre soient des paroles de remerciement envers les citoyens de la circonscription de Saint-Boniface. Ils m'ont fait la confiance de les représenter à l'Assemblée Législative de Saint-Boniface. Ceci est pour moi un très grand honneur et aussi une lourde responsabilité. Je ne leur fais qu'une seule promesse, celle de les représenter tous, sans exception, de la meilleure façon que je connaisse.

TRANSLATION:

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of course that the the first words I pronounce in this House, be words of thanks to the citizens of the St. Boniface riding. They trusted me to represent them at the Legislative Assembly of St. Boniface. This is for me a great honour and also a heavy responsibility. I will make them only one promise, that of representing them all, with no exception, to the best of my ability.

FRENCH:

Je suis heureux, Monsieur l'Orateur, d'apprendre que le gouvernement manitobain entendait bien continuer à porter son support financier au Centre Culturel Franco-Manitobain. Le gouvernement connaît aussi bien que moi qu'aucun centre culturel peut se suffire à lui-même. Les octrois gouvernementaux lui sont indispensables. Je trouve néanmoins difficile d'accepter la contribution préconisée comme étant équitable du gouvernement municipal par cette province. Etant donné que le site du Centre est à l'abri des taxes foncières, il me semble qu'une contribution additionnelle de \$50,000 est beaucoup à demander. Il ne faudrait pas que l'excellence des services aux citoyens soit amoindrie par raison de l'impossibilité du gouvernement municipal de boucler cette demande qui lui fut faite par la province.

TRANSLATION:

I am happy to learn, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Manitoba intends to continue its financial support to the Franco-Manitoban Cultural Centre. The Government knows as well as I do, that no cultural centre can be self-sustaining. Government grants are indispensable. Nevertheless, the contribution that this province deems equitable for the municipal government is difficult to accept. Since land taxes for the Centre's site have been waived, it seems that an additional contribution of \$50,000 is indeed a lot to ask for. The high quality of services to the citizens should not be diminished because the municipal government finds it impossible to meet with this request made by the province.