

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, April 11, 1972

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this Budget Speech and having missed my opportunity on the Throne Speech, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on the job you've done, and will do, under sometimes very trying circumstances. Also the appointment of my colleague as Deputy Speaker, also on the appointment of our two new Ministers and of course the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech.

I would also like to welcome the Honourable Member from Minnedosa. One part of his speech on the Throne Speech that really interested me was on the form of debate in this House. I'm afraid he's going to be very disillusioned, as I was as a new MLA.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't mind for one minute being called a socialist, a communist, and even in the heat of debate in committee, an arrogant bastard. I don't mind this because ... a bastard is a form of endearment. But, Mr. Speaker, what really hurt me was once during this session when the Minister of Highways, the Member from Thompson, was speaking and the Leader of the Opposition threw across the floor the word and I'll retract it, Mr. Speaker, if I have to, "flintstone", and that wasn't enough he came back later on in his speech with "mumbles". What a form of debate, Mr. Speaker, And it hurt our Member from Thompson. There are those who say that he resigned his position on issues of abortion, pornography, and this isn't so. His feelings were hurt and this is the reason he left the Cabinet, Mr. Minister, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to deal with a brief that was presented to the Northern Task Force when it first started out in 69 or early 70. This brief is from a young man from Flin Flon, a married man, a family man, a tradesman, who in my opinion truly represents the majority of the people of the north. He quotes: "It is time northern Manitoba was fully appraised and steps taken to develop its potential to the fullest. Developments should benefit the province and the people and not just develop money companies. A committee should be set up to scrupulously delve into northern Manitoba's possibilities for expanding established communities, should be studied." Well, Mr. Speaker, we've done this. First of all with the Northern Task Force which visited all northern communities and heard of the problems of the north from the people themselves, and I think we've done well. We have much better communication in our native villages, better housing, especially for our native friends, established the right for our natives to govern themselves, created employment. We've also had the Agriculture Committee - I won't dwell on this, Mr. Speaker, as I have no farmers in my area, but my solution is a strong union for farmers. The only answer.

We've also had the Municipal Committee, and let's talk about this L. G. system a while, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- the L.G.D.'s and the government administrators. I think, and most of my constituents agree that the system is outdated and obsolete. We've retired the horses, the bustles, the ... buggies but still we hang on to this system. We encourage our natives to run their own affairs, our students to take part in our education programs. We encourage local autonomy. So why, why do we have a local government administrator in our society of today; a man who is appointed by the government, often a man who is often arrogant and almost impossible to reach, and so is he swayed by the power of the mine corporations - and I specifically refer to Sherritt-Gordon and Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting in Snow Lake and Lynn Lake. Cranberry Portage is no better off. These men are not administrators, they are -- retract it, Mr. Speaker, -- Cranberry Portage.

All right let us go to Cranberry Portage just for a little while, Mr. Speaker, a small town. No. 10 Highway goes through it, the railway goes through it, looking for progress and frustrated and thwarted at every turn by the local government administrator who won't give.

We stress the importance of an Advisory Board which in my opinion is a complete farce. Often the Advisory Boards are merely rubber stamps and many decisions are settled before they are even consulted. The solution, Mr. Speaker, is this, and it's so simple. Have the administrator in an advisory capacity, and have the committee make the decision. The only fair and democratic way in our society. A law similar to the one in Ontario should be passed, that all ore mined in the province, should be processed in the province. The Hudson Bay Mining at Flin Flon are presently sending their copper to Quebec for refining. Sherritt-Gordon of Lynn Lake send their ore out of the province. The establishment of refineries in the province

(MR. BARROW cont'd) . . . . would be a terrific boon to the above communities as well as to the province. As a result of copper being refined in Manitoba, a variety of new industries would spring up in the province. Some of these new industries would probably settle down south due to the transportation and accessibility to markets. A very unselfish person, he could create employment everywhere, Mr. Speaker. I agree 100 percent with this young man, Mr. Speaker.

Here is a breakdown of where the ore is refined. The Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting the zinc goes to Flin Flon, the copper goes to Montreal. Sherritt-Gordon (a) copper refined in Montreal, nickle refined in Edmonton. Fox Mine, copper in Montreal; zinc in Flin Flon. Inco refined in Thompson, copper in Sudbury. Falconbridge the nickle is refined in Snow Lake and the copper in Sudbury. We haven't got around to this just yet, Mr. Speaker, but we will. I'm very disappointed the other side hasn't gone into this. There are far more handicaps on this side that not only must we listen to the government, we must also to the Opposition. Why haven't they done something in this line?

"Tax exemptions by the mining companies should be looked into." Well as one of my colleagues once mentioned in this House, the taxes these companies pay are peanuts, so we doubled them. We have taken away the three year exemption on new mines, and now we are taxing the large corporations 10 cents an acre on mineral rights of over 40 acres. It will be effective January 1st in 1973. It is true it is a small amount, but it is estimated at \$300,000 and it is a start in the right direction. "It's amazing the number of items used by mining companies that are tax free. The amount that these companies are not taxed is taken from the people. In reality the people are subsidizing the multi-million dollar companies. Mining companies get many tax exemptions and the opportunity to make millions of dollars profit each year."

I think, Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with this with the exception of eliminating the exemption of trucks and machinery and equipment, with the exception of farm machinery. It is also proposed to provide exemptions on hats, goggles, welders, and so on, clothing for miners. "We of the north would like to have the advantages that the people of the south now enjoy. We want equality not inferiority."

A MEMBER: Who are you quoting from?

MR. BARROW: This is from the brief. We are asking for the same things that the people of the south have. Well, Mr. Speaker, better roads, better living conditions, more opportunities for a job. The former Minister of Transportation in 69 put it very clear. He made no bones about roads for the north and I think it's obvious his program has been made, much progress has been made in the north. I only hope our present Minister of Transportation has the same attitude.

Our housing projects haven't been equalled. Seventy-two million dollars of public funds, and close to 5,700 dwelling units, and more to come in the next fiscal year. Opportunities for jobs of course, lie with the Federal Government, but Estimates have shown that 12,000 to 15,000 new man-months of work have been created under the PEP program out of a \$10 million budget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak a little on something that's been bothering me for a long time, and that's the strike in Flin Flon. It's brought up once or twice a week by the opposition and always the onus is on the union, always. What was the most important issue, Mr. Speaker, in that strike? I'll tell you. It wasn't salaries, it wasn't money. That was satisfactory. Working conditions, okay. The main issue was a pension plan. Let me tell you how it works. If you start to work on the ground at 18 and work until you are 65, and if you have some \$5,000 deducted from your pay, you may draw the magnificent salary or pension of \$200 a month - big deal. Most miners especially are either burnt out, suffer from silicosis, rheumatism, or what have you, emphysema, but burnt out, and this pension is their just reward. Now, Mr. Speaker, let's look at the other side of the picture. Two former Flin Flon gentlemen, who beat their way up from shift bosses to the very top of the heap, one way or another they got there. First we have Mr. Eric Austin, he's the President and Director of the HBMS and his salary is a mere \$96,447.00.

A MEMBER: How much? How much?

MR. BARROW: Well he draws welfare too.

A MEMBER: How much?

MR. BARROW: Ninety-Six thousand four hundred and forty-seven dollars.

A MEMBER: Ninety-six thousand.

MR. BARROW: Or \$8,000 a month, or \$2,000 a week, and by the hour, Mr. Speaker, \$50.00 an hour, \$50.00. Now the speakers over on the other side that complain so much about our minimum wage you know \$1.65, our welfare. How do you relate or who are you going after?

A MEMBER: What does the vice-president get?

MR. BARROW: Well we'll come to him. Four hours hard work for Mr. Austin is equal to a man's monthly pension, who served this company for 47 years, and his pension, \$48,890.00. How much is that a month? --(Interjections)--

Well, wait, I'm not finished yet . . . And now we come to the executive vice-president, Sandy Morris. He takes a big cut in his salary, it's only a mere \$73,582.00, --(Interjections)-- every year, but his pension is cut, it's down to \$40,000 or \$3,333.00 per month. Now this was the issue in the strike, Mr. Speaker, this is the big issue and these two people held 1500 steel and 650 tradesmen out of work for seven months because they couldn't afford to give them a few bucks in a pension.

Mr. Speaker, these are the gentlemen who make the decisions in Toronto, affecting the lives of the people of northern Manitoba; heartless gentlemen, who portray the policy of our honourable gentlemen on the other side.

Free enterprise - there's your free enterprise at its best. And who attack unions with such vigor and complain so bitterly about the minimum wage scale but, Mr. Speaker, seriously the people of the north are very bitter towards these gentlemen who place dollars ahead of people. Who emit so much pollution, both by air and water that turn their stomachs green and the grasses brown -- I hope to speak on pollution later, Mr. Speaker, I won't go into that.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on automobile insurance and I would like to speak just as a working Joe, which I am. I am not a politician really, or an educated person, but this was a big issue in our election, automobile insurance and when I came down here I wasn't in a position where I'm going to go for it if it isn't good, or bad, or vice versa, but I listened to people, and I listened at the hearings to real articulate lawyers, and people who could speak, and they swayed me, they really swayed me, and the demonstration outside swayed me, and I listened to the people over here who sell insurance - but I don't listen too much to them because they sell it and actually they have a vested interest and they shouldn't even be allowed to speak on it because they . . .

But what really swayed me, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that as you know, Flin Flon is a unique town, half in Manitoba, half in Saskatchewan. The Saskatchewan boys come over to Manitoba and they get jobs . . ., they live there. They should have their automobile insurance there but they didn't do this; they broke the law, they put their cars in the names of their fathers, their mothers, their brothers, their friends and kept their automobile insurance in Saskatchewan, but this wasn't the real thing that swayed me, Mr. Speaker. There was a gentleman by the name of Harley Vannan, a representative of the Western Division Insurance Bureau in Canada, and in the speech --(Interjection)-- Is that right? But he gave three cars, Mr. Speaker, (a), (b), and (c). Now on (a) car with his insurance you would save \$2.00; and his (b) car you'd save \$2.00; (c) you do better, you save \$3.00. Now these cars, Mr. Speaker, were low risk drivers, these people went to church on Sunday with their car if it didn't rain. This is the type of people that bought insurance but that year, Mr. Speaker, the average of the whole Dominion of Canada was 15 percent, it rose that high, 15 percent. This was the average rise in automobile insurance, which he didn't take into consideration at all, and besides that, there was \$35 million went into the public coffers that he would have had to put in, so we'll give him two percent, so while he saves them \$2.00, and \$2.00, and \$3.00, we've saved them \$17.00 on a hundred. Mr. Vannan is the best NDP member we ever had.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth occasion that the Minister of Finance has had an opportunity to present a budget before this Chamber and during the course of his remarks I could not help but be impressed by the almost childlike faith that his backbenchers seem to have in the presentation of that budget, and the figures, and the very complicated formulas that he developed during the course of his remarks.

They seem to have a childlike faith in those nonsensical nocturnes that become a part of Socialist philosophy, so much so that there isn't a hope that they could possibly believe anything else. Now in listening to the Member for Crescentwood this afternoon, one could not help but wonder how a man who is supposed to possess the education and the intelligence that he has, can be so stupid in expressing economic philosophy. One could not help but marvel at the twist of fate that occurred in this person's mind to cause him to believe the things that he believes in, in spite of every evidence to the contrary. In every country that socialism has been practiced, there has been a disaster. We have heard this afternoon, we heard this afternoon a question

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . . from the member for Fort Rouge, about people, the brain drain leaving Sweden. I happen to be of Swedish origin, and I often wondered if those people in that country had any brains at all in electing that kind of a government. And adhering as long as they have to that kind of philosophy.

Now, Sir, on several occasions, during the course of this session, we have heard from, we have heard remarks from the government side of the House, that the opposition is coming from the backbench, and I know that is what they would like. They'd like it, Sir, because anytime anybody criticizes them, because they are not further to the left, they love that. They'll listen to that, and they'll call that opposition, and they'll call that criticism, because that is the direction that they want to go. They only like to hear those things that makes them happy, and when somebody, when somebody suggests that they should go further to the left, they will applaud and say, "now that is real opposition".

Well now, Sir, the Minister of Finance brought in his first budget and that was in the fall of 1969, September 18th, 1969, and oh what a promise of spring that budget brought. Sir, it brought to this House all of the hopes and the aspirations of the Socialists, all of those things that they thought they could bring to this country in the way of benefits, and his remarks were optimistic and glowing in describing the opportunities that lie ahead for Manitobans, and those things that the government were going to do to improve the quality of life for Manitobans. And then the second budget came, April 30th, 1970, and one detected in the tenor of that budget debate, or that Budget Speech, that they had come to the realization that their long held nostrums were not going to be able to solve the problems of this country -- indeed I think the realization occurred to them at that time that they were going to create more problems than they solved, and how true that prediction was.

And then when the third budget was presented on the 13th of May in 1971, one could not help but detect the note of frustration that occurred in the words of the Minister of Finance, when he realized that greater difficulties were occurring in this province -- he would not admit, and the honourable gentlemen opposite still have not admitted it, that a good many of the difficulties created as a result of the unworkable nonsensical policies that they thought were going to cure the problems of this country.

Now then we have the last budget, presented to this House the other day, and Sir, the Minister of Finance reminded me of the bridegroom who sat on the edge of the bed all night and bragged about how wonderful things were going to be. They promised, more promises, more promises of wonderful things to come, and then he proceeded to present his Budget. Sir, that by all stretches of the imagination, has to be one of the most fantastic that has ever been presented in this Chamber. . . . reporting all over again. I might tell the Minister of Finance that before I close I do have . . . for him --(Interjection)-- and yes. Mind you, he says, the Minister of Finance says always of the same high level. Now I'll tell the Minister of Finance that everyone of them has a story and a moral, and I ask him to look for it. I ask him to look for it, because it does truly represent the sort of thing that happens -- here is the Attorney-General. There is one thing about the Attorney-General . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I request the honourable gentleman to address the microphone; everytime he wanders away I lose his sound. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: As I was saying, Sir, one thing about the Attorney-General if in the unlikely event that he ever resigns his seat on a matter of principle, the First Minister won't have to worry because he won't create a vacancy, there will be no problem.

Now, Sir, one of the things that seems to upset honourable gentlemen opposite in the presentation of budgets, is the feeling that this country, no, this province simply must have the highest possible taxes of any province in Canada, and, Sir, they are dedicated to that and simply will not rest until they are assured that the Province of Manitoba, and the taxpayers of this province enjoy the highest possible taxes. And you know their words, Sir, were exemplified --(Interjection)-- Well someone says the best programs - we'll come to that a little later - but their words were exemplified by a very staunch supporter of the Socialist party during the course of the agricultural committee hearings throughout the Province of Manitoba, up in Swan River as a matter of fact, one of their ardent supporters, and one who holds many positions with the government, Charlie Hunt, made this statement, and he was commenting on some remark that I had made about high taxes, and these are his comments, and it is the sort of thing that the honourable gentlemen opposite believe in, with all their hearts. This is what he said,

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) . . . . "I believe that in every highly industrialized, highly developed country, you have high taxes and there is nothing wrong with that", says Mr. Hunt. It's an indication. High taxes are an indication of the high development, a high industrialized country. "Every place in the world, there is nothing wrong with taxes", says Mr. Hunt. Well if we are to reach that degree of high industrialization, if we are to reach that nirvana that Mr. Hunt talks about, well why we don't we go to Russia? Because there they take everything away from the taxpayer. They leave nothing for us. Why go half-way? Let's go all the way and make sure that there is nothing left, and I'm sure that that is the direction that honourable gentlemen opposite are heading. It's a way of life, Sir, with the NDP.

Now, Sir, during the course of this Session some rather interesting things have transpired. We heard before the session opened that the government had plans to deal with the opposition, and we weren't sure just what those plans were, we weren't sure that they were going to do anything to prevent us from carrying on our function --(Interjection)-- No, I'm not going to accept any questions, until I'm through, and look - I'm going to tell my honourable friends something - I am going to occupy my full 40 minutes and if they'll give me unanimous consent to answer questions after that, I'll be very happy to do so, very happy to do so. I'll answer questions for the rest of the night if they choose. But I doubt very much if honourable gentlemen opposite are going to be prepared to give me that extra time.

And so we discovered that during the course of the session that they did have a plan and that plan was to muzzle the opposition; that plan was to insure that the opposition were not going to be given the opportunity to express themselves, to carry on the function as an opposition in criticising and examining the government. Well the First Minister, who leads the parade, every time there is an attempt to muzzle opposition, reached his height on March 29th of 1972 and that was not too long ago, when the Honourable Member for Riel was speaking.

Mr. Craik said this, "Well we've heard taunts come back several times, Mr. Chairman, prove it". That seemed to be the tactic of the government to insist that at any time members of the opposition made a statement in criticism of the government, that we had to offer proof. Well the First Minister says "nonsense". Let me read on, "Prove it, prove that the business community is discouraged, prove that people are moving out of Manitoba from business". Well as I say, Mr. Chairman, I'll tell you right now -- and then apparently there was a lot of disorder as usual from the opposition, a lot of noise from the government side of the House and so the Speaker at that time had to call order and he says "Order please. The Honourable Member for Riel;" and I know, Mr. Speaker, that you have a difficult time in keeping order in this Chamber when members opposite are, when they are being gored. But Mr. Craik went on, "We're not going to be able to prove it", he said, "we can still state it, and that is a fact. It's our belief, it's my belief, and it's my conviction that the business community is in a state of discouragement in Manitoba that has never been paralleled as long as I have been here. The graduates from the universities, coming out of the universities, are in a state of discouragement about prospects in Manitoba that has never been paralleled to my knowledge," and then there were some more interjections, according to Hansard. And then there were so many interjections that the Chairman said, "The Honourable First Minister on a point of order." Now I want to read into the record the point of order raised by the First Minister at that time which is an indication, yes the Attorney-General's is a better speech. It sure is a clear indication of the thinking of honourable gentlemen opposite.

"Mr. Chairman," he said, "It's a case of your determining whether it constitutes a point of order for the honourable gentleman again to engage in misstatement of fact and it is a matter of simple fact as to whether or not there have been more businesses operating in this province now or at some date in the past, and it is a matter of fact I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that the number of businesses operating in Manitoba is greater today than at any time when my honourable friend was in office."

And he concluded with these words "it is a matter of fact". That was the First Minister and he attempted to ram that point of order down the throat of the Chairman and was unsuccessful. Now, Sir, a few days later and on the basis of the suggestion, it wasn't really a suggestion from the First Minister, but it certainly was implied.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister. Order please. Everyone in this House is entitled to rise on a matter of privilege or a point of order. We don't need any comments in regard to that. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is that the Member for Morris

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . is now alleging that I, as a member of this House, tried to ram a particular point down the Chairman's throat, or whatever the - that's an accurate paraphrasing of what was said by the Honourable Member from Morris, just a moment ago, and I do believe, Sir, that it is a matter of privilege for an honourable member to be able to defend himself against such an accusation. I, Sir, regard the Chair with the utmost of respect and therefore would not want my name to be associated with any attempt to ram any point of order down Mr. Speaker or Mr. Chairman's throat.

MR. SPEAKER: I do think the Honourable Member for Morris should consider his words and consider how he is debating. I did also ask him, and I think he has attended to that, to speak into the microphone. Every time he wanders away I lose some of the sound and consequently cannot follow his thoughts. The Honourable Member . . .

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, there's three or four microphones around me. I say, Sir, that I never thought that during the course of the Budget Speech when one can discuss almost anything that they choose to discuss, that I would be called to order, but the First Minister has proven my point perhaps far better than my own words could have described it. But I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the fact is that although we are in Budget Speech, or not, I don't think that the Budget Speech is so broad as to give the prerogative to an honourable member to say that anyone in the House is doing anything improper with regard to the Chair or the Speaker, and I think that was the only point that was raised. Whether we are in a broad debate or not, that is not acceptable and I think that you have so ruled, and I think that the honourable member should accept that ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: I concur in that point of order. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: The fact is, Sir, the fact is that the next day the First Minister withdrew his point of privilege that he raised at that time and so did the Chairman.

But then, based on the suggestion of the First Minister, that we have got to prove everything we say in this Chamber, I introduced an Order for Return a couple of days later, asking for the very information that would have enabled us to substantiate or disprove the comments that were made by the Honourable Member for Riel, and that information simply asked for the number of new business enterprises being located in Manitoba, for each of the years 1969, 1970 and 1971, the name of each of those firms, and the type of business engaged upon, and the number of employees; and then his second Order for Return, asking for the number of businesses that had left this province, which would have given us the opportunity to make the statement, based on facts, or otherwise, and what was the answer of the Minister of Industry and Commerce? The First Minister said this "Mr. Chairman, the number of businesses operating in Manitoba is greater today than at any time when my honourable friend was in office, it's a matter of fact." If it's a matter of fact, then why can't we have the information? If that is a matter of fact, then the House is entitled to that information, Sir, and I say that the government are denying that information to us. Here's the reply of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. "Mr. Speaker, the government will accept this Order for Return subject to our ability to provide the information requested." --(Interjection)-- Right. All right if you can't provide it how can you prove it? How can the government prove it? How can they stand there with a neck full of Adam's apple and say that it is a matter of fact? They don't know themselves.

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

MR. PAULLEY: . . . not accept the order subject to the information that was possessed by the government and this is historic. We've always done that -- and be truthful!

MR. SPEAKER: I should also like to indicate while I'm on my feet, I'm not accepting the point of privilege because it wasn't. It may have been a matter of debate but I should like to indicate to the Honourable Member for Morris that he is repeating and re-reading Hansard to begin with which is repetition. Secondly he is also discussing and debating issues which have already been decided by this House. The Order for Return was accepted and was passed and it will be dealt with in due course and consequently he is debating an issue which has already transpired in this House. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, when it reaches the stage where I am unable to use evidence that I have before me to prove my point then it proves the very point that I've been attempting to make all the time - that this government are attempting to thwart the opposition. If the government to do that -- they did not have the information and I'm not quarreling with

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . . that -- then they have no right to say in this House that when we speak, when we say that business is deteriorating in this province that we don't have to prove it as the government says we did.

MR. PAULLEY: But be truthful.

MR. JORGENSEN: I'm being truthful.

MR. PAULLEY: You're not!

MR. JORGENSEN: The trouble with the House Leader is that he wouldn't know the truth if he saw it.

Sir, speaking of truthful statements, I'm going to now come to the budget.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to express to the Honourable Member for Morris that he's continually indicating that someone is not being truthful.

MR. JORGENSEN: They're accusing me of not being truthful.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I do not wish to debate with the Honourable Member for Morris or with any other member of this House but one of the rules is that one does not impugn any member of the House and I am sure that he is capable of knowing that. Now I'm not going to debate the issue with the honourable member. He knows very well what I'm speaking of and I do not wish to have a member interrupted continually on a matter of privilege because he's skating on thin ice. I think he should consider his remarks, consider what they mean and who they are going to offend. One of the rules is one must not offend members of this House. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Then, Sir, if it is improper to impugn motives, if it is improper to say that a member is not saying the truth and I ask you to ask the House Leader to withdraw his statement because he said I was not telling the truth.

Sir, now I come to the budget and I'm going to read from Page 4 of the Minister's statement in which he made these remarks: "In 1971 Manitoba's gross provincial income reached an all time high estimated level of close to 4.1 billion." And I want to ask the Finance Minister what does it mean? What does it mean by the gross provincial income? Where does those figures come from? What is the authority for those figures? Where does 4.1 billion come from and I want him to identify them when he replies when this budget debate is over. Surely the House is entitled to that kind of information.

Then he goes on to say this: "The output in sales in most economic sectors increased appreciably. Primary resource production for example rose by 10 percent over the previous year. Manufacturing output by 5.7 percent and retail sales increased by 8.4 percent." I wonder if the Minister could tell us just as an example if the \$4 million that was put into Western Flyer represents taxpayers' money -- represents part of that growth and then the half a million dollars that's been used to buy the product of that company represents more growth. --(Interjection)-- Is that their example of growth in this province? Perhaps the Minister can explain when he decides to rise at the conclusion of this debate. --(Interjection)-- Then -- Yes, I'm saying that -- that's what I'm talking about and the First Minister knows that full well. --(Interjection)--

In the primary resources industries he went on to say: "The largest expansion of output occurred in agriculture." And then he used this sentence: "The value of agricultural output increased from \$468 million in 1970 to \$553 million in 1971 - a difference of some 18.2 percent over the year." The Minister of Agriculture in introducing his Estimates the other day and you'll forgive me, Sir, if I quote back what the Minister said in the introduction of his Estimates - "that our farm value production is well over \$550 million" - and that indeed was a reverse, a good reverse this year compared to the last three or four years. Then he went on to say this" "Statistics are of course always easy to interpret one way or another and my friends opposite have certainly proven that and I want to remind members opposite not to take too much comfort from the fact that for 1971 we're showing a much healthier net income position from that of 1970, namely a projected \$160 million for Manitoba."

Well, Sir, let's look at those figures. Let us examine the agricultural statistics for the last two years. Now, Sir, I have before me a list of income figures for agriculture since 1951 up until 1971 - 20 years - and those figures were taken from the handbook of agricultural statistics up till 1965 which is as far as they've gone in that particular handbook and if anybody's interested in looking them up, their catalogue number is 21511; and then from 1966 to 1969, they're from the figures of farm net income 1969, catalogue number 21-202; but the 1970-71 figures are taken from the Outlook Conference in 1971 and the figures are compiled by the

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . . Dominion Bureau of Statistics. And rather than the figure of 468 million in 1970 and a figure of \$553 million in 1971, I find this -- that the realized gross income -- and that, Sir, I submit is the true income figure and the only one that means anything in agriculture. The realized -- if you're talking in gross income figures -- and that's what the Minister was talking about because that figure represents the value of products sold by the farmer for that year, plus wheat board payments, plus any other subsidies from the government, plus income in kind which represents the volume of consumption occurring on the farm. The farmer didn't have to pay for but it was deducted as income because it was income that he received in kind.

That is an interpretation of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. In 1970 that amounted to \$377,768,000 as opposed to the Minister's figure of 468 million. I wonder where he got that 468 million from. Maybe he could explain to the House, is that a fabrication of the new Manitoba Bureau of Statistics? He's going to have to give a better explanation of where he gets figures from if he expects us to believe anything that's in that budget.

Now then in 1971 he says the gross income -- he says the value of agricultural production in 1971 was \$553 million. Sir, realized gross income in 1971, and that's only an estimate, it's only an estimate because that's all it can be -- the final figures are not out yet. But according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics it is \$393 million instead of the \$553 million that the Minister talks about. Sir, that is a deliberate deception. It's either a deliberate deception or crass ignorance and the Minister can take his choice. --(Interjection)-- I've read the tables and they're even worse. They're even worse, Sir, and I'll come to those in a minute.

Now I attempted to give the Minister the benefit of the doubt because I thought -- surely the Minister, surely the Minister is not going to deliberately attempt to deceive the House so maybe he used a different set of figures. So I compiled the figures for -- I didn't compile them, they're already there. All I had to do was to copy them down and here they are here in this book "Outlook Conference" 1971 and Sir, before anybody rises to their feet I don't have to table it, it's a public document - anybody can get it for themselves. --(Interjection)-- Did I believe in what? --(Interjection)-- Well, Sir, I'll tell the First Minister this much. I've done a darn sight better job of interpreting them than the Minister of Finance has done because he's deliberately misled this House.

Sir, we'll go to another set of figures and that figure is entitled: **Total Gross Income** - and this can be a very misleading one because total gross income represents income received from the sale of farm products, income in kind. It also includes deficiency payments or whatever may be involved in the way of government payments - close inventory changes - and what happened in this instance. That figure is inflated because there was a \$65 million inventory change. And what does that mean, Sir? That means that the wheat that the farmer or the grain that the farmers couldn't sell next year transferred over to this year's account and still isn't sold but counted as income. I ask - even the First Minister is not so stupid that he doesn't know that that doesn't represent income unless it's sold. But they couldn't have even used that figure, Sir, because that only represents \$459 million, still \$100 million short of the figure used by the Minister of Finance. Where did that other \$100 million come from? --(Interjection) -- His hip pocket. The Minister of Agriculture has the answer and that's what they've done throughout this entire budget - grabbing figures from all over the place, hoping that nobody on this side of the House would recognize them, recognize the fraud that was going on on the other side in the presentation of this budget. Sir, it won't work. The only figure that means anything to the farmer -- and the Minister of Agriculture used the wrong figure as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of privilege and it is as follows. Earlier this evening during the remarks of the Honourable Member for Morris, he used a certain expression which I questioned the propriety of it, raised it as a point of privilege at the time. Subsequent to that the honourable member used the expression referring to an honourable member on this side and I quote: "You wouldn't know the truth if you saw it" - and then more subsequent even that that, he used the expression - "deliberate deceit" - and then in the last few seconds used the expression - "even such and such honourable member is not so stupid as not to understand that."

Now taking those expressions, all of them, Mr. Speaker, Sir, together, I would submit to you, Sir, that each and every one of them if not already going beyond the borderline as to what violates the rules and proper expressions of this House certainly comes perilously close



(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . to doing so and my point of privilege is simply to ask you, Sir, whether each of these expressions ought not to be taken under advisement by you, Sir, in order to ascertain whether or not we may not be trending slowly towards a debasement of common expressions used in this House.

A MEMBER: He's already told a joke ...

MR. SPEAKER: I would say that the matter of privilege that the Honourable the First Minister raised has some germane points to it. I would ask all honourable members to really try to maintain the decorum of this Assembly. I believe it's an auspicious Assembly and I should hope all honourable members when they are contributing to debate would also consider it as such and give second thoughts to their words before they express them. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Sir, I've given the honourable gentlemen opposite to take their choice. Either those figures were presented in gross ignorance or they're fraudulent -- and that is --(Interjection)-- Well maybe the Minister can explain where that \$553 million comes from. As I was saying, the Minister of Agriculture when he rose to speak on the Estimates, he said that the net income figures for Manitoba was \$160 million -- and I don't deny that, the net income figures for Manitoba is \$160 million; but included in that \$160 million is \$65 million of inventory transferred from last year and the year before that into this year. Sorry, it is not income unless it's sold and even they should know that and it does not represent a true income figure. What actually happened between 1970 and 1971 is that the income of western farmers, the income of farmers in Manitoba -- the realized net income --(Interjection)-- You know --(Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. JORGENSON: Do you know the Member for Winnipeg Centre, --(Interjection)-- the Member for Winnipeg -- ever since he came into this House, --(Interjection)-- ever since he came into the House has been attempting to make a fool of himself and possessing all of these --(Interjections)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! Order! Order, please! I would ask once again that members conduct themselves with decorum. I think it's most improper to make a personal attack on any one member in this House and it shouldn't occur by any member who wants to maintain the decorum. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: ... I'm going to conclude my comment to the Member for Winnipeg Centre who was not called to order when he called me a name by saying ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wish the Honourable Member for Morris would not refer to my rulings. I have called to order every member in this House, whenever possible. Unfortunately most members do not consider and listen to the decorum that should take place. And I'd once again ask for the co-operation of all members. It should not be necessary for your Chairman whom you elected and if you have any faith in him - to have to act like a policeman amongst you. I think I'm trying to conduct your rules so that you can have your business adjourned as quickly as possible. The Honourable Member for Morris has eight minutes.

MR. JORGENSON: Sir, and I hope you've taken into consideration the time ...

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I have.

MR. JORGENSON: Thank you very much, Sir. Thank you very much. But I say to you, Sir, that the business of this House can be expedited when members of the opposition are permitted to do the job that they're expected to do in this House and part of that job is criticism of the government.

But I was pointing out, Sir, that the Minister of Agriculture who knows better was using the net income figure of \$160 million as representing a fantastic increase in the income position of the farmers in Manitoba. Sir, it is nothing of the sort. The income figures of the Province of Manitoba according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, the agricultural division, as represented - and this is the best information that is available - the Minister was at that conference himself and he should that - the realized net income and the realized net income figure is a true income figure. It represents the amount of money that the farmers received for products that they sold in that particular year minus the expenses. What is more factual than that?

And what is the fact in connection with that income figure? In 1970 the realized net income figure -- and I wish when the Minister is speaking of net income figures that that's the one he would use because that's the true one -- realized net income in 1970 was \$96 million .071 --(Interjection)-- In 1971 the figure was \$94,813,000 --(Interjection)-- and that is the

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) . . . . figure -- and that is the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figure, Sir. --(Interjection)-- Now if the Minister of Agriculture has other figures from another bureau of statistics maybe during the course of the consideration of his Estimates he'll give us that figure. --(Interjection)-- I'll submit to a question when my 40 minutes are up. The First Minister and all of the members opposite have been attempting to encroach on my time in order to prevent me from making the remarks that I intended to make tonight and if they want me to answer questions, they'll answer them on their time, not mine. I've only got 40 minutes in this debate, Sir, much of which has been taken up in with interjections.

Now, Sir, the Minister of Agriculture illustrated or attempted to illustrate to the House all of those things that were going to create that millennium in agriculture. And he spoke of many things. One thing that he didn't speak of was the situation that he's created insofar as the egg problem is concerned. Sir, a real tragedy. The Minister along with the Attorney-General made a great effort and I congratulate them for it -- for bringing the matter of restriction on movement of eggs between provinces before the Supreme Court. That was a just and a proper move for the government to make. I congratulate them for it -- and, Sir, when I congratulate the government for something they must have done it right.

But then what happened? Having done that, having received the authority of the Supreme Court that restriction of the movement of eggs between provinces in this country was illegal and contrary to the British North America Act. The Minister of Agriculture was in eastern Canada carving up the country and Bulkanizing the country into various areas. --(Interjection)-- Yes, they were, but if I was a Tory minister in Ontario getting that kind of a deal I would go for it too. It was in the interests of Ontario to do that, it was in the interests of Quebec but it was against the best interests of the Province of Manitoba, and a good Minister of Agriculture in this province would have fought bitterly against it --(Interjection)-- would have fought bitterly against it because it's wrong, Sir.

The Minister of Agriculture from the Province of Alberta made a statement to the egg producers in that province just the other day in which he told them that their best interests lie in an expanded rather than a restricted market. That was the sort of thing that our Minister of Agriculture should have been doing here. Sir, Mr. Uskiw, the Minister will leave a legacy when he leaves the Department of Agriculture and that legacy will be the Bulkanization of this country so far as the marketing of agricultural products are concerned.

Sir, he has done a disservice to Canada in clinging to this nonsensical program of supply management -- a program that has never worked in any other country and will certainly not work here and yet they cling to it. It is a nostrum of theirs that they can't seem to forsake and they're going to ruin this country in an effort to attempt to prove their point. It's, Sir, it's nonsensical. It won't work and it will put the majority of our hog producers and the majority of our egg producers out of business in this province.

Sir, we depend on outside markets. Those markets are there. In the United States during the last few years the market for livestock products has risen considerably. We have not capitalized on those markets because this government takes an inward look towards the sale of agricultural products and as long as that inward look persists we'll be limited to the markets that exists within this country and, Sir, it will not ensure the survival of farmers in this province or indeed in western Canada.

. . . . continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, my original intention prior to earlier on today was to deal with the budget criticism that was presented by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. However after hearing contributions of several members of the House today I'm constrained to deal with some of those observations -- if I can use that terminology -- before dealing with the viewpoints that were put forward by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. I regret the fact that he isn't here tonight because the bulk of my criticism is directed to his remarks.

I think that out of respect to the honourable members of the House who have spoken but recently I'll direct some observations in respect to their contributions. In particular I want to single out the Honourable Member from Morris who has just taken his seat after delivering of himself a very mighty effort. It was a very considerable effort; it was full of sound and fury -- I won't indicate what it signified. I think that the statistical play that the honourable member made is something that will have to be rebutted by another statistician. I assume that he will take reference to the tables that were appended to the Budget Address and I'm sure that there will be further comment on that.

But I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member from Morris is -- a review of the statistics that were presented in the budget were as twisted as were his characterization of the words that he attributed to my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture -- because if such is the case then one can readily understand the confusion that exists in the mind of the Honourable Member from Morris because apparently he is unable to extract even by listening to the honourable - my colleague - or reading from Hansard of Friday, April 7th, it was available and his remarks were there to read. Obviously he has some difficulty with accuracy of expression and accuracy of accounting and I think that that is a difficulty I sympathize with. But I've alluded to it before and I think that honourable members have a duty to this House to endeavour wherever possible to state the facts as they are and not as what one honourable member in argument would like them to appear to be. Because, Mr. Speaker, my colleague when speaking during the introduction of his Estimates in answer to a commentary -- as a matter of fact it was a commentary from the Honourable Member from Morris who admonished that the records be kept straight and so on - my honourable colleague said this about the statistics, and I quote from Page 786 of the Hansard April 7th; "Statistics are of course always easy to interpret one way or another and I want to remind members opposite not to take too much comfort from the fact that for 1971 we are showing a much healthier net income position for that of 1970, namely" --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I know it vexes the honourable member to have to hear facts enunciated in the House but I think he has to constrain himself and I'll repeat again so that he won't be flustered. --(Interjection)-- I don't want him to be flustered. I do want the accuracy of my colleague's expressions recorded in the House in a proper manner this evening -- not left in the distorted fashion that the Honourable Member from Morris would like -- and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read exactly what my colleague the Honourable Minister of Agriculture said: "Statistics are of course always easy to interpret one way or another and I want to remind members opposite not to take too much comfort from the fact that for 1971 we are showing a much healthier net income position from that of 1970, namely a projected 160 million for Manitoba. - I think one has to accept the fact that those are guesstimates and that they may not be as meaningful as they seem to imply in that inventory changes and income in kind of course are part of that figure. --(Interjection)--

Now, Mr. Speaker, you see -- you see the Honourable Member from Morris is vexed that he's been found out -- found out in trying in argument to interpret something to my colleague . . .

A MEMBER: Shame.

MR. MACKLING: . . . that my colleague did not say in this House. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is the style of argument in the House of Parliament and if that is the devious manner in which my Honourable Member from Morris chooses to argue, why he may continue - he may continue because I suppose it's fun to rant and rave and put on an act and I think the Honourable Member from Morris is in somewhat of a competition with the Honourable Member from Lakeside. I don't choose to play favorites between them. I think they both adopt -- you know, I was waiting for that poem. I think they both adopt --(Interjection)-- that bard's expression that the world's a stage and every man must play his part -- and they're going to do their

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . . utmost to fulfill that ambition in this House. And I wish them well. I don't have any rancour towards that and as a matter of fact I found it most entertaining this evening. Maybe it's because I wasn't so much the butt.

But if I feel constrained sometimes, Mr. Speaker, to react -- and I think all of us react -- we react, Mr. Speaker, if there is an attempt to present something other than fact. Because you know, when I came into this House, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't thoroughly imbued with parliamentary traditions and I think that someone who hasn't been in the House in opposition like the Honourable Member for Morris isn't steeped to the same extent in the depth of the traditions that are here in the parliamentary system. And I'm the lesser for that and I confess that and I hope that in time I will become to be even more enamoured of the traditions and the formality -- and I know that my honourable colleague, the Minister of Labour, really has a true, a true sensitivity to the purpose and the propriety of this House and that's something I respect. But I had been led to believe that people who spoke in this House, that had spoke in parliament, used pervasive argument, strong language at times, eloquence, but above all honourable factual arguments. I have been somewhat misled, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sorry to have found that that is the case. But nevertheless my chagrin or my loss is not to be reflected on at this time.

I would like to give further consideration to the more effective criticism that -- well at least part of the effective criticism that has been presented in this budget debate. After having sat through the contributions of some of the members of the opposition I was rather appalled that there wouldn't be much effective debate in respect to the budget. I had overlooked the fact, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague -- and I'm proud to call him my colleague -- the Honourable Member from Crescentwood had yet to contribute to the budget debate. And I think honourable members on the other side of the House should have been listening. --(Interjection)-- should have been listening --(Interjection)-- because surely, Mr. Speaker, if there was an effective contribution -- (Interjection) -- Well I can hear some braying on the other side of the House and I think it's the Honourable Member from Riel who finds it, he finds it difficult -- (Interjection)-- you find it difficult to listen. He prefers to bray and he's braying now and I'll keep on indicating every time he brays, Mr. Speaker, because it's not intelligible to me -- (Interjection)-- it's not intelligible --(Interjection)-- so I think that I'll characterize it as braying. --(Interjection)-- He's braying again, Mr. Speaker, he's braying again. Now there's some silence, I'll carry on, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)-- He's braying again, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Riel. --(Interjection)-- He is braying again, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Riel. He is continually interrupting. He is continually interrupting. It is most unintelligible but obviously it's him. --(Interjection)-- Well he's carrying on, he's carrying on.

A MEMBER: Maybe he wants to move adjournment.

MR. MACKLING: I am sure he would. Most of his colleagues have gone.--(Interjection) -- But I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member from Crescentwood that his criticism is recognized by -- certainly by myself. I want to indicate to him that as much as I recognize that much of what he said should be recognized and acted upon, one has to frankly accept that in a society where we act in accordance with the will of the majority of the people in a democratically elected government, a government may only move in establishing policies and programs in keeping with the views of the majority of the people. And although there may be members of this House in some number who are prepared to accept a far more dynamic public sector, a government which would do far more to develop basic power structures for the people. --(Interjection)-- The Honourable Member from Riel is continuing to bray, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure that he's going to have to be taken out to the far pasture if he continues to keep on braying because he's going to upset even the honourable members on his side of the House who would like to sleep.

Mr. Speaker, much of what the Honourable Member from Crescentwood, much of what he said, he said with a conviction and a sincerity that should have moved honourable members on the other side of the House. The fact there are many people in Manitoba who have yet to recognize that government must be more effective in society is a sad commentary on the strength of the social material of our society. I do believe however that we have an obligation to move as effectively and as quickly in response to the recognized public desire for government action in every field, and part of the problem of course, lies with the fact that we have such ineffective and such very narrow political attitude in opposition. An opposition to be effective should be developing, viable, viable alternative programs to indicate to the people why and how they could

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . . be much more effective and much more progressive in the development of policies for the people; but we don't find that and I for one, although I recognize the effect that it can have, I certainly appreciate constructive criticism from the Honourable Member from Crescentwood.

Well I do miss the fact that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition isn't here, because I think that -- you know, he's probably been listening to the Honourable Member from Lakeside, the Honourable Member from Morris and thought that perhaps that's the style he should emulate. He kind of uses the -- if I could use the expression, Mr. Speaker, the cute approach -- he figures that maybe if he can approach the debate by way of a joke it will disarm everyone to believe that after all he is a very nice person and what he's arguing is all very nice. He used the pun on the word "shift", indicating that really when people realized what had happened they would recognize that it was a shaft and not a shift. Well I'm wondering you know, with this play of the vowel "i" for the vowel "a", I wonder if Sid might become Sad.

MEMBERS: Oh!

MR. MACKLING: You know what happens, Mr. Speaker, to a debator who talks about shafts and he doesn't make his point -- he's the one that gets shafted. --(Interjection)-- Well I'll leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, and other members as to whether or not the Honourable Leader of the Opposition really is on the receiving end of the shaft by the end of this session.

The Honourable Member from Inkster characterized the Honourable Member from Lakeside as really one who would consider a flood to be a lake that was reduced by two feet -- and I thought, you know, that was very imaginative but perhaps that was going a bit too far -- but you know, after having heard the contribution of the Honourable Member from River Heights, I'm now satisfied that it didn't go far enough.

You know, I really wonder at the argument of the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition -- he and his colleagues, subsequent to the Throne Speech, to the Budget Speech debate were saying: "you're mortgaging the future of the province. Oh, terrible thing -- you're pledging so much of the future of the province, you're doing a terrible thing. Well, I don't know where they studied their economics but I think they should make an effort to listen at least to some other Conservatives elsewhere in Canada. I don't know whether they are more progressive or less progressive but certainly they're not all reading the same kind of economic treatises and they're not indicating the same kind of approach. Now, the Honourable Mr. Stanfield who should be known to the honourable members opposite has been making speeches about reducing taxes, cutting taxes,

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel on a point of order.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, earlier in the evening that you did make a ruling about the limits of the budget speech debate. I understand we are now listening to the Attorney-General discuss the merits of Mr. Stanfield . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please. Can I make the point of order or do honourable members wish to argue amongst themselves?

A MEMBER: Whatever you like, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I was going to indicate that the honourable gentleman didn't have a point of order. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I trust that that intervention will not be taken from my time, because it wasn't a valid point of order.

Well, the Honourable Member from Riel I hoped might have taken the time to listen to something that the Honourable Mr. Stanfield was saying about the economics of government in Canada and I think it's applicable in Manitoba as well. He said that, you know, governments ought to be cutting taxes and increase their spending.

Well you know, if the honourable member had listened to the Budget Address -- and if he couldn't hear very well he could have perused the Budget Address and checked.--(Interjection) The net effect of the budget proposals submitted by my colleague is not only a shift but a reduction in tax --(Interjection)-- a reduction in tax and a commitment to very substantial capital spending. Now these are the very things that the foremost of people who want to be in office for the Progressive Conservative party are saying at other levels. Now surely, surely, they are not going to be so two-faced as to deny that what in effect we were doing seems to be in accord with what has been suggested as sound advice elsewhere. --(Interjection)-- You know, the Honourable D'Arcy McHugh in Ontario produced a budget and what did that budget produce --

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . . a massive, a massive deficit, a massive deficit -- (Interjection)-- of approximately \$600 million. And the honourable members -- (Interjection)-- mumble and bumble --(Interjection)-- about pledging the future --(Interjection)-- or mortgaging the future --(Interjection)-- the honourable members are concerned about a 2., approximately \$3 million deficit in Manitoba -- and in Ontario we have a \$600 million deficit -- and they leave this Chamber, some of them, ranting and roaring and saying to the Press "It's devastating, we're mortgaging the future of this province", and I'm going to have something further to say about this so-called mortgaging of the future.

The Alberta government, what did they do? They produced a very, very substantial deficit budget. But you know New Brunswick - I think the honourable members opposite would pattern themselves off another Conservative government of New Brunswick, I think that's probably more in their keeping. What did they do there? They had a very substantial increase in their current account spending, but what did they do to provide for some fiscal strength to develop an influence against the deflationary position of their economy. Well what they did is they held their capital spending to about \$1 million and they increased their current account spending by some approximately \$40 million. I don't have the statistics before me but those are approximations. Now, Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of very progressive fiscal budgeting that would appeal to the honourable members opposite.

And you know --(Interjection)-- you know, the honourable members opposite talk about doctrinaire socialists and there is another honourable member of this House -- I don't see him present -- who talks about the radicals or the socialists, now dominating this government. Well you know, I couldn't help but feel that the Honourable Member from Crescentwood squirmed more than I suppose most of us, but I certainly squirmed when that was said, because that's not even credible.

I'd like, Mr. Speaker, to allude just briefly to a part of the Winnipeg Tribune editorial of April 7th about budget prudence and in the last paragraph of the editorial they said this: "All in all, the budget appears to be prudent and conservative by normal political and economic standards." And you know that's not really unkind or unfair comment and I don't think that we can say in this House, and I certainly am not going to say that this is a very radical, a very in-temperate, a very terrifically expansionist budget. I think the Winnipeg Tribune editorial is quite right because this isn't wild budgeting by any stretch of the imagination -- a very moderate, a very, very moderate deficit - true a fairly substantial amount of capital spending but nothing, nothing unseemly, or unkindly, certainly not the kind of thing that should provoke the kind of reaction from the honourable members opposite and some honourable members who have made some comments about radical and so on within the New Democratic Party.

You know, if honourable members opposite, Mr. Speaker, would have their way we wouldn't embark on any capital spending: that you know is mortgaging the future -- mortgaging the future --(Interjection)-- of the province and you know, you know, Mr. Speaker, for those who are always accusing us on this side of being doctrinaire, about wooden, not entrepreneurial -- they are the people who are worried, who are worried to pledge a little of the credit of this province to develop capital work for jobs. And the Honourable Member from River Heights keeps wailing about the need for jobs, jobs, jobs and yet his party would have us entrench -- don't spend any money, you know that's risky - you're pledging the future of the province. Don't be entrepreneurial - you know, hold back and have a very tight budget, don't spend anything on capital expenditures. Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, who are the doctrinaire people? --(Interjection)-- Who are the doctrinaire people? Who are the entrepreneurial people? Who are those who are concerned to make our economy dynamic, make an economy that will produce jobs?

Now the honourable members are unhappy, unhappy with the exposure of the inadequacy of their argument. --(Interjection)-- Well I really can't help that. I really can't help that. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the honourable members opposite have no understanding of economics and it's a great pity because I think that it would be very helpful if they had some greater understanding about basic approaches to the fundamental policies that have to be decided by any government in this day.

You know the one thing that they have argued, Mr. Speaker, is that we've got to cut back and they took out the knife in respect to the Attorney-General's estimates on Law Enforcement. And you know they found that they didn't have anything to cut and I feel sorry for them because what they were going to do was inflict a higher impost on the people of Manitoba. They weren't

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . . going to give them anything like the services they thought and if that's the kind of fat cutting that they are going to produce why we're in for a very, very sorry continuance of the Estimates debate.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no question but that any government whether it be New Democratic, Liberal, God forbid, even Conservative is going to want constructive criticism, indications where it would be proper and advisable to cut back or retrench or change the course of any given program that has been in being for some time. But that's not the kind of thing that we are getting from the honourable members opposite -- we're getting the rumblings about mortgaging the future of this province and it's a pretty sick commentary on the calibre of the opposition debate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to briefly refer to the analysis that has been made of the budget by some of the media. The Winnipeg Tribune budget editorial of Friday, April 7th I have already referred to. In general, if I could paraphrase what they've said, they commended the budget. Then the Free Press of April 11th however, suggested there was some sleight of hand on the part of the Minister of Finance and they said in the concluding paragraph: "Thus Mr. Cherniack's wizardry -- there is however, one point in all this that the taxpayer might do well to consider. If the 1972 school tax reduction program is terminated at the end of the current year municipalities will no longer get the government payment of up to \$50.00 per dwelling unit -- and this is the important part, Mr. Speaker -- "Instead, the government payment of between \$50.00 and \$140.00 will go directly to the owner or renter but what will happen to counteract the drop in municipal revenues? Municipal taxes will increase by the equivalent of \$50.00 per dwelling unit and the taxpayer, excepting those who get more than \$50.00 through Mr. Cherniack's professed largesse will be right back where he started". And you know, one comes to accept the kind of negative damning by faint praise that is characteristic of the editorial comment frequently of the Free Press where they deem it appropriate to give some faint praise. We are more used to the kind of devastating or they hope, devastating broadside that they launch from time to time.

What gives me more concern though, Mr. Speaker, is when the Winnipeg Tribune of tonight's edition April 11th, in the concluding, well in the second column of this editorial commented that Mr. Spivak -- referring to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition -- had found a weakness in the tax credit plan and they allude to the suggestion that in 1973 the municipalities will not have the \$50 that was otherwise payable and therefore would have to increase taxes accordingly. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me make it quite clear to the editors of the Winnipeg Free Press and the Winnipeg Tribune and honourable members opposite, that the present tax credit plan, the \$50.00, the maximum of \$50.00 per household or per renter of a dwelling unit, including a rental unit, does not affect the amount of taxation that is levied by a municipality. What it does mean is that that \$50.00 of the taxes that would otherwise be payable by the ratepayers is paid directly to the municipality. The total amount to be levied is not changed in any way and in 1973 this same thing will occur. There will be no need to change the mill rate because of the tax credit reduction plan. The total requirement for the municipal tax purposes will be whatever is required according to their budget but the monies the monies will be paid, true, not by a remittance from the Provincial Government to the municipality but will be paid by the taxpayer as it was and still continues at the present time in 1971.

Now there may be some valid criticism that whereas in 1972 the municipalities and cities will be receiving a block of money quickly almost immediately from the Provincial Government by way of the educational credit plan and there will be a tendency for this to be deferred for a longer period of time under the new plan. There will be, I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, a desire on the part of ratepayers to pay their taxes so they can obtain the credit that they're entitled to on the filing of their 1973 tax return because, Mr. Speaker, no taxpayer who is entitled to a rebate can claim that rebate on his income tax form as a credit until he's paid his taxes. So the municipalities and the cities, I don't think, will be unduly harmed by the fact that instead of it being a direct payment from the Provincial Government to the municipalities -- we'll get the payment as always has been in the past from the ratepayer himself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- much has been said in commentary about this plan and by various persons in respect to the budget but I would like to refer, Mr. Speaker, to a commentary by another newspaper, a newspaper that unfortunately is not published in this province and I refer to the Globe and Mail editorial of April 8, 1972. --(Interjection)-- And this is in -- well, I believe it's a kind of a small "l" liberal if anything. --(Interjection)--

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . . Well there is some divided opinion, Mr. Speaker, as to what the nature of the political affiliation of the editorial staff is and I'm not absolutely certain. But in any event I would like to read into the record the editorial. The editorial's entitled: "The Manitoba Way", and I would commend it, it's good reading for honourable members opposite. I read: "We hope that whatever the differences in political philosophies involved the Manitoba budget brought down Thursday by Finance Minister Saul Cherniack will be required reading at least at Queen's Park. At the least some important lessons in honesty could be learned. The NDP government of Manitoba has increased the sales taxes on liquor and tobacco. The Ontario government also did the same thing recently but where Ontario attempted to hide a price increase to the alcohol business and handed the tobacconist a built-in opportunity to raise their prices even more than the tax, Manitoba chose the path of straightforwardness. The increase is strictly an increase in tax, Mr. Cherniack says. We're not encouraging and do not want the manufacturers to raise the prices for their commodity. We have tried to avoid the possibility of a built-in increase for manufacturers by avoiding any fractional boost. Thus a 17-cent cigar in Winnipeg now costs 18 cents. The five-cent increase in the price of a pack of 25 cigarettes will go entirely to the public purse, a significant change from the Ontario situation where the 1, 2 cent tax on cigarettes translates into a five-cent increase at the vending machines and a two-cent increase at the store. In another move it suggests the Manitoba government is rather more practically aware of the plight of low income citizens. Prices on Canadian beer and table wine selling for less than \$3.00 in that province will be reduced so that they will not be affected by the tax changes. Did such a gesture ever occur to Treasurer D'Arcy McHugh and the mandarins of Queen's Park when they were preparing a budget that hit harder at the little man than at any other sector in society?" That is the end of the quotation from that editorial. And I would commend it as good reading for not only the editors of the Winnipeg Tribune and the Winnipeg Free Press but all of the honourable members opposite because that's the kind of fair commentary about a people's government budget that I think should be required reading. --(Interjection)- You know, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from River Heights -- and I really regret the fact that he is not here -- produced a wonder sheet, and I call it a wonder sheet because one couldn't help but wonder what analyst he had hired, and I hope that he is not continued in employment by the honourable members opposite because I think he's leading them astray.

A MEMBER: . . . ask them "where is my wandering boy tonight?"

MR. MACKLING: No, I won't ask that question. I appreciate the fact that the honourable member has heavy demands on him but the example sheet is so full of air that one wonders if this is an attempt to really convince anyone or to distort the factual information that was produced in the House.

Example sheet 1 for example, in its final column says - net saving for 1973. Now I don't know what net saving is supposed to mean. I presume, we can only presume that that's supposed to mean a net improvement over the tax credit of \$50.00 in 1972.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister has four minutes. Four minutes.

MR. MACKLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, We return to Example sheet 2. The Honourable Member from River Heights produced -- I can't understand what sale value of the House has to do with the tax credit plan that was discussed in this House. I can't understand where he calculates the figures that he has in the final column called "net saving for 1973" because it's a complete distortion. So in short, Mr. Speaker, I am at a complete loss to understand anything of this metaphysical statistical analysis that some wonder man for the Honourable Leader of the Opposition prepared.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member has to return to his tables and do some more arithmetic. What I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, is that the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition, in condemning the tax credit proposals is really in effect condemning the efforts of our sister province and I'm sure he would like to be able to emulate the Honourable D'Arcy McHugh, the Treasurer of the Province of Ontario. And let me say this and put this on the record, Mr. Speaker, that the tax credit plan that the Honourable Minister of Finance introduced is not unique in Canada. It has a parallel and that parallel is with the Ontario tax credit plan, and the Province of Ontario is on record and committed to a scheme which in many ways parallels very closely the tax credit plan that is proposed by this government. And let me make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that no one has suggested that what is involved in the tax credit plan produced by and introduced by my colleague the Minister of Finance is a



(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . . negative income tax. That's something that we have indicated we are going to study and study carefully before there's any massive introduction of any such proposal. But the honourable member suggests that somehow this is a negative income tax. It is what we said it is - an educational tax rebate plan - and that only. It is not a negative income tax. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in proper perspective the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has not only failed to direct his analysis of the scheme in a way which will produce any positive contribution to this debate but he has lost his chance to show in a constructive way how this government might even have considered going much further in an expansionary budget to meet the needs of our economy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I realize we're on short time but I wanted to rise to -- particularly to comment on the comments of the Attorney-General. I see that he seems to be sitting here not being able to interpret what the Member for Morris said and thank goodness the Finance Minister was in his place because he understood it -- he got the full impact. And I want to apologize for our leader as the Attorney-General was criticizing him; I want to apologize not necessarily for what he said in the debate in the finance on the budget but certainly what he said certainly what he said when he was debating the Throne Speech. He stood in his place and made reference to that Treasury Bench over there and he made reference to Shakespeare and I say he should have made reference to Walt Disney because if that isn't a Mickey Mouse cabinet I've never seen one. It's an absolute Mickey Mouse cabinet. --(Interjection)--

The Member for Flin Flon stood and he made mention about, I think the president of Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting and his earnings of \$96,000 - a figure like that - the vice-president, \$48,000 -- and about the boards in the east that control the western investments. If he would just take a look and I ask him what the president of the union that runs and controls those men in Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting gets --(Interjection)-- I would like to know what they get in dollar and cents. And I say to you that the President of Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting has taken that \$96,000 -- is turning \$50,000 of it back into the economy by the way of income tax. --(Interjection)-- Well just look at that. Just listen to it and I'll say to you that that crook that's running that union - the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting - is not putting five cents back into income tax because if he hadn't served ten years in the penitentiary he wouldn't have had that job and I go on to say . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't think the Honourable Member for Charleswood should use that kind of language reflecting on characters of others who have no opportunity to defend themselves. I think he should reconsider how he's going to make his contribution to this Assembly. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: I withdraw those penitentiary remarks, Sir. I'll go a little deeper into unions and I'll go to the President of the United States, the Teamsters Union. I'll wait till the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The gentleman has called certain union members crooks. I demand that he withdraw and apologize.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: I withdraw and I apologize. I have to go a little deeper because actually I don't know who the president of the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting workers is so I'll go to the Teamsters Union president, one James Hoffa. Now if that man isn't a crook, a gangster and everything else, who is? --(Interjection)-- All right. There's a man, it's not a board in the east that controls like the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting does. This cigar-smoked room filled with cigar smoke in the States, right in New York. The President of the Teamsters Union. --(Interjection)-- Now just a minute. This is when he was put in the penitentiary, I say, not since he's come out -- but he's retired now on how many thousand dollars? -- hundreds of thousand of dollars -- him, his son, his daughter-in-law. How many hundred of thousands of dollars come out of the labour and go directly into that man's pocket and in the States and this is Canadian dollars. --(Interjection)-- I say that it's too bad the Member for Crescentwood wasn't here now when he talks about what goes on here in this city in the investments of Manitoba. --(Interjection)--that's fine. All right. --(Interjection)-- Right.

And I bring this letter out -- I dug it out of a file I have here only because the Minister of Municipal Affairs spoke today and only because the Member for Crescentwood spoke. When I listened to those speeches -- I could never understand what made this one Paul MacKenzie,

(MR. MOUG cont'd) . . . . provoked him to write this letter -- but I heard those speeches today and this man says: "Double standards seen in protest. Al Mackling, Steve Juba, Saul Cherniack, Howard Pawley, Cy Gonick and Joe Zuken with a crowd of about 150 people marched down our Main Street protesting the American underground explosions to be carried on in the Aleutian Islands. If this had just been a collection of known communists little would have been taken but these were the respected leaders in our community. No doubt some of them weren't believing that the test will harm mankind but why do these people . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would permit a question at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Definitely not. When I'm finished tomorrow afternoon I'll answer your questions if I over-run my 40 minutes. "But why do these people only demonstrate when it is the United States that is involved? Where were they when the Soviet and the Chinese Reds detonated their atomic bombs? Where were their protests? Where were the Soviet and the Chinese communists over-ran peaceful countries murdering and prosecuting people?" -- (Interjection)-- They were marching up and down the streets here. "Why are they so strangely silent when the Soviets and Chinese armed the Viet Cong and keep the war going in Vietnam? What about the latest build-up of Soviet missiles as recently reported in the press? Will we see the same public officials demonstrating against these acts or have our marchers forgot what is morally right and what is morally wrong? I say they forget when it comes to back their own political beliefs. They're masked, they're masked behind a certain New Democratic Party which sounds nice to the public and looks good when you hear it, but if the truth was known . . . anything new about that party and what goes on with it.

I also found another letter --(Interjection)-- and this is in the Free Press on October 16, 1972. It's headed: "Dear Alexei Kosygin: I see by the newspapers that you are visiting Canada later this month. Personally I am greatly honoured yet at the same time deeply disappointed. Your itinerary calls for flying from eastern Canada to Vancouver, then to Edmonton and back to eastern Canada. You fly over Manitoba going both ways --(Interjection)-- but do not stop off here even once. . ." --(Interjection)-- This hurts, buddy, cause this really strikes home with a guy like you. This really strikes home with a guy like you, doesn't it? Just listen, to what your people in Manitoba that your're representing -- just listen to what they think about this: "You fly over Manitoba going both ways but do not stop off here even once, not even for a brief moment as though you had never even heard that our province is the showpiece of socialism in Canada." That's a nice name to have. Socialist. Wait, I hope I get the same hand from the Minister of Inkster when I complete this letter. I can tell that you've never read this one. "I'm sure that you would feel at home here. I assure you that there's very little here which is different from your own country. For example just as in your country we in Manitoba are gradually doing away with all opposition. If we were here to tell you how many radical pieces of legislation we passed in our Legislature this year without giving our opposition even a chance to say "nay", it would straighten your hair, straighten the hair on your Slavonic . . ." --(Interjection)-- Well Orders-in-Council. Face it, face it. If the opposition -- if we want to know anything we ought to get the daily newspaper . . .

A MEMBER: Carry on, Carry on.

MR. MOUG: and with 20 in caucus just to make sure that we all don't catch what's going on in that paper, we get 14 from the government -- 14 papers for 20 people to read. It goes on, and he says: "Then why are the opposition -- you say I agree with you but don't forget it is only a holdover from the previous bourgeois capitalist government and I feel that maybe soon we shall be able to liquidate it altogether. So you see, comrade" -- listen to this -- "so you see this, comrade, we are not that much different from your own great socialist state."

It goes on and on and he's talking about a boat here and he says: "I mean a state steamer on the Lake Winnipeg which we now use for official cruises for our own Cabinet Ministers whenever they plan to do something and many other things -- and many other things too numerous to mention." --(Interjection)-- That might open some back doors of the cabinet rooms. --(Interjection)-- Right. He goes on to say - I want to pick out the important parts of this: "I don't believe all those capitalist lies about business moving out of Manitoba just because we have the heaviest taxation in the land. It's true, Imperial Oil is moving out, but what true blue or is it (red) socialists would want to live together in one people's state with a firm that boasts the name "Imperial". "You know, this would be ridiculous wouldn't it? If you lived in a

(MR. MOUG cont'd) . . . . socialist state such as this and you have an Imperial Oil, you know, how could Bilton put up with this? It wouldn't wash.

"So won't you please re-consider your decision to stop off in Manitoba only if for a little while. We could even -- especially in honour of your visit, comrade, arrange for the wives and daughters of our glorious cabinet ministers to sweep our streets at Portage and Main, bedecked with babushkas and toting the finest short-handled Chinese bamboo brooms. That, if nothing else, would I am certain bring a tear of nostalgia to your eye. Drop in but until then here's a toast to you to our two great socialist states." --(Interjection)-- . . .

Well I say, I want to thank the Member for Inkster for acknowledging that and another thing --(Interjection)-- no, I don't want to get you guys too deeply involved -- I want to give you some time to think this over. I'll finish off tomorrow. --(Interjection)--

But the Member for Flin Flon, when we were at The Pas at the hearing he was right there and he got up that night about Autopac and he said Autopac this, Autopac that, Autopact that. One of his constituents was in at the hearing of the L.G.D. 's on the Municipal Affairs Committee at The Pas -- and I am sure was a constituent from Flin Flon -- and he got up and he spoke and with great latitude. I agree with the member who chaired the Municipal Affairs Committee, he spoke with great latitude. But one mention of Autopac and their charge north of 53, you're out of order. You can't speak about that, that's not what we're here to listen to. They're not sitting up there to listen about that -- they don't want to hear about the tough hit the people got north of 53 with Autopac. They only want to hear about the nice things.

Mr. Speaker, the other day in the Committee of Supply --(Interjection)-- and I don't want to get involved in what I basically got up to speak about. I only want to mention one more thing. --(Interjection)-- The other day in Committee of Supply, with the Member from Logan in the Chair and you were absent from the House, Sir, there was a point of order raised by the First Minister on page 496 on March 28th and it went on that the Member for Lakeside spoke about it. The Attorney-General got up and he spoke and he mentioned about the Honourable Member from Lakeside and he paused to put himself together for what he was going to say, and the Member from St. Matthews says "He is a liar" and was caught, caught by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, called it to order by saying: "Order, I'm saying order to the Honourable Attorney-General because I heard a comment that I don't want to hear repeated in this Chamber by someone in the back." Now I say, Sir, that the Member for St. Matthews can't stand up and deny he said that. He's also not man enough to stand up and apologize and retract --(Interjection)-- to the member that he said it to, that's to who, to anybody that's got to get up in here and stand up and call somebody else a liar. And don't think I haven't felt like it, because I have sat here and listened to a lot of liars in this place but I wouldn't out and out call them liars and that man did. --(Interjection)-- he lacked the guts to stand up and withdraw it. And I say, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that you weren't in the Chair that day. There was a lot of confusion and it just happened to get by the Chairman's attention. --(Interjection)--

I wanted to kill time until 10 o'clock here, Mr. Speaker, but if the House Leader would accept this as 10 o'clock and leave this stand in my name. --(Interjection)-- All right. --(Interjection)-- There was a letter --(Interjection)-- I found a letter to the editor the other day --(Interjection)-- I was checking through some letters to the editor I had . . .

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, since we are infringing on Private Members' time, if the member . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. We are not infringing on Private Members' time - our rules indicate that when the Budget Speech takes precedence. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: I noticed there was one letter that I had here, Sir, from --(Interjection)-- letters to the editor. They seem to enjoy them over there, I got a hand from - this is Wednesday, September 29, 1971 and this is referring -- I might have read this before, I am not sure, it was referring to a double standard seen in a protest. It made reference to Al Mackling, Steve Juba, Saul Cherniack, Howard Pawley, Cy Gonick, Joe Zuken with a crowd of about 150 people marched down our main street. --(Interjection)-- You are pretty thick -- it will take time for this to sink in. I think this is worth reading twice. "Marched down our main street protesting the American underground explosions to be carried on in the Aleutian Islands."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member already read that in his speech today. Repetition -- this is the rule.

MR. MOUG: --(Interjection)-- . . . there's a . . . I'm particularly saying it for the

(MR. MOUG cont'd) . . . . benefit of the Minister of Finance. And it says if this had just been a collection of known Communists little notice would have been taken, you know - there were strangers got involved in that that day and it's very surprising.

Anyways, Mr. Speaker, in regards to the City of Winnipeg and I think that this certainly involves lots to do with finance insofar as particularly we are concerned in Charleswood, Tuxedo, and West River Heights particularly the area that the people are in that are farming now within the City of Winnipeg. --(Interjection)-- Those that are -- I'll be here at 10 o'clock, Russ -- those that are inside the perimeter are involved in Local Improvement Districts that are assessed for water and the likes of --(Interjection)-- I'll continue that tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

With regards to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, I had a note here that I thought should be read to him and read into the records. It's how to get rich quick - and I thought if he was interested in buying up an air force and getting one going and a land army with buses and a navy with its boats, that there's a good idea here for him to get something going. To get rich quick you start a cat ranch with 100,000 cats and each cat will average twelve kittens a year. The cat skins will sell for 30 cents each. One hundred men can skin 5,000 cats a day. We figure a daily net profit of over \$1,000. Now what will we feed the cats? We will start a rat ranch next door with a million rats, the rats will breed --(Interjection)-- you're an authority on that -- You're an authority on that. The rats will breed twelve times faster than the cats so we will have four rats to feed each day to each cat. Now what should we feed the rats? Well, we'll feed the rats the carcasses of the cats after they've been skinned.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour is 10 o'clock. The House is accordingly adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.