



First Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

26 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



Vol. XXV No. 5A

2:30 p.m. Tuesday, November 29, 1977

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY of MANITOBA

Tuesday, November 29, 1977

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Ruesell): At this time I would like to direct your attention to the gallery where we have 23 students from grade 5 standing of the St. Alphonsus School. These students are under the direction of Sister Loretta. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. We also have 15 students of grade 8 and 9 standing from Bruce Junior High. These students are under the direction of Mr. Brian Head. On behalf of all the members, I bid you welcome.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . . Oral Questions . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY,; Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. In our democratic tradition it is clearly understood that the function of the judiciary and that of the legislature is separate and remains separate. Therefore it is with extreme regret that I read in the Winnipeg Free Press, today, a statement which I believe to be totally untrue, incorrect and unfair insofar as the judiciary is concerned in the province of Manitoba. The statement states, in an article written by David Lee, that some judges had labelled the family laws as being unworkable. Mr. Speaker, I know of no judges that have entered into the political arena that have participated in partisan debate in respect to family law, neither am I aware of any comments or any references by the judiciary in this province in regard to the laws that are presently before this legislature. I regret very much that there should have been such an inference insofar as the judiciary is concerned in Manitoba and I would hope that the Winnipeg Free Press and Mr. David Lee would make immediate arrangements in order to ensure that there is proper clarification of these comments.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

HON. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Several weeks ago he announced in the paper that he was reviewing the situation of hay and feed supplies in areas that were adversely affected by the weather conditions throughout the West Lake, Interlake and Swan River areas. Is he in a position now to make an announcement whether or not there will be any feed assistance program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, due to the time of the season, the early part of the winter, we are unable to make an announcement of any proposed feed assistance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wish to pose a question to the Minister in charge of the Environment. I wonder whether he can indicate to the House what the policy is with respect to allowable discharge of animal wastes into rivers and streams, creeks, etc., in the province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, a supplementary question.

MR. USKIW: I wonder if while the minister is taking that question as notice whether he can also inform the House as to the provisions of the present permit from the Clean Environment Commission with respect to the operations of the right-angled farms at East Selkirk.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him what he intends to do about the thousands of head of livestock that are now being marketed that should not be otherwise marketed if he had done his duty and provided assistance to livestock producers who do not have sufficient seed this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the information that I have is that the thousands of head that are being marketed at this time of year are the normal flow of livestock from the producers with the movement of calves in the fall. It's their harvest.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose with a supplementary question.

MR. ADAM: I would like to ask a supplementary question and ask him if he is aware that there are thousands and hundreds, if not thousands, hundreds and hundreds of brood cows that are now going to market; a lot of calves as well but lots of cattle that otherwise would be kept on farms.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago it came to my attention that the federal government announced that funds would be made available to the province of Manitoba under the Federal Urban Transport Assistance Program and I believe on November 4th in an Information Services release the honourable minister described these funds — the allocation for Manitoba of these funds — as being totally inadequate, and that's a quotation. The Minister indicated that he expected to receive further clarification of the federal proposal when Otto Lang, the Minister responsible for Urban Affairs and Transport, that is to say . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. I would ask the member to ask his question as concisely as possible. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: The question, Mr. Speaker, was addressed to the honourable minister and I asked him whether or not he had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Lang in order to clarify the federal proposal and the allocation of funds for Manitoba, and I asked what response he received from the honourable minister in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have not met with Mr. Lang. The meeting that occurred was a meeting of departmental officials of the federal government and Urban Affairs and we invited representatives from the city to attend the meeting to clarify the proposal. The proposal is now in the process of review and I will be communicating with Mr. Lang after that is ready.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington with a supplementary question.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, insofar as this federal program and policy is going to have dramatic repercussions on the availability of urban transportation funds in urban Manitoba, I would ask the honourable minister whether he has discussed the possibility with representatives of urban municipalities throughout our province of taking a joint and concerted position in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: I have not yet, Mr. Speaker, discussed this matter with other urban officials. The City of Winnipeg has however invited the participation of the Urban Affairs Department in a series of meetings in Ottawa sometime in mid-December. One of the topics, of course, will be relative to this proposed program by the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington, with a final supplementary.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, in view of that, I'm wondering whether the honourable minister would clarify to this House whether or not his government is willing to enter into such a joint venture if that is the expressed desire of representatives of Manitoba's urban municipalities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister or the Minister responsible for energy and mining matters. There is a report of a federal-provincial conference

Tuesday, November 29, 1977

taking place, I believe this week, and I was wondering if the First Minister could indicate what kind of delegation this province is sending to that federal-provincial conference, which ministers, and if, in fact, they are carrying with them any form of proposal to their colleagues concerning the layoffs at INCO and the need for alternative measures to deal with the serious problems in the mining industry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, my information is that the minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro, who is also the Minister of Finance, will be attending. I'm not aware of what other officials, if any, will be part of the group attending with him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, with a supplementary.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister again, considering that one of the items on the agenda of that conference will be dealing with the problems in the mining industry, does the First Minister consider also sending along with the Minister of Finance the Minister for Mines and Natural Resources, so that this province would be able to present its concerns concerning the problems at INCO and other proposed layoffs in the mining industry, and does the government have any proposals or plans that they're prepared to lay before that federal-provincial conference in respect to those difficulties in the mining field?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that there has been liaison, or will be liaison between the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Mines with respect to the matter that my honourable friend raises. With the House sitting, it's impossible to get too many ministers away attending conferences. Of course, if we could speed up the business of the House, we could maybe get on to that important business.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. I'd like to say that I was pleased to hear that the 1977 Mining Safety Seminar has been rescheduled, although now we'll have to term it the 1978 Mining Safety Seminar. I'd like to know if that rescheduling was done in consultation with steel workers in northern Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, the reason it was delayed was because of the House opening.

MR. COWAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. My question was, was that rescheduling of the conference done in consultation with northern steel workers? I have been informed that it has not been. I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Labour. Has she talked to the northern steel workers about rescheduling the conference?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, the deputy minister has been in contact with them, and the date has been set for February the 1st through the 3rd.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill, with a final supplementary.

MR. COWAN: A supplementary, please. Could the Honourable Minister of Labour please inform this House how many loss-time accidents have occurred in the mining industry since October 11th of this year, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: If the Honourable Minister wanted to respond to that question, the floor is hers.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the member to file an Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question through you to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and ask him if he and his department are taking any special action to help the business community in the city of Thompson. We all know that that community is facing a very serious situation because of the layoffs. Are there any plans being formulated by his department to help that particular community?

Tuesday, November 29, 1977

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. ROBERT (BOB) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, in reply to that question, number one, there were some announcements made this morning with regard to proposed tax cuts. I think that will help to stimulate the economy. The other thing is that the Department of Industry and Commerce is looking at any possibilities and following up any leads that other entrepreneurs from Thompson are providing us with or that we are getting in from other outside sources.

MR. EVANS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister prepared to conduct a comprehensive study of the economic consequences of the layoffs at INCO in Thompson, a comprehensive study and formulative plan of action, a comprehensive plan of action?

MR. BANMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, not a comprehensive study as the member indicates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs and I would like to know whether it is now government policy to give preference to clearing snow from campsites for winter camping used primarily by users of high-priced winterized recreation vehicles rather than clearing snow from parking lots for users of ski trails, and I'm referring specifically to Birds Hill Park. A service bay in the campground was cleared which, by the way, was vacant last Sunday, but the parking lot for Cedar Bog was not, which is an extremely popular trail for users by families of young children, forcing them to don their ski gear on the shoulder of the highway — a heavily used highway through the park.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, in reply to that question, I haven't got around to issuing new orders for snow removal as far as the department is concerned, so I guess they are still operating under the guidelines of the previous administration.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In checking upon the past record of this government I would ask the honourable member is it not a fact that parking areas for users of ski trails have always been cleared?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will check into the specific matter that the member mentions and I can assure him that parking lots for people who want to use them for parking their cars while they go cross-country skiing, or participating in other winter activities, will be looked into and we will attempt to get those cleared up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: I would like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for the health and safety in the workplace legislation. Has the new minister made clear to the department that she fully endorses mine safety and doesn't follow the philosophy of the previous Conservative minister who said, "production before safety"?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the member wish to rephrase his question?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Is the Minister responsible for the health and safety legislation able to reassure us that her department is in fact giving priority to safety and not production in the mines in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are giving consideration to safety first.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas with a final supplementary.

MR. McBRYDE: Does the Minister of Labour support the miners in their request that a Royal Commission be held into health and mining safety conditions in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission. Since it has now been some five weeks since three deputy ministers were fired can the Minister indicate whether any offer has been suggested to the three people concerned, or paid?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: That question is repetitious. I have answered it already three times. The matter is being dealt with by the Civil Service Commission. I would correct my honourable friend by saying that three people were fired, two people were dismissed by Order-in-Council, one person tendered his resignation.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, just on a Point of Order, the First Minister has repeatedly said that he has no interest in the matter; that it would be handled in a routine manner by the Civil Service Commission; and so I think that it would be appropriate for the Minister responsible to indicate just what has been done. (Interjection) — well, if I can't get an answer to that, I would ask a supplementary, perhaps to the First Minister. I'd like to know whether, of the three deputy ministers concerned, it was either suggested or indicated that those who resigned "voluntarily" would receive a higher settlement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, certainly not to my knowledge.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Is the Honourable the Attorney-General aware of any judges in the province of Manitoba that have labelled the family law legislation as unworkable?

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to bring to the minister's attention that questions of awareness are normally not accepted in this Chamber. If we choose to change the rules, then I would suggest that this matter be brought up before the Rules Committee of the House.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I could rephrase my question, has the honourable minister knowledge of any judges in the province of Manitoba that have labelled the family laws as unworkable?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, on the basis the Honourable Member for Selkirk earlier indicated, he did not want to involve the judiciary and wanted to keep them separate from legislative proceedings, I would prefer not to answer that question.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health and Social Development. The freeze on the hospitals — will that affect the negotiation between the province and the federal government re the takeover of Deer Lodge Hospital?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): I hope not, Mr. Speaker. That's being examined.

MR. DESJARDINS: The answer is quite ambiguous. The minister says, "I hope not." Would that indicate that the decision has not been made then, that negotiation is still going on?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, the answer to that second question is yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the freeze on the hospital construction, will that affect the Shriner's Hospital? Will that be reviewed to see if they will continue the same as it's going now, or will the doors be closed or changed?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, all I can say to the honourable member on that point is that that subject is also under review. The Shriner's Hospital is a facility in which we're very keenly interested. No final decision has been made as to how it will be operated or who will operate it, or whether there will be some capacity of connection for a Shrine Board or whatever, but all of that has been looked at.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the minister responsible for the Manitoba Development Corporation. There is an inference in the editorial of the Free Press that the management at Flyer Coach is incompetent. Does he disagree or agree with that inference?

MR. SPEAKER: Before I allow the minister to proceed I would like to bring to the attention of the member that the question period is designed to elicit information from the government and questions

Tuesday, November 29, 1977

of an argumentative nature should not be introduced into this Chamber.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I'll rephrase my question and ask the same minister if he agrees with the Free Press that management is incompetent.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Seeing as how the minister responsible for the Workplace Health and Safety Act refused to answer as to whether or not there would be a Royal Commission into mining accidents of recent, I would like to address that question to the First Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: My honourable friend will learn after he has been here a while that questions relating to future policy are not in order in this period. When policy is to be announced in such matters it will be announced.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I ask the First Minister if he has received a request from the unions in Northern Manitoba for a Royal Commission into accident, health and safety conditions in Manitoba's mining operations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check and let my honourable friend know.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member from the Pas with a supplementary.

MR. McBRYDE: While the minister is checking maybe he could check to see whether he has answered their letter of request for that operation, and might also give us some indication of when this matter of policy might be decided upon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister responsible for housing. In reference to the report that I referred to this morning from Central Mortgage and Housing, the same report also indicates that the number of starts in the overall housing field, and the private housing field as well, are seriously down in the month of October and seriously down in comparison with the same period last year. Can the minister indicate whether he has examined this to determine whether it is a general trend and can he indicate whether he is planning any remedial action to offset that decline in housing starts in the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON, Minister Without Portfolio (Sturgeon Creek): Yes, we have examined it and we are looking into it. We are very concerned about it and we will be coming along with policies in that regard in the near future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with a supplementary.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Yes, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister also indicate whether in that examination they have turned up any evidence about the increasing number of defaults in mortgage payments for single family home purchases, particularly under the Federal AHOP Program, and the effect this is having upon the overall purchasing and buying of single family homes in the province.

MR. / JOHNSTON: I'll that question for the honourable member to find out that information.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct another question to the Minister of Agriculture on my previous question. When does he anticipate announcing a policy on feed assistance that he mentioned at this late stage of the year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the feed problem, as I

Tuesday, November 29, 1977

reported our people have been monitoring the situation. I think from the reports that I am getting it's more of a problem of the condition of the feed. In certain instances there are shortages, but more of a general concern of the quality and we have a feed test lab available to provide service for these people to see what has to be done in the regard of additional feed supplies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George with a supplementary.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Agriculture aware that there are areas in the province where very little feed has been actually cut, not only the conditions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the honourable, the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Insofar as the offers which the government is receiving, pertaining to the Lord Selkirk, could the honourable member advise the House whether or not favourable preference will be given in the consideration of those offers, pertaining to offers that would continue the operation of the Lord Selkirk in the province of Manitoba in one form or another rather than leaving the province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. ROBERT (BOB) BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of policy I think this government, in disposing of Crown assets, always wants to insure wherever possible that the jobs will continue in the province of Manitoba, so that's definitely one of the top considerations when looking at offers for that particular facility.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk with a supplementary.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, is there any consideration being given, as had been reported, to a gambling casino or something of that nature insofar as the Lord Selkirk is concerned?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, on that particular question I would like to say unequivocally, no.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary from the Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Would you advise us as to the number of offers that have been received to this date pertaining to the HMS Lord Selkirk?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, in reply to that question let me say that the advertisements will be placed in papers across Canada. They are being drawn up and will be dispersed by the Deputy Minister of Tourism and Recreation and Cultural Affairs. So that as soon as the ads are out we will assess the offers that we get and hopefully we will receive a substantial offer from some interested persons.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs be good enough to provide the House with copies of the advertisement offering the HMS Lord Selkirk for sale?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to provide that information, and I should maybe say to the Honourable Member for Burrows that if he would be interested in bidding on it and taking it off our hands, we would even accept a bid from him too.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health. I would like to ask him whether he has ordered any investigation through his department to ascertain the security of confidential medical records as against any possible leakage to RCMP or other unauthorized persons?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): I haven't authorized any such check or investigation, Mr. Speaker, but I did discuss the subject with officers of the Manitoba Health Services Commission, where, as the honourable member knows, many such confidential records are kept. I have satisfied myself that security is intact in that respect. If the member doesn't find that satisfactory I will investigate it further.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary — can the Minister then assure the House and the people of Manitoba that there have been no unauthorized leaks of confidential medical information?

MR. SHERMAN: To my knowledge there have been none since I have been Minister, Mr. Speaker. I can't answer for what has happened in the past, but I have had some satisfactory reassurances from the officials in the Manitoba Health Services Commission that there have been no such unfortunate incidents.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. I would like to ask him if MHRC is planning to continue to deliver the Rural and Native Housing Program in cooperation with the Federal Government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister in charge of MHRC.

MR. JOHNSTON: It is still under way, Mr. Speaker. We are proceeding along with that particular program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland with a supplementary.

MR. BOSTROM: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker — is the policy to continue to deliver, that is the question I asked.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, every policy is under review. That is a program that has been working very well with us though.

MR. BOSTROM: A final question, Mr. Speaker — I would like to ask the First Minister in reference to questions I have directed to him before in this session, when will the present government announce a program or programs to deal with the immediate problem of unemployment in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend had been paying more attention to what was being said this morning than reading the Regina Manifesto he would have heard the announcement of one program, the reduction of taxes in Manitoba, which will go a long way toward helping unemployment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask through you, Sir, to the First Minister, whether he can be as explicit as his colleague, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, who announced that there will be no assistance for Jobs and Small Businesses this year. Can the First Minister advise the House whether the government of Manitoba will or will not proceed with job programs for community associations, municipalities and other groups, who have submitted applications and I believe are awaiting replies?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in answer to my honourable friend, that second stage of the Make-Work policy that my honourable friends across the way produced when they were on this side of the House, is being reviewed and cut down. The extent of the program when it is finalized by Management Committee, which is now an operating sub-committee of Cabinet, will be announced when Cabinet has approved.

MR. EVANS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, again along the lines of creating useful work, useful work in terms of painting the pensioners' homes. Is it the intention of the government to continue the Pensioners Interior Home Painting Program that we announced a few months back to create jobs — you may call it Make-Work, but it is good work painting the interior of pensioners' homes?

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize the First Minister may I point out that there is five minutes left in the Question Period. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: That program is approved, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation and Cultural Affairs. In view of the fact that the cost of operating our provincial parks has to be subsidized out of the public purse, is it his intention to offer them for sale to the private sector?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK (Transcona): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Finance Minister. Could he provide further details regarding the request for government assistance from the Canadian Co-operative Implements Limited which the Minister publicly declined yesterday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Number one, Mr. Speaker, all the information we were apprised of we inherited from the former government. We inherited nothing new from the CCIL itself. But I would think prior to making that available that you would want and we would want in particular the concurrence of CCIL to do so. So it is not a decision for us to make, it's a decision for CCIL. If he wants the information personally I suggest he ask some of his former colleagues that were in Cabinet that had this for six months prior to us inheriting it.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Does the government rejection of assistance mean that the door is closed to any government assistance geared to keeping the operation of CCIL going?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the only decision that was made by the government was to facilitate a firm reply to the request that had been placed before the former government and the current government, and we facilitated that. It doesn't close the door. The basic reply was that at the present time that the government could not entertain, could not approve, that type of added exposure by way of guarantees, grants, loans, or any other form that added exposure to the public purse at the present time. This does not close the door on another occasion or on other negotiations to look at some form of support as long as it doesn't expose the government and public purse any greater than it is at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: A final question for the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Has the government pursued getting any assistance from DREE, the Industrial Development Bank or the Canadian Development Corporation in order to keep this manufacturing enterprise going and the consequential long-term manufacturing jobs?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, again he may wish to refer the question to his colleague directly in front of him. Mr. Speaker, with regards to whether or not . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Has the Member for Transcona a point or order?

MR. PARASIUK: I think so, Mr. Speaker, I may be new but my understanding is that a newly elected MLA asks questions of the government — not of the past government — and I'd like your ruling on that.

MR. SPEAKER: I have to say to the Honourable Member for Transcona that while he may ask questions he has no right to dictate the type of answers that he can receive from the member of the Treasury Bench. And while I'm on my feet I would also like to point out to all members that I have allowed the greatest latitude in the question period and would hope to be able to continue to do so. However, I realize that by allowing a lot of latitude that there may be less likelihood of questions being answered, and also the time that is used up may, in some way, prevent another member from asking a question that he legitimately would like to ask. So, I would ask all members for co-operation in the questions that they ask, and I also want to note that the question period is now over so we will move into the Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Pembina and the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. At adjournment time I had indicated to the Member for Lac du Bonnet that his time had expired. However, in deference to that same member if

Tuesday, November 29, 1977

he wants to have two or three minutes I would grant him that at this time.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I really did not intend to take more than thirty seconds to wind up my remarks and so I simply want to thank you, Sir, for extending to me the opportunity of completing my remarks. I don't think there is any need for further statements. Proceed with your next speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Pembina, the amendment moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. We are now open for the motion on the amendment. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

HONOURABLE WARNER JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may make a suggestion. I wonder if there would be any disposition on the part of honourable gentlemen opposite to go to the business that is on the Order Paper and proceed as far as we can with that and then, if there's time left over, we can go back to the Throne Speech.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I expect that we will, in the ordinary course, arrive at the rest of the Order Paper today. I expect that, and I fully expect it, and that's why I want to proceed in that way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on the point of procedure that my honourable friend the House Leader is speaking of. We had some indication, I believe, last night from the Leader of the Opposition that there would be no disposition to hold up second reading of Bill No. 5 introduced by the Honourable the Attorney-General today, and merely what my friend the House Leader is indicating is a method of facilitating that at the moment. If we could get that going and out of the road, and also the resolutions which have been on the order paper and are ready to bring on, merely to carry out what I thought was the accommodation being offered by the Leader of the Opposition last evening.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I fully expect that if we proceed normally we will arrive at what my honourable friend wishes today.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on the point, just to remind my honourable friend, and I realize that he is attempting to be accommodating, but we have been proceeding normally since yesterday morning and we have not yet arrived at any meaningful business on the Order Paper.

MR. GREEN: I am quite aware that the honourable the leader, the premier — it comes difficult, Mr. Speaker, I admit . . . that the honourable premier doesn't regard legislative debate to be useful business. We do, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I have recognized the Honourable Member for St. Boniface on the debate.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to adjourn the debate. I didn't realize that the Member for Ste. Rose was on his feet wishing to speak, so . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank my colleague the Member for St. Boniface for deferring. I believe that we had a roster of speakers and I was up next, so I thank him for extending me the courtesy to speak at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking the electors of the Ste. Rose constituency for having expressed once again their confidence in me by re-electing me to this assembly for a third term. The election in Ste. Rose was very interesting. I enjoyed it very much and the thing that happened in Ste. Rose, Mr. Speaker, this year is that we perhaps reversed the trend that was taking place in some parts of the province and we increased the NDP support by approximately two percent over 1973. This was quite satisfying to me. In addition there were some personal victories for me in that I took the majority polls at Winnipegosis where both of my opponents came from, even though they were two local fellows from Winnipegosis. I was very pleased to be able to maintain the confidence of the people of the town and the area of Winnipegosis and I obtained a majority there as well.

As well, the largest town in the Ste. Rose constituency is, of course, Ste. Rose and, for the first time since my election . . . And incidentally Ste. Rose is traditionally a Liberal poll, but for the first time I obtained a very good majority of the polls in Ste. Rose and as well in Laurier.

We did this, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that we had the Member for Lakeside going around and criticizing me and making personal attacks on me and not about issues. What he did forget to tell the

people, he was saying that, "Well, your Member from Ste. Rose is not a very effective member and he shouldn't be there." What he didn't tell them was that I was effective enough to vacate half of the Conservative benches when I forced a vote on the Beef Assurance Program in 1976. He forgot to tell them that.

But, Mr. Speaker, before I get too far into my remarks I would like to extend my congratulations to you, Sir, on being appointed or elected to the Speaker and I hope that I will not cause you too much inconvenience in our deliberations here. I know that you have a very difficult job to keep the decorum of the House and I will do everything I can to assist you in keeping the decorum of the House.

I would like to congratulate the two new members, the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. It's always traditional to see young members move the acceptance of the Speech from the Throne and I thought they did it very well.

I also congratulate all the new members here on both sides of the House. I am, of course, disappointed that some of those new faces that are on the other side are not on this side. However, that's the way that things go. This is the name of the game in politics and I want to wish them all well and I hope that they will be able to represent their constituencies well.

In listening to the young member who moved the adoption of the Speech from the Throne I believe that he was continuing on in a similar manner that the previous Member for Pembina, in this House, in that he really was applauding the free enterprise system. I did not hear him mention anything about Morden Fine Foods though when he was speaking so loudly in approval of the free enterprise system. I heard not a sound about Morden Fine Foods and all the market opportunities that this socialistic institution there now provides to maybe 200 farmers in the area.

I also find some confusion in the remarks when, on the one hand, they talk about free enterprise and, on the other hand, they ask for a Pembolier Dam. You know, the two just don't go along. One is a socialized thing and, on the other hand, they talk about free enterprise.

The Member for St. Matthews, there was one that I thought was quite confused because as I listened I thought I was listening to a Social Democrat speaking. I'm quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for St. Matthews was elected on a socialistic program. He went around speaking about housing for senior citizens, critical home repair — which he applauded, medicare without premiums, and so on and so forth. I know that his constituency, like many others, is in need of these programs and I'm sure that he will have some difficulty there in his caucus, if he already hasn't had some difficulty, in what is going on.

Yes, in some of the literature that was passed out by the Conservatives, and one in particular which was mentioned this morning, was that if you elected a Conservative government, that you must elect a Conservative government in order to have the continuation of these programs — premium-free medicare. In order to have the continuation of these programs you would have to elect a Conservative government — a continuation of premium-free medicare, pharmacare, critical home repair, and so on and so on.

Well, they are good socialists when it comes to election time but that's where it ends and we have already witnessed that in the short time that we've been in this Chamber in this Assembly.

The confusion that I heard from the Member for St. Matthews reminds me of a story, Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me some latitude and I know you have mentioned that you would. It reminds me of the Conservative who was in the pub and stayed a little too long and by the time he left it was getting quite dark, in fact, it was pitch dark, he couldn't find his home. So he wandered around in the dark until he came to a house and he said, "Well, this house looks like mine." So he walked in but there was a man there and there was a family there and the man says, "What do you want?" And he said, "Well, I thought this was my home." "Well", he says, "it's not. It's mine." "Well," he says, "I can't find my home. Could you lend me a lantern so I could find my home?" The fellow gave him a lantern so he took off and he was going around keeping on looking in the dark to see if he could find his home and finally he came to another house and he says, "ell, this looks like my home." And he walked in the kitchen and he had his little small dim conservative light. He looks around the kitchen and he says, "Well, this looks like my kitchen. It must be my house." He walks into the living room and looks around again with his lantern and says, "Gosh, this looks like my living room. It must be my house." Then he walked into the bedroom and he says, "This looks like my bedroom", and he says, "That looks like my wife laying there" and he says "That looks like me laying beside her." Then he stopped and said to himself, "You know if that's me laying there, who is holding the lantern?"

That is the confusion that I get from some members of the Conservative party. They talk socialism when they're out in the hustings but when they get back into caucus they are just ultra rightwingers and anti-social.

However, Mr. Speaker, we have to agree that they received sufficient support and were able to convince by whatever means . . . They were able to convince a sufficient number of people to re-elect them, to elect them to office — not re-elect but to elect them to office. They have to be congratulated for the way . . . Whichever way they do it, by hook or by crook you do it. At least that's what the Conservatives do.

But we are learning. We are not that senior at being legislators ourselves. We have only been here eight years and we are learning. We have learned new tricks. We have learned what is happening, what perhaps should be done in the future, I don't know. Some of my colleagues may disagree with me on this point but we have witnessed arrogance on the part of the leader. It has been mentioned a few times and I don't want to rehash but the arrogance of dismissing people before you are even sworn into office is certainly something that we should perhaps take cognizance of for the future. I would not want to be part of that but maybe we should think about it.

Tuesday, November 29, 1977

MR. ADAM: - Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that developed because of that arrogant attitude was that the Minister of Agriculture who was a novice, who had never had any experience as a minister, was brought into office without an orderly transition of what was happening. There were many things that he should have been apprised of. One of them was the feed situation that we've questioned him today on, and he would have been made aware of those things if he had been able to meet with the deputy Minister but the deputy Minister was no longer around. He was gone.

C suggest to you that there should have been a program of assistance in the beginning, around the election time. The situation had already deteriorated where there was many, many cattle going to market that would have been held back. And in spite of the denials of the minister today, there has been a drastic reduction in the basic herd, not only on my farm but on many other farms in the area, not five or ten head but sixty, seventy, eighty head less that would normally have been kept. If the leader of the Conservative party had not been so arrogant and so anxious to go on a campaign of retribution to dismiss people who have serving this province loyally he would have been able to have that information at his disposal and he could have come to grips with the problem.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the new Minister of Agriculture will be more interested in providing funds for mybe the Manitob stock growER OR HE WILL BE MORE INTERESTED IN BRINGING IN LEGISLATION FOR A CHECKOFF. That is the kind of thing he would be more interested in.

In fact, I got a call just before the 2:00 o'clock sitting and I was advised that the ranchers were meeting tomorrow NIGHT IN THE COMMUNITY HALL IN Toutes Aides. They asked me to be there if I could and they also wanted to know if there was any chance that they would get the new member for Dauphin to go down. I extend him the courtesy now of advising him that the people that called me asked me to extend the invitation to him to be present at that meeting

tomorrow night to discuss the feed situation, not only in my area but in his area. So when he hears his minister tell him that there is nothing wrong, that everything is normal, and there is no policy now, I am saying to him that there is a mass meeting tomorrow night in the community hall in Toutes Aides, north of Rorketon, and that they asked me to advise him that there was a meeting there.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative approach is the dogmatic one. It's an old, old philosophy — perhaps one of the oldest. It's an old philosophy, and I want to say that what is happening today is completely different from what we've had in the past. The new illnesses require new remedies and I do believe and the New Democratic Party believes that you have to change with the times and you must approach new problems with different approaches. That has been proven over and over again.

One of the things that is going to escalate the problem, in my opinion, is the total freeze on everything. All we have been hearing from ministers of the front bench is: It's under review. We're reviewing. Everything is under review. The people of this province are being asked to tighten their belts a notch or two and, on the other hand, they turn around and give a windfall to the upper income people of this province. They announce an income tax cut, and that can only mean one thing. It can mean there is going to be less roads constructed in the constituency of Dauphin. There will be less roads in the constituency of Ste. Rose. There won't be any in the constituency of Ste. Rose and there will be a little in the constituency of Dauphin. That's what's going to happen. What little money that is going to be available for roads is going to go in the Conservative areas. Back to the good old days of prior to 1969 when most of the funds were allocated to areas represented by the Conservative party.

It's a big error to have placed a freeze on the land lease program and you'll someday find that out. It's very unfortunate that they would freeze this program. It's a good program. There are many young farmers in my area that would not be farming if it wasn't for that program. I will say to you that the man who lives on the same section that I do is farming because of this program and there are many farmers in Conservative constituencies that wouldn't be farming where their fathers farmed before them if it wasn't for this program.

This program has assisted many young farmers in my area and in other areas and there was a campaign by Conservative members over the past couple of years which I consider to be malicious and really dishonest about this program. It was really malignant unjustly.

It is ironic to note, Mr. Speaker, that there was a program on the CBC, it came in after the election about this particular program that I am now SPEAKING OF AND IT INTERVIEWED SOME OF THE PEOPLE — mostly in the Conservative areas — who were farming under the land lease program with the option to purchase and it was a good program. But it is ironic that they would not show this program prior to the election because they thought it may have some effect on the vote.

I had one Conservative in to see me. He came into my office after he saw this program. He came into the office in Ste. Rose and said, "You know," he said, "I never understood this program." He voted for the Conservative party. He voted for the Conservative candidate in my constituency. "I never understood this program," he said, "until I saw it on television. I think it looks like a good program." I said, "Yes, it is, but the problem was that you were listening to the Conservatives." Perhaps next time around he may not listen to the Conservatives.

You know Mr. Speaker, the same thing happened with regard to the lay-offs at Thompson. That information — the information about the lay-offs in Thompson — was withheld, I believe deliberately until after the results of the provincial election were known. And I can't help but wonder, Mr. Speaker, if there isn't some connection; if there is not some connection between the political contributions of \$30,000 by INCO to the Conservative party. I ask this question: Is there a connection here? Why was that announcement held back until after the election? It would almost look that these two incidents . . . There is no doubt that we did lose some support because of the malicious

Tuesday, November 29, 1977

campaign conducted by Conservative members throughout the province on the Land Lease Program, the state farm. Well, I see the Member for Rock Lake — I don't believe that's his regular seat — waving a handkerchief. Is he surrendering or is he crying? Mr. Speaker, the province of Ontario also leases Crown land. They lease Crown land to farmers and I congratulate them for doing so, because it is foolish to lay land idle, it should be used. Not only does the Ontario Tory Conservative government have a Land Lease Program, they also go further, much further. They have state farms there too. They also have state homes. They have a Land Lease Program for if you want to buy a home but you can't afford to buy the lot. You can't afford to buy the lot so they have got a Land Lease Program in Ontario. We have a Land Lease Program in Manitoba because many young farmers can't afford to buy the land because of the high prices. But here we see that the good free enterprise government of Ontario has got a Land Lease Program that you can enter into if you qualify, if you don't have too much money. Lots are leased for a term of fifty years. You don't seem to have an option to buy here, I don't know I don't see anything about an option — oh yes you may, the option to purchase may be exercised by payment of cash or option may be exercised on agreement of sale plan. So it is a similar program that we have in Manitoba for our farm people. So let them not come and say and deceive the people of this province with their propaganda of state farms and so on.

Another argument that was often used by the Conservatives was that the government shouldn't be in the Land Lease Program because that just made another source of funds available for the purchase of land and the result would be too much more competition for the purchase of land and the escalation of land prices. Well, Mr. Speaker, last year the average price of land, I believe right from the inception of this program the average price per acre was approximately \$110 per acre and that is well below the selling price of good farm land today.

However, if we want to carry this just one step further, we now hear from the government that they want to bring in a program to finance the purchase of land. There is some kind of a program that we hear of from the government that they now want to bring in some funds, another source, when they were saying that this Land Lease Program was creating more competition for land and escalating the value of the land. NO WE HEAR THAT THEY WANT TO COME IN WITH A PROGRAM MAKE MORE FUNDS AVAILABLE. I say that it won't escalate the price of land. I would congratulate them if they can come in with another program, give these young people every option they can by whatever means you can. Give them every option. Do not tie their hands in the Conservative straitjacket. Give them the option, give them this extra option — freedom, give them freedom. That is what I am saying. Give them the freedom to choose whether they want to lease with an option to purchase or whether they want to buy, give them that choice.

The only thing that I am concerned about a provincial agency or some form of provincial funding of land is that it duplicates the Farm Credit Corporation, the federal lending agency who is much more able, they have a broader base to raise funds for this purpose. I felt and I do feel that Manitoba should be involved in providing funds for the purchase of livestock and farm equipment and it is to the advantage of a young farmer entering the farming industry to be able to pay off the higher interest purchases and that is farm equipment. On land you generally have a lower interest rate and it is to his advantage to be able to capitalize more of those items with a high interest rate, such as farm equipment, and to mortgage those capital expenditures which carry a lower rate of interest.

I feel that the MACC has provided a good service, I'm sorry to see that they are winding it down, and I hope that they will reconsider their decision to freeze the Land Lease Program because it is not a socialistic program. It is a free enterprise program. It affords the only opportunity for many, not all but many, young farmers to get into farming, and if they want any hard facts, substantiated facts, I can bring them to young people today in my area that would not be farming if it wasn't for that program. If you don't have farmers to provide customers for a town that depends on agriculture, the servicing of agriculture, your businesses soon wither and close up and leave. They have no alternative if there are no people to come in and buy.

Well, you know, the Member for The Pas, my colleague from The Pas, outlined some of the economic problems this province will be subjected to by the Conservatives, and the Conservative leader comments that the PC policy — and that is the comments he was making during the campaign — the policy will be one of acute protracted restraint. But, you know, Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say that very few people, very few ordinary people understood the meaning of that. They didn't understand what was being said. If he had been speaking in layman's language and said, "You know, our policy is one of protracted depression," they would have understood that because protracted restraint is only the polite way of saying protracted depression.

I find it ironic that we are cutting back. We are being told in this session that we must cut back on programs and by the same token we cut income tax for the higher income groups. Obviously our financial situation is not as bad as they would have us believe if we are able to cut taxes. — (Interjection) — Well, the government is able to cut taxes for the rich, for the higher income group, and they are going to cut off the programs for the lower income group. They are going to cut off the roads that we so sorely need in the rural areas of this province, particularly since most of the grain will have to be moved by road instead of railway in the future. We must have a continuation of upgrading of our roads in our province otherwise we will have no roads. When these heavy trucks with their big loads of grain have to travel longer distances at greater cost to the farmers we will have an escalation of the deterioration of our roads.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I just want to inform the member that he has five minutes left.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I perhaps will not be speaking too much longer now.

Their Leader was going around and I hear other Conservative members say, you know, "we are going to put more confidence in the businessmen of this province."

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Hear, hear, hear!

MR. ADAM: Hear, hear, hear, hear, well let me tell you a little story — hear, hear. On the 12th of October there was a fellow in my constituency who had made a deal to purchase a \$87,000 crawler and when the fellow came down on the 12th he cancelled the deal. He cancelled the deal because of the change of government in the province of Manitoba. That businessman lost confidence, he didn't gain confidence he lost it.

MR. MINAKER: There's one in every crowd.

MR. ADAM: If you want, you can come with me and he can tell you himself. Another fellow, Sir, cancelled out the construction of a \$125,000 service station because, according to him, of the results of the election. So you are not putting any confidence. There are two fellows right there — \$200,000.00. Depression started on October 12th in the Ste. Rose constituency. A \$200,000 cutback in investment because a Conservative government was elected in the province of Manitoba on the 11th.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more that can be said. I would have liked to touched upon the Family Law but I will have an opportunity when the Bill comes in. I would have liked to touch upon the Mineral Tax, but I am going to forego that because those bills will be coming up. I just want to say after listening to the hatchet man — I don't know what portfolio he holds — but the Member for Wellington Crescent, that he should also ask his leader how many soup kitchens will we require in Manitoba. There will be need for soup kitchens and they will be called "Lyon" soup kitchens. — (Interjection)— That is what is going to happen. That is what is going to happen. There will be soup kitchens. — (Interjection)— We've always had the third lowest, consistently the third lowest unemployment rate in Canada over the past eight years and on a few occasions, second lowest, but mostly the third lowest in Canada. I tell you that this winter you're going to join Quebec, you're going to join the Maritimes with your kind of policies. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Pembina, the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will defer to the Attorney-General or any other honourable member from the other side wishing to speak at this time. — (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, may I follow the traditional procedure of congratulating you on your election to the office of Speaker of this assembly. It's been reported in the press that some of my colleagues have expressed some surprise or shock at seeing you in that position. I don't share that. I don't really believe it's true, Mr. Speaker. I believe that you with your experience in the House and a fine deliberative manner, will make a very good Speaker for our assembly. I believe you showed that last night in handling the assembly under some rather trying conditions. I'd also like to congratulate the deputy speaker on his appointment. We have not as yet, seen too much of him in action and since there will not be any Estimates, it's not likely that we will be able to judge too much his abilities, although I will say that when he was taking over from you in the Chair, I believe it was yesterday, Mr. Speaker, he was called upon to give an opinion at very short notice on a matter of privilege, which he did very well and in my opinion, very accurately.

I would also like to compliment and congratulate the mover and seconder of the speech in reply. As new members to the House, and as they both pointed out rather young members and inexperienced, in my opinion they both did rather well on the opening day of the new session. We'll have a couple more comments to make as to the content of their remarks a little later on, but I hope that their success in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, will encourage some other new members on that side of the House to make their maiden speech, perhaps even during this Throne Speech.

I'd like to congratulate also, the new members on that side who have assumed their new responsibilities and I wish them well within those responsibilities. I'd also like to congratulate the Leader of the Conservative Party on becoming the First Minister of this province. We have noted in the few days that this session has been in progress the fact that that honourable gentleman rules his caucus with an iron hand. The Manitoba muppet show responds to the string-pulling of the First Minister. When he pulls the string, they pop up and when he leaves it slack, they remain in their seats whatever the provocation might be.

Some of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, have expressed some surprise at the policies that have been introduced in this first session by the new government. Well, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't surprise me to see a Conservative Government bringing in conservative policies. In fact I would be surprised and rather shocked if they did anything else. I don't expect Conservatives to attempt to outsocialize the socialists, nor do I expect them to be leisurely Liberals. I expect Conservatives to be Conservatives and to act like Conservatives. I expect Conservatives to know who their friends are, Mr. Speaker, for their friends are the rich in society, the corporate elite, the captains of industry, those with money and

power. —(Interjection)— One of my colleagues says the best party that money can buy and indeed I am sure that it has been bought and for a very comfortable price indeed. We should be no more surprised that the Conservatives act like Conservatives than we should be surprised that a duck takes to water, or that the flu virus causes influenza, or that a mosquito bites. For Conservatives are Conservatives and we expect them to bring in conservative policies. We expect them, Mr. Speaker, to change the load, the burden of taxation from the very rich and put it on to the very poor. We expect the Conservative government to accommodate their rich and corporate friends by arranging for a large pool of unemployed workers in the province. We expect the Conservative government to give away our natural resources or even pay corporations to come in and take out those natural resources. We expect the Conservative government to reduce or erode the rights of organized labour in the province and to increase rights and privileges of the employers of those workers. We would also expect the Conservative government to erode social services in this province, to whittle away at universal health care programs so that there shall be two levels of services available; one for those who can afford those services and another service for those who cannot. To put it in a nutshell, Mr. Speaker, we expect the Conservatives to facilitate the interest of the exploiters to the detriment of the exploited. If we should turn to the Order Paper and the Throne Speech, we should find that indeed this Conservative government is acting as we should expect it to do, in a Conservative manner. We find that it has brought in legislation which will benefit the rich, the employers, the corporate elite, to the detriment of the workers in this province, to the women, to the old-age pensioners and to the workers of Manitoba.

I have before me, Mr. Speaker, a little election pamphlet put out by a Conservative candidate in St. Vital prior to the last election, which I would like to quote to you, Mr. Speaker, and to other honourable members who might find it of some interest. Page 2 makes the statement: "A Progressive Conservative government makes the following commitments to the people of St. Vital" — and on the next page it goes on to say "A majority Progressive Conservative government will move immediately to implement its positive commitment to the people of St. Vital." Members here might be interested, Mr. Speaker, as to what a Conservative Party promised to the people of St. Vital. I will read you just a few of oh perhaps twenty, solemn promises made by the Conservative Party of what they would do for the people in my constituency and the rest of the province, if elected.

Among those promises made to the people, Mr. Speaker, was the provision of day hospitals so senior citizens can receive treatment without having to enter institutions. And again, they promised the construction of more nursing homes, the construction of more elderly persons' housing, and especially for the interest of the home owner, a Progressive Conservative government makes a commitment to the home owner for increased grants to municipalities to lower school taxes. They also promise that there will be tax credits to partially offset mortgage interest payments. They also promise the removal of school taxes on homes of middle and lower income senior citizens. They also promise, among other things, grants and loans to young people to buy and renovate older homes.

I will repeat the promise on page 3, Mr. Speaker, that they say "A majority Progressive Conservative government will move immediately to implement its positive commitment to the people of St. Vital." Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't see on the Order Paper, nor did I hear in the Throne Speech, any mention of any of those commitments that the Progressive Conservative party had promised to my constituents. I would also note, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a commitment from the local Conservative candidate that he would, if elected, work for these things. No, Mr. Speaker, the commitment is quite clear and quite definitely comes from the Progressive Conservative Party, promising exactly what a Progressive Conservative government would do. Now I was a little concerned when I saw these things because they're really not Conservative policies. In fact they put me in mind of the quotation that Disraeli once said that a Conservative government is an organized hypocrisy and for a Conservative government to be bringing in those sort of promises really smacks of hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker.

But should we at this stage of a new government, being only five weeks in power, really expect, or is it reasonable to expect a government to immediately implement those policies. Now it could well be argued and I am sure that members opposite would argue that it is not possible to do everything immediately, and I would tend to agree Mr. Speaker, and even with a session like this present one, we would under reasonable circumstances, I suppose, not expect a Conservative government to bring in any of its policy bills.

It announced that this particular session would be for the reason to bring in legislation having to do with AIB. If that were the only reason and the only matter that were put before us then indeed it would seem reasonable. But the government went further than that. They brought in four, five other bills having nothing to do generally with the matters outlined in this particular Paper.

I would be able to go back to my constituents, Mr. Speaker, for example to a pensioner, and I have a number of pensioners. It might well be a widower of eighty years or more, trying to keep up the payments despite rising costs, particularly of food which I note the other day has risen an amount of 12.7 percent, and he might well ask me what happened to that commitment from a Progressive Conservative government, that they would remove the school taxes on the homes of middle and lower income senior citizens. I would have to explain to him, Mr. Speaker, that there was no bill before the House to give him this relief that he so badly needed, but I could point out to him that if his father just happened to leave him a million dollars, then he would not have to pay a penny of tax on that. That is a measure that this government is bringing in for the pensioners in my constituency at this time. Or if I should find a single deserted or separated woman living in my constituency and struggling to bring up a couple of children trying to work, trying to exist on an inadequate separation maintenance

Tuesday, November 29, 1977

allowance from her estranged husband and she asked me, "Has this government moved to bring in tax credits to partially offset her mortgage interest payments?" And I would have to explain to her, "No, I am afraid they haven't done that to help you." But if you happen to own a square mile of land somewhere out in Manitoba this government would save her \$64 a year. Or if her estranged husband should happen to give her a gift of \$100 thousand then she would not have to pay that. I doubt if that would be very much comfort for her, Mr. Speaker, because probably her maintenance payments are three months in arrears anyway.

Or I could go to the home of a construction worker. At least he would have been a construction worker if he were not unemployed as a result of this government's freezes on construction. And he might well ask me, "Has this government moved to give increased grants to municipalities to lower school taxes?" And I would have to explain to him that no, they really haven't done that to help him but what they have done is to arrange so that now he can be unemployed at a time and one-half instead of unemployed at a time and three-quarters. Which again is probably of cold comfort, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has been quoted fairly recently in reply to a complaint that there has been some unemployment caused by the actions of this government and that he had replied, "Let them draw unemployment", Mr. Speaker, which is hardly the responsible reasonable attitude that one would expect from the First Minister of this province.

However, someone else made a similar comment to that and perhaps put it more pungently some 200 years ago, Mr. Speaker. I refer to Marie Antoinette who, when it was pointed out to her that the people had no bread, she replied to them, "Let them eat cake." Now that, Mr. Speaker, sums up succinctly the Conservative position, the government position, and most specifically the First Minister's position on this.

For, Mr. Speaker, we have seen a number of layoffs at INCO in Thompson, some several hundred people. There is threatened a layoff at Flyer of possibly some 300 people. And what is the reaction of this government to those people who find themselves in that position? Let them eat cake, Mr. Speaker. That is what this government says to them.

This government has brought in a freeze on construction which has led to a good deal of unemployment and threatens over the coming months to increase that unemployment to unacceptable levels. And again what is the reaction of this government? Let them eat cake.

A 12-½ percent increase in the price of food over the last twelve months and what is the reaction from this First Minister and from the government? Let them eat cake, Mr. Speaker. That is the reaction.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs, I believe it was, spoke to the urban municipalities about a week or so ago, Mr. Speaker, and explained to them that there would not be as much money in the pot this year and instead of \$22 million they would only get \$20 million. And his reaction to them was the same as his leader's reaction to them. They would not make any extra money available to them. They would not help out the residential taxpayers in those urban municipalities with this additional burden on them. The reaction again was: Let them eat cake.

I have a word of advice to the honourable members from Pembina and from St. Matthews who will probably be approaching their leader over the next few months. The Member for Pembina will go to his leader as he has told us in his Throne Speech contribution and he will tell him, "Mr. Leader, my people in Pembina do not have enough water." And he should expect the response, "Let them eat cake." He will also tell them, "The people in Pembina", Mr. Speaker, "are short of Jerusalem artichokes." And he can again expect his leader to say, "Let them eat cake." And, Sir, the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, when he asks his leader for more funds for the assistance of people within his constituency for housing, for apartment block renovation, again he can expect that classic Conservative response, "Let them eat cake."

Mr. Speaker, we heard an announcement perhaps not more than a week ago that a number of nursing homes may be closed because of fire restrictions. I would not suggest that the Minister of Health would be so heartless as to put those people out on the street. He has said that he will find accommodation for them in other homes but that, of course, will only increase the waiting list of thousands of people still waiting to get into the nursing homes. And again what is the First Minister's response to those people waiting for those places, "Let them eat cake."

We have seen from all indications, Mr. Speaker, that our unemployment rate is growing and that the policies of this government are likely only to increase that amount of unemployment. And again what is the response of this government, "Let them eat cake."

Mr. Speaker, this government has introduced a number of Conservative policies and I expect it to continue to bring in Conservative policies — policies that will work only to the detriment of the ordinary people of this province, to the workers and to the old age pensioners of this province. I expect the First Minister of this province to continue to take that same heartless and cruel, callous and arrogant attitude that he has taken so far by saying to them, "Let them eat cake". I expect him to continue to the end of his days to keep repeating that, Mr. Speaker, until the end of his days when upon his tombstone will be engraved the epitaph, "Here lies a man who when awake was heard to curse 'Let them eat cake'."

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Pembina, the amendment of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Wellington.

Tuesday, November 29, 1977

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, this being my maiden speech you will doubtlessly appreciate I am, of course, approaching the task ahead with a great deal of trepidation. I get counsel from Mr. Fox, the Honourable Member for Kildonan. He tells me to relax. I will attempt to do that. But before I do I feel that there is one formality that I would like to accomplish, that being my congratulation to you for your recent appointment and election to the position of Speaker. Sir, I commend you on the assumption of that great responsibility. I note that I appreciate the burden of that task. As a lawyer I might say that I understand that there is always tremendous onus and heavy burdens associated with any position that entails judicious conduct. I pray to God, Sir, that you have health, wisdom, and probably sublime patience in the days ahead and I wish you the best.

Sir, I also wish to introduce myself to you. I have told you that I am a lawyer. My chosen profession has given me experience in two sectors of our society, both the public and the private. I have had the opportunity in my years at the Bar to practice both within the public sector — and that was with the City of Winnipeg — and on my own, and in association with others. And, Sir, I might tell you that in that occupation I have learned to appreciate the sound principles of public administration and I might add that in my former years with the City of Winnipeg I was introduced to public policy formulation and I hope and pray that that will be of some benefit to me in this honourable Chamber.

Private practice has given me the opportunity to render assistance to my clientele and in so doing has imposed an obligation upon me to share in the burden of people's problems. It has been a bit of a set-off; a set-off inasmuch as while it has allowed me and enabled me to pursue a good degree of personal freedom it has also forced me to adhere to discipline and denial in many respects. Denial with respect to my freedom of access to leisure time. Denial with respect to my freedom of access very often even to income. But, Sir, I tell you that I have enjoyed those endeavours and so I come here, I think, with both knowledge gained in service of my profession and experience obtained therein. And, Sir, I tell you that I hope that that will be my currency to gain the privilege entering public service.

I have also, Sir, in the past had the opportunity to pursue a political career. That was at the municipal level of the City of Winnipeg and in that regard I have had the opportunity, of course, to meet several of my honourable friends opposite. As a matter of fact, we have had the opportunity to work together in the spirit of amiable co-operation. And, Sir, I can tell you that the experiences gained in that occupation I hope will stand myself in good stead because I can tell that it has engendered a sense of respect for all men who serve the public. And as I'm sure you are aware there is no level of public service that is perhaps more immediate to the day-to-day needs of our people than municipal service. So I hope that as well as my professional experience that my experience in that level of government — municipal government — will assist me in serving you and the people of Manitoba.

I noted with interest the speeches made by the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech. Mr. Speaker, it was with particular interest that I listened to the remarks made by my honourable friend from St. Matthews. He and I have the privilege of sharing a contiguous boundary. There is between our constituencies — it is not a wall, it is not a fortress buffering us but rather a simple avenue and I think that we both appreciate, and I certainly appreciated in listening to his remarks, that the problems and concerns of the residents of our neighbourhood — I think it's fair to call it that because we both represent the west end of Winnipeg, the old city — are similar. And so I empathized with him, Sir. I could empathize when he talked about the need for housing. I could empathize when he spoke eloquently of the need to help people who are disadvantaged, particularly senior citizens. And, Sir, I can tell you that it struck me that we also had a similar compassion for our new citizens. I think he remarked on there being an influx of new citizens and certain demands that were made on the community as a result thereof and I can tell you, Sir, that I share the same concerns.

Perhaps anomalously and less explainably I also empathized with the remarks made by my honourable colleague from Pembina. That honourable member spoke of the needs and concerns and the problems that beset in the Pembina district of our province. It may seem, Sir, to you, that it is somewhat unusual that a member representing an urban central constituency should be able to empathize with concerns expressed by someone representing what is primarily a rural and agrarian constituency. Well, Sir, I might tell you that many of the members resident and situate in my constituency have their origins and antecedence in that sort of background. I've, on many occasions, shared conversations with them about those origins. I can tell you, Sir, and I tell you unashamedly that I appreciate that those antecedence bring to an individual a certain awareness and respect for man's physical environment. I tell you, Sir, that it also brings a corresponding concern for man's fragile social environment.

So, Sir, I tell you that the constituency which I represent, although urban in location, is also blessed in a sense by a juxtaposition and balance not only of urban but also rural lifestyles and values.

There are also, of course, the balance and juxtaposition of differing ethnic and cultural origins. And in my opinion, Sir, upon reflecting on that, I would say that this has probably been the history of Manitoba. It is significant, I think, to reflect on the nature of the compromise that has been forged between our peoples.

I note, Sir, with deference, that the Mace that is upon the central table I am advised is in fact significant in that it represents the ensignia or has upon it represented the ensignia and emblems of the four mother countries of this province and as such is representative of the heritage of our people and I say to you, Sir, that this heritage is born of compromise. This, Sir, leads me to my remarks pertinent to the Throne Speech.

Tuesday, November 29, 1977

Sir, I am concerned because the Throne Speech as I heard it and as I have read it does not give effect to compromise. As a matter of fact, Sir, I would say that compromise is jeopardized by the implications of that Speech.

Sir, I might at this point wish to review the implications of the Bills before us. I note that this government has determined that they would repeal gift tax and succession duty legislation. Sir, I must tell you that in my opinion this legislation is very important. It is fundamental in preserving equality of opportunity amongst our citizens. I tell you, Sir, that the redistribution of income that is effected by this particular statute gives all Manitobans a better opportunity in that it prevents social stratification and therefore effects a greater deal of socio-economic equity amongst our people. I see it as recognizing society as an organic whole and in that respect the foundation of all achievement. It recognizes the current inequality of opportunity and leavens those inequities. That, Sir, I say is the fundamental premise of our social contract. That, Sir, is why we are here today. That is why we, as ladies and gentlemen, debate respectfully our varying points of view in this forum.

I note, Sir, with respect to Family Law the legislation, part of which has already been proclaimed, and I understand it is the intention of the new government to either suspend or defer the implementation of the balance. I say, Sir, that it is important that we maintain a spirit of compromise among our people in this respect. These Bills recognize the equality of sexes; it recognized the fundamental premise that marriage is a partnership and to me there is no reason why we should suspend the recognition of those fundamental tenets. It seems to me, Sir, that this is another compromise broken as this House is willing to pay lip service to the recognition of women's rights, but now this government won't legislate the reforms.

Also with respect, Sir, to the overtime Bill. I have very serious reservations about the repeal of this particular legislation. It appears to me that the effect of that will be prejudicial only to the unorganized sector of labour. It occurs to me that most union contracts that I am familiar with as a solicitor anyway already provide for more than time and one-half in cases of this sort. So the burden I say, Sir, is going to be borne by those who are not organized, who do not go through the collective bargaining process.

We have heard over the yeas, Sir, many many complaints about confrontation. As a matter of fact it is quite the thing now, it's the trendy thing now to talk about confrontation and the implications of that confrontation. I say, Sir, that if we are going to complain about labour management confrontation then this is not an appropriate Bill to bring before this House, because its only effect can be the exacerbation of that confrontation. It offers no solution.

Also, Sir, this is a disincentive to hire. The unemployed will be hurt. I know there is a good deal of argument and I am very sympathetic as a small businessman in a sense, because as I told you earlier I have a very small and modest law office, but I do employ some people. I can appreciate that small businessmen are in a bit of a pinch. I appreciate that costs are expanding, but if I appreciate that costs are expanding for people in my position I also appreciate, Sir, that they are expanding correspondingly for people in general, and particularly those who are unable to take initiatives on their own behalf, who are dependent on salary for their livelihood. Sir, perhaps my entire argument is crystallized in the reflections on the question of the ratification of the anti-inflation agreement. You know, in this country we have had so much difficulty obtaining any sort of compromise. Labour has beset management and the consumer has beset the producer. There has been no compromise and inflation for years ran amuck and that failure to achieve a compromise, Sir, led to the legislation that is pertinent before us this session.

Now this legislation has, in my opinion, worked hardship. It has worked hardship on those who rely on salary. It has failed to control anything but salaries. I think that is an observation that can be shared by members on both sides of the House because I have heard statements to that effect from honourable members regardless of their political or party affiliation. But, Sir, you know, the reason that such legislation was brought in was simply to try and effect a compromise, a compromise that the body politicked was not able to effect of its own accord.

I could perhaps also deal, Sir, with unity problems. Again we have been trying to legislate unity in this country. We have had various proposals on how we might do it, from redrafting the constitution to all sorts of federal bilingual policies, and no solutions. The problem again only becomes more and more exacerbated. I say to you, Sir, that there is a need for compromise. There is a need for more understanding, more sympathy, as between groups in our society. I say to you, Sir, that repeal of Family Law legislation at this time, the repeal of time and three-quarters, the repeal of gift tax and succession duty legislation, they will not induce that sort of compromise. That is not how you effect a compromise. They represented a compromise. As I said earlier they represented a compromise between men and women, between labour and management, between the rich and those of modest means in our province.

Now I also know, Sir, that in times of hardship and great duress there is a mentality which grips those in public life and it is unfortunate but I think true to relate. If there are complex questions besetting society then accordingly — and I think we would all agree with this — there seems to be an immediate turn to simple solutions. The old adage that there is no problem that is so thorny that it can't be simply resolved — Sir, that may well be true but experience has taught us, if it has taught us nothing else, that when confronting a complex problem there is a simple solution and Sir, unfortunately it is usually wrong. So we look at these reforms because that is what they have been represented to be, they have been represented as tax reforms and so on and so forth. I say to you, Sir, are they reforms or are they regressions in public policy? I suggest to you, Sir, they are the latter.

Respectfully, Sir, I suggest that the honourable members opposite are putting all their eggs in one basket. They are suggesting that by repealing particularly the tax bills, by repealing that legislation that will immediately lead us to nirvana. That will stimulate the economy and, Sir, if it were true, if we could build a stable socio-economic foundation in Manitoba by simply repealing all that old legislation I would support that. I would stand in my place, Sir, and I would be the first to proclaim that this legislation was wholesome and was to the benefit of our people, but I can't do that. It is not possible, because it is premised on a negative. It is premised on the argument that everyone in our society is self-interested, that everybody is after profit and, Sir, I can't believe that. I can't believe that any argument based on such a negative proposition should hold any currency before this House. I tell you, Sir, that it is unpalatable, it is unpalatable that all our people are leaving Manitoba—I should say all our wealthy peoples are leaving Manitoba, because of gift tax and succession duties.

Sir, I can tell you that I have looked at the statistics and in my opinion I think I have done a reliably credible job of evaluating those statistics, in my opinion the incidence and burden of that taxation per estate is no more than \$31,000.00. Would that in itself cause a man or a woman to leave the province of Manitoba, to leave his home, his family, everything one would presume he or she would hold dear, to go looking for greener pastures in some other part of the world, other part of Canada? I say no, Sir. It is not plausible, it is not credible, it will not hold water. I can't believe that everybody in our society is that base. I would rather think that our people reflect a much higher standard of conduct, a much higher standard of ethical morality. But the implications of these so-called reforms *cum* regression, Sir, they made me think of Shannon's Law. You know this is a law that I heard some time ago and I think basically it says what actually happens is less important than what appears to happen. I am suggesting, Sir, and with respect, that honourable members opposite are in a sense operating on this presumption. Their concern is not with stimulating the economy, Sir, that is not why they have repealed these taxes. Sir, it is because it gives the appearance of stimulating the economy. There will be no, I think, opportunity afforded either the members of this House or the public to review, assess, or evaluate the actual ramifications of this decision. If a man leaves Manitoba afterwards, how would we know if the reason for his leaving was one thing or the other, or if he doesn't leave how will we know that he didn't leave for that reason. There is no test. You can't dip the litmus paper in the solution and find out. There is no certainty whatsoever here. So I say to you, Sir, that it's cosmetic surgery, nothing more. Shannon's Law applies, because we will never know what actually happens but certainly know what our honourable friends told us was meant to happen and that will be the appearance.

I say to you, Sir, that I particularly deplore the suggestions in the Speech from the Throne to repeal the Family Law. They say that it is only for the adjustment of minor technical matters, so on that basis they say we should defer the recognition of women's rights in this province. Well, they have put me in mind, Sir, also of another famous observation and that made by Thoreau and I intend no pun. Thoreau observed that if you see a man approaching you and I underscore "man" approaching you, with the obvious intent of doing you good, run for your life. And that, Sir, is what I suggest is happening here. The honourable members opposite have suggested in the Throne Speech that they only intend to do good, a minor technical adjustment, nothing to be concerned about. But, Sir, there are other ways of doing it. If that were the case, Sir, I would say that they could proclaim for instance the Marital Property Act, they could leave the Family Maintenance Act as it is, and they could amend them in due course in the spring session. Imminently sensible, Sir, not a radical suggestion. It is the usual course of affairs I am told. But no, they feel that it is absolutely necessary to repeal the legislation.

Now the Honourable Attorney-General I should also note has entered the House and, Sir, in deference to him I would like to note that it is my impression that with respect to this matter he has perhaps introduced a new series of practical procedural regulations. Family law is not his only initiative. The first law he has proclaimed in this regard is when in charge ponder. Immediately, Sir, upon his entry into provincial public life he announced . . . I believe there was a news release that he was considering the ramifications of these two bills and he pondered on what he might do in that regard.

Then he introduced us to the second law. He was in trouble when he publicly pondered. Groups that were alive with the intent of the legislation came forward and they decreed that. So the second law: When in trouble delegate. So that honourable member, Sir, turned and he appointed private counsel to review the implications of the legislation.

Then last night, Sir, he introduced us to the third law: When in doubt mumble. When asked to speak in reply to the Speech from the Throne or I should say in his case in support of the Throne Speech he deferred and he has deferred repeatedly, Sir. I tell you that this is not becoming of a person occupying the position of the Honourable Attorney-General of Manitoba. I tell you, Sir, that response should be given. The people of this province are entitled to know what, if any, terms of reference have been given to the people that are currently analysing and assessing the Family Law legislation. They should know what it is that he wants amended.

Yesterday the Honourable Member for Selkirk asked him with respect to eight fundamental matters. He asked him a question. He asked him whether or not there were any of those fundamental matters that he could not accept. A simple matter, Sir. Everybody in Manitoba is wondering but yet no response, silence.

So what he's doing, Sir, and I might suggest this and I suggest so respectfully, is if he is unable to convince the people he is confusing them instead. He is for the principles but he won't say which ones. He sent the bill to legislative draftsmen out of House but he can't say what their terms of

reference are. An absurd position to be in.

So I suggest, Sir, that in view of all this we must seek compromises. That is, after all, what this legislative process is about. And I suggest, Sir, that these bills do not represent compromises. I have suggested already that with respect to Family Law we could proclaim the Marital Property Act. This would be to me an exhibit, a tangible exhibit of good faith. I would certainly be willing if the honourable member opposite is willing to proclaim the Marital Property Act and leave the Family Maintenance Act in place. I would be certainly willing to work with him in the production of what may be more efficacious and more workable law. Far be it for me to deny him or anyone else my time in that respect. But, Sir, that is not the intention. He demands repeal, no compromise, the axe.

Succession duties. Sir, we could make special exemptions for groups that were unduly prejudiced by this legislation. I have heard many arguments and I don't know the voracity of those arguments but that people in farm situations are prejudiced because of the nature of Manitoba farming as between older members of the family and younger. If that is true, Sir, and it can be demonstrably proven, then I would suggest that I think that I would be willing and I'm sure many members on this side would be willing to work towards exemptions that would facilitate the transfer of those family farms.

Also if they were to have come to us and suggested that the exemption limit should be raised and make a rational argument in that respect I think, Sir, in deference, it is quite possible that many members on this side of the House could support such an amendment. But that wasn't the spirit. Repeal.

The overtime bill. At least if the government would have complemented the repeal of the overtime legislation by a comprehensive employment program, if they would have been willing to establish — or for that matter continue — a comprehensive program of employment incentives then, Sir, I would say by that program of job creation they would have shown their good faith. And, Sir, I may well have been in a position — I only speak for myself; I can't speak for others — where I may have given consideration to the support of such legislative initiative. But no, Sir, no compromise. The rate goes down. There are no halfway houses. There are no nuances, no grey areas. It is all black and it is all white. It is all very, very simple.

And we could say that about the mineral acreage tax. I am not from a rural constituency but I have read in the papers and I have heard in this House that many retired farmers apparently have been suffering some prejudice as a result of the mineral acreage tax. I was not impressed unduly so, I must say, on hearing the observations made by my honourable friend the Minister of Finance. It did not appear to me that ten pennies an acre . . . I think it was averaging out to about \$30 a farm. I don't think, to my way of thinking anyway, that that was an exemplary burden to impose on anyone. But, Sir, I think that if he would have come in and he would have suggested that there should be some abolition with respect to the burden on retired farmers again I may have given that some credence and I think that I would have been willing to certainly consider conciliating my position — compromising my position — and perhaps supporting that sort of amendment but that wasn't the way. They have asked me and all my constituents, because my constituents are urban people, to in effect deny our share in the province's bounty. — (Interjection) — Either way. Either by giving up the tax and therefore bearing a larger portion of the taxation ourselves, because somebody has to pay for it, or by losing our right to see those mineral rights revert back to the Crown, to us. Hard law, Sir. I say to you "hard law". That's not a compromise. I don't want to lose my rights. I can only speak for myself, but I don't want to lose my rights as a Manitoban, a third generation Manitoban. It's true that I may have been by force of circumstance born in an urban setting and therefore be disentitled to any large holdings of land but nevertheless I regard the mineral properties of our province as belonging to all our people whether they be urban or rural or northern or southern — regardless, Sir.

So, Sir, if it's the intention of this government — and that is manifest — to simply abolish mineral acreage taxes that has within it implicit, Sir, a certain conceptual premise and that, Sir, is repugnant to my sense of principle and fair play. So, Sir, I will not support that.

Now, Sir, I tell you that those members opposite — those members of the government — are planning all these great initiatives on the assumption that things won't happen. They are presuming that everything will go well. They are presuming that Manitoba will somehow recover economically. We have already heard by their own admission that the present financial or economic state in Manitoba is not common or indigenous to this province. As I think our leader has said in his reply to the Throne Speech, there is a frightening symmetry in terms of what's going on economically in Canada today. But no, they are willing to go ahead with blinkers on, Sir, and assume that things won't happen and I say, what if they do? What if all these so-called "reforms" provide no stimulus to the economy because, as I said, all the eggs are in that basket? What if unemployment and inflation continue unabated? What is the legacy of that going to be, Sir? And I pose that question to all honourable members. I say, Sir, division, division of our peoples, conflict, acrimony, bitterness and mistrust — mistrust on the part of all those who will be prejudiced by the repeal of these items of law.

Who are these people? The working classes and I should say, Mr. Speaker, that — (Interjection) — My honourable friend, I was about to say and I'll reply to that . . .

MR. LYON: The people of Manitoba don't like that hogwash.

MR. CORRIN: . . . that the working classes, I hold no doctrinaire type of social democracy.

MR. LYON: Oh no, no, you're just social democrats.

MR. CORRIN: I'm a social democrat?

MR. LYON: That's right, yes.

MR. CORRIN: And I tell you that I have no monopoly on the working classes, because I appreciate that the working classes don't belong to any political party. The working classes include all our people, Sir. Lawyers work, laborers work, farmers work, fishermen work, even premiers work sometime, Sir. Although I might say, I'm not sure, I notice that the honourable gentleman opposite, Sir, has a great smile on his face, and I suspect, Sir, that that's probably as a result of his having listened to my speech; he's heard my submissions. I haven't vilified him, but maybe he's considered that to be so, and he has a great smile on his face. I presume that that would indicate, Sir, that he's found someone to blame. He's resting peacefully because he has already identified how he will deal with this problem. He will be able to divert attention from himself if things don't happen, if the economy is not stimulated. He'll blame it on someone else. Who? Ottawa? Who knows? We'll see. The former government will only work for so long; that one has been brought out on many occasions elsewhere and we all know that interest does abate after a short time. So, Sir, I tell you that not only working people, but people in situations that are modest people for instance like the aged, people on fixed incomes, they're going to suffer, they're going to be bitter and resentful that all their years of work having come to naught. Women, women whose lives are being severely prejudiced by the repeal of these family law initiatives, and urban property owners . . . As I have told you, as an urban property owner I have certain reservations about the repeal of the mineral acreage tax.

I say, Sir, that this is all too hard a line. Manitoba does not need a black and a white, a good and a bad. Manitoba demands and needs compromise in this House. And I say, Sir, this being my maiden speech, that I will work to the best of my abilities, and I will work earnestly, to effect those sorts of compromises. But, Sir, there is no compromise in this Speech from the Throne. The gauntlet has been thrown down and the honourable members opposite should not be at all shocked that members on this side of the House want to participate fully in debate, not at all. They threw a gauntlet down and the gauntlet has been accepted, and we're going to do our duty. Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I start my address this afternoon, I would like to extend to you my heartiest congratulations on your election to the senior position in this Chamber. You are the custodian of the rights of members on both sides of this House, and I'm sure that you will do the job to the best of your ability and with complete impartiality. And I can pledge to you, Sir, that I will give you my utmost co-operation in seeing that you are able to try and maintain order and decorum in this House. That is not always an easy thing to do, Mr. Speaker, as you probably have already found out. To be able to be elected as a member of a political party and then be thrust into the position of being the impartial arbitrator of disputes in this House, it is very hard — and I know from what limited experience I had that it is hard to divorce yourself from feeling partisan. But I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that you will gain confidence in yourself and the decisions that you make in this House, and the decisions that you make, I'm sure will be fair and honourable to all members of this House.

I would also like to extend my congratulations to the Deputy Speaker and Chairman of House Committees, a position that I had in this Chamber I believe for approximately five or six sessions in the time that I spent in this House.

I say to the Honourable Member for Roblin that next spring he will be prepared for long hours in that chair down there where the Clerk of the House is now sitting, and I don't know whether I should congratulate him or commiserate with him because of the hours that he will spend down there. Mr. Speaker will have a much easier time at that time than he has at this time.

I would also like, at this time, to extend my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. That's an honour, I must say Mr. Speaker, that I had, the honour and privilege of moving the reply to the Speech from the Throne I believe on two occasions. It's not always the easiest thing to do, but you try to say nice things about what the government is proposing, and I must admit in the Throne Speech that we've seen before the Chamber, that there wasn't very much for the honourable mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech to speak about or move on. The Throne Speech was the shortest, I believe that I have ever seen in my short time in this Assembly. It doesn't really say very much, it just tells us about what the present government proposes to do.

The Honourable First Minister has been urging us to get on with this process so he can get in and get out of here, ten days, or even less. He wants a short term democracy. I think that's his idea. Get in and get out of here. We don't want to listen to these fellows over here. I'm disappointed that he seems to have put a muzzle on the members opposite. — (Interjection)— Muzzle. Because I haven't heard anybody from that side except the Minister of Public Works and the Minister without Portfolio No. 2, who, I understand, once he gets through with his job, will probably work himself out of a job.

However, Mr. Speaker, to get back to what is before us here in the Throne Speech. We have legislation retroactively go back to October 1975 and set up provincial participation in the AIB, and when that piece of legislation appears for second reading, I will be making some comments at that time. I don't intend to speak about that too much at this time.

Tuesday, November 29, 1977

I am glad to see that the Minister of Labour is here. I wish to congratulate her. I think it's very nice to see that we have a lady of the fairer sex to take over the Ministry of Labour. I don't know if it's a first for Manitoba but it's a first in my recollection. I would say to the Minister of Labour that she has inherited quite an onerous task, and big shoes to fill. I want to give the Minister of Labour just a little bit of advice. I think that she's been getting some bad advice, especially from some of the members of the front bench. If she will recall, Mr. Speaker, this morning during the Question Period I asked her specifically about the former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. She assured me that notices went out. I think she assured me on the urging of the Minister of Health and Social Development, that all members of the Civil Service Commission received notification of meetings. Well, I want to draw to the Honourable Minister's attention that the Civil Service Commission met Friday last, November 25th. I checked with the former Civil Service Commission Chairman. He did not receive notice of that meeting. Now, I say, either the Minister is the recipient of some very bad advice from other members, or she is deliberately trying to mislead this House.

I prefer to believe the former. I believe that she is trying to get the grasp and the feel of her department. But I would say that if she is not sure, and if she was not sure this morning, she should have got up in her place and said, "I would take that question as notice." She said that for the last two or three days, anyway, so surely once more would not have hurt. But she was quite emphatic, all six members received . . . Now, I think that the Honourable Minister of Labour, if she's going to get up in this House and stand in her place and make statements that she's not sure of, then she has a lot to learn. And she's going to suffer in months to come and years to come.

A MEMBER: She may clarify that before the Throne Speech debate is over.

MR. JENKINS: Well, I hope she does get up during the Throne Speech debate, some time or another. I would hope that other members on that other side would get up. But already we have seen that the First Minister — I don't know whether he's Kermit in the Muppet Show, but he goes like this, he goes like this, nothing moves. It's a great show they've got over there. I don't know who plays the piano over there, but somebody must. — (Interjection) — Oh, the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I don't want the Honourable Minister of Labour to leave yet because I want to speak a bit more about the former Civil Service Commission Chairman. This is a very cute ploy that has been used by the government. Under the Civil Service legislation, you can't fire the Chairman unless you have 66 percent of the agreement of the members of this House. So they haven't fired him, no, no, they've just changed him from being the Chairman to being a member. He drew a salary as the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission so they can't fire him. They'll invite him to meetings though and you know, the meetings, I believe, for half a day, is \$30 per diem? Something like that. Now, if he's going to be invited to meetings, and I believe they're held once or twice monthly, that's \$60 per month, but even on \$60 he's not going to live. But on nothing — I think my honourable friend says, "Let them eat cake." Well, I think that the former Civil Service Commission Chairman will have an awful time. He won't even be able to afford doughnuts, never mind cake.

You know, the Civil Service members, the Deputy Ministers who were fired, we've never been able to get an answer from the First Minister about severance pay. But the Civil Service Commission Chairman, they're not going to fire him, they're not going to give him severance pay, they're going to terminate it one way or another. They're going to starve him out. So he'll quit himself and they won't have to give him anything. I think that's a terrible state of affairs that goes on in this province. This is the type of government that we see, that the Progressive Conservative Party is prepared to carry on.

The First Minister gets up and mumbles when asked — I think on two or three occasions, but he goes to the Civil Service Commission. I would ask that either the First Minister, surely he's going to take part in this debate at some time or another, or maybe he's going to sit there, maybe somebody else is pulling his string. Perhaps it's the people over at Great-West Life that are pulling the string. Maybe it's a chain that comes across, and they decide when he will get up. Because sometime even he doesn't get up. He sits there. So there must be someone else, surely, that is pulling the strings. It's not the First Minister. Maybe it's the President of Great-West Life.

I had a very interesting conversation with one of my constituents after the — (Interjection) — no, no, he's not a constituent of mine I can assure you — after the last election, the most recent election. He asked me in all sincerity, he said, "Bill, is it true that the Progressive Conservative Party is going to change their name to the Great-West Life Party?" I said, "You're joking, of course." He said, "No, I'm quite honest and sincere. I think that is what they're going to do at their next provincial convention."

But anyway, enough of that. I would like to make a few comments on I guess one of the most important pieces of legislation that was ever passed in this House. I had the good fortune to be a member of the committee that met interessionally and met during the last Session, to hear briefs from interested people, women and men appearing before that committee, making briefs before the Statutory Committee on Regulations or something like that. Statutory Regulations. I went to that committee as a member not too well versed in what was really happening. I had certain sympathies for the inequities of the law as it was, but it was pointed out very clearly to me by members of many, many groups of society, not members of an organized NDP *claque* as the First Minister tried to intimate on television that I saw last night. "Oh, that was organized by the NDP and some other followers along. Fellow travellers or fellow wishers, or something like that." That's the sort of attitude we get from the First Minister.

The Honourable the Attorney-General has had ample opportunity to get up and explain his

position, what his position is on this piece of legislation. Not once has he got up, except to sit and mumble in his chair. I believe tonight he's going to. Maybe tonight's the night. Maybe. Who knows?

We have two pieces of legislation. It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that five members of the former opposition party, over on this side, voted for the Marital Property Act. The Honourable Minister of Finance who was the candidate in Riel, the Minister without Portfolio No. 2, the Member for River Heights, the Honourable Member for Wolseley, which was surprising, the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, and the Honourable Minister of Health. You know, Mr. Speaker, it is just by a mere coincidence, I guess that's what it is, but every one of those people had a lady candidate nominated and running against them in that election at that time. Isn't that quite a coincidence, Mr. Speaker? It's ironic. I agree with the Honourable Member for Morris. That is ironic. Really is ironic. Perhaps the lady had not been nominated at the time that the Honourable Member for Morris — I believe he had a lady candidate running against him — but maybe she wasn't nominated at that time or maybe his vote on the Marital Property Act would have been different from what it was.

You know — I guess you all look at the newspaper — I think that Frances Russell has really come to the nub of the point, and she has said in a very good article, has said that the time has come for the Attorney-General to quit fudging around and tell us exactly what he doesn't like in this legislation. He's been fudging around, he's been saying this and been saying that, he said, "Well, we like the legislation, we agree with the principles of it," — pardon? — (Interjection) — They want to reword it. Oh, yes. And what a nice gentleman they are going to bring in to help them reword it.

I can remember in June, down in Room 254, — (Interjection) — well, that's just like putting a fox in charge of the chicken coop. When you appoint a person like Mr. Houston. Mr. Houston said that he didn't care for the law in any way, shape or form. He didn't even agree with the law that we were proposing. He said he wasn't a draftsman, I believe the Honourable Attorney-General has already made that point. I don't know what his function is going to be, whether he's going to be the Lord High Executioner, or whether he's going to be the chief mortician when they bury this bill.

We're not discussing the bill and I don't know when the bill is being discussed. We can't refer to certain sections of the bill, but since the bill is here now and we've had it distributed, I think that when the Honourable Attorney-General is — and I understand that some time this evening he's going to get an opportunity to make his maiden speech in this House. We'll all be waiting with baited breath. Maybe I'd better not hold my breath. He might just get up and say, "I move, seconded by someone else that the bill be now read a second time." He may not even get up and explain. He hasn't got up and explained anything yet in this House. So maybe they're going to start a new tradition on that side. Those are the people over there who are the traditionalists. — (Interjection) — Patience is virtue, yes, that's true.

But we have the Member for Morris. Well, I'll get back to him later on. I have a few things to say about him and to him after. But I think when the Honourable Attorney-General gets up and he makes his maiden address in this Chamber this evening sometime or another, that he should state specifically what he's opposed to and his party. hope that he will say that he is going to bring these amendments back to the House at some time, not four years from now, not in 1981 when lo and behold, we're on the verge of another provincial election. I think that the Honourable Attorney-General should tell us what he's going to do to the bill, when he's going to bring the amendments back, and I think he should meet with the people and I want assurance, not only from the Attorney-General, but I want assurance also from the First Minister. Well, the honourable member from St. Vital says, "Would I believe them? I have to under the rules and regulations of this House. When an honourable member gets up and states something I have to believe him. You know otherwise I might be held in contempt of the House. I would be abusing the privileges of the House. If the Honourable Attorney-General or the Honourable First Minister gets up in this House and assures me that when the bill leaves the House and goes out to Committee, Law Amendments, Statutory Regulations, whatever Committee it's going to, and I wish he would state what committee it's going to, whether he will listen to public representation. I know the First Minister has said, "Oh yes, we'll hear representation," but he didn't say who would be hearing those representations. I believe that the First Minister is referring to the Review Board, Mr. Houston, and what's the other chap's name? — (Interjection) — Anderson and Mrs. Bowman, Mrs. Myrna Bowman, who was asked as an afterthought to sit on there. I would like also, other members of that side of the House to tell me what they think of the bills to postpone, especially the mover of the Speech from the Throne. If I might refer, Mr. Speaker, to Page 6 and here where the — (Interjection) — he's not in his seat, he's over in the seat of the seconder, but I refer to the Honourable Member for Pembina when he was going along and telling us about his wonderful constituency and I agree it's a wonderful constituency. I think that's something that all of us agree, that our own constituency is the best constituency in Manitoba. I am sure that the Honourable Member for St. Vital thinks that way. I'm sure that every honourable member in this House thinks that way. I think that the constituency that I represent is one of the best if not the best in the whole world. I think it's number one. — (Interjection) — I'm not like the honourable minister without Portfolio No. 2. He's like Avis, he's trying harder to get to number one. He used to be number one but he slipped. But anyways, the honourable member is just trying to distract me. I'd better get back to the Honourable Member for Pembina. He was speaking about the good virtues of his constituents and he said that the old adage is that when the going gets tough, the tough get going. That definitely applies to the farm population of my constituency. I say the farm population because I mean that in no small regard. Have wives and children of those farm families made a contribution to the health of our agricultural community like Mrs. Murdoch and others? How the member for Pembina can get up in this House and I'm sure he will, vote to emasculate the most progressive

legislation on family law that is here in this fair country of ours.

I would also like to state to the Minister of Labour, I don't want anyone to think that I am picking on the Minister of Labour — (Interjection) — but she is one of the fairer sex and she is one of those who has been on the receiving end of bad social legislation with regard to family law and life in Manitoba and in this country. There have been cases where members of the male community have suffered, but in the main it has been the ladies, God bless them. They have been the ones who have been the recipients of bad legislation. I want her to say what she thinks about family law and property law here in Manitoba. She is unfortunately the only lady representative that we have in this House and she's also a member of the Business and Professional Association, who made briefs to this House for the type of legislation that we have, and so I would dearly love to hear what she has to say. Surely she is not prepared to see this legislation emasculated. — (Interjection) — I could use some much cruder terms, I can assure the Honourable First Minister.

You know, they say that a prophet is without honour in his own country and legislation that is passed in this province is hailed elsewhere. You know, the family law group, I believe, met in Halifax just recently, I believe it was the Nova Scotia Advisory Council on the Status of Women with delegates from all over Canada, I believe. They sent a — if I can just quote — the Council decided to send a telegram. This is in today's paper, November 29th, the Winnipeg Free Press. I hate to give them a plug but anyway that's where I have to pick it out of. The Council decided to send a telegram to the women of Manitoba indicating their support in their attempt to retain the two family bills, The Maintenance and Matrimonial Property Act which were both passed by this Legislature this spring — I believe it was more or less this summer.

Mr. Speaker, honourable members of this Assembly, how are we going to know what is the opinion of the members over there? We don't know, and I can assure you that if they are silent here that when we go into Room 254 and if we can get that assurance from the Attorney-General and from the First Minister that public representation by members of the public will be made to that Committee, and that's something, Sir, that you and I and other members who have been in this Chamber for some time know that is not automatic. We have a unique system in Manitoba. You people are the traditionalists and I hope you don't break the tradition. We have established, and I don't know when it was started — in fact I made some enquiries when I was Chairman of Law Amendments and at other times of people who had been here quite some time. I asked even Charland Prudhomme who was the former Clerk of this House and he said he didn't know. But in most Legislative Assemblies, Houses of Common, etc. under the parliamentary system, a bill is referred to a committee with specific instructions that public representation will be heard. But here in Manitoba we have a unique situation that every bill that goes out of this House goes to a committee and public representation is invited. Don't break that tradition. — (Interjection) — Oh yes, I said every bill that is sent out of this House. Now if the Honourable Member for Morris wants to correct me, I will accept his correction. Bills dealing with The Legislative Assembly Act, treasury bills, I know don't go out of this House. I understand that the Honourable Member for Morris was instructing the new members in decorum and procedures and rules of this House. Certainly I would have thought that he would have pointed that out already to his new members. Perhaps he hasn't. — (Interjection) — We know, and I'll get back to you after the supper hour because I have a few minutes left to speak to you about decorum. I want a bit more time to speak about your decorum when you were on this side of the House. As my colleague, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre said, he's going to spend the next couple of years reading back to the Honourable Member for Morris, the Minister without Portfolio No. 1, his speeches back to him. All I can say to him is for God's sake, don't read that one about the Little Red Hen because I've heard that one enough times. I believe that that one appeared in quite a number of his speeches.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few more things and I see that the hour is approximately 5:30. I wonder if we could call it 5:30 and I'll finish my remarks after the supper hour.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the House to call it 5:30? Very well. The he hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m.