



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. 7A

2:30 p.m. Wednesday, November 30, 1977

# THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY of MANITOBA

Wednesday, November 30, 1977

Time: 2:30 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my right where we have 55 students of Grade 9 standing of the Carman Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Johnston and Mr. Revel. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Meer for Pembina.

At the same time, we have 29 students from the Adult Basic Education Department of Red River Community College. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan. On behalf of all members, I welcome you here today.

At the same time, on the loge to my left, we have the former Member for Transcona, Mr. Paulley, and I would also ask you to welcome him this afternoon.

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 Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere):** Mr. Speaker, it doesn't matter particularly if the Minister of Health or the Minister of Labour were to choose to answer this, but I shall go by rule of precedence and ask the Minister of Health whether he has, in light of the industrial dispute at Misericordia Hospital, met directly with the two parties to the dispute in an effort to bring about an early settlement?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L.R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** No. I have not done that, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, in light of the circumstance and recalling my honourable friend's attitude on that as evinced in his questions when he was on this side, can I ask him at least whether he is undertaking to do so at the earliest possible opportunity?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not averse to undertaking to do so. I haven't undertaken to do so as yet. I'm in consultation with my colleague, the Minister of Labour on the subject, and also with departmental and hospital officials. My consultations extend only to that range thus far.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, then I should like to ask the Minister of Labour whether she has in the circumstance met directly with the two parties to the dispute at Misericordia?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, our conciliation officer has been in contact, meeting with the members of the union all through the weekend, and with the board.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. TOM BARROW:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Labour. Due to the fact that there have been three fatal accidents in less than a month in the Flin Flon area, two maybe unavoidable — the last one definitely could have been avoided — would you consider having an inquiry there as soon as possible?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, there is an inquiry going on at this time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Flin Flon, with a supplementary question.

**MR. BARROW:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the same minister. Flin Flon is — I hope you realize this, it's a unique situation — (Interjection) — I'll have to do a little explaining — where the ore runs in two provinces and the buildings are in both provinces. So what happens, the jurisdiction comes under the federal people, which makes it awkward for any legislation we have passed to apply there. And, of course, what the corporation does is use the federal or provincial, whichever suits them . . . likely to be put onto the marketplace?

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

**HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye):** Mr. Speaker, I presume the situation will be handled as before. If there is a large amount of funds required, this particular government, with the understanding from the Manitoba Development Corporation Board of Directors, is not advancing any more monies at the present, and this would be something that would have to be reviewed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster with a supplementary.

**MR. GREEN:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Am I then to understand, Mr. Speaker, that the government is preventing or restricting the Manitoba Development Corporation from making a straight commercial decision, uninterfered with by any political considerations, concerning Manitoba's participation in the Tantalum Mining Corporation?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, it has been agreed upon by the Board of Directors that there will not be any additional loans or additional monies flowing out of the Manitoba Development Corporation.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Minister's answer, is the Minister telling us that the Manitoba Development Corporation Board of Directors came to that conclusion or merely agreed to follow the Minister's or government's instructions that they are not to make a commercial decision with regard to Manitoba's participation in Tantalum Mining Corporation, which, Mr. Speaker, the secretary of the Mining Association — if that impresses my honourable friends — says that it is one of Manitoba's best investments and they should increase it.

**MR. BANMAN:** Well, the Board has agreed to suspend any new loan activities or get involved in any new ventures. I should point out to the member, I know the point he is trying to make that Manitoba, with the 25 percent shares, has the first refusal on the 51 percent shares that were put up for sale.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. —(Interjection)— Order please. It would only be with the concurrence of all members of the House.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, apparently the Minister did not understand my question and therefore I would like to repeat it. He has indicated that the Board has agreed. May I ask the Minister whether that is a Board recommendation that they not advance further funds or whether that is something that the government told the Board?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I repeat again, I have discussed the matter with the Board and they agreed at that time with the position that we felt we should take of freezing loans.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour, which I gave prior notice to and I would hope she would have an answer at this time. It concerns the recent actions in U.S. and Ontario courts concerning the fire hazards of aluminum wiring. I would like to know whether the province of Manitoba, her department, have examined the degree of hazards that presently exist, extent of the use of aluminum wiring in the province, and whether this province intends to take any action to safeguard the uses of aluminum wire over the past decade or so?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, I did make some inquiries, and a presentation that was made to the Commissions of Inquiry by Mr. Lambert of the Manitoba Hydro had this to say: "In summary, my experience to date indicates aluminum wire is safe. I do not consider the complaints and problems in comparison to the number of homes wired with aluminum to be of any great concern. My experience indicates problems connected with aluminum have been through the use of incorrect terminations or poor installation techniques. To the extent there has been some concern with aluminum wire, it pertains to the use of it by untrained people. In this respect the code book is not an instruction manual for such people, people but rather a safety standard for the installation of maintenance of electrical equipment by only qualified people." The information we got to date indicates that there has been no court cases in Ontario or anywhere else in Canada pertaining to this matter. There has only been one case in the United States to date.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I would think that perhaps the Minister of Labour might check more closely on the court cases in Ontario, because the Consumers Association has launched a suit in that province. But the point that I would raise would be whether the Minister of Labour and the Fire Commissioner's office would, even in acknowledgement of the problem expressed by this gentleman from Manitoba Hydro, would seek to inform consumers that those who have aluminum wiring should exercise some care and caution in the installation or in the reinstallation of those wirings as the fittings

begin to wear out. I would wonder if there is any intention to undertake an information program to draw attention to that problem and to take some corrective steps in this regard.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Honourable the First Minister. In view of the fact that it would appear that Mr. Merlin Newton states that there is no precedent for settlements in the case of a dismissed deputy minister, and in view of the fact that the Honourable the First Minister stated that the Civil Service Commission is dealing with this matter in a routine fashion, which seems to be contradictory, is he prepared to give us the information as to the terms of reference given by him to the Civil Service Commission?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charles Wood):** Well, Mr. Speaker, at the risk of offending the rule against repetition, the only further information I can advise my honourable friend of is this, that at least one of the persons in question has retained counsel to deal with Mr. Newton, the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, but I don't think it would be appropriate to discuss that while those negotiations are going on. One of the other parties — the one who resigned — is out of the country, I understand, according to my most recent information, and not able to conclude any arrangements that are being suggested to him, and I'm not sure whether the third party in question has counsel retained or not, but I have had no recommendation re settlement as yet with respect to the two persons who left their positions by action of Order-in-Council.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact then that apparently the Civil Service Commission is to make a recommendation, rather than have the authority to make a decision — I'm interpreting that from the Honourable the First Minister's words — is he not prepared to make public to anyone who's concerned, including the parties, what the terms of reference are?

**MR. LYON:** The terms of reference, Mr. Speaker, are for the chairman of the Civil Service Commission to make arrangements for severance pay which would be in accordance with whatever precedent he can find in the circumstances, and which would be reasonable and fair to the people in question and to the Treasury of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns, with a final supplementary.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I want to address a question to the First Minister. I would not call it supplementary, although it could be interpreted that way. I would like to know whether reading page 59 of Hansard whether the First Minister is prepared to withdraw his statement or to apologize to the women of Manitoba for talking even facetiously about the Conservatives being "among the best breeders in the world." Is he prepared to withdraw that statement or apologize?

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may ask . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Has the Member for Inkster a point of order? The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, the other day the Minister of Finance presented to the House a statement with respect to the government's position on an application for a loan from CCIL but in indicating that the loan was not acceptable to the government of Manitoba or the Manitoba Development Corporation, he did not tell us the nature of the request. I am wondering whether perhaps the First Minister could indicate to the House just what the exact proposal was from CCIL and why the position that has been taken on the part of the province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the question might more properly be directed to the Minister of Finance where this file was for some ten months before we came into office and my honourable friend could well speak to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks and find out all of the details. There were some options that were made available to the previous government, or suggested to the previous government, which were under consideration by the administration of which my honourable friend was a member. I think a number of his colleagues, if not himself, would be aware of what those options were, the letter that was sent by the Minister of Finance on Friday dealt with those options and it did not, as my colleague mentioned yesterday, close the door on future matters that they may wish to raise with the government.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, obviously the Honourable First Minister is not aware that we did not have the options that they were presented with on the part of CCIL. That is why I am asking the question, what was in fact the precise proposal that was turned down by the present administration. Because my understanding is it is quite different from the proposal that was given to the previous administration.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I'll take the second part of that question as notice and check with my honourable colleague, the Minister of Finance, but my understanding is that the matter that was being dealt with was the proposal essentially that was laid before my honourable friends some months ago.

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

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, because of the magnitude of importance of this matter, I should like to ask the First Minister, perhaps he will take it as notice companion to the last question, and that is this: Given that the most recent proposition involves or would involve an obligation or risk on the part of Manitoba approximating 20 percent of the total financial package as opposed to something in the order of 80 to 100 percent of the total financial package, that being the case, does the government feel that they have exhausted all need for further exploration of the most recent proposals?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, to be accurate and because we're dealing with information that is confidential in the sense of CCIL's involvement in it, I would prefer to take that as notice and give an answer that would be accurate as to any modifications or whatever that might have been suggested to the proposals that my honourable friends had for some ten months.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition asked me this morning about any continuing committee, I believe the word was, with respect to the INCO layoffs at the Town of Thompson. I am able to advise him that as a result of meetings attended by the Minister of Mines and Resources in this province and outside of the province there has been established an *ad hoc* committee. The members of it are the conciliation officer from the Department of Labour, the Chief of the Manpower and Immigration of the provincial government, the President of the United Steelworkers of Thompson Local, a representative of employee relations from INCO in Thompson, the Mayor of Thompson, the Chief Administrator of the City of Thompson. They have had one meeting and the Senior Municipal Planner of the Department of Municipal Affairs has been appointed to prepare a study on the effects of the INCO layoffs in Thompson and the overall effects that these layoffs will have on service and construction industry in Thompson. The report I'm advised is in progress and meetings will be held soon although no date has been set at this time. I would stress that that is an *ad hoc* committee.

In addition to that the Thompson City Council is preparing a variety of proposals which they will be bringing to the government. The Minister of Northern Affairs, the Member for Thompson, is in touch almost daily with the Thompson City Council and will be making arrangements for representatives from Thompson to meet with the appropriate ministers when they come in.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs relating back to the answer or non-answer I received from the Minister of Labour concerning the hazards related to aluminum wiring. Would the Minister of Consumer Affairs undertake to acquire the information related to the potential hazards of aluminum wiring and if it does present a danger to those who presently use that wiring in their homes, provide them with the information particularly in terms of the re-installation or refitting of their homes as it comes about?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**HON. ED MCGILL (Brandon West):** Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the subject matter of the question put by the Member for Fort Rouge to the Minister of Labour. I can tell him that in my term of office I have not seen any information relating to the subject of aluminum wiring. However he has aroused my interest and I am certainly going to see whether or not this matter has been brought to the attention of my department and we will be able to apprise him of the information which we have in due course.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question to the Honourable the First Minister relative to the Canadian Co-Operative Implements Limited. If indeed there has been a more recent proposal made as we understand, would the minister consider referring that proposal to the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Development Corporation to obtain a straight commercial decision as to whether the investment of moneys in that corporation could see the continued establishment of the company in a similar way, Mr. Minister, to what was done to save from bankruptcy and keep in Manitoba one of its most important industries, Versatile Manufacturing? Would the minister consider

having the expert advice available by the Manitoba Development Corporation Board of Directors, who I am sure the minister respects, to consider whether on a straight commercial basis the latest proposal is one which should be considered?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, the decision that was communicated to CCIL last Friday is with respect to all proposals considered up to that point. It has been indicated to CCIL if they have further proposals to make that there's an open door for consideration.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Was the most recent proposal considered on a strict commercial non-political basis by the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Development Corporation?

**MR. LYON:** The most recent proposal, Mr. Speaker, was considered on a strict commercial non-political basis having regard to the state of the Treasury left by my honourable friends opposite and the inability to do some of the things that, from time to time, governments might wish to do if they had that ability. But, we have left the door open for any further proposals that they may wish to make.

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

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask then, in light of the last question, that given the fact that Manitoba's gross provincial product has more than doubled even in real dollars, not current dollars, in the decade of the 1970s, and the Treasury of the province therefore being different because of that, can my honourable friend indicate whether or not the confirmation, which I believe has been made public by CCIL and the co-operative movement, that they are prepared to undertake risk at least in a ratio of three to one to any one province, and given the fact that the province of Saskatchewan has in the past 30 to 60 days confirmed that they would be prepared to participate on a proportionate basis — in light of these more recent facts, can this government confirm that they are prepared to exhaust every possibility of sharing proportionately in the risk, but a very necessary one, to the future well-being of this province?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Leader of the Opposition would be well advised to check his statement with respect to the intentions of the government of Saskatchewan, with whom we have had some contact. And I can only repeat again that the government of Manitoba stands ready to listen to and keep an open-door policy with respect to any new propositions that they may wish to make to us.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, I really am not asking for any more than that. But lest — and I suppose I'm rising on a Point of Order — — the impression be left that I have not checked with the province of Saskatchewan, that is just the point, Sir, I have, and indeed there has been confirmation of a willingness on the part of that province to jointly share the burden of risk with the province of Manitoba. That being so, and I say to my honourable friend, in the event that I can give him a confirmation of that by virtue of that statement itself — I'm sure I can get it from one of the local newspapers — will he take that as notice of the fact that circumstances do change?

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I have a further question to the First Minister relative to his most recent answer. Can he tell me, Mr. Speaker, on coming into government, what his government has been faced with comparable to a \$200 million obligation to finance a politically inspired forest mill in northern Manitoba which did not . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. I must remind the Member for Inkster that questions should not be argumentative. The Member for Brandon East.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. The \$200 million is related to inflation. Comparable to what we have today the obligation foisted on our government was \$200 million which we were obliged to pay out.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**A MEMBER:** Walter Newman told us we were obliged to pay it out. He is a good lawyer.

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to, through you, address a question to the Minister without Portfolio, the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. Recently the Minister responsible for MHRC announced the appointment of six new board members of that corporation. In view of the active business interests in the field of construction and land development of a number of them, is the minister not concerned of the serious possibility of

conflicts of interest arising between the business interests of those people and the interests of Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Minister in charge of Manitoba Housing.

**HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON(Sturgeon Creek):** Not one bit concerned.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I note that one is in the field of plumbing contracting, but another is in the field of construction and land development and yet another in real estate and insurance, and therefore I say to the minister, I ask the minister then, if he is not in the least bit concerned how is he going to satisfy himself that that conflict will not arise? How will he monitor the situation? How will he assure the people of this province that there will not be that conflict of interest? How will he ensure this?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister in charge of Manitoba Housing.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** My insurance is the integrity of the gentlemen that are appointed.

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

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Of special significance today I think in light of the fatality at the Centennial Mine in Flin Flon, I would like the minister to reaffirm to this House that the rescheduling of the Mining Safety Seminar to be held in Thompson in February was done in full consultation with the labour organizations involved.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I have to remind the Member for Churchill that that's the same question he asked the other day. Repetitive questions are normally not admitted in the Chamber. We will now move on to Orders of the Day.

**MR. COWAN:** Perhaps I could rephrase it then, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. COWAN:** I direct a question again to the Minister of Labour. Has the date of February 1st through the 3rd been acceptable to those labour organizations involved?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, through you to the honourable member, I'd like to tell him that it's February 1st and 2nd. It has been made agreeable to the Manitoba Federation of Labour, the Mining Association, the Manitoba Redi-mix Association and the Roadbuilders and Heavy Construction.

The people who are going to be extended invitations to it are the Honourable MacMaster, Mr. Tom Barrow, MLA for Flin Flon, Honourable Keith Cosens, Honourable Brian Ransom, Honourable Gerry Mercier, Mr. Krga the CIL President, Honourable Snyder, Minister of Labour in Saskatchewan, Honourable Berube, Minister of Natural Resources in Quebec and the Honourable Betty Stephenson, the Minister of Labour in Ontario.

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

**MR. COWAN:** A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I will have to apologize for getting the dates wrong if the honourable minister will apologize for giving us the dates wrong yesterday, and I read from the Hansard. It said "rescheduled for February 1st through 3rd." As a question I would ask the honourable minister to explain how as of noon today neither the Manitoba Federation of Labour or the United Steelworkers of America or any of their representatives were yet aware of the new date which you said was made in full consultation with them and is acceptable to them.

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

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. Could he confirm that the announcement he made Monday concerning an expenditure on the upgrading of the electrical system at the Portage Home for the Retardates that not one penny of that amount will go toward upgrading the building in which some of the people in the facility died earlier in the spring?

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

**HONOURABLE HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

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

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister in charge of the environment is ready to respond to the question that he took as notice the other day.

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

**MR. RONALD McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Mines and Environmental Management. Has the minister issued a directive or direction to his department not to hire the environmental aides who have just finished their New Careers training with his department?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Mines.

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney):** Mr. Speaker, yes, I have issued that directive. I can review the history of the program as I understand it. I believe in 1975 there were approximately nine people selected to undergo new careers training for work as environmental aides. Now my understanding was that the cost for the training of those people was borne by the federal government. The training process lasted for about two years. There initially was provision made in the estimates of this department for 1977-78 for ten staff-man-years and an appropriate amount of money to accommodate these people at the completion of their training period. That amount of money and the staff-man-years were cut from the budget. The people in question completed their training as of the end of September of this year, 1977. The cabinet then approved an amount of money to cover the employment of these people for October and November of 1977 and I might add that during that period of time negotiations were going on with the federal government to see whether or not they would share in the cost of hiring these people. The outcome of that was that the federal government would not share in the cost of continuing the hiring of these people.

The previous administration had made no provision in their budget for money or staff-man-years to hire these people after having brought them on and encouraged them over a period of two years through their training program. At the end of November the money ran out; there was no provision in the budget and I was forced to make the decision that we had to terminate the program at that point.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** I will ask the minister then, Mr. Speaker, if this cost-shared program was quite worthwhile for the northern communities whether he took this decision to cabinet, whether he is aware that there is some obligation on their part to hire the new careers trainees, and whether or not he is aware that in the past new career trainees have been facilitated within the department in which they were trained?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Questions of awareness are not normally accepted in the question period. The Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the honourable minister telling us that he has no choice with regard to this matter when he says that he was forced to make that decision? Is there no way within the government mechanism that those people can be hired? Is that what he's telling us?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Mines.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I am continuing to examine possible ways by which we might be able to continue but in light of the situation, with no money provided in the budget and no staff-man-years we had no choice but to issue notices of termination.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. BARROW:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. My colleague from Churchill coming from a mining area I think should be included in the invitations to that seminar. I think it was just an oversight on the minister's part.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I'd be delighted to include him in the invitations.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I just wonder if I could get confirmation from the Minister of Environmental Management whether this decision was made by himself or whether a decision was made by the cabinet of the Conservative government to terminate these people.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Mines.



**Wednesday, November 30, 1977**

**MR. RANSOM:** The termination decision was made by myself in light of the cabinet decision that there is a freeze on hiring, and in light of the fact that there was no provision made in the budget by the previous government which now professes great concern for these people. They brought them on over two years of the training program and made no provision in the budget to hire them at the end of that program, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In light of the fact that previous northern ministers have been able to get such decisions changed and priorities changed to make sure that the north was not neglected, I wonder of the Minister of Environmental Management received any encouragement or pressure from the Member for Thompson or the Minister of Northern Affairs to keep these people on staff?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend having been a member of the Executive Council should be well aware that discussions between members of the Executive Council and cabinet are not matters upon which cabinet ministers report to him or anybody else.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. About a month ago when he announced a freeze on construction of public buildings throughout the 'province, he revealed either accurate or fairly accurate figures on the construction costs or total costs of these projects. Does he now intend to make this a standard policy?

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

**HON. HARRY ENNS:** I didn't get the latter part of his question. I didn't understand his question.

**MR. DOERN:** Well a month ago, Mr. Speaker, the Minister announced accurate or fairly accurate figures on construction costs or total project costs of public works buildings throughout the province. Does he intend to continue that policy?

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

**MR. ENNS:** I still have grave trouble understanding the question - understand what policy? I will always be accurate in whatever I respond to, whether to questions in this House or to members of the news media, to the best of my ability. I don't understand the portent of his question. -

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood. Would he care to rephrase his question?

**MR. DOERN:** If he continues that policy, what he is doing in effect is providing construction companies with figures by which they will probably adjust their bids and I would suggest the result would be the province would probably pay more for its contracts if he continues that policy.

**MR. ENNS:** It may not have always been the practice of the previous administration, but I can assure honourable members opposite that in all instances, particularly instances such as the honourable former minister refers to, we will abide by the public tender system. The tender system will provide the best dollar value to the public whatever we undertake in the nature of new construction.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I must remind the honourable members that there is approximately two minutes left in the question period. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I won't take two minutes. I would like to go back to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and ask him whether there was not, upon his entry into the office which he now assumes, a draft memo either signed or blank, indicating as to what steps could be taken to hire the environmental aides that he now says he is forced not to hire and he has no choice not to hire, that there is a memo indicating the procedures which could be taken to the hiring of those environmental aides. I'm not disputing his judgment as to hiring or not hiring them, I'm asking whether in fact, there is a way of doing it, which he now says there isn't.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Mines.

**MR. RANSOM:** I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, that I know of the memo that the honourable member is referring to. If he would assist me in finding that memo I would be pleased to study it.

**MR. GREEN:** Fine. I'd be happy to do that, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member knows I offered him that assistance as soon as he took office. I would now offer him by way of question — would the

minister check with Management Committee, if he is unable to figure out a way himself, what steps are available to him which would remove his "no choice" situation in not hiring those environmental aides, because I assure him that he has much freedom of action in this connection.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, the alleged freedom of action that we apparently have at this time, without any provision in the budget, without any staff many years, leaves me rather baffled in view of the fact that the previous government knew full well that these people were coming off their training period at the end of September 1977. If they were so concerned about providing the service and the employment for these people, why did they not provide for it in the budget? It would have made the situation much simpler.

### THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Pembina and the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Point Douglas.

**MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I offer you my congratulations for having been chosen for the very important, difficult and responsible post of Speaker. For my part I will try my best not to add to the difficulties of your job. I sincerely wish you success. Also, I would like to offer my congratulations to the mover, the Honourable Member for Pembina and his contribution. He told us all about how wide, how long, how deep is his constituency and also he mentioned that he is sort of a trainer of mules. Well, he'll have a tough situation for the next four years to train them well. Also, I would like to congratulate the seconder, the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, for his contribution toward our discussion. Nevertheless I would like to congratulate the new ministers and I would like to welcome the new faces in this House on both sides.

Now to begin with I want to thank the people of Point Douglas constituency for having elected me as their representative for the third time and with a complete majority of the votes in the constituency. I don't think there are a greater proportion of people with a university education in Point Douglas than in other areas. In fact I am pretty sure there aren't. I believe the people in my area are naturally possessed with good common sense. They know when they are well off. They fully appreciate the good things the New Democratic government did for them and the rest of the people of this province.

The people in my constituency know from past experience that there are no solutions to modern economic problems through outdated Conservative policies, so they voted solidly for the NDP. Of course I like to believe they also voted for me because they consider me a good representative. For this, I would like to thank them very much. I will continue to do my best on their behalf. Unfortunately not enough people in other constituencies showed the same good sense, or maybe they were so overwhelmed with the Conservative oratory and vague promises of jobs, they voted against their own best interests in spite of their good sense.

Even though I am an NDP supporter, I would be happy if I could praise the government for the measures introduced at this so-called special session, but I see little in the bills before us to make me happy. There is no reason why I should be glad that the government is going to abolish the five million dollar succession duties and gift tax. My children aren't counting on inheriting a few million from me and the kind of gift I can offer is not affected by the present gift tax. Our MLA salaries are not that big that we can afford that kind of gift.

Mr. Speaker, I said it before and I will say it again: I doubt whether there is one person in the whole of my constituency that will benefit from abolition of these taxes. Probably less than two percent of the people in the province will gain either directly or indirectly from the abolition of these taxes. Possibly not even in River Heights or Tuxedo is there a majority of people rich enough to benefit from this Conservative handout. And what about the Mineral Tax? How many people will benefit from the abolition of this tax? Certainly not the people who need some tax relief.

I am not a tax expert but I believe that my leader has already pointed out, by giving the tax break of five million to wealthy individuals and corporations you'll have to raise more money from the poorer taxpayers. You can't hope to make it all up by laying off a lot of civil servants.

I know it would be better if the Federal Government collected these taxes for the provinces. This would put all provinces on an equal footing as far as attracting investors is concerned. But since the Federal Government is reluctant to adopt such fair taxation policies the provinces should retain this tax because it is a very fair tax. But seeing as how you have a majority I know that I am wasting my time to convince you. I know you are in a big hurry to abolish this tax and you are even going to make it retroactive to October 11 so a few well-heeled people and some wealthy Crown corporations will get a nice Christmas present. Maybe you even want it gift wrapped.

Mr. Speaker, I know all the Conservative arguments. You call these taxes nuisance taxes. Of course nobody likes paying taxes, so all taxes are considered a nuisance. You have put forward the argument that the taxes imposed by the former New Democratic government was discouraging business and investors from investing their money in this province to create jobs.

My goodness gracious! We have close to a million unemployed in this country, Mr. Speaker. Provinces which have long had Conservative governments have the highest rate of unemployment. So how is it that investors aren't flocking in greater numbers to those provinces where these taxes do not exist?

Yesterday I think that maybe you saw on television what happened in Toronto. They had a great demonstration in front of the legislative building.

I notice that the government was also in a big rush to abolish the one and three-quarter overtime rate. You are quick with the \$5 million tax break to the wealthy and you are just as quick to take away some slight benefits enacted for the workers. That is, of course, Conservative policy but is this a just policy? As I understand it, in the one and three-quarter overtime rate was not really intended to put much more money in the workers' pockets. It was primarily intended to discourage employers from relying too much on overtime instead of hiring more people.

With so many unemployed there is absolutely no justification for the working of overtime except in unavoidable emergencies. The big number one problem in this country is to get the unemployed into jobs. The Honourable First Minister made a big issue of this during the campaign — which I will outline a little later.

This, Mr. Speaker, brings me to another point which the present government regards of the utmost urgency. One of the government's first acts in assuming office was the appointment of a task force. The chief aim of this body is to see how many civil servant jobs can be eliminated. According to the report in the press there is the possibility of eliminating 800 civil service jobs in the year through dismissal and attrition.

Mr. Speaker, I am all in favour of efficiency but having close to a million unemployed in our country is certainly not making efficient use of the nation's labour force.

I want to say also that in what way will it benefit this province and this country if the task force can eliminate a few hundred civil servants from their jobs when there are no other jobs to go to. Obviously, the thousands of people unemployed living on unemployment insurance or welfare haven't as much money to spend as if they were fully employed at regular wages. But this is better than it was during the depression years. Thousands of people who lost their jobs then were immediately cut off from all purchasing power. They had no unemployment insurance to fall back on. It was only when they had exhausted every resource could they collect a bit of relief to keep body and soul together.

The reason I mention all of these dreary facts, Mr. Speaker, is not to put honourable members to sleep but to wake them up to where their present policy of restraint may lead us.

In those depression years private industry and governments practised restraint to the utmost degree. At the first sign of a slowdown in business, private industry slashed salaries and wages and resorted to massive layoffs — as INCO in Thompson is now trying to do. This sharp decline in buying power naturally resulted in business getting still worse and so we had this vicious circle. Governments practised restraint by keeping relief payments at the barest minimum. They could hardly get lower than the 20 cents a day they were paying the single unemployed in the relief camps.

In the early thirties the government of the day in this province practised restraint by slashing civil servants' salaries by 25 percent. This, of course, meant that they had 25 percent less to spend as customers.

The reason I am rehashing this old fact of history is because I want to reveal to my Conservative friends a most important fact which they have overlooked. The reason why our economy is functioning as well as it is, the reason living standards remain relatively high despite massive unemployment is due to CCF and NDP policies that have been put into effect in the past, sometimes even by Conservative governments.

Today we have old age pensions. The pensioners have buying power, not enough in my view but much more than when there were no pensions. Today we have unemployment insurance. This is still a poor substitute for a job and decent wages but it is much better than being without unemployment insurance as it was in the dirty thirties. Today we have family allowances. We have medicare, pharmacare. We have welfare payments. So through these various social security measures governments at all levels are pumping about \$17 billion into the economy in the way of purchasing power.

In addition there are the \$3 billion national defence expenditures. So you see, Mr. Speaker, governments at all levels have become important distributors of massive sums of buying power. This money circulates in the economy buying goods and services, paying wages and salaries, paying doctors' fees and no doubt also some lawyers' fees as well as dividends to shareholders.

If governments at all levels didn't provide customers for business through this massive circulation of buying power in the ways I have mentioned, our private enterprise economy would collapse entirely. So I fail to understand the reasoning of the Conservatives who are so strongly opposed to government involvement in the economy. They are loudly condemning many government expenditures when they must know that such expenditures are helping to keep the economy going.

There has been much talk in Conservative circles about granting tax incentives to investors to stimulate investment. The Conservative view is that profits should not be too heavily taxed so business can reinvest these profits in further business expansion. But surely there are limits as to how much expansion is necessary. It doesn't make much sense to expand an industry already operating at less than capacity.

We have an obvious example of over-expansion in the private sector right here in Winnipeg. There has been such an enormous expansion in the construction of office buildings that we now have a surplus of empty office space.

On my way to the legislative building I pass a lot of empty buildings along Main Street. The huge Confederation Life building is standing there empty and closed up. A little further on is the big Bank of Commerce building which has been empty for about ten years or more. In almost every block along Portage Avenue there is empty office and shopping space but still more is being built even though many

of the newly finished buildings are still begging for tenants. Quite obviously too much business profits have been invested in excessive office space at a time when we urgently in need of more housing, hospitals and other more essential buildings.

Mr. Speaker, it would have been better by far if more of the profits invested in excess office buildings had been taxed by the government so that the government would have had the revenue needed to spend on things of greater benefit to the people than empty office and shopping space — empty ones.

I could mention many more examples of the extravagant expenditure of funds by private industry but I will limit myself to just one more example. Most of you may be aware that Shell Oil has branched out into the food business. The fellows who will sell you gas and oil will also sell you bread and canned beans. I understand they are going to open up five outlets in Winnipeg for a start. The one on Osborne and Roslyn Road is almost complete.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, we are virtually smothered in food stores already. In heaven's name, why do we need to have Shell Oil open up still more food stores? I ask my Conservative friends, is this wise business investment? Is it responsible investment? Is this the most efficient way of handling food distribution? This move will certainly not benefit the people even it may turn out to be profitable for Shell Oil, which I frankly doubt.

I know the government is in a big hurry to sell out all government enterprises. When in the opposition you had some pretty harsh things to say about government enterprises that failed. As if private enterprises never failed.

Mr. Speaker, I could with very little research fill up an entire copy of Hansard with accounts of private enterprises that have failed this past year. One of the enterprises to be sold is the Lord Selkirk because it is not paying its way. You know, of course, this failed as a private enterprise and was taken over by the government because of that.

**A MEMBER:** That's different. That's different.

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** I believe the private businessmen who built this ship and put it into operation are to be commended despite of the fact that this failed as a private operation.

**A MEMBER:** They used public money we got from the tourists.

**A MEMBER:** Well, well, well.

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** That I didn't know that even they were using the government money, and still they call it private enterprise.

**A MEMBER:** From the Tories. From the Tories.

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** This is a modern and beautiful ship. It is a very attractive feature of the Manitoba life in the summertime. Where else in Canada can you take a 300-mile cruise up north on one of the big lakes in the world? I have been on that ship once and I enjoyed the experience. Let's make use of our natural blessings. Not all private enterprises are an overnight success. With a little more time and patience this ship may yet pay its way. But we should not expect every government enterprise to pay its way in dollars and cents.

For instance, Headingley Jail has never shown a profit, Mr. Speaker. We are subsidizing Winnipeg Transit and many other things because we feel they are needed or are beneficial to the community in some way. I understand the Lord Selkirk has on occasion arranged special cruises for senior citizens at low rates. Many uses may be found for this ship from which many Manitobans and outside visitors would benefit. I appeal to my honourable friends, especially the minister in charge now on the government side to use a little imagination.

I will not say anything about Flyer Industry and some others. You want to get rid of it in a big hurry. I would like to leave this to my colleague, the Honourable Member for Inkster — he is an expert on it.

I plead with the government not to be too hasty and resort to "fire sale" tactics to get rid of those industries. Mr. Speaker, I have left to the last one of the most important matters to come before us. That is the Family Law legislation.

The government is in a very big hurry to give tax concessions to certain wealthy groups. It is also in a big rush to take away a few slight benefits from the workers with regard to overtime payments. But the government is in no hurry at all to allow the Family Law legislation to come into effect, yet this Family Law legislation passed by the previous New Democratic Party government is widely regarded as the best and the most advanced legislation enacted to deal with family relationships.

I find it incredible that even a most conservative government would want to arouse widespread protests by tampering with this legislation. We were the witness, Mr. Speaker, last Monday that hundreds of wives and husbands and children were here, and I didn't see that even a single one of them were happy or they were smiling. They were really sad at what's going on.

Mr. Speaker, times have changed. Our ideas on husband and wife relationships have changed. We are no longer living in an age when a wife is regarded as no more than a piece of furniture or property of her husband. We may not have achieved complete equality of the sexes yet, but we have come a long way in that direction.

The Family Law legislation was another big step forward in establishing equality and fairness in the acquisition and sharing of property and other family relationships.

So much has been written and talked about this family law. I will not take up more time of the House in repeating what is already known. All I want to do, Mr. Speaker, is express my strong protest at the government's action in delaying this law from coming into effect, or what is even worse, Mr. Speaker, the government may bring in their version of such a law which may be worse than no such a law.

I am appalled by the fact that the government has appointed to the body that is to review this legislation, a man who had been the strongest opponent of it. And I don't know, Mr. Speaker, how many times he was divorced, but for a fact I know once he was, and such a man without feelings, he wants to tell us what to do, how to raise our children, how to be a good husband . . .

**A MEMBER:** Now we don't?

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** Now we do. We will. It is also annoying that this legislation is being shelved because certain business interests are opposed to it, at least this is the main excuse we have heard so far from the other side.

I hope public reaction against the government's attitude will be sufficiently strong to convince honourable members on the government side to re-think and change their position.

I will conclude with a brief comment on an editorial which appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press on November 4th. I do so because it brings out the contrast in NDP and Conservative philosophy and policies. The Free Press has always been a strong supporter for Liberal and Conservative governments and it has always been a most bitter opponent to the New Democratic Party or social democratic of any kind. But now, Mr. Speaker, the Free Press seems to have become disillusioned with the Conservatives, too. It has lost all hope and belief that Liberal and Conservative governments can cope with our major economic problems which means unemployment.

**A MEMBER:** The honeymoon is over.

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** Unemployment is the basic thing, my dear friends, with empty stomachs you would not be here.

The Free Press in this editorial pointed out that in the Thirties, Canada, the United States and other industrial nations suffered one of the worst depressions with massive unemployment. The Free Press admits, in this editorial, that neither Liberal or Conservative governments in Canada, nor Democratic nor Republican governments in the United States could end unemployment.

"The depression," said the Free Press and I'm quoting from the editorial: "The depression was cured not by any government but by a world war."

The Free Press according to this editorial now believes, and I'm quoting the editorial again: "Only a totalitarian government such as that of the Soviet Union can make sure there is no unemployment." That, Mr. Speaker, is the most gloomy and defeatist attitude I have ever seen in print. If the Free Press were right we would be faced with a grim choice of another world war or a totalitarian government as the only solution to unemployment. What a dismal prospect.

Fortunately the Free Press is hardly ever right. I am positive no one on this side supports that gloomy Free Press view. We on this side remain firmly convinced there are happier alternatives, but it is an alternative neither Conservatives nor Free Press would support.

Few kinds words have been said in those quarters about Social Democratic government. The Free Press has never said one kind word about the New Democratic Party government. But, Mr. Speaker, we can point to the fact that New Democratic social security policies are now in effect on a national scale. This has meant a tremendous improvement in the lives of the people. It has given people a degree of economic security and stability which they didn't have in the Thirties.

These social security measures have also become a built-in feature in our economy which has helped to maintain at least a minimum of stability even with Liberal or Conservative governments in power. With a million unemployed, can you imagine what our economic position would be like if it wasn't for these billions of dollars in social security money circulating through the economy?

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

**MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I think the honourable member is reading his speech.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Carry on.

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** Mr. Speaker, thank you for reminding the Honourable Member for Roblin, but I saw him sitting on your chair and he was also reading. I don't know what he was reading. I didn't ask him and question it. I have a note for your information. —(Interjection)— — Because they are very important, I would like to be sure.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the Member for St. Boniface have a Point of Order?

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS:** On a Point of Order. When a member making a speech is quoting a newspaper editorial, of course he has to read it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but they took already two minutes from my time.

But we can also point to examples of what happened in other countries where the social democratic governments have been in power on a national scale. Some of these countries have maintained full employment and high living standards for over four decades, and they did this without becoming involved in war and without curbing any of the democratic freedoms. Sweden is one of those countries often mentioned.

There are no easy or perfect solutions to modern complex economic problems. There are no perfect governments anywhere.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. The honourable member has five minutes.

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We on this side don't claim to have all the answers. But the difference between us and the Conservatives is that we believe we must keep looking for new answers to our problems. But Conservatives believe the policies that were good enough in John A. MacDonald's day are good enough for today.

You also believe policies that were good enough for R.B. Bennett or Sir Rodmond Roblin's government of 60 years ago are still good enough for the government of 1977 led by the present Conservative First Minister.

During the election the premier made a statement, that one-sentence solution to all economic problem. He said, "Leave it to private enterprise."

During the election the First Minister promised to perform miracles in job creation by restoring investor confidence, and he said, Mr. Speaker: "There will be and there must be jobs," and Mr. Speaker, before he became the premier of this province he changed the meaning of the sentence 180 degrees.

**A MEMBER:** No way. No way.

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** Before starting to hire, he's starting to fire, and the meaning, in essence of his sentence, I understand should be written like that: "There will be and there must be layoffs."

Maybe he forgot himself that he is the premier of Manitoba, not of Uganda, and he reminds me very much by his action, by his leadership a fellow whose name is Idi Amin. Mr. Speaker, surely the time has come when even the most conservative thinkers must accept the fact that private enterprise, even with the best will in the world, cannot solve our economic problems. People who accept the responsibility of government must do some hard thinking to come up with a new idea, new policies to cope with the problems for which private enterprise has no solution. Mr. Speaker, since we are now approaching the holiday season I would like to express good wishes for Christmas and also for a good and prosperous New Year because I don't think that I will have a chance to speak more in this Chamber. At the end I would like to finish my remarks with a sort of a prayer. To all of you, in this effect, Mr. Premier and all members of the government, please don't lead the people of Manitoba into lamentation by abolishing a good and most human legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa):** Mr. Speaker, the member for St. Boniface indicated that the speaker, the member for Point Douglas was reading from an editorial. I wonder if you would be good enough to table that? article that he was quoting from, so that we might have the benefit of it?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

**MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I will do it when I have it. I just have my notes on a piece of paper, but I will do it with pleasure because I know the date and so forth.

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

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for acknowledging me during this Throne Speech debate. I would like to, as is customary, and as preceded by many of my colleagues to congratulate you on your appointment to this high office. I have to say that like the member for Selkirk, although I didn't express my feelings to the media, I was in the first instance slightly taken aback by your appointment, but I really shouldn't have been because in the last number of days you have certainly displayed a very capable and impartial manner that you have been able to guide all the members in this House very well indeed. I would like to congratulate all the new members who were elected during the past election in their respective constituencies and also the mover and the seconder to the Speech from the Throne, each of whom no doubt, (and I listened to them quite carefully) contributed well in respect to the attitudes that they had towards the constituencies and the people that they represented. I would also like to thank publicly, all the people of my own constituency of St. George and the Interlake who supported myself and the New Democratic Party in the past election, and especially all those people who actively participated in the electoral process and worked in my campaign.

During the campaign it was evident to me that the polarization was taking place and was very clear

and was very evident. In fact the Liberal and Conservative candidates in my constituency — I don't know how they really got a Liberal candidate because during a public debate he admitted that during the Nominating Convention of the Conservative candidate, he was a member of the Conservative Party — but I guess since the nomination which happened to be about six months before that, he decided to change his mind and went over to the Liberal Party and decided to become the Liberal candidate. I have to say that the strategy of the Conservative Party during this past campaign was very accurate in terms of reflecting or being able to judge the mood of the electorate, to be able to liken their campaign manual, to be able to attract the right wing Liberal vote and to be able to polarize the right wing supporters in this province and come up with a very clear majority. I have to congratulate their strategists on a very effective job of determining the mood and the polarization that has taken place in the last election.

But I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that overall I thought the campaign to a degree was one of negativism and very, in some instances, hypocritical. I imagine that in public life there's over the years a time we have to — I don't know whether members say it just to make headlines, or whatever they do — but it is very hypocritical. You have an instance that was very evident here just the other day. You had the Conservative Party during the election campaign running down the Civil Service of which they have a member from Swan River, so is a member of the Civil Service running them down continually. Then you have just the other day the Attorney-General, at least got upon his feet and said that all too often we are criticizing civil servants that they do not do their work and they are just no good. Now that's the kind of hypocrisy that the Conservative Party has thrown out in the campaign. There are many pledges that the Conservatives have made in the campaign of getting out of business and we have heard in the last several days now the sale and the advertising of the MS Lord Selkirk the boat and cruise ship and the possible sale of the Hecla Hotel which is located within my constituency. I hope that the Conservative members recall that the (and I have to give them credit in terms of the Hecla Island Provincial Park) that under the FRED program that they signed in 1967 which covered the entire Interlake region, one of the major projects that was in business was envisaged was a provincial park within that region. Now it would certainly be a very negative move on behalf of the Conservatives in terms of having the hotel built at public expense from both the provincial and federal government and now to nicely turn it over to the private sector. There's no doubt, Mr. Speaker that we have, — I must say, Mr. Speaker, that your change in dress here. I would also like to congratulate the member for Roblin, who has now taken over the Speaker's chair as I looked at him, in his appointment to his high office as Deputy Speaker. — (Interjection)—

The sale of the Hecla Hotel and the Hecla Hotel as part of the overall park complex and park atmosphere in the Hecla area is only one of a number of the operations and options open to residents of Manitoba because the hotel as we all know, has not really been geared to the lower income people of this province in terms of the cost of the hotel and the operation of the hotel. There's no doubt that the hotel was envisaged to attract the international tourist trade and the tourist trade across this country. But developed along with it, were the cottages that were built for lease and rent by modest income families and are well used along with the camping facilities on Hecla Island, so it is part of a complex. I would urge the Conservatives before they make any hasty decisions in terms of doing away with business, to examine all avenues very carefully.

As I stated earlier, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party's attack on the Civil Service, its size, was in my mind a deliberate and knowingly wrong campaign in terms of how Manitoba Civil Service fared with the rest of the Civil Service in this country. I think the member from Swan River should be able to get up and I would hope — there's been very few speeches in this session from the members opposite, especially the new members in terms of this legislature. I would hope that I could encourage at least a few words from the Member for Swan River or the Member for Springfield (I've recently met him). I would hope that he would at least say a few words in this session. I would hope that the Premier does not hold an iron fist over all your heads in terms of this session so that he could muzzle you and not have you at least acknowledge the area that you represent and the people that you represent and your thoughts in respect to the Throne Speech that has been presented. Don't give me the impression that when the Premier says "jump", all you say is, "how high"? I don't think that the people who elected you want you to be that way. I would hope that the members opposite, especially the backbench because the frontbench there will certainly have an opportunity to debate their bills and at least answer questions but the backbench should be able to participate and would want to participate in this new session especially the new members. I would encourage them to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the new government that was elected on October 11, prior to or just after they were sworn in, and I would only relate this to the Premier because I don't believe the new Minister of Labour or the minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission really knew or still knows or is able to familiarize herself with the operations of her department well enough to pull, what I would call, a stunt such as they have done. The dictatorial method used in my mind to dismiss the Commissioner of the Civil Service and I say yes, dismiss, even though they will deny that and deny the statement that the Commissioner has been dismissed. He effectively has been dismissed. It is the first time in the history of this province, Mr. Speaker, that such an arrogant, a very dictatorial ploy was used by the Premier of this province and no one else can be held responsible for it but the Premier. To go into the civil service to a person and without cause, because I don't believe there has been any cause shown, and then without cause to ask that member or at least remove him from his permanent position I don't believe that it is legal. I would hope that the Commissioner would certainly be able to prove that the actions undertaken by the Premier of this province are certainly not legal. Because, certainly there was no one on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, ever, that a commissioner of the civil service was removed from his position, prior to either reaching the age of sixty-five or voluntarily retiring, or saying that he wished to resign,

but no, Mr. Speaker, the new government called the commissioner in, told him that they were removing him from his permanent commission, and telling him that he would serve as a part-time commissioner. Yes, he would serve as a part-time commissioner, but what, they won't even notify him of the meetings.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I wonder if the honourable members could continue their discussions out in the hall, so the honourable member could be heard.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know the honourable members will not like to hear some of these comments but I think some of them are not aware of the machinations that their leader has been carrying on while they have been at home attending to their own business since the election. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the actions of the new administration are not only tyrannical but of such a dangerous precedent of political interference into the office of the Civil Service Commission as to undermine it completely.

Mr. Speaker, the office of the Civil Service Commission historically has been one of a non-political and non-partisan nature and there is no one on this side or even in the history of this province who has tampered with the Civil Service Commission like your premier has done here.

**MR. ROBERT G. WILSON (Wolseley):** You did; you did.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, not only have they effectively — and I say "effectively" — dismissed him, and the reason I say that is that they are not even notifying him of the meetings that are being held, the Minister of Labour got up in this House and said that he is being notified of the meetings. Mr. Speaker, I checked last night with the Civil Service Commissioner and I asked him whether he was notified of the recent meeting and he told me no, that he was not. Now whether they could not reach him; that may be the feeble excuse that they were going to give but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if they couldn't reach him certainly they could have notified him by a note, by a short letter, by letter. And of course, Mr. Speaker, if they really were honest in their intentions, if the premier of the province was honest in his intentions he would have answered the questions put forward by the Leader of the Opposition, my leader. But he would not even answer; he wouldn't even say a word whether the commissioner was being invited to the meeting now that he was a part-time commissioner and effectively his total income had been nullified. That is the actions of the new premier of this province in terms of dealing very well with the Civil Service Commission. But as I say again, I caution the Honourable the First Minister that it is such a very dangerous precedent that he has embarked on and I believe it is totally illegal in terms of the spirit and intent of the Civil Service Act in dealing with the commissioners. There is no one I don't believe in the history of this province that has dealt with a commissioner of the Civil Service Commission in the manner that the First Minister has dealt with him.

The feeble excuse that the First Minister gave, Mr. Speaker, as one of the excuses, that he wanted to bring back the merit principle. Can you believe that, Mr. Speaker? The merit principle. I challenge the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, to bring to this House information on while I was Minister of the Civil Service Commission or my colleague the former Member for Transcona, the Honourable Russell Paulley, during his time, that the regular appointments through which regular hirings were done of the Civil Service Commission, that the merit principle was not adhered to. And I don't believe that he can do it but I challenge him to bring that information forward to this House.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that at any time in the history of this province that we have witnessed such calculated and disgraceful actions of any administration, and especially this new one. But I believe that in a number of years the public will be able to judge for themselves as to the conduct and to the conduct especially of the First Minister.

During the campaign they also talked about doing away with contract positions. In fact they were supported by the president of the MGEA who I believe they have now co-opted into the task force with the minister, I guess number one, the Minister without Portfolio, or number two. —(Interjection)— Number two, okay, the Minister without Portfolio number two. I still haven't got it straight. In terms of dealing with contract people, when the next number of years go by I don't believe that the number of contract people will change very much, Mr. Speaker, and I'll tell you why. Because I don't think in operating a government as large in terms of new intentions, which I assume the new government will have, that they will always be hiring permanent civil servants. They will, of course, want to hire people on contract from time to time to do various jobs and I don't believe, even though they professed that they would do away with the contract positions, that they will even want to do away with them because I think it was a ploy just to gain public support during the campaign. They will require contract positions during the tenuous tenure of their office.

I want to say in all candor that I am sure that the area of contract positions while we were in government, by some departments and to some degree, could be calculated as some abuse in terms of hiring people on contract. I don't deny that. I don't think that's something to be ashamed of. I know that we wanted to deal with that area of contract people in terms of certain jobs where people were hired on contract. But I say to the members of the opposition you will have to swallow very hard the pledge that you made that you will do away with contract positions in the Civil Service because you will not do away with them. You will not want to do away with them, as you have campaigned. You will totally be hamstrung and you will not have the flexibility of dealing with the kinds of things that the Minister of Mines today said that he didn't have the flexibility of doing. And there are ways of doing that.



We now have a new government, Mr. Speaker, a new government that says that if you want to work for our government, volunteer. Volunteer for our government. And who has volunteered, Mr. Speaker? Who has volunteered for this government? Has an average citizen volunteered to work in the Civil Service? Yes, an average citizen who would be considered of the corporate elite in this city, in this province. Members of what I would consider the right of this legislative building, across the street. . .

**A MEMBER:** Winnipeg's finest.

**MR. URUSKI:** Manitoba's or even Western Canada's finest. The members of the Great West Life Assurance Company.

Mr. Speaker, I don't speak very often but I spoke in this House a number of years ago and I challenged the members opposite who stood here and I challenged them and I told them they happened to be in the pockets of the insurance industry and of course the Member for Riel, the Finance Minister, at that time challenged me and said you couldn't prove it — that we were — and to retract my remark. Well today, Mr. Speaker, I make that chance today again, that they are in the pockets of the insurance industry and we know that we can prove it. Who wrote the manual for the Conservative party policy for the new election? Members of Great West Life. Who has volunteered to work within government? Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, if some of us volunteered to sit in the board rooms of Great West Life and tell them how to run their business and their management, what they would tell us? They would say, "Well, these are private funds. You have no business being here." Well, Mr. Speaker, every policyholder who buys insurance from that company. . . Those funds are public. While they might say that these are all private funds; you have no business here.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we have elected a Conservative administration or a Conservative party. We have elected a Great West Life party to the legislature. That's who we have elected: the Great West Life party in Manitoba. The Great West Life party. The volunteerisms of Manitoba have come to work here. While the puppets sit here across the way the strings are pulled right across the street. And I say again that the investment of Great West Life and all the insurance industry was very cheap within this province — very cheap investment and very. . . I don't know what they — the Great West Life or the insurance industry or industry — individual members and executives of the insurance industry donated to the Conservative party whatever it was I would say it was cheap. It is a very cheap investment. It is an investment that right now they are running the show along with the First Minister and several executives from Great West Life. That is how government is being operated in this province here today.

Mr. Speaker, in the auto insurance industry alone, over the last five years. . . You know they should have donated to the Conservative party I hope at least two or three million dollars because over the last five years had they been in business here it would have cost the taxpayers and the policyholders, the drivers of Manitoba, over the last five years at least \$150 million more for their auto insurance. So just \$2 or \$3 million in investment to your campaign was very cheap.

Now I would hope that the members opposite would be able to tell us, you know, what kind of an investment they have made to your party in terms of future considerations of no accident and sickness insurance because why should the Conservative party have accident and sickness insurance when they have cabinet ministers in shadow from the Great West Life Company? There is no need. There is no need of doing that. We can do very well without it. We can have auto insurance in competition and of course that kind of strategy by the insurance industry that has been played of this free enterprise certainly has been a very cheap investment in terms of the government that they have elected in this province.

Mr. Speaker, during the campaign the Conservative party talked about maintaining the health care programs of the previous administration and improving them. Well I implore the Minister of Health, who isn't here right now but I would hope that he would read my remarks, I would implore them to go on with the five-year construction program that was announced previously by my colleague because they have already stopped one project in the middle. It had been tendered. The tenders were called but they have not been let and I don't know where the project is and I would hope that if they are true to the commitments that they have made to the people of Manitoba and those within the Interlake and in my constituency that they would proceed with the calling of tenders for the nursing home in Ashern and Ericdale — those that were announced several years ago. And as well I was informed today, and I was a bit shocked, and I hope the Minister of Housing listens to my remarks and also indicates the senior citizens home that was scheduled for construction this fall in the small community of Moosehorn will be proceeded with. Because they indicated and I have to say that the people who voted for them believed in what they had been saying and if they are true to their word that they will continue those projects as quickly as possible. Because any delay and any freeze will only mean greater pressures for the services required that you even argued that we were too slow with it; we weren't doing enough in terms of nursing homes. Now all of a sudden everything is frozen so how can you now say that there is any less urgency today than there was two months ago?

But that's really what is happening, Mr. Speaker. They talk about that they would continue the programs. Now they have frozen the home care. When you freeze the home care services, Mr. Speaker, you effectively don't even stand still; you go backwards. You are not even going to be able to continue the level of service because we all know that the costs are rising slightly and as costs rise and if you freeze the level of service you are not even continuing to maintain the level of service that you have promised. You are going backwards. And, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Minister of Health and that government continue to at least lift the freeze and continue the humane, the necessary program of

this province that was innovated and pioneered by this government in terms of home care services, and we have been able to receive cost-sharing from the federal government towards this program, that you continue with it and press on with it.

Mr. Speaker, the premier of this province spoke at the recent meeting of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. And before I go into that I would like to congratulate the Member for Osborne, the Attorney-General, on his appointment as Minister of Municipal Affairs. I am sure and I am hopeful that he will certainly conduct his office in the traditional manner that the Minister of Municipal Affairs offices have been carried on in this province and I would hope that he does continue to dialogue and the discussions with the municipal leaders of this province to be able to try and resolve the always never-ending problems of rural Manitoba. And I know that the staff in the Department of Municipal Affairs will certainly, as they had for me as your predecessor — they gave me all the assistance and the help and I'm sure that they will do so to you. I was not one of the ministers that did phone you at all after the campaign but I am certain that my Dept Deputy Minister in terms of informing you of all the current matters certainly would have done an excellent job in bringing you up-to-date on the matters that were either not dealt with or left with as a result of time and change of government. But I am sure that the staff will give you all the co-operation that you need and I wish you well in your new endeavours.

But I was speaking, Mr. Speaker, on the speech of the First Minister to the Union of Municipalities. I attended the banquet that was hosted by the province there and his speech, Mr. Speaker, certainly goes back to the tenure of the election campaign of being a very negative, a negative speech but negative attitude towards the entire finances of this province.

You know, Mr. Speaker, he, and it was very deliberate, the posturing that he had done while giving this speech, he likened the finances of the province of Manitoba to the City of New York, Mr. Speaker, during his remarks, and he told the municipal leaders not to expect any more funds; in fact expect less funds. The members opposite, many of whom are from rural Manitoba, I know will have to go back to their constituents and tell them, even those damn projects — those socialist projects that the Member for Pembina has been asking for — I don't know whether they will get

off the ground. Hopefully they will. Even if it is in his constituency I hope the new government will get them off the ground. But certainly the finances to local government, they have already been told that they will be cut back. Yet, while finances to local government are being cut back or at least being told that they will be cut back, we are announcing tax cuts. We are announcing income tax cuts and corporate tax cuts. We are announcing gift tax cuts and succession duty cuts, Mr. Speaker. But yet we will cut out the funds of the very heart of the grassroots government of this province, the municipal government. That's what you will be doing. You will be cutting out the heart of the very services that are needed and required by the rural people; those roads that you have argued about that have been in very poor shape. You are cutting your own throats, Mr. Speaker, because you will not be able to provide the funds to pave those highways that you condemned this government for when we doubled and tripled the maintenance budget of the highways department in this province. I want to see and I would hope that the provincial roads throughout this province are going to be maintained at a level. I at least hope the Minister of Education, the Member for Gimli, and of course the Minister of Highways — two members from the Interlake — will be able to continue and maybe even do better than the former government in terms of the road construction program in the Interlake region. I hope that they will fight on behalf of all the Interlake people in that group of men that you call colleagues, who are your colleagues, and ladies. . . I'm sorry. It has been one session since we have gotten away from having a lady in this House. But I would hope that you will continue to press on for the funds necessary to maintain the road system in the province and in the Interlake area as an example.

Mr. Speaker, during the campaign as well they talked about jobs. The Conservative government was saying we're going to free Manitoba — free Manitoba. Well we really freed Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. Several days after the election we had 650 layoffs in Thompson. Those people were really free. They were free to go wherever they could find a job. They were so free, Mr. Speaker. Were they ever free!

Mr. Speaker, in terms of municipal governments we did have a direct job creation program in terms of municipal loan funds. I hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs, under whose direction or jurisdiction the provincial job office is, will continue the special municipal loans funding in terms of providing loan forgiveness in terms of job creation for winter months and summer months, that the capital projects that are so vital and necessary and infrastructure in many of the rural communities in terms of sewer and water, roads, drainages, fire halls, municipal office buildings — whatever necessary projects that the Conservative party called "hand-outs."

Mr. Speaker, they called it "hand-outs." When the money was distributed amongst average people, they called it hand-outs and welfare. But if they provide funds to the corporate sector, the private sector, they call it incentive, they call it an incentive. A real freedom, Mr. Speaker. Freedom for whom? Mr. Speaker, thank you for the five minutes that I have left.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by saying that the policies of the Conservative government that they have announced in the Throne Speech just recently in terms of the shifting of the tax burden from the middle and moderate income groups, shifting it onto them from the higher income categories, really points to a long-term policy of socialism for the rich and free enterprise for the poor. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion and the amendment thereto by the Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. WILSON PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to begin by congratulating you

personally on your election as Speaker of this Chamber. I had the pleasure of getting to know you at the parliamentarians conference and getting to know your respect for the legislature and its functions. Your task is difficult but I'm sure your dedication will serve you and I look forward to your continued fairness in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I must tell you it's a different experience for me to leave the raucous public life of a civil servant and the rowdy environment of the gallery and come down to the calm serenity of this Chamber.

I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to my predecessor from the constituency of Transcona, the Honourable Russell Paultley. Russ Paultley has served his community and the people of Manitoba for well over 35 years in a public capacity—23 of them spent in this legislature. I was glad he returned to visit us today and I hope he will be with us for a long time.

I would also like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech. They, like myself, are new members and they are hoping to learn, hoping to contribute to the proceedings of this assembly as best we can and hopefully we can try and resolve some of the problems of the day.

I would also like to take this opportunity to tell you a bit about my constituency. My predecessor has been around the House so long that I'm pretty sure that most of you have forgotten his bachelor speech, or more likely most of you weren't here when he first made it so you perhaps don't know that much about the constituency of Transcona.

Transcona is a distinct community of about 25,000 people within Winnipeg. Only a small fringe of it consists of farmers. Its people are primarily workers. They are people who work and the community got started as a railway town but we have welcomed all into our midst: teachers, lawyers, foundrymen, bus drivers. Those are the people that make up the great vast majority of Manitoba and certainly, Mr. Speaker, they make up the great majority of my constituency. My constituency also includes representatives of all ethnic groups. It is very much a symbol of the cultural mosaic that makes up this province.

It is also a very prolific community, Mr. Speaker. It's prolific when it comes to raising politicians. Three of the present members in the House were raised in the community of Transcona. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews grew up in Transcona, the Honourable Member for Brandon East grew up in Transcona, and I grew up in Transcona. I think that is quite an impressive percentage out of 57 seats.

Also, Mr. Speaker, it is a very astute community. It has elected and re-elected CCF, NDP members for over 30 years. It's the type of community where people want to remain. You find three, four, five generations of family living there. Old people want to be near their grandchildren, children and grandchildren want their parents or grandparents near them.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the top priority for my constituency is senior citizens housing and nursing home care. Plans are underway for both. I hope that these needs of the people of Transcona can in fact be met over the course of the next year or two.

We, as a community, Mr. Speaker, are faced with the types of problems that people in other urban, and to a degree rural, communities are faced with in Manitoba. High cost of housing, high cost of providing services, frustrations with unemployment and inflation. But, Mr. Speaker, we have always lived in an uncertain world and the problems are magnified when the uncertainty is increasing in that little part of the world that we live in. Mr. Speaker, the economy of Canada and of Manitoba has been undergoing some very drastic changes over the last 25 years and this has added to the uncertainty that most of us feel.

On the worldwide scene Canada is faltering in its traditional role as a hewer of wood and a drawer of water for others. Other countries, notably Third World countries, are increasingly fulfilling this function. Also many countries are attempting to reduce their reliance on imports, not only through tariffs but also by encouraging their own domestic industries in the manufacturing area to cut down on imports.

So, Mr. Speaker, Canada's role with respect to fishing, forestry, some types of mining, and generally manufacturing seems to be declining in terms of earning export dollars. But, Mr. Speaker, our reliance on imports, especially for finished products, is increasing. In fact the real strong point of our present economy is the hydro carbon industry and that explains why Alberta, and to a degree Saskatchewan, and B.C. are the only bright lights in our rather stagnated economy at present. But in Manitoba we have very little oil and we are being subjected to the same economic forces that the rest of Canada is. Our agricultural sector is under pressure. We have no more good arable land for expansion and past methods of productivity improvements through economies of scale lead to the decline of the family farm, to rural depopulation and a general undermining of the rural fabric.

In the north the forestry and mining developments are subject to boom and bust cycles and these are compounded because there is no secondary processing of forests or minerals. Because of the boom and bust the turnover in the work force in the north is incredibly high. Miners and loggers are somewhat wary of going up north in a boom and buying a house at a high price then being laid off and having to sell it at the bust period and in the process either forfeiting their house or losing anything that they might have saved over a period of three or four years of very hard work. The irony of this is that while this is going on in the north we have huge pools of indigenous people who are underemployed or unemployed.

In Winnipeg the traditional types of commerce are following the massive oil developments and shifting out west, warehousing, securities and some forms of manufacturing although we never were a great manufacturing province.

Now these broad market forces and trends which I have talked about are not the product of government. Indeed government in Canada is and has been quite passive toward the economy. While we have had very rich raw resources, we were able to have and tolerate *laissez-faire* growth and some

improvements in life standards as this growing pie was cut although the distribution of the pie was very inequitable. But some of these raw resources are running out and the pie isn't growing as quickly.

Thus Mr. Speaker, in this period in our country's evolution when in a sense our exploitation of raw resources is plateauing and even declining and with all these consequent dislocations in society, the philosophical and pragmatic questions of the role of government in economy and the society become, I think, very, very important.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are considerable differences between the people on this side of the House and the people on that side of the House on the philosophical and pragmatic questions of the role of government. For my part, I believe that government can and must be used constructively to ensure that the economy is fully employed and in this sense, I do understand . . . and also structurally balanced, so it's just not dependent on one sector or one industry. So it's not completely at the mercy of international commodity boom and bust cycles. So that it is not necessarily at the mercy of large, multi-national corporations, whose interests are short-term, and they do not enhance the longer term interests of the people of Manitoba.

On the social side, I believe that government can and must ensure that there is a greater equality of the human condition so that people, especially the elderly, can live in some type of civilized dignity and so that people, especially the young, can have fuller equality of opportunity to fulfill themselves. In practise, I look with pride at the performance and experience of the public in providing goods and services such as universal education, universal health care, public roads, public parks, providing water through a public aqueduct, providing public pensions for the elderly, publicly providing housing for senior citizens and low income families. I look at these successes, and I compare life now to life in the past, and I hope that we can provide other public goods and services, such as accident and sickness insurance and universal dental care to all people, with full accessibility.

We've learned that we can provide these goods and services that I've named more efficiently publicly than we can privately. We also realize that we have to pay for these public goods and services. And I believe, and my colleagues, do, that this is best done through a system of fair taxation, and the fairest system, Mr. Speaker, is one based firmly on the ability-to-pay principle.

On the practical side again, looking at experience, I am relieved that I and my children, and my neighbours, do not have to suffer the horrible consequences of economic depression that my parents had to suffer and that characterized past *laissez-faire* conservative economic periods under R. B. Bennett and Herbert Hoover. This is because of government that tends to manage the aggregate demand for goods and services in the economy. I look with pride at the performance and experience of public corporations such as the Manitoba Telephone System, Manitoba Hydro, and the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. I look with pride at the job done by Manitobans, be they farmers, carpenters, storekeepers, miners, electricians, doctors, teachers, manufacturers, railway men, in providing goods and services privately.

There are many goods and services that we still lack, but I trust that some judicious mixture of public and private effort can, and will provide these.

Looking at our experiences, Mr. Speaker, I must tell you that I am disappointed to realize, in such a young country, that many of our forests are gone, and that many of our minerals have been taken out of the ground, for a pittance, never to be replaced. The natural resources of the province are its people's birthright, and I'm shocked that these are being squandered, and the wealth that is derived does not go to the people who own the resources but rather it goes to people who exploit the resources, without caring about the future of the area in which the resources are being exploited.

The workers in Thompson, the miners, the small businessmen, the teachers, they don't want to go to Guatemala and Indonesia, but the capital, or surplus of wealth created by the extraction of our ore out of Thompson, somehow, it's going to Guatemala and Indonesia. The workers in Thompson want the capital to stay in Thompson, or at least in Manitoba, and be used to refine the ore, to smelt it, and to make goods here in Manitoba for ourselves, and possible for export.

Mr. Speaker, we've done a very poor job of protecting our natural resources birthright in Manitoba over the last forty years, and it is this area of natural resource development and related manufacturing that I think a good part of our future lies. This resource development must take place in such a manner that the public interest, in the long run, as well as the short run, is not neglected. And the responsibility for ensuring that the public interest is protected, surely lies with elected government.

Mr. Speaker, this interest is best preserved in Manitoba by the people of Manitoba getting involved in developing our own resources. I hope that this newly elected government will not give away those developing resources that we have so wisely invested in over the last six years. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I, and I think my colleagues will certainly fight to keep this birthright from being alienated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we look at the Speech from the Throne and past and present utterances from those on the other side, we can glean some of the philosophic and pragmatic approaches to society and to the economy of the members opposite. Philosophically, the members opposite do not believe in a mixed economy as we on this side do. The members opposite have a legitimate belief and that's part of the democratic process, that the less government the better. That belief, however, isn't always sincere in practice because as the mover and the seconder have indicated in their speeches, and I am sure most of the members on the other side, in due course will as well, there are times, many times, when they will agree with us that the public should provide in Pembina a dam, that the public should provide roads, education, health, pharmacare, senior citizens housing and on and on. So pragmatically, in practice, we find that often there is agreement with things that have in fact been led by people who believe the government can be a very useful instrument in our society.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite, by their tax policy do not believe, as we do, in a fair system of taxation. They do not base their taxation policy on the ability-to-pay principle, as indicated in the press release which the Minister of Finance handed out to the press and not to the members yesterday — a tax reduction of \$13.00 a year for a family earning \$10,000, at the same time that a family earning \$50,000 gets a tax reduction of \$267. a year, is very very inequitable. A negation of the ability-to-pay principle. Mr. Speaker, these tax changes along with the proposed abolition of Succession Duties and Gift Taxes shows how far this new government of Manitoba will depart from the system of fair taxation brought in by the past government.

We have a new approach in Manitoba. Yes, the Robin Hood approach to taxation has been replaced. It's been replaced by the Sheriff of Nottingham, who taxes the average and lower than average person relatively more than he taxes those few who are wealthy. And we know who this Sheriff of Nottingham is; he sits on the other side of the House. But alas for the electorate we still don't know the identity of Prince John, and I gather, from the previous speaker that the speculation as to the true identity of Prince John is narrowing down.

Now the Conservatives rationalization of their tax changes also illustrates they're approach to the economy. It's basically one of let the private sector do it; give it extra money to invest. Now that's a very big, big gamble. It is based on ideology, Mr. Speaker, it's not based on pragmatism. It is based on hope analysis. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we have increasing unemployment in Manitoba. That means the economy is slack, that the plants have unused capacity: Canadian Co-Op Implements, Flyer, Air Canada's hangar, Versatile, Eaton's old warehouse, the CPR, the CNR, the building industry. Mr. Speaker, all these plants and industry are laying people off because people don't have the money right now to buy their products, not because the plants don't have money for further investment. And yet the tax cuts are being seen as a stimulus to somehow add to the production capacity of our province. And that, Mr. Speaker, belies the facts and that is why their hope is ill-founded, even though I think their hope is genuine.

Now if they wanted to stimulate demand for products then surely they could have used the tax credit system. They could have used it to the same tune of \$16 to \$18 million. And that most certainly would have been fairer because the tax credit system is in fact based on the ability-to-pay principle. And it would have put extra purchasing power into the hands of those who need it most because of inflation, and those who also have the greatest likelihood of spending the money locally.

Now the effect on the deficit would have been the same, because these tax cuts this year will have an annualized effect of increasing the so-called deficit by about \$23 million per year. Now that's performance. A deficit which is quite large already because of a general economic slowdown, has been increased one quarter on current account in less than the week that we have been sitting here in this legislature.

So I think, when people talk about deficits and responsibilities, I think that they should do their homework quite carefully and realize that we are in the process right now of having really quite substantially increased our deficit. We don't know what the effect will be on the economy. We hope that somehow it will be improved.

We don't know what the situation will be with respect to supposed cutbacks in government spending because from a public administration view, Mr. Speaker, I find the situation of the so-called Task Force on government efficiency very confusing and very inefficient. Just think of it, we have four members of this task force. We have one co-chairman, who is the minister, minister I I guess. He has to try harder. We have a co-chairman, a non-political person, to set up a task force of four. I don't know whether in fact the minister reports to the co-chairman from the private sector or vice versa. But it certainly is very confusing, it's very confusing with respect to ministerial responsibility. I am pretty sure it must be very confusing to the people who have to relate to this task force.

I also find that out of a task force of four, we have a vice-chairman as well. That's out of four. That leaves poor Gordon Holland, he's the only worker left on that task force. That's out of a task force of four.

Now if that's the way they are going to structure such a task force, and it's been in operation for a while, I wonder whether in fact it will have any, any effect on reducing the cash flow of expenditures. That's quite important because what's taken place over the course of the last while is not that unusual and it's taking place in every province in this country. There is a revenue slowdown. It's a revenue slowdown that has affected every province. And when you find out about revenues slowdown a natural course of action that was taken last year was to sit down and determine where in fact you can make some priority decisions and reduce expenditures. And we've done that and that's a normal thing to do. But you do it quietly and you do it internally and you try to do it quickly and expeditiously, if you're serious about you set up a rather dealing with the problem. If you're not confusing apparatus; you try and make a lot of political hay out of it. But I don't know whether in fact you really solve the problem.

I look with interest at finding out, whether in fact and any of the task forces deliberations will be made public. They've asked for briefs for example. Will they make this public? There is that confusion right now. I hope that they can get on with the task quickly and do what has been done in past years. In fact, in introducing their interim restraint measures they virtually took out the same restraint measures that have been exercised by the previous government, last year.

Mr. Speaker, the economic circumstances in Manitoba at present aren't that good, because of national and international circumstances, but ut they're going to get a lot worse, not better, in the future. And these Conservative policies which are geared in their estimation to stimulate the economy and reverse the outside market force trends, are themselves very market oriented and will backfire by accentuating the negative trends in the market. And I predict, that an economic slowdown will be pushed or induced into becoming quite a severe recession for Manitoba. Unemployment will go up. Rural

depopulation will again become a reality as it was, Mr. Speaker, in the second half of the 1960s. An out migration from the province will jump to the high levels experienced in the 1960s. I regret that, as a Manitoban, but I think that this type of policy that is being introduced by the members opposite will in fact accentuate those forces. We on this side, will in fact have to use this House to point out to the people of Manitoba what is going on and what will take place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is a difference towards economic management between myself and the members opposite, and I do acknowledge that they have been given the responsibility to manage the provincial economy. By a minority of the electorate, by the way, albeit a significant minority. I hope that they will not ideologically abdicate that responsibility completely to the private sector because most certainly, Mr. Speaker, they cannot abdicate from being accountable for their performance of the provincial economy over the next few years. They have left the economic future of this province solely in the hands of the private investor, who may or may not invest in Manitoba. And, Mr. Speaker, we will probably find ourselves losers for it. This is not because of pragmatism, Mr. Speaker, it is because of Conservative ideology. They are prepared, as we found out, not to get involved in a package that may provide a working capital bridge financing to Canadian Co-Op Implements, and thus keep 800 jobs, long-term full-time jobs in the manufacturing industry, an industry that they themselves have said is in decline — and it is because of international conditions. They had an opportunity to keep these jobs intact or at least make the reasonable attempt but they have said no, Mr. Speaker. They said no, because they don't want to go further in debt. But they said that, Mr. Speaker, virtually the same day that the government went \$18 million further in debt in a deficit situation to create jobs supposedly. Supposedly, they would create these jobs through and equitable tax system. I find this rather ironic personally, Sir, because in the recent election campaign in Transcona my opponent went around saying that we're having all these shutdowns, and if the NDP is elected he implied the CCIL would close down. And it's rather ironic that what has happened in practice is that CCIL may in fact close down — but it may close down because an NDP government wasn't re-elected. I

At least in Alberta, even Conservative Alberta, Mr. Speaker, it utilized the Crown, not because it was blatantly ideologically but because it realized pragmatically that by purchasing Pacific Western Airlines, it would keep that Airline from moving to B.C., and from establishing B.C. as the bridgehead in the transportation system to the far north. Now this was something that was going to move, it was in fact going to move to B.C. That's why they acted. —(Interjection)— No, but not the actual operations. Now what happened was that this was a common sense approach. It was public intervention. But it was common sense. At least we had some pragmatism there. But not here. Not in this government. Not now. Ideology reigns.

Now this ideological blindness has also shown itself in other areas of the Throne Speech. And of course, here I'm referring to the family law legislation. The members opposite prefer inequality to greater equality. They prefer the old inequitable legislation to the new one which is based on a concept of equality. And, Mr. Speaker, we on this side will stand up, and we have stood up in the past for greater equality. And that's why we fight, Mr. Speaker because this legislation that has been brought in with respect to family law, and we must remember this, is not an improvement, it is effectively a voice; it scuttles the present act and lets the old live.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must pass some comment in closing on the mood of the session so far. If we are suspicious with respect to family law, I'll tell you I think some of the reasons why I'm suspicious. There was a newly elected member coming in for my first session, call a special session, but five other bills tacked on. So it's an irregular session, not a special session. And the first — and this was also a session where the bills were somewhat contentious, they didn't reflect the consensus of society and some of them didn't reflect any type of mandate at all.

Mr. Speaker, what were we faced with on this first day, this spirit of goodwill? We were faced with two rather abnormal motions. One for a supposed speed-up and the other for a dropping of the normal rules of procedure in this House. Neither have been agreed to. But yet they have both been introduced brought forward today, on day one, and left hanging over our heads. And this, Mr. Speaker, is the democratic atmosphere in which we have to exist. And if we are suspicious, I think that we have been given good cause for that suspicion. But, Mr. Speaker, the legislature, as you yourself know is a vital part of democracy, and we won't be intimidated by these types of actions of hanging motions to withdraw rules over our heads. Rather, Mr. Speaker, we will do what we judge to be right, in our consciences and given the situation as it arises and we'll do so according to the old rules and customs of democracy. We can do no more as legislators, Mr. Speaker, nor should we be asked to or forced to do less.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture that debate be adjourned. —(Interjection)— The Member for Lac du Bonnet. Won't the Minister let me use him as seconder? He's in his seat; Mr. Speaker, he's in his seat.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I take it from the remarks of the Member for Inkster that he was referring to the Member for Lac du Bonnet. Is that correct? We have a motion that debate be adjourned. Is it agreeable.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Can I ask the Government House Leader if he wants to proceed with the . . .

**HON. WARNER JORGENSEN (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, I think that the attorney-general would like leave of the House to introduce for first reading a bill that has arisen that is becoming quite urgent.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is there agreement to let the attorney-general proceed? (Agreed)

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne)** introduced Bill (No. 8), an Act to Amend The Summary Convictions Act.

### GOVERNMENT BILLS - SECOND READING

**MR. SPEAKER:** We will then proceed with the Order Paper in the normal manner.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you will to call Bill No. 2.

### BILL NO. 2 8 ANTI-INFLATION ACT (CANADA) AGREEMENT

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister, Bill (No. 2). It is open at the present time. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, this is one of five bills, I gather, that we have introduced in second reading. I intend to give my friend, the Government House Leader, notice of a question which I intend to put to him during question period tomorrow. How many more bills can we expect will be introduced during the current session? I am now giving him notice that that question will be on the Oral Questions tomorrow.

This is also, Mr. Speaker, the only bill that has been introduced at second reading which I will not be voting against. I will be supporting this measure and I want to indicate to honourable friends that I support it in order to facilitate the government dealing with this matter in the way in which it thinks it has to deal with it. There has, Mr. Speaker, I think been a remarkable — and I say that with some congratulation to the First Minister — remarkable restraint in the way in which this bill has been debated. It has been indicated by the First Minister that he doesn't intend to try to make something of the fact that a measure or a procedure adopted by this government was found to be incorrect by the Supreme Court of Canada by a decision of five to four. He indicates that the decision was five to four. Our opinion, Mr. Speaker' was only as bad as the Chief Justices of the Supreme Court of Canada, the Honourable Bora Laskin and three of his other Superior Court Judges and the Superior Court Judge in the Province of Manitoba, the Honourable Mr. Justice Nitikman. It's quite often, Mr. Speaker, that I have given a correct legal opinion and it's been found wrong by even more judges, so I have no sensitivity whatsoever about the government's manner of proceeding. It was a perfectly legitimate manner and one which we had reason to believe was correct.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I want to distinguish between what happens when a government is in power and when a potential government is out of power or an aspiring government is out of power, because recently in the province of Saskatchewan, some legislation which interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, was approved by the Superior Judge in Saskatchewan, unanimously by the Court of Appeal in Saskatchewan, went to the Supreme Court of Canada — I believe it went down seven to two. Which means that if we count the Superior Court Judges who ruled on that question, eight were in favour of the government of Saskatchewan, seven were against, but the Conservatives in the province of Saskatchewan, being out of power and therefore being a little hungrier, immediately condemned the Saskatchewan government for bungling the finances of the province, for enacting . . . — (Interjection)— Oh, you get that way. And trying, Mr. Speaker, to assert that this demonstrated an incompetence on the part of the Saskatchewan government. Well, I have quite a good deal of confidence, Mr. Speaker, in the ability of the Saskatchewan government to hire lawyers, to find ways of doing lawfully that which it was suggested by Superior Court Judges was done unlawfully and I note that in today's paper it is indicated that they were bringing forward other legislation. I rather expect, Mr. Speaker, that they would do what I would do if I were in their boots, that I would continue to bring legislation forward until a majority of the Supreme Court of Canada decided that it was correct, howsoever long that would take.

May I say that that's not always a simple point to answer. When President Roosevelt was elected in 1933, he brought forward under The National Recovery Act numerous pieces of new deal legislation, almost all of which universally were ruled to be *ultra vires* by the Supreme Court of the United States of America. Roosevelt kept bringing back the legislation and kept making appointments to the court and in

due course, Mr. Speaker, the decisions of the court found that his legislation was *intra vires*. So that kind of thing has to happen. That is not unusual. Some people can deal with it cynically; some people will try to make a great deal of mileage out of it. My good friend, the Minister of Public Works, who entered the debate did take a swing, which he is entitled to and which I don't think is very effective, at the fact that this session is made necessary only because we did not do what we were supposed to do.

Well, I'm going to deal with the matter, Mr. Speaker, on two grounds. First of all, I believe that legal opinion is equally divided almost, unfortunately the last decision is the right one, because it is legally held to be the right one, not because it happens to be a better decision. The last decision, almost equally divided as to the merits of what we were doing, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we're that far out on a limb that it would justify remarks from my honourable friend, that somehow we knew legally that we should not be proceeding as we did. And I really commend the First Minister for the moderation which he showed in dealing with the question because, and I rather think that the First Minister does it, in all sincerity, because it's correct, and as a matter of prudence also, because I don't think we want to be involved in a lengthy debate on that particular question. There was a procedure that was adopted, it was found by the Supreme Court not to be correct. What this legislature is doing is acting out of necessity and legalizing a procedure which this government can hardly complain about because we wanted that procedure to be followed in the first place. That's the first point, Mr. Speaker, and I would, despite what I may think about the legislation, or the prudence of this bill, not quibble with the government. In other words, I would facilitate a government that wanted to enact legislation or enact a measure which would legitimize an administrative procedure which I would myself was involved in. I think I would find it very difficult to come to this Chamber and do anything else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what was the politics, and I'm now talking to colleagues who are involved in politics, and of the measure in the first place why did we take the procedure that we did, and what is an analysis of what is happening today. Because I am not certain that the First Minister needs to do what he is doing, although I'm going to facilitate him, I'm not quibbling about that. In 1974 — when was that election that the Conservatives went about the country asking for a freeze on wages and prices, the Conservatives love the word freeze and has been adopted by this administration — they were not talking about incomes and policy. They were really talking about a ninety-day freeze to give the economy a chance to cool off. But nevertheless, they were the party who went to the public on this program, the party who went to the public against the program won, then that party instituted the program. And what's occurred, Mr. Speaker is that ten provincial premiers, and provincial premiers meet frequently, Mr. Speaker, and one of the problems of provincial premiers meeting is that rather than meeting about their own jurisdiction, they tend to get very cosy together with one another, despite their politics, and become a united front against the federal government. And therefore, the provincial premiers, in looking around at the economy and seeing problems, called upon the federal government to do certain things with respect to the economy. And the Prime Minister of Canada saw a marvellous opportunity of finessing the provincial premiers, and making them responsible for the program rather than accepting full responsibility for himself. So he announced an incomes program, Mr. Speaker, but he announced it in such a way as would require provincial legislation for a federal anti-inflation program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that this was a very dangerous course, or not a dangerous course for Mr. Trudeau, but it is a very dangerous course for the national government policy to be based on arriving at a consensus with provincial governments. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we'll have a great opportunity to discuss this matter further, there are many people in the country, particularly amongst provincial governments, who say that there shouldn't be a national parliament, that national government should be composed of representatives from provincial governments. And that this would be one of the ways of solving the constitutional crisis. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that type of proposal would suit very well, particularly the province of Quebec and the province of Alberta, although I can't say that they have made it, I have heard this kind of matter discussed during the course of constitutional discussions. And what we then had, Mr. Speaker, was not a national government that adopted a program and accepted responsibility for the program, we had a national government that adopted a program and adopted it on the basis that it would be confirmed by the provinces. And that's the program that came to the province of Manitoba. And, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works is right. Ministers of the Crown, at the provincial level, did not have responsibility for administering a prices and incomes program, it was a national program passed under that area of jurisdiction that gives the national government responsibility for peace, order, and good government. And in my view, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it can be questioned because it was done during wartime, the federal government had legislative powers to enact everything that it expected to be administered. And to have administered everything in wartime, the Wartime Prices and Board made was a federal board, it wasn't a provincial board. But what the Prime Minister succeeded in doing, the federal Prime Minister, and that's why I want those fellows over there to listen to me. You know, we're on the same side of this question. There's none of us who should be trying to help the Prime Minister of Canada accomplish which he doesn't accept full responsibility for. And what he did, will say that this program is going to be something that is going to be legislated within the province. And what came to our province, we look, Mr. Speaker, at what was, despite the varying views, the minimum way in which it can be done, and the way in which it would be acceptable to the federal government, and we found that we had a piece of legislation which allowed us to make that type of, that agreement legislation was made known to the federal government. The federal government was perfectly satisfied as to the legality of what was being suggested, and they accepted that legality, and we went into the program. But let us not forget, that at all times, we described it as a federal program, and that it was always administered as a federal



program. The only thing that was different about it was that the Prime Minister of Canada was given the luxury of not accepting full responsibility for the Incomes and Prices program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are various opinions on the program. There are some people who are strongly for it, there are some people who are reluctantly for it, there are some people who are willing to give it a try. There were varying differences of opinion. There can be no difference of opinion amongst, at least, we, who had the responsibility to administer government at the time that it was enacted, that we would facilitate the enactment of the program. And therefore, if the First Minister, as he obviously has decided, feels that the way of handling this matter, is to bring in legislation as it was done in the province of Ontario, we could facilitate it. But, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, that is by no means his only choice. I'm not going to tell him that he is proceeding wisely or unwisely, but I'm suggesting that this is a federal program, that it was supposed to be the federal government that wanted to see to it that there were to be no differences of income, either in the private sector or in the public sector provincially, and for the federal government to suggest that it didn't matter in terms of its program whether one province made it available to the public sector or not is absolute hogwash.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say that the province of Manitoba did everything that it was obliged to do, did everything that we undertook to do, did more than it should necessarily be expected politically of us to do, because I don't see why provincial politicians or provincial governments had to accept responsibility for a federal program. But we did. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is late in arriving. I don't mind his interruptions, they usually provide a good means of dialogue. But now you are late in arriving. I've indicated that we did that, and we accept it and whether it was the only way or not the only way, we agreed to participate in that way, and we will facilitate you participating in that way. I'm saying that as a matter of principle, Mr. Speaker.

I don't think that national policy should be administered or set as an amalgam or as the result of a conciliation between the federal and the provincial governments. I believe that the national government should set national policy, that the provincial governments should set provincial policy because what we have learned from this hybrid type of operation, national policy legislated by provinces, responsibility therefore accepted by provinces, is that we are involved in legislating a program which they are administering. And even the First Minister, who was a friend of the program, who was one of the ones who were strongly for it, rather than ones who were reluctantly for it — and I've agreed to that — found, Mr. Speaker, that despite his co-operation, he was involved in the administration of an incomes program over which his government had no control. And some of the decisions that were made constituted a great problem. We were involved in some of the appeals.

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure my honourable friend that I have not tried to depart from what the Premier did. I don't think that I have tried to provoke a debate here as to you being wrong and us being right, or vice-versa. I am merely asking for the consideration of members, because it's going to go beyond this particular bill, for the consideration of members, that it is not conducive to the economic or political well-being of this country for national policy to be something which arises out of a concerted agreement between provincial governments. . . That national policy should be the responsibility of the elected national government of Canada, that the political pressure should not be on the provinces for that policy, it should be on the member of parliament, and on the national government. In this area, I am merely indicating that it would not have been a shock to me if the First Minister said — and I'm not suggesting it even as a better course — that this was a national program. The province of Manitoba did everything that could be expected of it to facilitate it, it did not change its laws, it did not bring in legislation because it shouldn't be expected to, for a national program, it did something which the federal government accepted as being completely satisfactory insofar as the Anti-Inflation Board program is concerned, and if that's not satisfactory, somebody has to correct it.

Now, who has to correct it? the Premier has indicated we'll correct it, and we will vote for it. The persons in this group will vote for it and we will not oppose it. There may be individual members of the House that will say other things, but I am able to say that in large part, the measure will be facilitated. But not because it has to be, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I remind the Minister that it is now 5:30. He will have twenty minutes to . . .

**MR. GREEN:** Well, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I'll pick it up. I probably could finish but I'll pick it up tomorrow for five minutes.

**A MEMBER:** Tonight.

**MR. GREEN:** Oh, tonight. Well, then I'll finish it. If the members give me a minute, I'll finish. One minute, Mr. Speaker.

I merely indicate, Mr. Speaker, that I feel obliged to facilitate anything that the Conservative administration wants in this connection. I feel so because I say that this is something that the government did that it would ill behoove me to say now that I won't do everything in my power to facilitate the Conservatives remedying whatever problems arose from what we did. I am not by any means saying that I consider that the provincial government legislating to integrate a national incomes program, is a proper way of doing it, and that the onus still, in my opinion, this is a federal program, a federal program which they should be judged on just as we have to be judged on our programs for the good of them, and for the problems that arise therefrom. I think that that's a correct means of political

responsibility.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister on Bill No. 2, is it the wish of the House to . . .

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I wonder if the honourable member is aware that the debate will proceed this evening. Is he adjourning it for another occasion, or does he wish to speak tonight. In which case, he shouldn't adjourn it.

**MR. JENKINS:** I wish to take the adjournment, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hour of 5:30 having arrived, I am leaving the chair to return at 8:00 o'clock.