



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. 13A

2:30 p.m. Monday, December 5, 1977

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY of MANITOBA

Monday, December 5, 1977

Time: 2:30 P.M.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my left where we have 26 students of grade 11 standing from the River East Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Harvey. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rossmere, Leader of the Opposition.

We also have four students from Daniel McIntyre Collegiate here. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wellington. On behalf of all members, we bid you welcome here today.

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, I believe that there were a series of questions which were directed to the Minister of Finance, both during his presence and also during his absence while he was at the Ottawa meeting, all relating to Co-operative Implements Limited. Some of those questions may be of a nature that he could reply to today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure which specific questions the First Minister refers to. There has been some discussion since my return and we may have dealt with some of it. Maybe he would like to remind me or place the questions again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Well Mr. Speaker, in summary, I would pose the question as asking the minister whether he can confirm that the most recent formal proposals relating to CCIL, have to do with a revised application in which the co-operative movement generally and the province of Saskatchewan have . . . whether or not they have formally confirmed a willingness to participate at a substantial percentage sharing of the risk in any financial guarantees and in light of that, can the province of Manitoba confirm its own intentions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of Saskatchewan saying in the last week that they were prepared to go on any fixed amount or under any conditions that were different or are different than the conditions that existed before. They were, earlier on, prepared to wait on the lead of the province of Manitoba in this respect. To the best of my knowledge — and there's no reason to think that we would be able to answer the question directly, I think the answer would probably have to come from CCIL or from the province of Saskatchewan. There's no new information to the best of my knowledge as of the last week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to direct a question to the Minister of Health. This morning I understood him to say on a radio program that deterrent fees are under consideration or under review by the Manitoba government. Could he clarify that statement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the subject should be put precisely in that context. I think that what is happening is that jurisdictions right across the country concerned with the escalation of health care costs, are considering all possible ways of holding the line on escalation of those costs. As a consequence, I think there is a realistic assessment and examination being undertaken not only by the Department of Health and Social Development in Manitoba, but across the country, as to what options are available.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, my question is related to deterrent fees. Do I then understand that the minister is saying that if there is a move on the part of other provinces to re-institute deterrent fees

that Manitoba will join that movement, or will they go along with that movement, or — in my thinking — would they oppose such a movement?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you recognize the hypothetical aspect of the question. However, that doesn't bother me. I would attempt to answer it for the honourable member by saying that what I have said is that Manitoba has no interest in moving in isolation in that area, that if there is a general trend in that area across the country, I am sure that we would take a very serious look at it. We're not pushing for it. We're not pressing for it. All I can say is that it comes into the general area of health costs and how to bring them under reasonable control. It's one of the options that jurisdictions across the country are considering.

MR. DOERN: Then I would ask as a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, of the minister, is this not in apparent contradiction to the stand of the Conservative Party during the election campaign, namely that they would preserve and protect the medical health plan that we have in existence?

MR. SHERMAN: On the contrary, Mr. Speaker. I think it's in precise concert with the stand of the Conservative Party during the election campaign, on the grounds that what we were attempting to do, and the basis on which we recommended ourselves to the electorate, were largely areas related to the economy and related to the capacity of the taxpayer and the revenues of the province to sustain ongoing programs. We have no intention of affecting, injuring or dismantling any program of the kind to which the honourable member has referred. But, Sir, I think it can be said that even in an in-house way, at the departmental level, in provinces right across the country the concept of the user fee has been examined, has been explored as a means of trying to contain the escalation that has occurred for the last decade or two. That's all. I think that a government would be less than honest, less than candid, and less than realistic if it didn't explore that kind of option.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister responsible for the Emergency Measures Organization. Has he asked the Armed Services to find out whether there are more anti-tank missiles or shells lying around the CNR shops in Transcona?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, my office this morning has been in contact with Mr. Miller of the Emergency Measures Organization, who normally utilizes the services of the RCMP in an expedition like this, and he will be in contact with them and I will report further to my learned friend as the matter develops.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. TOM BARROW: My question, Mr. Speaker, is directed to the Minister of Mines. Due to the statements of your government that you're going to move any action with regard to mineral exploration, could the minister inform me what will happen to ore bodies that have been found by the government? I specifically refer to the one from Flin Flon, Trout Lake.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is essentially the same question that was placed by the Honourable Member for Inkster a few days ago, and at this stage I can only tell the House that our policies in that regard are under review.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister responsible for the Civil Service. Can she confirm that Management Committee and not the employing minister has terminated the employment of two civil servants without giving any reason for same? A Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Minister responsible for the Civil Service not having replied, I am assuming that it is because she is not aware of it. Would she undertake to acquaint herself or to check on the statement that two civil servants of the Planning Secretariat had their employment terminated without cause last Friday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice.

MR. CHERNIACK: A supplementary question. Would the honourable minister also undertake to ascertain the method by which this termination took place; that is, if I may just explain, by the employing minister or rather by another branch of government which may not be properly the employing person or body, or the body which has the authority to terminate?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, I would take it as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed toward the Honourable the Attorney-General. In view of the fact that when the AIB administrator, Mr. Tansley, rolled back the Liquor Control Commission employees' wages an assessment or penalty was levied to the extent of \$240,000 against the Liquor Control Commission. Has the Honourable the Attorney-General entered into any discussions or correspondence with the federal government in order to obtain, by way of agreement, waiving of this assessment of \$240,000 prior to the passage of the legislation that is before the House at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance, federally, was contacted on this matter and we have heard back from him. We have, yes.

MR. PAWLEY: If I heard the honourable member correctly, he said he had heard back from the Minister of Finance, federally. Has there been any success in negotiating the waiving of the fine or levy? **MR. CRAIK:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I will have to take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce to whom the Manitoba Development Corporation reports. Mr. Speaker, is the minister contemplating dispossessing the people of Manitoba from its present ownership of Tantalum Mining Corporation, a corporation which suffered very badly and was about to close in bankruptcy under private sector and is flourishing under the public sector?

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

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): The question, Mr. Speaker, is under review.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for the building code. Could she tell us whether there has been any monitoring of city proposals on the new expansion of the Winnipeg Stadium to determine if they are providing proper access for those who have handicaps and are in wheelchairs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I will take it as notice and check into it for him.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the Honourable, the Minister without Portfolio. I don't know his correct title, Mr. Speaker, but I assume he's the one who is responsible for the reduction of staff of the government and programs as well. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know from that Minister if the termination of employment of civil servants who were employed in the Planning Secretariat is one for which his group, or his portfolio, is responsible and if he is aware of the circumstances involving same.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I think the question has already been put and taken as notice in terms of the detail but I am aware of what has taken place and my assumption, Mr. Speaker, is that it is in conformity with procedures from the past with respect to termination.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary question from the Honourable Member for St. Johns?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the honourable minister's response, and an indication that he is aware of something that has happened of which the minister for the Civil Service is not, and I'm not sure now which of the two ministers are taking this question as notice. May I therefore ask the Honourable, the Minister Without Portfolio, if the terminations that have taken place have taken place in spite of the fact of his publicly announced intention to redeploy the staff of the Planning Secretariat, and is this an indication of his failure to do so, resulting therefore in that kind of firing without cause.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the Planning Secretariat was disestablished but I think the Secretariat

Monday, December 5, 1977

was made up of people who were on contract, people who were on term, and some who were members of the Civil Service. I can say, Mr. Speaker, that many have been transferred to different departments as a result of a request of the ministers involved, some have not, some have been terminated.

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

MR. CHERNICAK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Honourable Minister Without Portfolio. Does he not make a distinction between his obligation as a minister for civil servants being fired as compared to with people who are on contract and may be terminated or otherwise.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have lived up to what responsibility I've had both from the public declarations and my responsibility as minister.

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture when he is going to be in a position to indicate to us, and the people of Manitoba, of new opportunities for production of commodities that to this point in time have been denied to new producers, mainly those coming under marketing boards? When is he going to amend his regulations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Was the minister intending to make a statement?

HON. JIM DOWNEY, Minister of Agriculture (Arthur): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the opportunities for all the segments in the agriculture field, production processing and the entire agricultural community will be able to expand and new opportunities will grow as of October the 11th.

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

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister is prepared to elaborate somewhat on what is intended, what the current policy is for that matter, with respect to those commodities that have strict production controls. People have the impression that there is a relaxation under way and I'm wondering whether the minister can indicate whether there is any opportunity for new production amongst all the commodities that are now under control production. It's not hypothetical, it's a matter of today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As most of the programs now . . . that whole area of marketing board is under review with the people that are doing the producing, and the people that are doing the processing, and the people that are in government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Would the minister be good enough to explain to the House his apparent change of thinking with respect to the Lord Selkirk. Over the past number of weeks he has spoken inside and outside of the sale of the ship but today's advertisement invites offers to purchase or lease.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Honourable Minister for Mines, Resources, and Environmental Management. I would like to ask the minister if he agrees with the recent Lynn Lake local government district resolution that Lynn Lake has been the site of increased exploration activity in the past two years.

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

MR. COWAN: A supplementary to the minister then: Is he prepared to meet with the mayor or a delegation from Lynn Lake in response to that resolution to discuss the development of a regional geological office in this town.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have had correspondence within the past three or four days, I believe, from the Mayor of Lynn Lake, with respect to the matter referred to by the Honourable Member from Churchill and I will be responding to that letter.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Finance. He gave me an undertaking just over a week ago that he would file a reply to an order for return. Can he tell me when we might expect that document.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I will make sure that that gets filed immediately. That is the order that was placed in March of 1976, Order No. 40, and we will make sure that it is now tabled.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the minister indicate to the House, whether there are any commodities which will continue to be restricted as to increased production in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, until a review taken of the entire agricultural system of marketing and controls, it is too early to say, at this time, whether that in fact could take place. —(Interjection)— However, I have been informed that we will be out of the black bean business.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether the minister can explain that since it is now so difficult to get out of those regulations, why it was so easy to get out of them during the election campaign.

A MEMBER: It is not difficult at all.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the minister without portfolio in charge of the government task force on organization and economy. I wonder if the honourable minister could indicate to the House a deadline or approximate date for the filing of the report and major recommendations of the Task Force on Government Organization and Economy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the task force would provide the Premier and Management Committee with reports, progress reports, starting some time in January. I would hope that we would be in a position to present a written submission to the Premier and Management Committee by the end of March or possibly by the end of February.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable minister for his answer. As a supplementary, I wonder if he could indicate to the House, approximately how many persons are involved in the task force as such, and what percentage or what proportion of the task force are from outside of the government.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, a number of review teams have been formed already, not all of them have been completed. I would expect that the private sector involvement, which would include some who are involved in some public activity as well, will number between thirty and thirty-five and this will be in addition to those people from the government service who will be seconded. I must say as well, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the honourable members opposite, the private sector people are participating without cost.

MR. EVANS: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the minister for that information also. I wonder if the honourable minister could indicate to the House, whether he has any preliminary estimates at this stage, of the number of Civil Service positions that will be eliminated as of April the 1st, or whatever particular deadline, or does the honourable minister have a set of targets, or goals, as to the number of jobs in the Civil Service that the government hopes to cut out by that time, because I understand that that is one of the objectives. Surely there must be some idea that the government has as to what size the Civil Service might end up as of April the 1st.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: I would be happy to attempt to answer that long and rambling question, and may I say rather silly question from the Member for Brandon East by telling him that the objects of the task

force are to bring back under control the government of Manitoba, which under the previous administration with its — and I will be very charitable — its lack of management technique had allowed it to grow beyond reasonable bounds. Those are the objects of the task force. As and when the task force reports my honourable friend will see with what degree of success or otherwise we have been able to bring government under control in Manitoba. What we took over was pretty messy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has already had two supplementary questions. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister concerning a statement he made on Friday to the Manitoba heavy construction industry, in which he said that public works are fundamental to a healthy economy and more emphasis should be placed on them by the government. I would like to ask him how he can relate that to the actions of his government: Freezes on public works and housing, freeze on health care construction, and while he is making that speech to one group, his Minister of Municipal Affairs. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I remind members that questions are supposed to be concise and to the point, and they are not supposed to be argumentative. However, I have allowed a great deal of latitude and would hope to be able to continue to allow as much latitude as possible. I would suggest that any lengthy questions of that nature may better be handled by submitting them in writing. We do allow written questions on our orders as well. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I think I have been influenced by the House of Commons. I watch their question period and it is very interesting. I was about two seconds away from completing my question and so I would rephrase it by simply saying to the First Minister, how can he make a public statement saying that public works are fundamental to a healthy economy and that more emphasis should be placed on them, in view of his government's dismal record in public works.

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

MR. DOERN: I would then direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs who made part of that statement, and ask him on what basis his government made a 90 percent cutback in the municipal loan fund. Why didn't they eliminate it altogether or why didn't they make another cut? How do they arrive at this magic figure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: The fact, Mr. Speaker, is that the \$5 million that was supposed to be allocated for the last stage was not included in the budget of the previous government for this fiscal season and by reason of the large deficit that we were facing, we felt it was necessary to reduce that substantially but recognizing that some sort of a commitment had been made to municipalities. We hope that the municipalities will get their applications in as quickly as possible with a view to providing employment over the winter months. The honourable member would note that there is 100 percent labour forgiveness during the winter months. We . . . hope those projects will come into operation and be completed during the winter months.

MR. DOERN: I would also like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs whether he gave any indication to the municipalities of new job creation programs or additional moneys for welfare funding.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe Management Committee has been dealing with a number of other make work projects, which had been previously announced by the previous government and announcements will be forthcoming with respect to those in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, just following in that line of question, I wonder if the Minister of Municipal Affairs can indicate whether he or his staff have been in discussion with the city of Winnipeg concerning potential ways of funding the storm sewer program that the city apparently desperately needs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, there has been no communication received from the city of Winnipeg with respect to the storm sewer financing. The Mayor and Chairman of the Executive Policy Committee and the Deputy Mayor have requested that I travel with them to Ottawa within the next few weeks to meet with officials of the federal government in order to determine whether or not there is any possibility of any federal government assistance in this area. Perhaps the honourable member with his close connections and their communion of faith could indicate very early as to whether or not it is of any value to make that trip.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to accommodate the minister as long as the phones

downstairs keep working and the Minister of Public Works sees to that but . . .

MR. ENNS: Pay your bill.

MR. AXWORTHY: . . . Pay the bill is it? Not while I'm working on government business. Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary to the Minister on that. Does he plan to attend with the City of Winnipeg officials and does he intend to provide any incentive to the federal government in terms of indicating whether the provincial government is prepared to help in that capital financing in any way or is this part of the general freeze as well?

MR. MERCIER: The intention in this regard is to seek assistance through CMHC, the federal agency, Mr. Speaker, but there are a number of other matters that the city wishes to discuss: the Sherbrook-MacGregor overpass and the federal urban transportation assistance plan recently announced by the federal government. We would be dealing with those and perhaps a number of other smaller matters.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, early last week the Honourable the Attorney-General took as notice a question pertaining to the task force on maintenance. I wonder whether the Honourable the Attorney-General is prepared to answer that question now. If not, is he able to indicate whether or not a decision has been arrived at in connection with the principle of establishing such a task force and if so, when it would be established.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, that matter is still under review.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. Can the Minister tell the House what is the present status of the pensioner critical home repair program? Will this program be cut back or will it be continued and at what level of funding?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I believe that came up last week. The critical home repair program at the present time is loaded with applications and we are examining it very thoroughly to do as many as we possibly can within our means and the budget which was set by the previous government. We just have so many in that we are examining them all.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question either to the First Minister or to the Minister responsible for the Task Force on government organization and economy. I wonder if they could simply tell us, or tell us in a very straight-forward way, do they expect the size of the civil service to be larger or smaller as of April 1st?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: I can tell my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, that he should quit and see.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the First Minister then, can he advise the members of this House and the people of Manitoba whether the government has certain targets or goals that they would like to achieve in terms of levels of civil service staffing?

MR. LYON: If my honourable friend would like another whop of an answer such as he got before, he's sure put his face up for the pie but I think I have answered that question. We're trying to bring the administration of government back under control. We have no predetermined targets on numbers of civil servants or anything like that at all. What we are trying to do is to run an efficient government with the number of people necessary to run an efficient government. That's one of the jobs of the task force and my honourable friend from St. Boniface can mutter away from his chair as often as he wants. I'm glad to see him getting back into shape in the House again. I'm glad to see him getting back into shape and returning to his old parliamentary form but I have told my honourable friend, the papers have said what the subjects of the task force are, I'm sure that it has penetrated with my honourable friend's mind even by way of osmosis, as one of my previous colleagues used to say so I don't think that anything further I can add at this time would be helpful to him except to say that when the new estimates come down, when the budget comes down, when we have an opportunity to fully walk the parameters of the kind of a mess we have inherited, then we'll be in a better position to tell him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East. May I remind the member there are

three minutes left.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, my questions are short. I would like to ask the First Minister a supplementary question. Can he indicate to the House whether the MGEA will be consulted formally on this matter if there should be any major layoffs or when a major reorganization of government takes place?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the question is hypothetical in the sense that my honourable friend is presuming a set of circumstances that have not as yet arisen.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. I would ask the Honourable Minister of Labour if she has received any notification as per the Employee Standards Act of further layoffs in the workforce at Thompson INCO Metals, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I haven't received any report to that effect.

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

MR. USKIW: I would like to ask the Minister without Portfolio, having regard to his responsibilities on the task force, how many people he has with him, either as advisors or in whatever capacity, who are not on the payroll and on whose payroll are they?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, they are on the payroll of private organizations; they are on the payroll of organizations that are involved in specific areas of activity and some, believe it or not, are on the payroll of government through the universities.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to know how many there were who were not on the public payroll but continued to be on the private payroll, if the minister can answer that question.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Spaker, I think I indicated that not all the people have been selected for the review teams and it's very hard to give that information to the honourable minister but I am sure that he will have an opportunity of having it presented to him and he then can make his own analysis as to what percentage would fit the kinds of categories that he would like to examine in his examination of the task force personnel. In general, Mr. Speaker, and I want to make this point, that with respect to private sector involvement, it has come without any cost to government and, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the function that they are going to perform, it is bringing the government an area of expertise that is needed and I think will help us do the job of bringing the previous government under control so that we will be able to carry on the kinds of programs we have announced.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether there is a way in which the honourable minister can assure the House that there is no conflict of interest on the part of these individuals who are advising or working for the Crown on the payroll of other private corporations?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I think we would apply the same kinds of standards that were used by the previous government in the way in which they involved private sector involvement in the host of decisions that they had to make with respect to the variety of problems they had. I think it would be wrong and improper for the members opposite to suggest or imply a conflict of interest unless they are in a position to document, otherwise, Mr. Speaker, all they are trying to do is tarnish the work of people who have come forward community-minded and prepared to serve this government.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Pembina, the Honourable Government House Leader has twenty minutes left.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The latest exchange during the Question Period is certainly revealing in that it tends to indicate an attitude and a frame of mind on the part of honourable gentlemen opposite. The attitude that they are taking toward people who volunteer their services on this task force is the same attitude that they took toward volunteers on any government body. They just don't believe that any person in this province is public spirited enough, public minded enough, to want to do something for his province. That is a typical socialist attitude, Sir, and it was never manifested better than it was just in the last five minutes or so, particularly coming from the Minister of Agriculture, or the former Minister of Agriculture, who perhaps

exemplified that kind of attitude and demonstrated it time and time again during the course of the number of years that he was acting as Minister of Agriculture on this side of the House. My honourable friend purports to give advice as to who should be in the public service and who should be working. Well, he would be the last person in the world that I would want to take advice from in that regard, I can tell you that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, at the adjournment for the lunch hour, I was indicating some figures that come from the public accounts which purport to demonstrate the budgetary planning of this government and I was pointing out that on no occasion did the estimate of revenue that the government had projected ever come near being the actual estimates of revenue and the same is true with their expenditures as well. I see now that the Member for Inkster . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster have a question?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member will permit me to ask him a question with regard to the estimates of revenue? For the most part, would those estimates not be, in large measure, those estimates which are passed on by the federal government to the provincial government, which are not estimates by the provincial government at all but estimates by the federal government — for the most part?

MR. JORGENSEN: No, I don't think so because, Mr. Speaker, in those years, up until this last year, those estimates were always exceeded by the projections. The point that I was attempting to make, is that in spite of the fact that the estimates of revenue always exceeded the projections, it never failed that the estimates of expenditures far exceeded those. It seemed to me a tragedy in those years when revenues were piling up and revenues were coming in, that we did not take advantage of that opportunity to reduce the public debt to the point where this province would have been in a far better financial situation than it is today. The final figures in the increase in the public debt, just in the last few years, have indicated that from 1973 the increase in the public debt was \$78 million in 1974 it was \$80 million; in 1975 it was \$248 million; in 1976 it was \$293 million; in 1977 \$267 million. Increases in the public debt of that magnitude, Sir, are bound to create problems in the economy. The interest being paid on that debt is bound to pose a problem for the taxpayers of this province.

Now the Member for Rupertsland made an interesting comment during the course of his remarks — one that I just want to refer to for a moment — when he said that small business never had it so good in this province. And this is the reason he gave for that: Because the NDP were putting money in their pockets. You know, that, Sir, is a typical attitude. The NDP were putting money in their pockets as if they were grabbing the money out of thin air or manufacturing it themselves. If indeed they were putting money in the pockets of the businessmen, they were getting it from those same businessmen. They were getting it from the taxpayers of this province.

Then he went on to make another observation, one that leads me to believe that my honourable friend is now beginning to do a little thinking because it seems to me that if he will just project that thinking a little bit further now, he will come to the same conclusions that we on this side of the House have come to and that is the reason for inflation. He said the UIC benefits create inflation because people are being paid not to work. Mr. Speaker, he really stumbled onto a truism when he uttered those words and I don't intend to try and elaborate on that argument with my own words because honourable gentlemen opposite have heard me on this theme so many times that I am sure that they wouldn't want to hear me again. I would much rather use somebody else's argument, one that they may want to believe. Recently in an article in the Telegraph Sunday Magazine — it's a British magazine — there appeared an article by a J. B. Priestly and some of my honourable friends opposite will recognize this article, or this person, as quite a famous British novelist and dramatist, and he is also a veteran socialist. He's 82 years old and has been in the Socialist Party for a good many years but this is what he had to say, and if there is any doubt in the minds of honourable gentlemen opposite that the conclusions that the people of this province have come to are isolated, then they had better listen to the words of J. B. Priestly because I think he uttered or wrote in this article a lesson that my honourable friends opposite should start listening to. He said, "Both in our plans and our behaviour, we ought to be guided by common sense touched with compassion. If we cannot conjure up the compassion, then at least let's keep in mind common sense. We English were famous for it once but there are whole days now when I wonder if I am not attached by habit, affection, faith to a silly nation. Common sense among us seems to be dwindling fast. Where we were once represented, admired, imitated, we are shrugged aside and we have asked for it. If I kept on spending more than I could earn, I would soon find myself in a bankruptcy court, condemned to listen to some harsh judgments on my conduct. I will not be so harsh with our government but I must point out that it has ceased for some time to be guided by common sense." And it is a socialist government that he is talking about. "So you and I, who were never asked what we thought about this fabulous borrowing have to shoulder the burden of the interest on it. The result of this is that we are now murderously taxed. The further result is that some of the brightest and best among us quit the country" — and my honourable friends will recognize that — "while many others begin to feel the lack of any incentive. At the same time, profitable private trading having been made as difficult as possible, public money is spent on providing jobs that have been lost by this wide departure from common sense. While public ownership begins to look like elaborate imbecility, it is proposed we should have more of it. Sixty years ago when I was a young Socialist, I used to bring the post office into my argument." — and my honourable friends are still doing it but J. B. Priestly has long gone past that stage. "I do not know

when common sense left the post office forever, but it has certainly vanished, never, I feel, to return in my time. What goes on? What super idiot principle is hard at work? What giant rats have gnawed away at our national character? Have doses of LSD been dropped into the water supplies at Westminster?" Then he goes on to relate some instances of legislations that are being passed in England which I have no familiarity with and so I won't cover that particular passage.

A MEMBER: What year was that?

MR. JORGENSON: It was 1976 and I will table it for the benefit of my honourable friends because I think it would be something worthwhile for them to read. It may be a kind of a lesson that they require at this particular stage. "When authority is guided by common sense touched with compassion, it takes trouble to discover what people in general want or do not want. This is real democracy. What is false democracy comes from ideology, the fanatical worship of a theory and a system far more important than people." The sort of thing that my honourable friend, the former Minister of Agriculture, used to believe in so fervently. "With common sense disregarded, we are at the present time the constant victims of ideology, busy imposing a stamping process on us without regard to our thoughts and feelings. We have ministers who are going to do us good, even while we run screaming. We can discover them day after day without a glimmer of common sense between them. Sometimes I feel we are already half way to Moscow."

Like the story of the group of boy scouts who came home and reported that they had done their good deed for the day, that they had helped a little old lady across the street. The Scout Master said, "Well, it surely didn't take all of you to help the old lady across the street." They said, "Yes, she didn't want to go." That's the way my honourable friends have been acting. "Common sense declares that wherever you find a really good school you should leave it to continue its invaluable work. Ideology wants to abolish it and put something worse in its place. Common sense holds that pay-beds help national health, while ideology insists upon phasing them out. Ideology believes we should all like to live in a multi-racial society while common sense tells us that this is nonsense. Ideology defies truth and common sense by insisting that the English should welcome complete equality, when we know very well that the English want nothing of the sort. They have longed for heroes to cheer, and the large personalities to enjoy — both kinds being in short supply among the ideologues. Common sense knows that it is foolish to ignore or frustrate the deepest instincts of mankind. Ideology, perhaps beginning history with Karl Marx will have none of this. So for example, most normal men and women instinctively desire a better and more abundant life for their children, and try to plan accordingly. But now, with ideology triumphant, every obstacle is placed in the way of such parents, who find themselves frustrated at every turn. At the same time, they are compelled to keep at vast expense an army of officials whose duty it is to prevent those wretched taxpayers from obeying their deepest instincts. This is ideology furthest removed from honest democracy and common sense."

That's really what the question period today was all about — questions coming from the former Minister of Agriculture. He's concerned that his army is going to be reduced somewhat so that they won't be on the backs of the taxpayer any more. That, to him, would be a sinful departure from the kind of government that he feels should dominate in this province.

"We're commanded to depend more and more on a government that has offered us no examples of common sense in all its larger operations and transactions. It has made us look like a silly nation, invaded by rich Arabs bidding for large country houses and the best hotels." And then, in brackets, he puts this: "These same oil-rich Arabs would never have known what they had in the ground had it not been for western technology." "Common sense has always set limits to the interference of government in its peoples' lives even if it is busy doing good to them. To most ordinary English people, there is something suspect about the good intentions of bureaucracy, and I for one, regard with increasing despair the Morning Post, which for one letter offering me the chance of earning more money, seems to have a half a dozen official communications telling me how I must rid myself of the money I do earn. Apparently I exist, not to express and enjoy myself, but to be governed. This is ideology at work again.

"The trouble is that as common sense is more and more neglected and less and less taken into account, it is the ideologues who seem to have the harder edge in their thoughts and feelings. The rest of us, with little or no aid from common sense, seem to lead a blurred existence as if we were fumbling around in a foreign country, bewildered and half lost, putting up with altogether too much. I say again, and now with more emphasis than ever, that we should come back home to ourselves, ready to be guided again by common sense. If with a touch of compassion, then so much the better, but compassion or no compassion, commonsense has to be there, laying down its own firm rules. Without these we would be quietly going out of our minds, behaving like the frightened children that ideology wants us to be, with the totalitarian iron road closing in on us.

"Friends," and then in brackets he says, "not comrades:" "I tell you that without common sense we shall keep moving in a fatal wrong direction."

I don't know how long that we have to travel the road that we're tralling today, or had been travelling up until October the 11th, but my honourable friends opposite will recognize the dangers, the loss of freedom, the loss of control of government, that will take place if they are allowed to continue.

I know my honourable friend, the former Minister of Mines and Resources, Member for Inkster, made a comment in a speech that he delivered in this chamber during the course of the last session.

I'm going to have to paraphrase him, and I hope that I will not incorrectly paraphrase him, when he said that he's not so naive as to think from time to time, and he must have had some instinct guiding him at that particular point in his speech, not so naive as to believe that they will be in power forever, thw from time to time there will be changes of government. He said that while they were in government, meaning, my friends opposite, that we will continue to make progress. Progress in his terms, meaning further and further down the road to totalitarianism, down to the road to a communist state. That to my honourable friends is communism, that to my honourable friends is progressiveness and progress. Then he went on to say that the years that we will be inpower, meaning the Conservatives, then we will just stand still. I think the great disappointment that my honourable friend is feeling at this time is that we're moving back from that direction, we're moving away from it, we're attempting to be the kind of responsible government that does have consideration for the people who make this country work, the taxpayers in this province, the people who create the wealth and generate the money that is necessary to enable the government to have compassion. When you discourage those people from investing in their own country, when you discourage them even from living in that country, you discourage the means whereby you are able to create the wealth that you want so much in order to do all of the good things hat you want to do.

My honourable friends had reached the stage where the discouragement among that group of people was so great that they decided to take action, and they took the only action they coulfat the time. They got rid of a government that they felt was destroying their chances of making a living in this province. I think it was a gob move on their part.

My final observation would just simply be that I have for eight years now watched my honourable friends, and although they make a great pretence, and I am saying that in most generous terms, of trying to be the friend of the so-called little man, I get the feeling that theirs is a double objective, they take money from the rich and votes from the poor with the objective of trying to protect one from the other.

But their real objective is power to dominate, and they've demonstrated that that was their objective not so much in the way that was obvious but in the little ways that peoplenoticed so very much. The lack of opportunity to do things on their own, the burden of government paper work that was shouldered on them all the time, the increases in taxation all the time, the regulations that were preventing them, more and more, from doing the things that they want to do, that they as people in a free country should be entitled to do. And without detracting one single bit from the need to be compassionate, from the need to take care of those people who throughmisfortune or otherwise are not able to look after themselves, governments, in the words of J.B. Priestley, "must use common sense." I got the impression in the latter years of the previous administration's term in office, they had lost track of common sense and were rightfully defeated.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question of the previous speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Could the Honourable Member for Morris indicate, if only in an approximate way, what the level ofprivate sector investment was in Manitoba in the period to which he seems to be yearning for, and how that compares with private sector investment in this decade?

MR. JORGENSEN: No, I can't do that Sir, I just don't have those figures with me. But ifthe private sector investment is declining then the reason for that is the flight of capital from this province. It's the flight of capital simply because they don't feel that the opportunities are in this province. But to answer my honouraE FRIEND SPECIFICALLY£ NO I don't have those figures with me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition with another question.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I indicated in advance that I didn't expect the honourable member to know specifically, but if it is a fact, and I believe we can get the figures, that privaz sector investment in Manitoba has not declined in relation to the 1960s, even when put in constant dollars, then would he acknowledge that there has been no decline in private investment?

MR. JORGENSEN: If one was to accept the Leader of the Opposition's statement at its face value, then he seems to imply that there should b no increase in private sector investment, that as long as you hold the line at times such as this, when the opportunities in this part of the country are greater than they were before. . . I t seems to me that in the last few years, western Canada has reached the point where here is where greater activity and increased development should be taking place. The very geography and the nature of this country now would seem to indicate that. And if there has not been that increase, then I think it's a sad state of affairs. It should have been increasing considerably.

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

MR. DESJARDINS:mr. Speaker, I have already participated in this debate, having spoken on the amendment, but a few things that happened today cause me to say a few words at this time.

First, it was the Minister of Finance, from his seat, who called some of the members of our front bench here, dishonest; then it is a statement that I did agree with, from one of my own colleagues, the

Monday, December 5, 1977

Member for Inkster, who said that the election was won because the Conservatives fought this strictly on ideology and they made it quite clear to the people of Manitoba what this was all about. I disagree with him, partly anyway, and I'll try to come back to that. Thirdly, some of the statements that were made by the last speaker, the Honourable Member for Morris, the Minister without Portfolio.

It seems to me that we're back at the old days of calling names, that nobody could be honest, that it has to be only one side, either this side or the other side, the government or the opposition. Oh no, you can't disagree on certain things and having good motives, somebody must have some bad motives. It seems to me that the government again is acting like a cry-baby. We're brought in in this session . . . It would have been very very easy I'm positive, as far as I'm concerned anyway — I better not put words in anybody else's mouth — that had we been told, "We have to have a session to correct this question of the Anti-Inflation legislation. This is all that we will bring in this session." I feel that probably we certainly would have had a quorum and could have taken one or two days, and this could have been done. Well, this government, as certainly is their right to do, they brought in a Throne Speech, and they brought in certain bills which represented their priorities. And then we were chastized in this House by the Minister of Public Works, who pretty well told us we had no business discussing any of these bills, because we had to get down to the business of Manitoba.

I wonder what he thinks the business of Manitoba is. It seems that this is a necessary evil, this question of the House, that that we are supposed to conform, we are not supposed to do our work as a member of the opposition. Many of the members of this House would also have preferred, the same as the members of the front bench, maybe to get accustomed to our new roles, start slowly and be ready for the next session. But we didn't call the session and we didn't introduce all this legislation, but sure as we're here, Mr. Speaker, certainly it is our responsibility to debate in the Throne Speech and other areas.

The members of this side are always talking about the doctrinaire New Democratic Party. These people are just as doctrinaire, if not more, than many of the members of the New Democratic Party. They are so doctrinaire that I question their sincerity, when they would do everything possible to see that we ULD LOSE AN IMPORTANT INDUSTRY WITH JOBS. AND God knows there are enough problems with unemployment, as Flyer Coach, because they want to be able to say, them and their friends, "Well, there's an NDP program that didn't work. Government should stay out of business, they can't work." You'd think that they would forget about everything else at this time, they are the government. Sometimes you wouldn't think so, they're still in the process of fighting a campaign. This is all that they seem to worry about, telling us, well, you should have answered and so on, and they don't want to accept their responsibility.

They talk about commitments they inherited from us and they pick those, they pick the commitments. I'll tell you that one of the strong commitments that we made in this House was that we would immediately build personal care home beds. And I can assure you there was no partisan decision in that at all. I don't even remember where these beds were going to be built. But it was a commission, an independent commission, the Manitoba HEALTH Services Commission, that stated, "Here, you can't get away, you've got to at least build this." They're not talking about this Commission, the Minister is saying, "Well, I've got to know." And in the meantime, his staff is waiting.

Now, mind you, I know that they're all supermen, but nevertheless, they had no experience in this before, and in a couple of days, he'll be able to tell us, alone, — because if he asks the Commission, I know what they'll tell him — where they're going to build the beds, what they're going to do. And these are the commitments that they don't want to accept.

They brought other legislation and there is one that I would normally vote for, even if I voted alone. It is the one on Succession Duties. I want to make it quite clear that I believe it is a fair tax, it is a good tax. But I do believe that if the other people are not going to pay for it in the other provinces, and it's a degree here of disagreement with some of my colleagues I don't necessarily feel that we should wait till all Canada has to do away with this tax, in western Canada it's done away with — I would go along, I would say normally.

These people are talking about free enterprise. Just back off a minute and see what has happened at this session. Do you feel for a minute that free enterprise would do such as this government is doing? They said, we will ask a task force, and that, Mr. Speaker, is a sham. It's window dressing; it's nothing else. These people, and the members of this House, were elected to do a job and they are getting somebody else. This is no reflection on these people to say that of course these people are going to be faced with a pretty tough decision out there because they have conflict of interest. Of course they have conflict of interest. People working for an insurance company will have quite a decision to make, and they are partisan. What is going to help that Commission and their company and so on. That doesn't mean that we're saying these people are dishonest. But you know, if we dare say anything about certain groups in society, especially the businessmen — that's been going on, not only for eight years, for close to 20 years in the numbers I've been in this House — this is awful. But they can laugh, they can ridicule, like they did this morning, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture — among these people, the workers, the people with overalls — well, then you can ridicule them. But if they wear a vest and if they're in the high set and so on, well don't you dare. The Gordie Howe of provincial politics — remember that.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, I would normally go along with the Estate Tax but when do you say the Minister of Health, for instance, said, "We will definitely make cuts in there." And then later on, he'll say, "well, if we have to make cuts." But he started his statement, "We will definitely make cuts."

Now we have a Commission and the Chairman of the Commission is the most liberal of all the members. Are they trying to finally destroy him to show him who's boss, to show him who the premier

Monday, December 5, 1977

is, and that he's completely finished. He's the me who was way more to the left of I when I was sitting there and who wanted us to give lunch after school to the people of Manitoba. Now they're talking about the abuse that we made.

Well, I'll try to stay with something that I'm a little more familiar with — the budget that I had when I was minister responsible for Health and Social Development, which was roughly one-third of the total budget. I challenge today the new members and the old members to point out in Hansard during the last three years where a single member of the then-opposition said: "This is a program you shouldn't have." You know, they tell us how awful we are with business, with the people that have money, and you know, that automatically if they leave the country it's our fault. You know, somebody has to start. A few years back, not too long ago, in the free world, and I'm not going to talk about the other side of the Iron Curtain, they were all Conservative governments, every single one of them — in Europe, everywhere.

There was abuse of these people and the people rebelled, and then you got the unions and so on — they were tired of working for nothing and this is what started. You couldn't just leave it to these people. And you know, it's a sin if you say: "Well, fine, but in this province, or in this country this is the minimum that we feel our lower-paid people should receive." That's not free enterprise. You are ready to abandon for the good of everybody . . . Sure, maybe it creates more jobs, creates more opportunity, because you're looking at your own pocket; but are they supposed to tell us that we're getting those virtuous people out of here? It's fair game, I'm not knocking that. But what about these people? If you just stop and close your eyes for a minute and just imagine you're waking up tomorrow. You haven't got your farm, or your business, you're not an MLA, and you haven't got a job and your fifty or your forty-five. Heh? You're going to listen to this question of free enterprise, you're going to listen to this "you don't need at least a minimum." I'm not trying to say you're dishonest, but I sure as hell don't want you to tell me I'm dishonest because I don't agree with you. And besides, we hear, since October the 11th: what has elected this government, you know, their commitment? They have not told the truth. Definitely, the big business and the people behind the scene, and maybe my Honourable friend for Inkster is a back-room boy of the Conservative government, maybe he knows that, but many other people, you know, were naive enough to take it literally when they said: "We will not cut a single one of our programs and social programs." And this was said in the House last year, and during the next session I will point out to you, and I defy you — I challenge you — to show me one program that you said . . . and don't say Mincome because, and don't come back — I want to serve notice that I won't accept the members of Mincome who were strictly on contract, and it has been announced they were going to leave as a saving to the government.

You know, we didn't hire all the people that we had, we hired a maximum of ninety per cent, and I've never heard and I could look at all the programs . . . What did we hear the Leader of the Opposition who is now Premier of this province got up on his seat and he said: "You haven't got a monopoly on virtue, you damn Socialists." He said: "We don't believe in socialism but we believe in social reform." And ninety per cent of your programs are social reforms that we brought in. They didn't say: "We're going to build as many hospitals or personal care beds, as this government said." They said: "We will build more — that's in the programs." And when the then First Minister warned the people that this couldn't be, it couldn't be, you cannot cut taxes, you might say that you have paper clips and you get an editorial from the Free Press, but then what? Then what? Are you going to save that kind of money? You've got to cut down on services. And this is where I disagree with the Member for Inkster, because they said they would not cut down on services. They said they would build more personal care homes; they thought they would do more on home care. And, all of a sudden today, we hear something new.

You know, we're talking about utilization fee or deterrent, as if well, the people . . . this is a possibility. That's been a possibility from Day One. This is something that we've looked about and this is one thing that I said, "Well, the Conservative government . . ."

I'm ready to have that good honest fight, to have a government, the people of ideologists like my honourable friend was saying: "Well common sense is that people don't want discrimination, /." That's not true, we must have maybe a little bit of discrimination because that's what the people of this country want. It's to keep the people here at all costs, starve ten per cent, that's fine. He can be just as sincere — he feels that on the long run, this is what you must do. And he can be honest, and there's no reason why I could say that he should have any ulterior motives. But, on the other hand, there's no reason why he should say that I have if I don't agree with him.

And I defy the members of this House — they think that they got in and everything is fine. Well, they opened that first envelope . . . and that's good, because you need a little time to get used to it, to get your feet wet; and that'll give you the chance, when they're busy looking at what this past government did. But it's not going to last forever. It's not going to last forever. And I want to know, did you or did you not say that you were going to have more personal care beds? Did you or did you not say that you would do at least as much on day care, home care, and all these other services? And my honourable friend, the Minister of Health, is saying that he's going to do more in the areas, in certain areas of preventive medicine and that is going to save money. It's not going to save money, but I'm all for it, because I think that's the name of the game, to help our people.

And, furthermore, the then critic of health for the Conservative party — we were questioned — I think there were different groups — one day it was nurses, and he said: "We don't know anything about these things. You will decide. We will raise the money, and you will decide. We will ask the doctors, the dentists, the nurses, the LPNs, we will ask them that." — (Int) — Well the Minister of

Monday, December 5, 1977

Health said the same thing in another area in sports with the sports federation, he said: "We will raise the money and we will give it to you." And I am saying that if you think I'm going to be scared because somebody is going to say: "Oh, don't you dare say anything about a member on that task force." That is a sham that task force. And I would like to know exactly — not what publicly has been said — what that minister has been saying. How can you come in this House and say: "Everything is frozen." Even the things that we committed, some of our commitments — no building of personal care homes. But did

you freeze the other side? Would you see free enterprise? Anybody in his right mind say: "We're going to lower revenue." That's not frozen. You're lowering revenue before finding out what the programs will cost, and you're going to say: "Well, it's not our fault. An independent task force decided. We would like to build personal care but we have no more money. We have no more money."

And what are you doing? Cutting down some taxes. I said that normally I would vote with you, and certainly on one of them at this time, but again, I want to repeat that I think it's a fair tax, and I think the federal government should be jising it and then distribute it back to the provinces and then you would only have the rich get richer and the poor get poorer or you do without. You can go ahead in Alberta, they can go ahead and turn it back to you. But we can't compete with that, what's the use of being a country if that's the case?

Now, Mr. Speaker, we were told that ninety percent of these programs were brought in by this government, and I want to know, and I say you have misrepresented the public. My honourable friend said they helped this old lady across the street — she didn't want to go. Are you taking her where she wants to go? Did you hell her during the election that she will not have a bed? And my honourable friend, all of a sudden, is saying this morning, not in this House — and I'm referring to the Minister of Health — "Well, you've got to take care of your people, you know, the family." I said that when I was sitting on that side of the House but that doesn't mean that I give up. We have to go along, you can't just change society so much. I've received more phone calls than when I was the Minister of Health this last week or so: We're being pushed around; we don't know. His government told us that nothing would be changed." You know, if during this session, the last session, we would have been told that's a good program but we haven't got the money. My honourable friend said that today: "You've got to draw the line." I agree with that. And if you looked at the speech that I made in Quebec City last year, before the election, to the Canadian Hospital Association you would see. I repeated the same thing in this House. Did I get any help? Did anybody come back and say, "Yes, he's right. You know, there's Osborne House and these people are putting pressure, but there's a limit." Oh no. I was chastised and I was asked all kinds of questions. You know what I'm told? "Well that's fair game; we were in opposition." Well, I'll make a commitment to this House, Mr. Speaker, that I will speak the same way from this side of the House as I did on the other side. I think that if you're going to be honest and work for the people of Manitoba, this is what you should do.

My honourable friend talked about all the increase of taxes and all the change during the last eight years. What increase of taxes? There has been a redistribution of taxes that I happen to agree with and you don't. It doesn't mean you're a damn fool or silly like your leader would say. That's the way you look at it and I look at it a little differently. I feel that no taxes are good but I do believe that ability to pay is the best tax. And I'll pay my tax even if I have one or two days holidays left, I'll pay my tax. I'm not going to starve. I'd much sooner have those kind of taxes than if we are going to go back to the system where we had premiums on medicare and premiums that everybody paid, the same people. You know, you had people that had no revenue, that had the pension, just their meagre pension. They were paying exactly the same thing as the millionaire. I have said in the past that I would like to see and study a kind of a utilization fee, but what are we going to get? We're calling it a deterrent fee immediately. And you know what the danger of this will be? The same deterrent will be there for a millionaire or that pensioner again. Will it be a deterrent for the millionaire? Will a dollar or two dollars a visit, will that act as a deterrent for the members of this House? You know, you start a program and they say, "Well we don't abuse it." Of course, there's certain abuse in certain areas and there's abuse in the high bracket, the people in the cocktail circuit, there's abuses there. They beat the income tax as much as they can, sometimes for millions of dollars. But boy, if you see a lady going out and buying chocolate puffs for her kids when she's on welfare, Holy God, you know, what an abuse, what an abuse. I say that that commission — and I am not afraid, it could be construed the way you want. I am not knocking anybody on that commission or any class in society. I say of course there's a conflict of interest if you had the Great West Life and the Great West Life was not elected, the Great West Life are not the ones who are supposed to decide. What are they going to do? You know ahead, you know what you're going to do because you made it clear, you've closed every door, you've reduced the taxes. You've got to cut down on services and you will and if you feel that this is right, then well at least be honest about it and you weren't. You didn't win this one only on merit or because the people were afraid of this government. It was many things and some of the people were naive enough to think that their taxes would go down because there was all kinds of abuse under the New Democratic Party but that no services would be dropped. I don't know so much about agriculture and what you said about that. I didn't pay too much attention. I had enough trying to run my own department. But show me somewhere where you said you were going to stop home care. You took advantage of a very unfair program on Twenty-four Hours to call the residence, and you stated that instead of doing our work and saying that there were enough staff — I challenge you, are you going to give them their 200 staff that your friend Robertson wants? Are you going to give him that extra 200 staff at Portage? You can't even assure us that you will keep the staff that's there now. We find say we were ready. We were lectured, you know, that we are irresponsible, we want to spend money. That is not true. Maybe this is why it's good that there's a change of government somewhere. Maybe this is why I'm on safe

Monday, December 5, 1977

ground when I say that I still believe. I know some of my colleagues didn't like that. I still believe in what I call liberalism and middle-of-the road at times, not ideologies necessarily to the left or the right.

Well, all right, I've had no trouble in the years that I've been in that Cabinet, certainly not more than any ordinary person

would have had. I didn't agree with everything; nobody did. I wasn't the only one because I saw that these people were responsible. There's a lot of things that we tried to do that we couldn't do. For instance, I wanted to dismiss certain people on my staff; I couldn't because of union regulations I guess. Now I'm saying that's fine. All right. You know, we don't have to be honest or dishonest, we can have the two groups of people or three who are individuals, that believe in certain priorities. During the election, you didn't show any priorities at all. You mentioned the things that you were going to do. You were going to cut down the taxes on heat and some sales tax. You were not going to increase the sales tax; you were not going to institute any premiums or utilization fees. You weren't going to do that. You were going to build more beds; you were going to do at least as much but administer it better under the day care and the home care. The Minister said that the dental program is one of the best programs that he had. You told us that we didn't have enough community residences, that we should close this place maybe in Portage. The Minister didn't realize that the average age was no longer 14 years old but 34 and that it cost a heck of a lot more money.

And we didn't get any help, certainly no editorial from the Free Press saying, "Here, this is a stand. They should do that." It was always if we said no, if we took a hard stand because we didn't have that much money. What was it? It was confrontation. It was confrontation that we had. You know, I had a minister that didn't want to talk to the Sports Federation or the Medical Association or anybody else because they wanted this confrontation. I was reminded that I had a responsibility and my leader at the time told me, "When you got this job," he said, "Don't think you're going to be popular, you're going to be a son of a bitch," and I learned that he was right because I was called that many times. But we were trying to be responsible. All of a sudden, you know, the Free Press in an editorial, they're so afraid you're going to make a mistake, they're getting you all set ahead of time. It must be annoying. They are saying: All right, if this commission that you name, don't agree with them, replace them. No confrontation — replace them — and the minister told us, "They agreed to do what I told them to do." No confrontation. Everything is fine. Well, Mr. Speaker, I say that we can have it either way. They want to be partisan in every way and if this little dictator in the centre can get up and tattle on every question that we're stupid, and so on, we'll play that game. It's a hell of a lot easier, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the house to play that game. I hope that we're going to be as responsible as we were when we were on the other side.

I would like, if it's ideology, I would like to see the people say — and this is what I suggested they should do last year and they didn't accept it, they said no — they bring in the utilization fee. That would be conservative. Not utilization, that's not quite as bad, but a deterrent to get the people not to use any of these programs, cut these programs immediately while you're having somebody to use. Is that a genius in there that knows how many extra people that they had? Do they know that? And who is going to decide? I thought we were elected for that.

Who's the co-chairman, a very respectable gentleman, but I don't wish to knock it, conflict of interest. Of course he has; of course he has. If not, why don't we have somebody representing the retired people of Manitoba. Maybe they'd even work for nothing. You know, it's a great thing that these people are a dollar-a-year men. These people are not a dollar-a-year men; they're getting paid. They're getting paid by certain people who have vested interest and it makes a hell of a lot of difference if you are going to cut down 2 percent on income tax or 3 percent or 4 points to a company like Great West Life. Don't tell me that it doesn't mean anything at all; don't tell me that. Does that mean that I am trying to ridicule anybody. I'm killing it the way it is and you know it.

Don't tell me you're going to decide pretty soon, if, in this Autopac, if you're ready to leave it — I know your inclination is if it's working well, leave it — but there was a commitment made and the Free Press wants you to live up to it. You might make that mistake of opening it to companies and you'll see, because, how can you have it when somebody is going to cream it and the government will be left with the other cases. But anyway, you were duly elected, that's sure. But don't tell me that there's no conflict of interest. Don't tell me that. When I had the Commission when I was the Minister, I defy you to look at the Commission to see if I tried to handpick supporters of the government. I don't think a single one of those people were dismissed. Why can't you do the same thing?

You know the uproar that we had a while ago by the Minister of Finance, who talked about Rex Grose as the Gordie Howe of the Manitoba Civil Service, and we know what happened. We were surprised, not for firing him, for letting him go. This government was not in government yet, but these people were summoned and they were told that they were fired. I believe that it is only right when certain people, certain Deputy Ministers — and I don't know how they do it — some Deputy Ministers can be civil servants all the way, and they could be as honest — I had some working for me and I know they're going to be just as loyal to the next Minister and they'll be very valuable people. Others can't and others don't want to. I had a former Deputy Minister in Health, who, if I had been a Conservative I wouldn't have kept around too long. That's understandable. But if we do anything like that — why are you insulting certain people, because of course, people with money and certain people have a tendency to favour the Conservatives, are smart, they should be respected, they dress better, they follow the cocktail circuit and they know better. That's different.

This is what we're trying to say now. Our system, if you let it work . . . I also believe in democracy

but I was rudely awakened when I realized that democracy was a great thing when the good guys were in power about eight years ago . . . he government, with their help, and I can tell you some of the people that cax all the way from England, to say, "You've got to save the people against themselves, they're stupid, they don't know what they're doing. Protect the people against themselves. They're going to vote Socialist. Tyy're going to have a socialist government." That's democracy. on't get me started. I'm not going to get started on the freedom of the press because that's another thing that hurts— when you see thekind of —(Interjection)

The Member for Morris said a while ago, that we don't understand that people are interested enough that they can do some work. I had to smile when I heard that because that's exactly what they've been saying, anybody on this side wm helped this side there's a motive. And if a guy's ever been in business befor even though he might not be rich, but if he has a fair salary, he doesn't ever worry that he's not going to starve. But he's a traitor, I'm a traitor, I'm a Judas because I left the Liberal Party, because I do believe in some of the ideas, some of the things, and I thought that my form of Liberalism was better served under this government and with this group of people as colleagues, and I haven't been disappointed. But you know, even some of my friends look at me and say, "Well, you're nuts. What the hell do you worry about these people for? You should try to fix it so you pay less tax in business, and so on. That's the main thing. Take care of yourself. Why worry about these guys?" And then you become a Judas, you're either. . . sometimes practically a Communist. I used to be on the other side, I remember calling my friend a Communist when I was with the Liberal Party.

I can tell you that my policies haven't changed. I think I've been very consistent in this House for the last 18, 19 years, I don't know exactly. Different names in parties haven't disturbed me. that much. I remember — this is not all new8 as I said a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, this was the same situation. They were complaining about mismanagement and so on, well, Walter Weir was doing that. And he was going to sue the federal government on the constitution and now they're talking pretty well about the same thing. They were going to cut do and the people were told that they couldn't believe in this socialism, we were going too far. I'm not saying for a minute that that is not a danger, because where do you stop? The more programs that you have the more people want. If they have nothing they're satisfied with crumbs. But when they have more — and that's a temptation — that's difficult and it might be that it's a good thing that we had a change of government, but Sir, as I said before, they should be a little more humble and not call everybody on this side of the House " i diots" for stupid questions. And nohthink that we should not call a spade a spade or say what we think, and think that we should not. We were told, very seriously, "Doyou dare?" Is this going to be something that you're going to run down the people that want to work for this province for nothing? They're nohworking for nothing to start with. And it's not running them down. But to say that there's no conflict of interest, that is idiotic, Mr. Speaker. That certainly is wrong.

Now, if there was a committee the members of this House havenothing to do with it. It is the members from the outside. What qualification, if they want toxring in some legislation and programs and they're talking about Finance, I can see that. But why get some of these people on the outside, I don't know of many doctors, or I don't know of many Directors of Hospitals or the Chairman of the Advisory Committee or the Review Committee on Welfare that was invited, and say, qell what is this all about? What great asset has the Vice-President of Great-West Life got to do with the programs on welfare? He doesn't know what it's all about. It's not running him down, that's a fact.

I was told that there's been somechanges now, but I think one of the Secretaries or Executive Assiswnt, one of the guys working up north who was going to work for nothing. I don't know if that's been changed, but what kind of a country have we got if we're going to have a war to see what party can have people working for nothing. We've lost that battle because our priorities haven't been to take care of these people as much.

So Mr. Speaker, I say very clearly, that this Commission is a farce. It isa farce if they would have said, all right, this is it and we're going to leave it alone. We're not lowering any taxes, here's no doubt that it goes against our principles, this is what we want, we don't want taxes in this field, but they also said, we wnt more personal care homes. But they froze that. I would say that that Commission, that Task Force has got three strikes against it. Already they've made all kinds of noise. There is no way — dp you think that I'm going to be naive enough or surprised enough to say, well the commission is going to come in af say, you know, there hasn't been that much. You're not going to save that much. Do you think that's going to go? You know, I'll bet you a million dollars to a doughnut that that's not going to happen; I'm sure it's not going to happen; it's impossible that it'll happen. You know what's going to happen though, some of these programs will gmdown. As I say, if the people would have been told, all right. Now I know why there was no Liberal Party, the Liberal Party received no votes. We are talking about ideoloves on the two extremes apparently. Talk about one that said, fine, we'll help big business and so on, but we'll still give you all these things. —(Interjection)—I beg your pardon?

A MEMBER: . . . tell people we were going to cut off their pensions.

MR. DESJARDINS: You're a lia sir, if you said I said that. You are a liar, sir. You withdraw that then, and I'll withdraw the name. You said that I said that. You pointed at me. Then don't say that I said that. All right. Well I never yard it. —(Interjection)— Maybe you should name somebody that said we would drop pensions. —(Interjection)— Who said that we would withdraw pensions? —(Interjection)— No, not colleagues. You're the one that made this accusation. Oh. Well all right. Well if I finish my speech — but don't get somebody to come and say that we're going to take their pension.

What we did say . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has another two minutes but I would suggest only one speaker in the House at a time.

MR. DESJARDINS: That has never bothered me in the past, Mr. Speaker. I realize that you're not too interested in what bothers me, you want to keep decorum in this House. It doesn't bother me at all, but whenever anybody wants to make an accusation they better be able to stick by them and to prove what they said. What the First Minister said, "Yes, the taxes will be cut down. Definitely. But you won't have the programs." And this is what I said, and it was supposed to be sour grapes when I said that there was no way that you could cut down on taxes and that you were going to just keep on and just increase the programs, and that is not possible. That is what you wanted the people of Manitoba to believe. I know that certain people like the Member for Inkster and some of the people in the back room, the Party knew but they didn't take that seriously, but that poor little old lady — that the boy scout helped — that didn't want to go across, she was naive, she didn't want to go across because she believed that they would have the same programs. As this is what we said, that was supposed to be scaring the hell out of the old people. Well, they're scared now, the phone calls that I have, people crying and saying, "What's going on?" This morning, listening to the Minister, I don't know what he said, but they're afraid. And I think it's going to be more. So maybe, in a way, there'll be this balance and maybe you'll be back on this side and there'll be another group sitting on the other side. It's not going to be an easy matter.

What I'm saying is, take your job seriously and start now. Start now. And don't chastise us for doing our work in opposition. Try to live to your promises, at least to most of your promises during the election.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. BOB ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, first, by way of tradition and by way of conviction, I offer my congratulations to you on your election to your high office. Granted, there were some fresh reports of some misgivings from certain people as to your impartiality, but the manner in which you've conducted business in this House, with both good judgment and good humour, indicates to me that your tenure in office will be long and happy. I would like, at this time, to express my thanks to the voters in Springfield for their confidence in me. I'd also, at this time, like to pay some tribute to my predecessor, Rene Toupin, for the eight years he spent serving the people of Springfield. I wish him well in any future endeavours he may have.

It is also customary, on one's first speech in the House to, shall we say, take a journey around one's constituency. Springfield is perhaps one of the more unusually shaped ridings in the province, where it borders almost the entire east side of the City of Winnipeg and runs right to the Ontario boundary. On the extreme northeast corner of the City of Winnipeg is the Rural Municipality of East St. Paul, which is, to the casual traveller on Henderson Highway, indistinguishable from North Kildonan, and as a matter of fact, the RM of East St. Paul is the home of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition who chooses to live in the quiet confines of a more rural riding, as compared to the hustle and bustle in the one that he represents.

The Rural Municipality of Springfield is to the south and east of the RM of East St. Paul. That municipality takes in a number of small towns, Dugald, Oak Bank, Anola, Hazelridge areas. This area has traditionally been noted for a sound agricultural base. In recent years, however, this area, because of its proximity to greater Winnipeg, has been an area of substantial development by people who choose not to live in the urban area, but prefer to live and to raise their children in a rural atmosphere and still be within easy driving distance of the large urban centre. The constituency also comprises the Rural Municipality of Richot, which is directly south of the City of Winnipeg, taking in a number of towns on either side of the Red River, St. Agathe, Glenlea, Ile des Chenes, St. Adolphe. And Richot, along with the Rural Municipality of Tache, is home of a substantial number of people of French extraction or French background, and Springfield I am sure has the largest concentration of people of French background of any constituency in the province, with the exception of St. Boniface.

As we proceed further east, we take in also the entire municipality of Whitemouth, which has a significant dairy industry and supplies a substantial amount of the milk that is used in the City of Winnipeg. Our riding extends to the Ontario boundary. That area comprises the Whiteshell Provincial Park where tourism is a significant enterprise.

As well as being an unusually shaped riding, Mr. Speaker, our riding perhaps has as great an ethnic mix as any riding within the province. Besides having the usual make-up of people of British background and the large number of French people that I indicated earlier, we have a large number of German people, people of Mennonite background, Czechoslovakian, Dutch, and so on, as well as four Hutterite colonies. With an area of this size and shape, it should be apparent that we do have some problems. One that perhaps comes to mind most perhaps frequently because of the diverse area that it is, is transportation and one of the problems that I look forward to dealing with is the situation of the secondary provincial roads within the riding. Over the last number of years their condition has deteriorated and it will be the responsibility of this government and my responsibility as the representative to deal with that situation. The problems in agriculture will require a lot of

attention over the next number of years. I look forward to working with the Minister of Agriculture to make it possible for the initiative and the ingenuity of farmers all over our province to grow and prosper, and contribute to the future growth of all our people within the province. As well, because the east end of my riding is comprised of a tourist area, developments in that industry will also require a great deal of our attention and because the Whiteshell Park is one of the few large parks within relatively easy driving distance of the city of Winnipeg, there is virtually unlimited scope for future development in that area. Because so much of my riding bounds the city of Winnipeg, it has a problem that is perhaps unusual to a lot of rural ridings, in that there is substantial pressure of urban development on the rural area. As a matter of interest, Mr. Speaker, from 1973 to 1977 there was an increase of more than 3,000 voters within the riding, which is quite unusual for a rural riding. With that brief outlook of my constituency, I look forward to the next four years. The people of Springfield, 'chose me as their representative by a margin in their wisdom, of more than 1,800 votes, which is very gratifying, but it is also a great responsibility. With your help, Mr. Speaker, I intend to live up to that responsibility. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have, of course, already had one opportunity to reply to the Speech from the Throne and the motion related thereto, and I will not be unduly lengthy in my remarks and observation today. It is my intention to limit my remarks specifically to the implications of the decision of Pacific World Airlines to move into the area of air transport formerly occupied by Transair, a company I think that was operating a head office out of our province.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that I addressed several questions to honourable members opposite, relative to this matter, in this morning's brief session and at that time I was advised that it was the intention of the government to file an intervention with the Canadian Transport Commission. I was advised, when I queried as to the rationale for that decision, that it was a manifestation of concern, primarily I think in the field of employment and the quality of service. I think, although the references were vague, and I don't mean to misconstrue the replies received, because I think they were given honestly, and the question period perhaps prohibits extensive, expansive replies to the question. But basically, I think there was concern that employment might be withdrawn from the province as a result of the takeover and there was also some reference made to the quality of service, as I said, and there was a concern that, I suppose, that the quality might possibly be

I prejudicially affected by the conversion of assets to PWA. I share these concerns, Mr. Speaker, I think they are well-founded. I think that members on both sides of the House are justifiably concerned that PWA may not maintain the service to the same standard as we would like to enjoy. I won't say to the same standard that Transair maintained it, because I think that for years, as we all know, there has been extensive debate as to the adequacy of that particular service, particularly in remote northern points. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I might say, in saying that I share these concerns, that I share other concerns as well, and Mr. Speaker, that is why I was so concerned about what motivated the decision to intervene.

What primarily motivated me to be so interested in this matter, I should also mention, was an article I read in a local newspaper, sometime ago and it was an interview with, purporting to be with Mr. Lougheed, the First Minister of Alberta, and a gentleman by the name of Mr. R. Eaton, who I believe is the chief general officer in charge of the new airline. Mr. Lougheed, of course is not, and I say this I suppose somewhat facetiously with intent, he is not a doctrinaire socialist, but he is obviously also not a doctrinaire Conservative. Mr. Lougheed, I think with fairness and equanimity can be described, and I think fairly so, as perhaps being a bit of a blue socialist. I would like to think, and I say that in a spirit, I suppose, of fun that that position suggests to me one of compromise and rationality. Mr. Lougheed in replying to questions put to him by the reporter gave the reason for the acquisition of Pacific World Airlines, and it recommended itself to me frankly. I think that it entailed a good deal of responsibility to the public he represents. Mr. Lougheed indicated that this matter had first come to their attention when they had heard that there was a good possibility that the then British Columbia oriented firm was about to become merged by a British Columbia syndicate. Apparently they were planning to amalgamate the PWA with their operation along the northwest coast of the continent and frankly his main concern, as suggested in the article, was that this would effect a loss of competitiveness. It would somehow deflect from the competitive position of the Alberta people in competing for industry in that province. There was a great deal of concern that if the private investment were retained by the private British Columbian trust, that they would plan their future policies with a view towards the expansion of the British Columbia northwest as opposed to orienting their concern to northern Alberta. So, he indicated that it was a government decision to intercede and in effect compete in the private market place in order to make an effort, and obviously a successful effort, to retain the asset known as Pacific World Airlines.

Well, this Mr. Speaker, concerns me in its implications. Having successfully done that of course, history tells us it was decided also by the Alberta government that they should expand their airport and it was announced I think last year, or sometime early in this year that they would be making an attempt and effort to take over the operation of Transair when that company announced that it no longer considered further operation being viable in its sphere. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have an application to do just that, before the Canadian Transport Commission. My concern emanating from this, Mr. Speaker, is that this, as I suggested earlier dramatic in my remarks, is going to have ramifications to the people of Manitoba. I cannot for the life of me see the possibility of Mr. Lougheed

Monday, December 5, 1977

having by necessity the responsibility to maintain the public interest of citizens that live within the borders of our province, and most certainly, although I am not going to question his motives, I am willing to suggest at this time that it is quite possible that there may come a time when the interests of Alberta and the interests of Manitoba are not consistent with one another. There may come a time when there is a conflict, essentially of interest as between those two provinces and their representatives, and the people of those two provinces. We have had recent examples of that, Mr. Speaker. I think one need only address the recent problems associated with the sale of oil and one, I think, can readily appreciate and understand the consequences of these sorts of disputes because I think as the facts have demonstrated, provinces although they may be well motivated one as to the other, do not necessarily have one goal. I would suggest that the protection of the public interest is most certainly Mr. Lougheed's government's goal, and that would be the interest of his people, the people of Alberta.

I found, as a matter of fact, the remark of the Honourable Minister of Finance this morning of some interest in this regard. He suggested that any public representative would have to acknowledge that the prime responsibility of any elected representative was the protection of public funds. He said that was the paramount concern of anyone elected to public office in this province, and I would suggest that that is not correct. I would suggest rather that the protection of the public interest is the prime concern and I am suggesting, Sir, that the public interest is not necessarily served if we acquiesce and allow PWA to take over the interests of Transair. I am suggesting, Sir, that in the future, and I suppose I could also suggest scenarios in the future, there will come a time when the establishment of this service as applied for by PWA and the Alberta government may represent a manifest injustice to our people.

I would suggest that the retention of this service may in fact be used as a lever, it may be used as a lever at future conferences, conferences of the First Ministers of the various provinces. I would suggest that to merely acquiesce and concern ourselves with the detail, whether or not there will be an assurance as to employment, or whether or not the quality of the service will be maintained. It is naive, that's essential naivety. Sir, I suggest that the real concern is what effect will this decision have on the future, and I would suggest, Sir, that the possibilities are staggering. I am going to suggest and I think again in all fairness, that it is possible that the government, the Alberta government, may use this lever in an inequitable fashion, if not an overt fashion, perhaps tacitly in order to try and place itself in an enhanced and more competitive place vis-a-vis Manitoba, in terms of economic preferences, in terms of tariff and so on, and I would suggest that we are going to be very hard pressed, perhaps not at the bargaining table, but in the backrooms. We are going to be very hard pressed to take a very determined and principled position with this government, it, in fact they have got us in a sense in their back pocket, and that is what we are allowing them to accomplish. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we are laying open the way to future problems and I suggest this not as a criticism, I don't want to put this before this House as a criticism of the present government, because that would be unfair, and of course it is not paternal advice, I suppose quite obviously as a new member of this House, I am in no position to give anyone paternal advice, but I think as a member concerned with the interests of our fellow citizens I have a responsibility, a responsibility to brooch this subject and to have it thoroughly aired on the floor, and I take this opportunity during the reply to the Throne Speech to do that because it seems to present itself as the only opportunity that I will be availed of to bring this to the attention of other members.

So I would suggest in conclusion, and I said I wanted to be as brief as possible, in conclusion I would suggest that we give very serious consideration prior to acquiescing before the Canadian Transport Commission, give very serious consideration to probing the ramifications of this decision with the government of Alberta. I think we should give very serious consideration to approaching Mr. Lougheed and his respective ministers, and very serious consideration to asking for some sort of assurances and not verbal assurances because those types of assurances will not be of any value after the Lougheed administration passes, although I must confess that it's not likely that administration will ever pass. But I would suggest that it is necessary to get firm written commitments, commitments of the government of Alberta. I would suggest that it would not be untoward and I think it would be reasonable to suggest to our friends in Alberta that consideration be given to giving Manitoba a special interest in the future operation of Pacific World Airlines as it relates within the context of Manitoba. Because, after all, we purport to represent, and we do represent the people of this province and we cannot abrogate that responsibility. It would be irresponsible for us to suggest that Mr. Lougheed and his cabinet members should be able to make decisions, that will affect transportation northern and rural Manitoba and that may well have economic implications that are at present not in sight, but may well crop up in the future. I would suggest that it is not satisfactory to merely allow him to come in and establish himself. He has been prudent, he is protecting the public interest of his people. He is establishing an entity, and I would suggest that it is another thing that I must say I find somewhat repugnant, he is establishing an entity that will essentially be in competition with Her Majesty's official air carrier, Air Canada. He has suggested repeatedly that his only interest is to give this service to the people of Alberta and to the people in the general prairie region, but it has expanded. I know for a fact and from reading the newspapers and hearing comments that are made by the private sector that they are concerned as well that that is not his intention.

His intention is to expand that service throughout Canada and he has the capacity. We're talking about a government that admitted investing more than \$700 million—I couldn't believe it when I read

Monday, December 5, 1977

the figure but it was from his very mouth — investing \$700 million in three separate enterprises last year. That was Syncrude, the Alberta Energy Company, and Pacific World Airlines. We're talking about a government that has recently been able to retain a heritage fund, a trust fund, in the order of — it astonishes me, it's a figure I can't even comprehend, it's not relative to anything I can understand — \$8 billion, that's in trust, earning interest for the people of his province.

So I would suggest we have good reason to be concerned because as he's often described, this blue-eyed Arab, I've described him perhaps as being a blue socialist, may have other aspirations and ambitions and the leverage, the leverage inherent in this vital transportation network is fantastic. As far as I can see, it's one of the most upsetting features and I suppose I place it on an equal level with the unity crisis, the leverage that is being exerted there from the east is going to be offset by the leverage from the west. The irony of the situation is that on the one hand we have a — I don't know if I should call him a gentleman but he is a Firstminister — we have a gentleman saying that his province hasn't got a fair share and on the other hand, we have somebody who wants more than his fair share.

I find it also exceedingly interesting, I think it was naive for my honourable friend, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, to suggest that he wasn't concerned about this and he said that it was like Air Canada. He suggested that like Air Canada, PWA would serve the public interest. It was another Crown corporation. He suggested that he couldn't distinguish between the two. I suggest there's a very great distinction, a very great difference between PWA and Air Canada. We do have a vested interest in Air Canada. The people of this province do elect representatives who review the affairs, assess and evaluate the affairs of Air Canada's board.

A MEMBER: And the City of Toronto elects more than all prairie provinces put together and . . .

MR. CORRIN: That's another inequity but we'll deal with that in the future and I agree with you, I think that is an inequity.

A MEMBER: : Especially when they have a Conservative government there.

MR. CORRIN: If I can digress and return to my theme. I would . . .

A MEMBER: : You can digress but we take you away from it.

MR. CORRIN: You're not supposed to heckle me.

A MEMBER: : I'm suppose to heckle.

A MEMBER: : Yes, he's supposed to heckle you.

MR. CORRIN: That's right. That's playing fair. The Member for St. Johns and I share an office in the basement so he has ample opportunity to heckle . . .

A MEMBER: : I could change that for you.

MR. CORRIN: Please, if you want, I will digress and I will deal with the conditions found in our office. I'm sure those conditions are very different from the conditions experienced by you and honourable members on the other side.

A MEMBER: You can file a complaint about the offices.

A MEMBER: Ask your neighbour.

A MEMBER: I have no offices at all.

MR. CORRIN: So in conclusion, I think I concluded my remarks on one other occasion but in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that there is a distinction. Air Canada and PWA do not serve the same masters and I would suggest that the threat is momentous. I would suggest that we do not want to be at the sufferance of Alberta and I would suggest that we should take immediate action to advise our counsel, whomever that counsel is and that's one thing I haven't found out whether it's governmental counsel, or whether it's private counsel, but whomever that individual may be, I would suggest that we should advise he or she that the terms of reference of that intervention should be much broader than are normally perceived in these circumstances, that are normally conceived in

these circumstances. I would suggest that we shouldn't just look at the mere technicalities the implications involved in employment and scheduling and quality and all that sort of thing. Those just skim the surface. I, would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we should look to the substance of the matter and we should consider the possibility of asking the Canadian Transport Commission to adjourn their proceedings, to adjourn their proceedings until Manitoba has had the opportunity to confer with the Alberta government and to try and establish some formal recognition of Manitoba's rights within the framework and context of Pacific World Airlines application. If we don't do that, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that there will be havoc. I'm not going to say that there will be a price to pay because as I said, these remarks, these observations are made in a spirit of goodwill. There's not going to be a price to pay but I suggest there may be a price to pay for the people of Manitoba if this advice isn't heeded. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Pembina, the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are a few comments I would like to make on a few matters. One is the statement made by the Honourable the Minister without Portfolio, in charge of being House Leader, who gave the apt description when he talked about the concern or the attitude of government as it ought to be as being not how much government does for people but rather, in his belief, it ought to be how much government allows people to do for themselves.

I'm pleased with that statement. I think it is a good description of conservative philosophy and I'm always glad that there are a few members opposite who do discuss philosophy and the House Leader and the Minister of Public Works, the Bobbsey Twins, sitting side by side there — I refer only to that in the sense that they bob up and down more often than others do — do at least participate in the debate and discuss philosophy. Now that the Minister of Public Works yelled something which I didn't hear and I finished my sentence, I'm prepared to listen to him.

MR. ENNS: I said that description of "these two Bobbsey Twins" is a little kinder than the description of another set of twins that you used to refer to, "the Gold Dust Twins," "the barefoot boys from River Heights," or "those kinds of people," you know, "that live on that side of the tracks."

MR. CHERNIACK: I remember talking about "Twiddle-dum and Twiddle-dee" and we have many such twins and triumvirates and other groupings and categories. I'm sure the members I referred to don't one bit mind the reference that I made to them as the Minister of Public Works does. It's kinder than other references made, I would say by them as well as by people on our side of the House. — (Interjection) — There's another contribution from the Member for St. James who used a term which I only know as being highly repugnant but he may not have meant it that way.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment that I believe the basic difference that I have sensed between the two parties in this House is that we believe that you cannot leave it just for government to let people do for themselves what they've done throughout the many many years in the past where I feel there has been a clear-cut separation between those who have and those who have not, those who aspire to have and use the means that are given to them by what they call a free enterprise society to achieve what they want. I would say that it is more important for government to make it possible for people to do for themselves both collectively and individually those things which they are able to do because government makes it possible to do and I would say in the sense of creating a greater equality of opportunity. It is something that is essential before people are allowed to go into the mainstream of society with all the strikes that so many have against them and with all the advantages that so many have working for them.

So I would rather say that it is important for government to make it possible for people to attain or strive for those objectives that they have and in doing them collectively they are able to accomplish a great deal. I believe that it is only through the instrument of government that people can collectively do what is in the common interest of all, therefore, of course there is a difference in our approach and I do believe that we are much concerned in making sure that people have the opportunity, in education, in health, in freedom of movement and in the opportunity to develop their full potential.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I move down to two people I referred to earlier today who were fired by the government of Manitoba without any cause being shown. I recognize — and I think I did all along — that government had the right to inform deputy ministers that they were not wanted any longer. I deplore and I think very badly of the manner in which it was done by this government, before it was even a government, to dismiss out of hand three deputy ministers but the right to dismiss them was there. The manner was reprehensible, it was inexcusable but that may be the hallmark of the Progressive Conservative government of Manitoba.

I referred today to two civil servants, people who had been accepted into the civil service, who were career civil servants, people who, to the best of their knowledge, served well and capably and to the satisfaction of their employers, to summarily get a notice, a two-week notice to be told their employment is terminated, not to be told that there is a reason, not to be given an opportunity to discuss and not even to have any form of recommendation involved as saying you have served well but we no longer have a role for you or whatever. Just cut them off. To me that is inexcusable; that is not the way I would like to think governments — or human beings — function with others and I do think that that kind of arrogance and that kind of cruelty is something for which this government is responsible and all the members opposite and two of the members on this side of the House who sit at

the centre aisle are inexcusably involved in condoning that kind of activity.

Mr. Speaker, I want to comment just for a moment on the Finance Department. I am pleased that the Minister of Finance, in his discussion of tax reductions, indicated that it was not a decision of this government which affected the major reduction in income tax which will take place in 1978. I did not hear him comment on the principle of indexing which is built into the federal income tax scheme whereby taxes are reduced or rather exemptions are increased by the extent of the cost of living increase. And that, Mr. Speaker, was a principle adopted by the federal government with which the former government of Manitoba took issue because just as the individual is affected by inflation, so indeed is the government or any large agency which has costs that are related to inflation and costs that are related to cost-price increases and therefore which needs the additional revenue. Actually, it

is a great loss to the government in that it is less able to cope with the responsibilities that are assigned to it. The Minister of Finance did not refer to it; I'm sorry we don't really know his reaction to the indexing at the national level but I do give him credit for not trying to take credit for a reduction over which the government had no control. I would have liked to have thought that he would have recognized the danger inherent in reduced income at a time of increasing price.

I must point out that I am seriously concerned that the government's position in reducing taxation is such as to indicate to the world that it is reducing income and creating a deficit at a time when it must go out and keep its credit standing at the high level which was left to it by the New Democratic government. I am concerned by the fact that the government has made no effort whatsoever to tell the truth to its creditors about the good financial position in which this government finds itself vis-à-vis so many other governments who are borrowers on the world market. I think it's damaging and I think the government will have to catch up to its responsibility. To hear Conservative members when they were in opposition enlarge and exaggerate the deficit position or any other attack on the financial structure is not surprising but nevertheless should be noted I was glad to hear the Minister of Industry and Commerce admit that the former statements by the Conservatives about say a \$40 million loss on Flyer Industries, a statement repeated by the two newspapers of this province again and again, were finally accepted by the Minister of Industry and Commerce as being false and he definitely after awhile — it took some prompting — for him to admit that the loss could not be named at higher than the \$16 million which was recognized by the former government.

I give him credit for that but at the same token, I say he does damage to his own cause and to that of the government of the people of Manitoba when he talks in terms of all the billions of dollars that were lost by the move out of Manitoba. I gather that he admitted that he had no substantiation for that figure. That's the impression I have. At first he talked as if there was some kind of a document which was available to the former Minister of Industry and Commerce which would support that statement but I gather now he's backed away from that and although he has still, I believe, failed to produce the document he referred to and although I now have a feeling that he is not going to produce that document either, yet he is on record as having made a statement about the monies which have left the province which he cannot substantiate and I believe it is his responsibility to do so. Until he does, I think that that will fall into the same category as that of the Honourable Member for Roblin who made exaggerated and false statements at the last session and has not supported or been prepared to stand up and give us the information, proof of either what he said or an apology for having misled us.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): On a point of personal privilege, I told the honourable member the other day when the Minister of Agriculture tables my order for return, I'll bring the Hydro Report.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, do you notice how cutely the Member for Roblin is waffling on his promise. He made a pledge to the legislature that he would do an act and now in order not to do it, he is blaming his seat mate who sits right in front of him in the second row who he says is failing to do something and until that is done, he will . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. First of all, I don't believe the Member for Roblin had a point of privilege at all. Points of privilege are very rare in this House and I think the debate between the Member for Roblin and the Member for St. Johns could probably be solved better outside the House but let the Member for St. Johns proceed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to challenge your decision or question it, but I believe the Honourable Member for Roblin did have a point of privilege, and every time I make the statement I'm going to, I think that he should rise and either make his weak excuse or he should produce. But until he does, if he feels offended by what I say — I think he's got a point of privilege — I welcome his contribution that he makes, because I've given up hope of his making the contribution that he undertook to make by honouring his word and standing up in order to maintain his integrity in the eyes of the opposition. Mr. Speaker, I must say that this debate that you say we are having should be outside of the House. Indeed not, Mr. Speaker, I think it belongs in this House because his pledge was made in this House as a result of the misstatement — which I believe is a misstatement — he made in this House with the intention of misleading the people of Manitoba, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would deplore the debate that might take place out of this House when the member should feel accountable to the members of this legislature and to this honourable institution of parliament. I think he's abused it and that's why I have referred to it. He will probably do it again and again, Mr.

Speaker. — (Interjection) — Would you repeat that?

MR. ENNS: Besides he's got thirty pounds on you Saul.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, that's true, he's much younger and bigger than I am and I recognize that.

Mr. Speaker, I'm glad the Attorney-General is in the Chamber. I've been watching to see if my select five are in the Chamber at any time when I might rise to speak, and I finally gave up hope and stood to speak knowing that my select five were not here — select six I should say — and then the Honourable Attorney-General appeared and I welcome him because I want to direct myself to some specific remarks dealing with the marital property laws which are being debated under bills.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General and his leader have been involved in some discussions about marital property laws outside of this House, and have made statements, or have not made statements, have discussed, or have not discussed, but are reported as having discussed various aspects of the principles of the laws without giving an opportunity to members of this House to hear their opinions, limited as they may be. There are various comments attributed to both the Attorney-General and to the Premier of this province relating to their attitudes in various respects. The Minister the Attorney-General has made statements such as: "The government believes in the sharing of property between spouses to a marriage," but yet he is reported outside of the House as having been less than prepared to extend that sharing principle to commercial assets. I don't know if that's true, but that's the way it was reported. The Premier the First Minister has said nothing within the House of any moment in regard to the principles involved, but is reported out of the House to have made certain statements challenging some basic concepts. And therefore, I think that it is morally incumbent on the Honourable the Attorney-General, on the First Minister to become involved in making some assurances of their concepts and principles and intent to the people of Manitoba. I don't suppose they owe us, on this side, any obligation to tell us what they believe, but I think they owe the obligation to the people of Manitoba, especially since these issues were never part of a provincial election campaign. And I don't know that the Honourable the Attorney-General ever made a statement during the election campaign as to what would be his intentions if he formed part of government's side.

I don't believe that the Honourable the First Minister made any statements on the election trail, yet we find that they come rushing in here, by way of a special session — so-called special session — special only in that they don't have to pass the estimates, and to that extent they are much better off than we were when we formed the government, but they call a session with a limited number of bills, and come rushing in with this one in particular, in order to stop what already been passed. That's a very drastic action they're taking, but having taken it they have the arrogance to refuse to say to the people of Manitoba: "We are delaying the proclamation of a law which was passed after much debate, we want to do some corrective features to the draftmanship, but they don't commit themselves on any of the principles involved. I think that's an affront to the House, but as I said, they're not really required to bring us into their confidence, but certainly to the people of Manitoba.

I wanted also to address myself now to the honourable members of the Conservative party who voted in favour of the Marital Property Act. We know who they are, but let's just put it on record — the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Health, the Minister without Portfolio responsible for staff and program reductions, the Member for Crescentwood, and the Member for Wolseley. Now they voted in favour of this Act, and have we heard from them? Now, Mr. Speaker, I've been out of the House from time to time but I've been careful to find out who has spoken while I was out. I find the Minister of Finance has been silent, the Minister of Health has been silent — oh, he said that he might listen to some delegations but he's been silent in the House on the issue — the Minister without Portfolio to whom I referred to has been silent on this issue, the Member for Crescentwood and the Member for Wolseley have been equally silent.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they never really made it clear why they voted in favour of this Marital Property Act in the first place. As a matter of fact, if you recall, the Minister of Health when he spoke as representing the Conservative party and attacked the bill bitterly, that when I made comment that I was surprised because he seemed highly sympathetic to the bill, he rose in outraged dignity and said: "Wait for the vote." And sure enough when the vote came he voted with us, but he never explained what his problem was or why it was that he obviously accepted the principles in the bill. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have five members of the Conservative party who voted for the Marital Property Act, we have the entire New Democratic Party that voted in favour of it, we had the entire Liberal Party voting in favour of it, and today we have the New Democratic Party, the Liberal caucus in support of continuing the Marital Property Act and the five members opposite who have been re-elected on their record and who voted for it, have not said one word in this House about it. And the Attorney-General has said nothing but a general statement: "We believe in the principle of equality of sharing." Do you know, Mr. Speaker, do you remember? Kenny Houston is in favour of that too, he said. Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, the suggestion was made that all that has to be done to take care of the Murdoch case, is to put into the Marital Property Act the statement that there shall be a presumption of equal rights to share, And if that were done that's all that would have to happen. That was the comment that had been made during our extensive study of the Marital Property Act. Is that what that government means when they say they believe in equal sharing? Are they so ashamed to state their objectives that they will leave it to the people of Manitoba to be concerned about what they really mean when all we've heard — I think the Honourable the First Minister made that kind of a statement — all you have to do is to tell the courts that we believe there should be a presumption of equal

sharing and then let things happen. Because, Mr. Speaker, one of the members opposite has said that after all, maybe the wife should get more than half and we have to make it possible for the wife to get more than half.

Mr. Speaker, we provided for judicial discretion, but we knew from the long history of the law and the jurisprudence built up on the marital property sharing that the courts were not prepared to recognize work at home as being equal to work out in the field, to recognize that the person who brings in the dollars is no less entitled to share in the family accumulation than the person who stays in the home — looks after the home, looks after the children, and looks after the maintenance of the entire family. Now that's not the kind of statement that we've heard from the Honourable the Attorney-General. Indeed we've heard so little from him that I want to encourage him — no, I want to beg him, I want to entreat him, implore him to speak on behalf of his party and to tell us what they believe. Mr. Speaker, he was right on one occasion to suggest that as a member of the Treasury Bench, he should not be giving his own opinion because he was bound by the opinion of the Treasury. I recognize that, there's nothing wrong with stating his own opinion, but if it's so vastly different to that of the rest of the members of his Cabinet or caucus, I can understand his embarrassment in not wanting to state his personal opinion. So, he is the Attorney-General, he is responsible for the bill that we will be debating in the next few days, and I believe that he has a responsibility to the people of Manitoba to state precisely which of the principles that have been studied over the many years are those that he endorses, a which he is not prepared to endorse. So we'll find out, but he alone is not enough, Mr. Speaker. His leader ought to get up and make some specific statements rather than talk about dog's breakfast and talk about unworkable laws, to talk about the principle.

If the people of Manitoba had reason to have faith in the government's attitude on the principles, then the people of Manitoba could rest much easier to know that all they're doing is the patching that they think is necessary. And the Member for Fort Rouge made statements suggesting that he would feel better, and he believes others in Manitoba would feel better if there was an undertaking that by — I think he said July 1st next — there would be a proclamation of the Act, as amended, but still an undertaking to proclaim proclaim, something that this government has not yet had the courtesy or the intellectual integrity to do. Instead they said, when we're good and ready we'll do it. And, if I quote the Attorney-General properly, I think he said "hopefully" in 1978.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there's a great difference between hopefully and a commitment to act, and I deplore that, because, Mr. Speaker, draftsmanship does not take much time if people are only correcting what they consider poor draftsmanship. I will go into that when I speak on the ct itself.

But let me use my time on the Throne Speech to not only plead with he Honourable the Attorney-General to deal with it, not only beg him to do it, but beg him to do it before the matter is closed on second reading. It is very easy, and I've been in that position, to sit back and wait till every person in the House has had his say, and then you get up, and then you make the speech you want to make, whether you want to respond to what was said or not. That is a little too easy, and I don't like the Attorney-General to have the opportunity to ignore what has been said to him in this last week on the Marital Property Act, what will be said. There are ways whereby he could state his opinion and make his commitments in advance of the closing of debate, so that what he says would still be subject to review and assessment by us on this side. He may yet speak today. He has the right, as he had in that peculiar and I think, discreditable way, that was tried — was it last Thursday, or last Monday, a week ago — when they tried to get the Attorney-General ty opportunity denied to him by this House to introduce his bill. And he knew very well, he couldn't have been that much of a neophyte in this room not to know that he could have said all he wanted to say, between the day the Throne Speech motion was moved and that Monday evening. He did not take advantage of the opportunity, but rather he and certain other members opposite cried crocodile tears that they didn't have the opportunity — (Interjection) — the Minister of Public Works is saying it again, do you see the crocodile tears across the way, Mr. Spaker? — (Interjection) — Didn't give us a chance! They had the chance before, they have the chance since, and they have not taken advantage of it, so their efforts to speak on that one occasion was to me, farcical. And I urge, and I challenge, the Honourable he Attorney-General, to get up and speak and state his opinion and state his commitment to one of the basic principles that have been announced here.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge him, but I do not by any means, not equally challenge the five members who voted in favour of the Marital Property Act, and I equally challenge the new members who never had an opportunity to express tyr opinions, their dedications, their beliefs at all on this question, to get up and speak on it, so we know where you stand so you know whether or not you believe in some of the principles or not. And we don't know, and we may not know, until you get orders from the Cabinet in the next session of the House, if the government decides to bring it in. That, Mr. Speaker, would be an awful pity. And, we do have a member of the Legislature who should feel that she is part of the large group of Manitoba citizens who have been at a disadvantage in our society throughout all their years.

MR. EINARSON: You're jealous Saul.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm not jealous, I'm only jealous of those members opposite who have the opportunity to share a caucus room with a member of qat they call the fair sex. To that extent, yes, but I would say that I would like to hear from her, I would like to hear what is her opinion on the vinciple of

the marital property law. You know, Mr. Speaker, I haven't even heard from the Minister of Public Works as to his beliefs of these principles this time. Of course he makes many of his . . . no I was going to make a snide remark, but it's not true. I think that when he gets up and makes a speech on it's usually worth listening to, and I would like to hear him speak on this issue, but with a sense of accepting the challenge to speak on specifics.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Rouge suggested a deadline by which the government would commit itself. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk suggested certain concepts or principles which he read from an article or a brief. I jotted down some principles on which I would like to know the commitments of members opposite and I intend now to close my remarks by reading them, and it is an outright challenge to the Honourable the Attorney-General, to the members of the backbench, to the members who voted for the Marital Property Act, to respond and give an indication of commitment, and if I had a promise of commitment in favour of some of these principles I would certainly think that there is a hope for so many of the people of Manitoba who have been disadvantaged over so many years. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether the government or members of the Conservative caucus or the Attorney-General are prepared to commit themselves in the principle that property acquired by either spouse during their marriage other than the exceptions already in the Act, are shareable equally. I'd like to know that. I'd like to know whether title to the family home and family assets, as defined in the Act, should vest immediately. Should they have equal rights to the ownership of those properties which are used as part of the marital arrangement, the furniture in the house, the family automobile?

I'd like to know — and I direct that specifically to the Honourable the Attorney-General — does he accept or does he not accept that the commercial assets as defined in the Act shall be shareable equally on separation? Let me indicate, Mr. Speaker. You may recall this in committee debates, Mr. Speaker. I believe that assets accumulated for investment purposes for the family ought to be considered family assets. I think that if a family over 20, 30 years has accumulated a bank account or real estate which is out for investment purposes, for rental purposes, should be owned by both members of the family and both should have say in the disposition of it. I really don't believe that they ought to be commercial assets but I accept it. The discussions we had — and you were part of them, Mr. Speaker — that they should be considered commercial assets, but I cannot accept the thought that those life savings of a family remain in the control of one of the members only and not of both. I would like to know whether the commercial assets of that kind should be recognized as being shareable equally. I would like to know whether the Honourable the Attorney-General who is responsible for these bills believes that there should be this protection offered in the event of dissipation of assets as referred to in the Act. I'd like to know whether he agrees that there should be variation in the right of ownership only by mutual consent or by discretion of the court. Those two, either mutual consent or the court's discretion, but that there should be variation available only in that way and not unilaterally. I'd like to know — and I make the point — that not only does the Act provide for a mutual opting-out agreement, but it also gives the court the opportunity to intervene and to create a difference from the principle, a variation from the principle of equal sharing. Is that not enough? Must there be unilateral rights?

And I would ask the Attorney-General if he recognizes that the court's discretion, which is built right into the Act and is exercisable by the court, should not continue to be exercised only under exceptional circumstances or does he really want to open up the judicial discretion all the way back to the Middle Ages. I think he ought to tell us what he thinks about that.

And in relation to the Family Maintenance Act, do the Progressive Conservatives believe that the responsibility of mutual support exists as it is set out in the Act and, if they do, why don't they say so? Do they believe that a spouse should be entitled to information of the other spouse's earnings and assets? Do they believe that a husband should have the right to know what his wife earns or the wife know what the husband earns? Do they believe it well, if they do, why don't they say so?

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know — and this is basic, basic — do they believe in the principle of a couple being entitled to a separation order or a member of a family to be entitled to a separation order without having to prove fault of the other? Is it necessary in their minds to drag the parties into court to lay accusing challenges against each other when it is clear that there is no future for that couple, that there is no way in which they are going to be able to continue to live together, is it really necessary in the minds of Progressive Conservatives that they do go into court and they do drag the "dirty linen" as the expression is made in order to prove fault?

And do they approve of the law which they are trying to reinstate, the Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act, do they really believe that a wife should only be entitled to support if her husband beats her or if her husband is guilty of persistent cruelty to her or if her husband refuses to support her? Is that the only occasion when she is entitled to support? Do they believe that the husband should be entitled to commit adultery without the obligation of support but that the wife is not entitled to support because of an act of adultery? Do they believe in these archaic laws because, Mr. Speaker, they are intending to reinstate them without a promise to remove them. I think members opposite ought to state their commitment on these principles and now. Mr. Speaker, do they believe that spouses' support shall be based on need in accordance with the principles set out in the Act? Because, Mr. Speaker, we do. We don't believe that a person should be able to just ride easily along on the support of the other spouse without making some effort to become financially independent of the other and, at the same time, should not be penalized by some arbitrary way when there is a need for that kind of support. Do they believe — and there is judicial discretion in the act now — that the judicial discretion to vary from the principle of support based on need should be limited in some way

Monday, December 5, 1977

as in the Act and, if not fully as in the Act, then to what extent should it be limited? These are basic principles that have nothing whatsoever to do with the draftsmanship. The point I make, Mr. Speaker, is that they have an excuse that the draftsmanship is poor and I say, if that's your excuse, stand up and say that you agree with the principles we have enunciated so that we know we are debating legislative draftsmanship and not basic principles. I don't mind debating basic principles but don't try to mislead the people of Manitoba that all you're concerned with was with cleaning up the Act.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by pointing out to them — and I will at greater length on another occasion — that they are the ones who show little faith in the judicial process. The jurisprudence dealing with marital property law has continued over many years. The laws we know have been developed through the common-law process. The principle we all have accepted, that through the development of consideration by the courts, by the judges, of the application of laws, a complete jurisprudence has been built upon how the law should be applied and they are the ones who are showing a complete lack of confidence in the courts to build up the jurisprudence based on new principles. The new principles are the ones that I have enunciated and I challenge any self-respecting member of the Progressive Conservative Party to make his stand clear before we vote on the backward step of pulling back on the bills and before we revert to an archaic law. They owe it, I think to themselves and to Manitobans, to know how they stand on the principles and if they are with us in principle, we should be able to work out the legislative problems.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Pembina, the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to start but I wonder if you would consider calling it 5:30?

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreeable with the House to call it 5:30? (Agreed) Therefore, I'll be leaving the Chair to return to the House at 8 o'clock tonight.