



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. 4**

**10:00 a.m. Tuesday, November 29, 1977**

**THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY of MANITOBA**  
**Tuesday, November 29, 1977**

**TIME:** 10:00 a.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Harry E. Graham(Birtle-Russell):** Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS**

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

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK(Riel):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a short statement regarding Manitoba income taxation. Mr. Speaker, the personal income tax rate in Manitoba at 56 percent is among the highest in Canada and the same is true of the rates of tax on corporations— 13 percent for small business and 15 percent for large business as defined under the Federal Income Tax Act. This new government has already begun the process of tax reduction through a series of expenditure restraint measures and through the elimination of succession duties, gift taxes and mineral acreage taxes. I now wish to announce further reductions to encourage private spending and investment and thus add impetus to economic expansion in our province.

First, effective January 1, the Manitoba personal income tax rate will be reduced from 56 percent to 54 percent. This 2.0 basic rate reduction represents approximately \$13.6 million and the indexing related increase in cost of living tax credit benefits a further \$2.5 million. The cost of living tax credit increase does not affect 1978-79 revenues but occurs upon filing the 1978 tax return.

On the corporation side, our government believes that the first priority must be to reduce taxes for small businesses. We also propose then a 2.0 or 15 percent reduction in the rate applicable to small business in Manitoba effective January 1 and setting then the rate at 11 percent. This rate reduction will bring our rate to the same level as Alberta's, the lowest in Western Canada. Since approximately 80 percent of the businesses in Manitoba are defined as small under current income tax definitions, it is clear that this reduction will have a beneficial impact on one of the most important segments of our economy. The lowering of the small business income tax rate is expected to reduce corporation income tax revenues by around \$2.6 million next year.

In accordance with our tax collection agreement with the federal government, legislation to effect both the personal and corporation income tax cuts announced here will be introduced at the regular spring session of this legislature. The purpose in announcing the changes at this time is to facilitate the printing of the appropriate forms by the federal government for 1978 distribution.

Mr. Speaker, I have passed out a set of comparative tables to accompany this statement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. SAUL A. MILLER:** Thankyou, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I just received the copy of the statement issued by the Minister of Finance. It comes as no surprise because certainly this is one of the key planks in the Conservative campaign. I would want to point out, however, that in fact Manitoba's total tax impact on people is amongst the lowest in Canada and has been amongst the lowest in Canada. When you take the entire tax impact into account and the tax credit system which we introduced which made for a more equitable tax impost, the taxes in Manitoba, I know and they know, are, in fact, amongst the lowest in Canada. By this step they are simply, as I say, honouring a pledge that they've made. Whether, in fact, it will benefit the majority of Manitobans, I very seriously question. I don't doubt that the lowering of the tax rates from 56 to 54 will mean something to some people, mostly in the higher income brackets. Those, let's say in 20,000, assuming they are a typical married tax filer with two dependents, at the \$20,000 income level he'll save all of perhaps \$29.00 a year. It's a great saving. On the other hand somebody in the same size family with a \$75,000 income will save about \$265 or perhaps double that. So you see, Mr. Speaker, this is a reduction that I suggest to you is a reduction on the personal side benefiting the highest income people in Manitoba. Only time, of course, will tell whether, in fact, they will retain those aspects of our taxes which we felt made it the most equitable in Canada, which did, in fact, redistribute income and make it possible for people in lower incomes to benefit most through our property tax credit system and through our cost of living tax credit system. Only time will tell whether they'll continue that aspect as well' because if they don't then Manitoba will move from being a fair tax province to a tax province which favours the favoured few.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

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

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement just made by the Minister of Finance regarding the reduction in personal income tax rates and corporate income tax rates and considering the government's great desire for a balanced budget etcetera, in elimination of deficits, can he advise the House whether he is now contemplating either an elimination or a downward revision of the property tax rebate system.

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

**MR. CRAIK:** The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no. We plan no reductions in announcing this in the property tax rebate. We plan no increases in the sales tax, as a matter of fact whether it's this session or next session we will probably make some announcements regarding changes, albeit minor changes in the Sales tax Act to clear up some of the contradictions and nuisance aspects of the sales tax as well.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a supplementary question.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to hear the Minister of Finance say that he is not contemplating any changes, downward revisions of the property tax rebate system because it seems to me that for some number of sessions he stated the contrary, that he didn't believe in that. However, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask him about a parallel tax relief system that the New Democratic Party government brought in, a very progressive system, and that is the cost of living tax credit system. And again that's related and I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister of Finance whether he has any plans or intentions or thoughts of eliminating the cost of living tax credit system.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Brandon East had listened to the press statement or to the statement I just read to him he would see that there is an amount tagged on to the increase in the cost of living credits, in that statement.

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

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I didn't have the benefit of the written statement and I heard the reference to indexing and so on and the 2.5 million, I heard the 13.6 and I heard the 2.5 but I'm not — I'm talking, Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order 8 please . . . order please.

**HON. WARNER JORGENSON (Morris):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the Member for Kildonan is just gnashing his teeth in anguish over the kind of questions that are being asked from that side of the house. Now the honourable member knows full well and indeed, when he was on this side of the House he insisted that when a member rises on that side during this period of our deliberations that he asks a question and not makes a speech as the honourable member is attempting to do now. According to our rules the question must be asked without any prefacing. That was the rule that was insisted on by the Member for Kildonan. I wonder why honourable gentlemen opposite now do not want to insist on that kind of questioning.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East on a point of order.

**MR. EVANS:** On that same point of order, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the honourable member is quite correct in his observations but I can only say that I've sat on that side of the House for eight years and I learned some lessons from that honourable member, the Minister without portfolio, III, but as a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, I'm still not clear and I'd like the people of Manitoba to be clear whether or not you are going to eliminate what is referred to as the cost of living tax credit system as a tax relief system apart from any reference to the personal income tax — these are two different things that we're talking about, I believe. And that's what I'd like to know and that's what the people of Manitoba would like to know.

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

**MR. CRAIK:** For the second time, Mr. Speaker I'll answer the member's question, and that is, read the press release. Read the statement that was read to you in this House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct some figures I gave — I wouldn't want them to appear incorrectly in Hansard. The reduction from 56 to 54, I indicated would represent \$29 per annum on a gross income of \$20,000 — that should be \$58 per annum on a gross income of \$20,000, and instead of a savings per year of \$265 on a gross income of \$75,000, it's a tax saving of \$330, so the comparative benefits at \$58 to the \$20,000 earner and \$330 to the \$75,000 earner.

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

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister responsible for housing. In the latest Central Mortgage and Housing report released for the end of October, it's indicated that only 872 public housing units have been started in this province since the beginning of 1977, which is substantially less than half the number of units that the previous government indicated would be built. I wonder if the Minister of Housing could indicate whether, in fact, that substantial decline will continue in the next two months of 1977, and if this is a product of direct government policy, or does he have any plans of correcting this serious shortfall?

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

**HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek):** To answer the member's question, Mr. Speaker, the reason for the shortfall of starts in public housing or family housing in Manitoba this year is the ones that are being presently built, that you speak of, were part of the 1976-1977 program, which has been continued through 1977. We worked with a difference of CMHC year ending being calendar, our year ending being March. The reason for the 1977-78 program not being under way is the previous minister did not submit a program to Management Committee to be approved and to be put in effect as it usually was. It was the previous government's formula to present the program to Management Committee, to see that it was within the terms of the budget or moneys brought down. That program was not officially submitted when I took office. We're working very hard, very hard, to hit the deadline of tomorrow's CMHC when the programs must be in to be approved, and after that time, I think I'll be in a better position to announce the numbers to you.

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

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Yes, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate that because of the fact that Central Mortgage and Housing works on a calendar year budget system, that the shortfall in housing, or the lack of application, will mean that substantial amounts of money will be returned to the federal government that otherwise would be used for housing in the province of Manitoba in 1977?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Not necessarily. Not necessarily.

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

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Yes. Mr. Speaker, when the minister says "not necessarily" could he indicate then that in the month that we have left to us, which is the CMHC calendar year — something better than thirty days — can he give us some indication of how many applications Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation intends to submit in order to make proper use of the allocated federal capital funds for public housing in this province?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Approximately forty — we don't know whether they'll all be approved or not. Forty projects.

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

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY:** My question is directed to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General assure this House that proceedings are continuing in order to place Alexander Kasser on trial in Austria or to obtain his return to Manitoba?

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

**HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne):** Yes.

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

**MR. SAM USKIW:** I'd like to ask the Minister of Finance whether it is that they are anticipating an increase in the deficit for the next fiscal year with this latest announcement, or whether they expect to raise revenues by other methods?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I'll be able to give the members, I trust, an answer to that approximately March of 1978.

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

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister in charge of the environment whether he's had an opportunity to look into the question that I put to him yesterday and, if not, would he give us an answer this afternoon?

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

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM' Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management (Souris-Killarney):** Mr. Speaker, I believe that the problem that the honourable member refers to had to do with contamination of wells in the East Selkirk area. I am informed that there were four possible sources of contamination there, that the most probable one is private sewage systems, but investigations are still under way at this time.

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

**MR. USKIW:** I have a supplementary. Mr. Speaker, is it true, Mr. Speaker, that effluent flowing from Right Angle Farms contained very large amounts of cauliflower into the drainage ditch that flows into an aquifer?

**MR. RANSOM:** I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that monitoring of the situation is continuing, but that my advisers believe that the private sewage systems are the most likely source of contamination, but the issue has not been settled completely yet.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, on a final supplementary.

**MR. USKIW:** A supplementary Mr. Speaker, the honourable minister, assure me that there is no contamination from Right Angle Farms? Can he give me a definite answer that there is not contamination from that farm?

**MR. RANSOM:** No, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I'm sorry, the Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. WILSON PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the First Minister. Is he aware that it was the Coalition on Family Law that organized last night's demonstration in front of the Legislature' and is he aware that those participating in last night's demonstration included — this is a question — did he know then, Sir' did he know those included in the demonstration were the Winnipeg Council of Self-Help groups, the Committee for Women Artists, the Manitoba Association of Social Workers, the Women's Institute of Manitoba, the Federal Advisory Council on the Status of Women, the Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women, the Manitoba Association of Women and the Law, the Voice of Women, the Canadian Congress of Women, United Nations Association, a Women's Place, Manitoba Teachers' Society, Women's Liberation, Manitoba Librarians' Association, National Council of Jewish Women, NDP Status of Women Committee, Liberal Association of Manitoba, the YWCA, the University Women's Club of Winnipeg' the Provincial Council of Manitoba, the Diocese of Rupertsland, Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses, Provincial Organization of Business and Professional Women's Clubs and the Junior League of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a Point of Order again. I did not want to interrupt the honourable member in his maiden speech in this Chamber, but I want to draw to your attention, Sir, that a question that supplies its own answer is not permitted on Orders of the Day.

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** I've waited for the First Minister to respond. He has not responded and therefore I don't think he is aware. Would he undertake to meet the coalition on Family Law immediately to find out who this group is and who is supporting it so that he will not make further misleading statements about who organized last night's demonstration and further mislead the public of Manitoba.

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

**HON. STERLING R. LYON (Premier)(Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to have the alleged information given by the Member for Transcona and I am sure — I think I was reported as saying outside of the House — that the NDP and a number of other well intended organizations organized last night's meeting. With respect to the second part of his question my colleague the Attorney-General I think has already made arrangements to meet with the coalition.

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

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Labour who is also responsible for the Civil Service Commission. I wish to ask this question, Mr. Speaker, through you to the minister. What is the present status of the former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission of Manitoba? Is this person still on salary to the provincial government?

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

**HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member for Logan<sup>81</sup> would like to inform him that he is still a member of the.

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

**MR. JENKINS:** I would like to then ask a supplementary question. Is the former member being informed of meetings and is he being paid a salary at this time?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the Member for Logan that he is being informed of the meetings. I don't know whether he's attending or not.

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, through you to the minister. The minister has not answered one question which is, is the member on salary? And if he is not on salary is it the intention of the minister to terminate him? And if so, is severance pay being considered?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, to the Member for Logan, he is on a per diem rate.

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

**MR. SAM USKIW:** Mr. Speaker I would like to ask the Premier whether he has had an opportunity to read the legal contract between the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation and its lessees under the Land Lease Program.

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, there were a number of contracts entered into by the MACC and the lessees. To the best of my knowledge I haven't read one of them recently, I read one of them a year or so ago.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to then ask the Premier how it is that he indicated on a Points West TV program that the contracts other than since last year did not contain a provision for the lessee to purchase the land, if he hasn't read the contract?

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

**MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Finance. In view of his statement this morning, I apologize for missing the first part of his statement but I would like to know if he can assure the House . . . I would like to know, Sir, . . . well, the Minister of Health is getting into the act, but my question is for the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. If he could assure the House that no reduction will occur to the municipalities on the sharing of the income tax by reason of this reduction of 2 percent.

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps again to underline — the purpose of the announcement at this time is to facilitate the requirement to have the forms prepared by the federal government which come out for payroll deductions in 1978. As far as replying to all the effects of the income tax reduction, the member will have to wait until the budget is prepared for the next session of the legislature. But to answer him indirectly,

because I can't give him a direct answer on all these things, it is not the intent in making this announcement to have an impact on other revenue sources. The intent of the announcement is to indicate that the government is carrying through with its undertaking that it has given the people of Manitoba that it intends to, in its estimation, spur the economy with the tools that this government feels are the most effective way of doing that and that's the reason for the announcement at this time — it's a technical one — but the purpose for the tax changes is intended to spur the economy, it is not intended to change the taxation levels or revenues of other sources.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Has the Member for Ste. Rose a point of order?

**MR. ADAM:** My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is I have asked the Minister of Finance a very simple question: whether there would be any reduction in the share allocated to the municipality under the

income tax sharing percentage and he rises to make a speech in its place. I just want yes or no and not a speech.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I point out to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose that the purpose of the question period is for members to ask questions. Ministers may, if they so desire, answer. Now, the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether in the spirit of a free Manitoba whether it is possible for producers producing products that are controlled by marketing boards to increase their production today or whether it is his intention to make it possible tomorrow or when, or what changes he is anticipating to make it possible for anyone not to be shackled by those regulations as they have indicated they were during the last election campaign.

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

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, I believe in answer to that question that that gets pretty much under the area of policy and will be dealt with by the government.

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

**MR. USKIW:** Yes, a supplementary question. Can the minister assure me today that anyone wishing to enter production in any of those commodities may do so without regard to the quota limitations?

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

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health following on an answer he gave yesterday concerning Seven Oaks Hospital when he indicated that the government was undertaking a review or a reassessment of that particular project. Could he indicate whether in fact the construction that may have been initiated by the company in question has in fact also been halted while this review is going on?

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

**HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is no and I think the honourable member for raising the question because I think there was some misinterpretation of the exchange between us yesterday. Construction has not halted.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, in those circumstances then, can the minister explain how the review is going to take place while the construction is going on. Have they set certain terminal points for the construction company at which time they would cease construction if the review was in the negative or have they given any clear instruction to the company involved exactly what the limits of the work should be while this review is taking place?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, the government is in a position where it feels the decision is still available in option form although it can't be postponed too long. The pillings are in for the hospital, the hoarding is almost completed but no interior work of course is underway as yet pending completion of that stage; so the options are still open to the government to move in a conversion manner, a redesigned manner, a reapplication of the facility, those are all the things that are under review.

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

**MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that he has indicated today that there is a method by which you can prepare the way for retroactive legislation to take place next spring or even summer, would he explain to the taxpayers of Manitoba why he found it necessary to bring in legislation at this emergency special session in order to bring in legislation on gift tax, succession duty and mineral acreage which could have been done just as effectively by retroactive legislation next spring, with an announcement today as he has done with income tax? Could he explain that waste of taxpayers' money?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, with regard to the mineral acreage tax, at least, Mr. Speaker, it would have been necessary to make a rebate of the '77 collections had the legislation not been changed. The bills, as he probably recalls, go out towards the end of the year for the entire year and would normally have gone out I suppose in December or January for collection of '77 mineral taxes. If there'd been legislation passed next spring, that money would have had to be rebated which wouldn't have been an optimum way of handling the situation, therefore the legislation in that case was

brought in at this time.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** No, Mr. Speaker, I want the Minister of Finance to rest on his own answer. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Finance. In the expectation . . . well, I'd put it differently. Is he making preparations to do some borrowing on the market for the province of Manitoba and, in anticipation of that, would he indicate to the legislature how he is planning to overcome the exaggerated claims of his own leader regarding the deficit of the province and how is he going to explain to prospective lenders how it is that the province's credit will not be affected by the fact that facing a deficit and announcing an exaggerated deficit, the government is now announcing an indication of intentionally reducing the income of the province?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, working backwards on the member's questions, with regard to the deficit position of the province and so-called exaggerated statements, the statements that were put out were put out by the Provincial Auditor and were quoted directly by members of the government in the statement to the public. As far as moving back further than that into the question of borrowing, the primary borrowing that has been going — and the last was during the time between October 11th and 24th when his side of the House was still in the reigns of government, the last one was European borrowing and that's the last borrowing that was undertaken by the province of Manitoba. I expect that there will be some further borrowing, primarily with regard to continuing the obligations to the Crown corporations, specifically Manitoba Hydro. When that takes place, it will be announced.

**MR. CHERNIAK:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance. Does he state that the Provincial Auditor has given figures of per capita debts in the province and well in excess of \$3,000 each, or is that, indeed, a statement made by his own leader on the election campaign platforms?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, the amount of three billion, four hundred and some million dollars is contained in the statement which was mailed out to the Member for St. Johns, along with all the other members of the Legislature, and along with Public Accounts.

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

**MR. RON McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the minister responsible for the health and safety in the question workplace legislation. I wonder if the minister could tell us if the Mining Safety Conference originally scheduled for last week, if that's been rescheduled, and if so, when.

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

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform you that the Mining Safety Conference has been rescheduled for February 1st through the 3rd.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could tell us which government ministers will be attending this conference.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable — has the member another question?

**MR. McBRYDE:** I guess I'd better have, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister tell us how many fatal accidents have occurred in the mining industry in Manitoba over the past year?

**MRS. PRICE:** Could you repeat the question, please? I didn't hear you on the first one, either.

**MR. McBRYDE:** The first question I asked was which of the government ministers are going to be attending the Mining Safety Seminar?

**MRS. PRICE:** The meeting was just rescheduled yesterday, but to date, as far as I know, I and my deputy minister will be going, and I don't know other than that. As I say, it was just rescheduled yesterday.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister has the information as to how many fatal accidents have occurred in the mining industry in Manitoba this year.

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



**MR. PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Finance Minister. I just wanted to clarify this — he just told my honourable colleague from St. Johns that the auditor put out this interim statement. Is that correct? Did he or other members of the government give any instructions to the auditor with regard to format of this statement or substance?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, in reply to the member's question, the auditor's statement was to the September 30th, 1977 cut-off date, and I think the member knows that if he reads the information that was supplied to him. It was distributed to the members of the Legislature in advance of the public announcement. The projections to the end of the current year, March 31, 1978, are the projections from the end of September. The remaining six months of the year naturally can't audited because an auditor is an after-the-fact audit, so the projections from September 30th on to the end of the year are produced by the Department of Finance, and the reply to the question I gave, the last question of the member for St. Johns, he'll find that the figure is contained about four pages back in this booklet that was distributed to him, and again the exact amount of the per capita, gross per capita, debt, as I've said, was 3,470 billion, etc., working out to an approximate per capita debt of \$3,434 per man, woman, and child in Manitoba.

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** Yes, I'll repeat my first question, Mr. Speaker, because the Finance Minister didn't answer it. I asked him if he, or any other members of the government, gave any instructions to the auditor with respect to format or substance.

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I think as a person who has spent a good deal of his life working in the government, that the Member for Transcona knows that nobody instructs the Auditor of Manitoba what to do.

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** Well, then, as the interesting thing and I'll wait for the Public Accounts Committee but I'll ask him to ask the Auditor whether, in fact, he instructed the Auditor to present a statement which bears no relationship on the first pages to the statements that he has presented to the House in the past, with respect to format.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, my reply to him is that he has the full right as a member of the Legislature to speak directly to the Auditor and you will perhaps ask some of the senior colleagues on his side of the House that the Auditor is available to the members of the Legislature. If he wishes to query him on the procedures, he's quite welcome to do it.

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

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the First Minister with regard to air service. I would like to know whether the First Minister can tell us whether he or any of his colleagues have undertaken any efforts to bring about air service to the city of Brandon.

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, that is one of a number of unfinished items that my honourable friends left, along with a tremendous financial mess that we're looking at right now.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, in case the honourable First Minister is not aware, hearings are about to begin, in a matter of weeks. As a matter of fact, on January 16th the Air Transport Committee is to hear applications for air service to Brandon. My question is, inasmuch as the leader of the Conservative party during the campaign stated that he believed in first-class service, could he explain how he is going to bring about first-class service, meaning jet service, to the city of Brandon, because that was a promise he made to the people of Brandon, and I'd like him to tell us now how he's going to bring about first-class service to the city of Brandon.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I well remember the context of the particular comment. My honourable friend was suggesting he was satisfied with second-class service and coming from a second-class government we know why.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable First Minister is incorrect. We were talking about third-level air service — he doesn't know his technicalities. And he should talk to his colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Mr. Speaker, I and the people of the city of Brandon are not satisfied with your sarcastic, arrogant remarks. We want . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. I'll thank the Member

for Brandon East for finally recognizing the Chair. The next question is from the Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. BEN HANUSCHUK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the First Minister. Could he advise the House under what authority the Civil Service Commission is dealing with matters related to the termination of employment of three deputy ministers? Is it under some provision of the Act of which I'm unaware or pursuant to some directive from government?

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that my honourable friend will be unaware of many of the provisions of that act, but it is being dealt with by the Civil Service Commission.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Is he prepared at this time to provide me with an answer to the question which he took as notice on November 25th, page 16, dealing with the St. Boniface Family Court project?

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

**MR. MERCIER:** The answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the First Minister, in relation to the question asked by my colleague from Burrows. Yesterday he indicated that if we wanted answers maybe we should phone one of the former deputy ministers. I did that. I find out that the matter isn't routinely being handled by the Civil Service Commission . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. Order, please. If the Honourable Member for Transcona has a question I would ask him to ask it.

**MR. PARASIUK:** The question is . . . routinely handled by the Civil Service Commission? Since no one has wound up the First Minister so that he could answer the questions or plug in the tape recorder I would like to tell him that I phoned up the person yesterday and it's been back in the Executive Council and left there.

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

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I would like him to advise us of exactly what industries the various investors that he's spoken to recently are particularly interested in. In the Tribune of Friday, November 18th, the Minister is quoted as saying: "That private individuals with millions of dollars has spoken to the provincial government about investing in Manitoba because the business climate has changed." I wonder if the honourable member could explain what industry specifically these people are interested in?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas. Has the Member for Brandon East a supplementary question?

**MR. EVANS:** I have a supplementary question to the first one that was not answered. I would like to know then, what is the source of this capital supply that is coming into free Manitoba? It said in this article that the minister did not name companies or individuals with private investment capital, but said that they "came from islands which are tax shelters in countries whose citizens are buying Canadian farmland." Could he please advise the House now exactly where this money is coming from and how it may be utilized? Is it just simply to buy Canadian or Manitoba farmland?

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

**HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye):** First of all, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the Member for Brandon East, I will make announcements when I have announcements to make, and furthermore that I have indicated and it is common knowledge in many of the business communities in the province of Manitoba that the climate has changed. There are people once again looking actively at investing in Manitoba and if the member would check his own figures that the department had provided to him in the last number of years about the declining investment in this province he would have realized and acted on some of them.

**A MEMBER:** Right.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. Order, please. I want to inform the House that there is only about one minute left in the question period. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** A supplementary then. I again relate to his statement that they come from islands which are tax shelters. Is he therefore suggesting in his encouragement of investment capital in this province that he is about to suggest to his colleagues or about to offer these would-be entrepreneurs that Manitoba would be a tax shelter for these people?

### ORDERS OF THE DAY — THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Pembins and the amendment thereto moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. At closing time last night the Honourable Member for St. Johns had 17 minutes left.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope the 17 minutes includes the time taken by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works during last night's debate, because Mr. Speaker, I think that you are going to have a difficult job in carrying out your functions when you have to deal with people such as the Honourable Minister of Public Works who you recall gave your predecessor a pretty hard time as well.

In the light of the problems that you are going to have, I do want to wish you well. I know that we have had exchanges between us which would indicate a lack of rapport in connection with policy and philosophy, but I do feel that you have been one of the most conscientious members in opposition and I believe you will be a conscientious person in the Chair. For that I want to try to support you in your efforts and urge you to be impartial as you intend to be, and I want to support you in that.

I want also to recognize the role that will be played by the Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member for Roblin. I would like to offer him the same co-operation that I offer you but I will have to withhold that until I find out whether or not he is prepared at long last to honour the commitment he gave to the last Legislature to produce certain . . .

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

**MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege. May I inform the Member for St. Johns that I will give that information as soon as the Minister of Agriculture gives me the Order of Return. It's been held up for some three years.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the House Leader hasn't got up and chastised the Honourable Member for Roblin for improperly rising and to indicate to him that if he cannot talk to his own colleague he has problems. But, Mr. Speaker, to find that he is now hiding behind some other matter in order not to reveal a foolish statement or a deliberate misrepresentation compounds the position in which he put himself last year.

Last year he — made the statement, Mr. Speaker, and you know I started out this morning in a complimentary way in offering a sense of co-operation to people put in your position and I don't withdraw it from you, Mr. Speaker, but by golly, Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Roblin is going to continue to deny his own promise — and I will remind you, Mr. Speaker, I think I have the page reference in Hansard, yes I do. Page 1622 on April 6th of last year, the Honourable Member for Roblin spoke and said that there was an increase in his Hydro bill from \$10.00 to \$50.00 implying that that was the normal rate increase which he was suffering. He was called on that. He promised to bring his bills, he did not do so. He had excuses then, he's looking for excuses now. He is not facing up to his obligations to be an honourable member of this House or a proper representative for the constituency which has sent him here.

Mr. Speaker, I must remind him again, and I will again, that he has made a promise to prove a statement which was so blatantly wrong and he is continuing to smile sweetly where he sits and to do nothing about it.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that the Member for Roblin has continued to indicate a lack of respect for this House and for his own integrity, I do want to welcome his colleagues who are new to this House. I have met very few of them. I'm looking forward to opportunities when we will meet on other occasions to get to know each other better because there can be a camaraderie in this House amongst people of different political motivation and one should start with an effort to try and understand each other and know each other and work together.

I want to wish well the predecessors of the new members in this House some of whom, of their own volition and others of the people's volition, are no longer with us. I think they have all served well and are entitled to be remembered in that respect.

I want also to welcome the new ministers, and when I say new I mean not only ministers who are newly on the job but also those who are thrown into the position of being members of the Treasury Branch without having had the experience in opposition. I want to indicate to them that they do have a difficult job. It will not be made easier in the House and it is one which they will have to learn as they

go along. I wish them good health in doing so.

I want also on my part to welcome the three new members to our caucus and in doing so not only to welcome the new members but to give tribute to the people whom they have replaced. The Member for Wellington has joined us replacing Phillip Peterson with whom I had the privilege to sit as an elected member back in 1950 and with whom I had a long-lasting and, for my part, a very enjoyable experience. The Member for Transcona whom I welcome as well, has replaced the former leader of this party under whom I served as deputy leader and for whom I have a great regard and who will certainly be missed in this Chamber although if one ever stops for a moment and lets the silence permit the reverberations of the echoes in this Chamber, one can still hear the former leader of the NDP, Russ Paulley, giving one of his speeches and I am sure many of us will reflect with nostalgia on it.

The Member for Churchill has joined us. He will be a real asset to our caucus but I have to say that he has replaced a person who has also shown a genuine interest in people, a concern about people and he will be missed. As mayor of Churchill, I suppose the treasury bench will be seeing him more often than we will because there is every indication already that the Conservative government is going to hamper the growth and development of various municipal entities and I know now that the mayor of Churchill, Mayor Les Osland, will not let things go by without a struggle.

I want also, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the mover and seconder of this motion. I must comment that the Member for St. Matthews who has shown such a great concern for senior citizens will soon be voting on legislation which will do everything but benefit the people for whom he has expressed such concern. The indication that we had this morning of the dropping of the income tax, which is the second most progressive tax I have ever run into, is something that we have all forecast and that the people of Manitoba did not really comprehend, I believe. The most progressive form of taxation I can think of is succession duty, the taxing of people who have done nothing to earn the money which they have inherited to which they fell heir without any effort on their parts. They didn't work for it; they didn't sweat for it; they didn't save for it; it is just a windfall that came to them and governments of the western countries have long recognized that an inheritance tax is the most justifiable and progressive taxation.

Now the second one is progressive income tax and how remarkable it is, Mr. Speaker, that we know that in the first session of the NDP government in 1969, we removed the invidious flat premium medicare tax and replaced it with an increase in the most progressive form of taxation and typically the Conservatives in their first opportunity are reversing that very process. It should be known, it should be recognized, that what we predicted would happen did just as it was predictable that the new Premier of this province would make arrogant statements about the gross debt and I can credit the Minister of Finance today for saying "gross debt" because he has learned already as his own leader must know that when you have self-sustaining debt, it is false to attempt to declare that as being a burden on people who are the normal taxpayers of this province.

I cannot help but commenting that the Question Period today, as yesterday, indicated an attitude on the part of government which will develop and grow and that is a disdain for the parliamentary function. To see some of the ministers sit back and not respond to questions and the leader of the government is the one who has shown the greatest arrogance in continuing to sit and to mouth responses in an insulting manner but not to reply honestly to a question which has been directed to him. I think that all of this is an indication of the next four years to come and all of the Throne Speech itself, and the legislation brought forward, is a clear indication of the allegiance and loyalty of the Progressive Conservative Party. Its concern is and will always be to those who are taking advantage of a social and economic and tax system to their own personal advantage and with the least concern for those who are not capable of fighting this battle that the free enterprisers have promoted so strongly.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is clearly something we have to debate in the future and I think it is clear that members on this side will do their best to draw to the attention of the government and indeed, and more important, to the people of Manitoba, of what it is that Conservatives really mean for the ordinary citizen. What it means so far is an increase in taxation; what it means so far is a benefit being given to the wealthy and to indicate it so strongly, we find that in a time when everyone knows that there is a reduction in income generally for all governments in Canada and for provincial governments in particular, that at such a time this government is now prepared to reduce the taxation of the wealthiest and in doing so, increase that burden of debt which was a great platform speech made constantly by the leader of the Conservative Party. Increasing the burden which he himself has decreed; increasing the burden on whom all of the taxpayers, when he divides the total debt by the number of taxpayers, clearly he is now increasing the taxation burden on people who are least capable of handling it. That is truly what the Member for St. Matthews has yet to learn that coming as he does from a district which represents people of lower than average income, he is now about to vote in favour of increasing the burden of taxation on them by reducing the burden of taxation on those who are best able to pay and that is what we have to realize is the proper philosophy and trend of the people in the Conservative Party.

Mr. Speaker, I want to comment again about the farce that took place last night when the government promoters, the Acting House Leader and the Premier attempted to indicate the frustration that they and the Attorney-General would have felt because they were asked to follow the proper procedure of this House. When they were asked to go by the rules, they indignantly cried copious tears that their poor Attorney-General wasn't given an opportunity to introduce his bill. Mr. Speaker, I pointed out last night that he may not have known because he is not expected to know the

rules and how to work with them well, but his colleagues and especially the minister who sits immediately on his left, knew very well that the Attorney-General had every opportunity yesterday and the day before to speak on his legislation. He had the opportunity today and he has it in two minutes, in two minutes he has the right to stand up and respond on his intentions in relation to marital property and to do so in a way which is honourable and that is to respond to what has been said on this side of the House rather than wait for the opportunity to get up and read a prepared speech, which no doubt he has ready, on introduction of his bill. He can do so right now, enter into the debate, respond to what has been said and show that what they acted out, the farce they acted out last night, was a sincere one and that is to indicate now and for all of the people of Manitoba, what are the intentions of the government on that kind of legislation which affects the lives of every person in Manitoba and where history has proven there is the greatest need of protection. I challenge him to do that and to show that he is indeed prepared to assume his responsibilities as a member of this legislature and a member of the treasury bench. Mr. Speaker, I would welcome an interruption by the Minister responsible for Housing and Renewal, either by way of a question or a speech because he has that opportunity right now.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Would the honourable member permit a question?

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Yes.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** My question, Mr. Speaker, to the Member for St. Johns, are the members of this House to be told what they are to say in the Throne Speech by the Member for St. Johns or are they allowed to speak on this Throne Speech freely as all the other members on the other side are?

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, in response to the question asked by the honourable minister, let me tell him that I would not presume to have the right to instruct others how to speak but I certainly have the right to advise them on what is their role and how to do it. Why, the House Leader today gave a lecture which was completely out of place for him to do where he actually did instruct and demand, and even command others on how to behave. So let the member, the Minister for Housing look only in front and to the left of him to find that person who is quite prepared to lecture others. I am not, I am challenging and that's a very common parliamentary practice, challenging the Attorney-General to respond to what has been said about the legislation which is, I believe, the only legislation he has to bring in this House and if he doesn't want to do it nobody can force him to except possibly the Minister for Housing Renewal who may have a greater influence than I have over the Attorney-General.

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

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat hesitant in rising because I had my eye on the Honourable the Attorney-General, I thought perhaps he may have wanted to respond. However, in view of the fact that there is no response from the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker, then I would want to . . . But there has been a response, yes, there has been a response as you may have heard, Mr. Speaker, from the Minister without portfolio, III, III yes.

**A MEMBER:** IV, V.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** No, III. If the honourable member had read the list of ministerial appointments he will find that in order of precedence he's III. I believe the Honourable House Leader is Minister without Portfolio, I, the Minister responsible for Staff and Program Reduction, II, and the Honourable Minister responsible for Housing, III. Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on your, and I believe the correct term is election as Speaker, I think that from time to time we hear the expression used, being appointed Speaker and I don't think that Speakers are appointed, I believe that the more proper expression is being elected. There is a motion in the House, properly moved and seconded and I suppose the motion could have been amended, there could have been a vote on it, it could have been defeated, could have been debated and so forth. But the fact of the matter was that pursuant to the moving and seconding of that motion it was unanimously accepted by the House.

Having had the experience, the privilege and experience, of having served this House as Speaker for two sessions some eight years ago, I know that on occasion your task will not be an easy one and it will indeed be a difficult and challenging one but it's a challenge that I'm sure you'll be able to meet extremely well. It brings to mind a comment made by a former Speaker of the House of Commons, Mr. Speaker Lamoureux, who at one of our conferences stated that in his opinion the secret of being a good Speaker is to know when not to enforce the rules and from observing you in action, Mr. Speaker, for the past three days I sort of sensed that you do have that feeling for the proceedings of the House; that you know when to roll with the punches, as it were, at what point to step in and bring honourable members of the House back to the Orders of the Day and thus in that manner allow the business of the House to proceed.

I'm not going to be one who will promise to make your task easy. I'm elected the member of the

House and I'm elected to do a job and perform a certain function. At this present time and for the next few years it's in the role of opposition and I intend to fulfill my duties and responsibilities to the best of my ability as an opposition member and if from time to time such action on my part or that on the part of any of my colleagues should send you scurrying to the rule book, well, so be it. Such is the democratic process and I suppose that is one of the occupational hazards.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that in this instance your job may even be a bit more difficult because from time to time we may, on this side of the House, we may have to resort to the use of certain four letter words, four letter words that perhaps weren't used with such great frequency in the past and I'm not sure whether those words are unparliamentary according to Beauchesne or not but this is something that you may want to check. There is one four letter word that we may be using from time to time, it begins with the letter T — Tory and I'm not sure just how you would look upon that. There are a couple of other four letter words but I know that you will rule them out of order because it is not proper to refer to honourable members by name but from time to time we may make reference to another four letter word, Lyon, and another four letter word, Enns, so I know that this may make your job, your task somewhat more difficult.

I would want to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech for their contribution to this debate as has been indicated earlier by other honourable members and I think that all of us sense this, particularly those who had sat in the previous legislature that in the words of the mover, the Honourable Member for Pembina, there were echoes and overtones at his predecessor, Mr. Henderson who represented his riding for the last eight years. And one could have shut his eyes and could have very easily imagined, without even seeing Mr. Henderson, who happened to have been present in a loge at the time, but one would have thought, one would have imagined that his spirit, his presence is here in this Chamber somewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I would want to wish the present occupants of the treasury bench well.

I would want to welcome the newly elected members to this legislature, on both sides of the House. Those who had represented those ridings in the previous legislature I have known very well, some of whom for more than two or three legislatures, and I'm sure that all of us will remember them and their contribution and participation in this House with fond memories and would welcome seeing them if at any time they should have the opportunity to visit this Chamber and at the same time extend their best wishes to their successors.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this session is rather strange. First we hear that there's a freeze imposed on capital expenditures. The further expansionary change or modification in programs and staffing is also frozen and during during this freeze everything is under review. Everything is under review by the Minister without Portfolio, H. Everything is under review by him. And, well, on the surface it may have seemed as sort of a reasonable approach for a new government to take. You know the new government could say well say, well, let's hold the phone and let's get our bearings, find out where we're at and do an assessment of it, of our position and then we will decide upon the course of action that we will take. So, all of this is under review and everything being under review it also becomes somewhat apparent the nature of the answers given by members of the Treasury Bench. Most of the answers are rather, if we do receive any answers, but those that are offered most are rather vague and everything is shrouded with the comment that government programs are under review and when the review is complete we'll have more definite, more precise answers.

Well, as I've

said, that's a fair enough position for a new government to take.

But, while this freeze is on programs are being reviewed, capital expenditures are being reviewed, staffing is being reviewed. The Leader of the Party says we must hold this particular session in which we're participating at the present time, to deal with certain matters. One, AIB legislation. Well, that's one issue and you've heard the response of this side of the House to that. Deal with other legislation, which for the life of me none of us could understand the urgency about, or even the justification for it, but certainly not the urgency to deal with it. And, in fact, Mr. Speaker, you will recall very well that even before this party became the government, on the eve of becoming the government, became the government on Monday, October 24, on the Saturday, October 22 while the present First Minister was still only leader of a political party, he was not sworn into office, took it upon himself to call in three deputy ministers and dismissed them, dismissed them, two days before he became the Premier.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is traditional and customary in a change-over of government for the outgoing members of government, of the outgoing government, to brief and acquaint their successors with the lay of the land upon the takeover of portfolio. But,

it would appear, Mr. Speaker, that in this instance, there certainly was no need for that type of liaison, for that type of meeting between two respective ministers because it was quite obvious that some body had already made up his mind on the course of action they're going to take. I don't know who — whether it was the minister of each of the respective departments — in fact, I doubt very much whether it was the minister because from the publicity that followed, one would get the impression that the ministers of the departments — Public Works, Education, what is the third one . . .

**A MEMBER:** Agriculture.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Agriculture — weren't even consulted on this change of deputy ministers. They weren't consulted. In fact, when they were asked, you know what the comment — well, they said, "Don't talk to us. We had nothing to do with this. It was the boss who made the decision." So, obviously, he had made a decision on the course of action that he could see his government take and, in line with whatever ideas he had in mind, he felt that he ought to dismiss these three deputy ministers. So, either he had made up his mind — maybe, it was the people to the west of us, across Memorial Boulevard at Great West Life that made a decision as to what should be done within this building. We don't know. We don't know, Mr. Speaker, who had made that decision. But, nevertheless, a decision was made by somebody other than one of those three ministers — you know, Education, Agriculture, and Public Works — they had nothing to do with this. But the decision was made because it was felt that those three men did not fit into their plan and their program. Now, you know, Mr. Speaker, I suppose one may say that in politics, in government that's fair ball, and it's true — with change of government, governments want senior personnel, particularly deputy ministers, of a type, of a calibre who would give effect to the philosophy, the program, the planks of the program, that the government wishes to implement and appoints its deputy ministers accordingly. That's the way it's been in the democratic system for many, many decades and centuries. That's nothing new, Mr. Speaker. But, it was the manner in which it was done, it was the manner in which it was done. Even before the leader of the Tory party, and I'm sorry if I have to use that four letter word, be came the First Minister of this province, he took it upon himself — before he even had the power to fire them, because I doubt if he fired them on the Saturday, he couldn't have, you know, he wasn't Premier — but obviously he gave them notice that come Monday morning, after he walks out of the Lieutenant Governor's office, you know, that they're out of a job. It appears that this is what he must have told them. It was the manner in which it happened. And, then, something else that is even of greater concern to me, Mr. Speaker, and I do regret that the Honourable Minister of Education is not in his chair at the present time, because some of the comments that I wish to make in my contribution to the debate on the Speech from the Throne do relate specifically to my former portfolios. However, he is elsewhere, and I'm sure that if he should wish to be, as all of us, receive Hansard, and he'll be able to read my remarks in Hansard at some future time. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, because I made this publicly known some three weeks ago or so, I had written to the Minister of Continuing Education and Manpower and Minister of Education — it was one and the same individual — stating that, in view of his government's action, certainly the action of his First Minister, re the deputy ministers, therefore I see no need for me to meet with him re the transfer of responsibility from one government to another, that it appeared quite evident that the government had made up its mind in what direction it's going to go and is determined to head in that direction, therefore the need for my meeting with him has become unnecessary. Now, it so happened that the press, or one of the news papers, in reporting the contents of this letter to the Honourable Minister of Continuing Education, had given the story the heading

that I am uncooperative with my successor.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it was the other way around. It wasn't I who was uncooperative. It was my successor who was uncooperative. It was he who refused to cooperate. Now, either he deliberately or his First Minister, you know in pulling the strings or in calling the shots, was uncooperative, might take it upon himself, even before he became the government, to let the deputy minister go, which made it quite apparent that this government must have plans of its own, and therefore, there's no need for me to meet with them. So, it was this government that was uncooperative, not I. I was quite willing to cooperate, but the Honourable Minister of Continuing Education either personally, or upon instructions from someone else — you know, person or persons unknown, be it his First Minister or the corporation across the street, Great West Life — chose not to cooperate with me. Now, I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that before the eighth day allotted to the debate of the Speech from the Throne, that we will have an opportunity to hear from the Minister of Education, from the Minister of Continuing Education and Manpower.

You may have noted, Mr. Speaker, in fact, I would think that it must be rather difficult for you during the Throne Speech debate to, you know, always have to direct your attention to this side of the House. It must be

a strain on one's neck muscles, rather than, you know, have the opportunity to be able to look to both sides of the House where there's, you know, equal participation in the debate on the Speech from the Throne from both sides. But, you will recall that, you know, over the past few days, that the contribution to this debate from that side of the House has been, you know, very, very minimal. There's only one — well, the mover and the seconder, of course — and then last night we heard from Minister without Portfolio II — (Interjection) — well number two according to the order of precedence — there're three, and their precedence is in the order in which they're sworn in.

Now, as I've said, you know, the reason for calling this session, as first it was indicated, the main reason — to deal with the AIB legislation — I'll admit this is quite understandable. But, in the same breath, the government said a freeze on this, a freeze on that — everything is under review — and while this review is proceeding, while this review is proceeding — bringing in legislation, removal of Gift and Estate tax, removal of Mineral tax. This morning, Mr. Speaker, you heard the Honourable Minister of Finance make an announcement dealing with further income tax concessions, which you know as well as I do who will be the main beneficiaries of it — certainly not the person at the middle income level or below average income, but the person with the high income level will be the greater beneficiary. Why the rush with this legislation, particularly proceeding with this legislation, when the government itself, you know, has indicated that it doesn't really know

what the beneficial financial impact, if any, of their own legislation will be on the economy. They say they don't know, they don't know. You know, they don't know whether the removal of the Provincial Gift and Estate tax, whether that's going to attract investors to the province, retain investors, keep investors from moving out of the province — they don't know, but, nevertheless, they still proceed with legislation. But they do know this, Mr. Speaker. They do know that they can estimate fairly accurately the number of dollars short that the public Treasuries will be by the removal of Succession duties and gift tax. They do know that, Mr. Speaker. They've indicated that. They estimated the approximate amount. And they do know that to deliver a host of government programs, that those dollars will be needed. But those dollars aren't going to be there, Mr. Speaker, the number of dollars that succession duties and gift tax in the past have generated and which was estimated to generate in the fiscal year to come. Those dollars won't be there. So, then one of two things will have to happen, one of two things will have to happen. Either certain programs will have to be cut, or a greater financial burden be imposed upon someone else, and most likely upon those least able to pay.



But the government has also said that by attracting investment and keeping investors in the province that there will be, you know, indirect benefits, but they can't quite define those indirect benefits to the economy. Well, to find out what the indirect benefits may be, I thought, Mr. Speaker, that seeing that the government is so vague in defending and justifying the legislations before us, I'll attempt to go and seek out some of the direct beneficiaries of this legislation and see how they feel about it. You know, there must be some who will benefit from the estate tax legislation, the gift tax legislation, the two bills brought in by the government. Mr. Speaker, I went through my riding — I went all through Burrows constituency — and you know what, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't find any beneficiaries of this legislation — not one, not one in Burrows constituency. Well, I thought, Burrows is only one of fifty-seven, I'll try some others. I went to the constituency of Point Douglas — I went looking there. You know how many I found? None, none — (Interjection) — well, I was going to go to Flin Flon but it so happened that I ran into the Honourable Member for Flin Flon a couple of weeks ago — I asked him. He said he did the same thing in his riding — he went looking for some direct beneficiaries. And I asked him, "How many did you find?" He says none — not one. Well, I tried the constituency of Logan — none. I tried the constituency of Winnipeg Centre. I was told, Mr. Speaker, that once upon a time, yes, there was one born — I'm not sure whether he was born, but he claims to have been raised in Winnipeg Centre — a likely beneficiary — a fellow by the name of Al Golden was raised in Winnipeg Centre. He might be a beneficiary of this legislation, but, of course, he's not living there. In fact, continuing further in my search for direct beneficiaries of this legislation, I was told that there are probably very few of them around at this time of the year because they're all away in the Caribbean, you know, being the winter season, yes, this is now time for their winter holiday. You know, in the summer time, you take a summer holiday, you take an autumn holiday, now it's time for the winter holiday.

**MR. LYON:** . . . in Saskatchewan. That's where they don't pay it either. Now it's Mr. Blakeney. You're making the wrong speech. You've got your partyline mixed up.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** You know, Mr. Speaker, I would hope too that before the Throne Speech debate ends, that we will hear from the First Minister, because, you know, we don't hear from other members of the treasury bench, only one from whom we heard yesterday and if . . . I don't know why, for what reason other members of the treasury bench don't participate in the Throne Speech Debate but I would hope that at least he would participate in it. So, there we are, Mr. Speaker. The direct beneficiaries of this legislation just . . . you know, I just haven't been able to find any and obviously they're not residents of my riding. I don't know, perhaps they live in River Heights, maybe in Charleswood constituency, Fort Garry, I don't know. Well perhaps honourable members on that side of the House would be good enough to assist me by identifying some of the direct beneficiaries of their legislation, because I would like to get their views, get their reactions. But then I understand that if these people are away in the Caribbean — winter holidays in the Caribbean are becoming increasingly expensive and no doubt they need all the help that they could get. It's no fun staying in the Hilton Hotel or Sheraton Hotel if you have to worry about how you're going to pay your \$100 bucks a day for your suite. I appreciate that so they need all the help they could get and hence it asked that the legislation has to be retroactive to October 11th. I can well appreciate the government's thinking on that.

But as I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that here is this government, uncertain as to future course

of action in a variety of programs, but mixed in with this uncertainty, some time prior to October 14th, the Minister of Continuing Education and Manpower was interviewed by two reporters, one from the newspaper at the University of Manitoba, the Manitoban, and the other from the Uniter, the students' newspaper at the University of Winnipeg; and you know, intentionally or unintentionally, I'm not sure which, but the Honourable Minister of Continuing Education and Manpower did tip the government's hand as to what they proposed to do, as to the course of action that they intend to pursue. Even though, as I have said, the economic benefits of their legislation on the order paper now are uncertain, but one thing is certain, that if the economic benefits that they envisage not materialize, somebody will have to pay. Who will pay? Those least able to pay. Let a portion of the cost be borne by whom? By the students. By the students of our post-secondary institutions, our 30,000 students.

The Honourable Minister of Education — you know, once again I do regret that he has not been able to return to the House. He said, in response to a question, "Do you think tuition at Manitoba universities or community colleges should remain at its present level?" And here's his response — and this appears in the November 14th, 1977 issue of the Manitoban. His response says, "I would hope, Elaine," which I presume is the first name of one of the reporters, "that it could. Once again, economic factors are certainly going to have some bearing on what happens in that area. I know that increased tuition fees will certainly prove a hardship to many students and I would be personally very much opposed to having to make that type of move or being part of that type of move, but there is an economic reality that may eventually force us into that position." Now, an economic reality that may force us into that position, Mr. Speaker.

You know, Mr. Speaker, if you read this carefully, the Honourable Minister of Continuing Education is saying much more than that. This question was related to, primarily, the reporters being from two universities, was related primarily to the university students. What the Minister of Continuing Education is really saying . . . that he is going to take upon himself the responsibility to encroach upon the authority, the independence of the boards of governors of the two universities and he's going to walk in, step in and say, "This is going to be the level of tuition fees that you fellows are going to charge," and that is it. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, and of course in the last two legislatures, they spoke differently — they spoke out of both sides of their mouths when it came to talking about independence of boards of governors of universities.

**A MEMBER:** Political expediency.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Whatever they felt was to their advantage. In some instances they charged us with political interference; in other instances, when they felt that it would be to their political advantage to come to the defence of a group of striking employees, they told us to interfere, they told us to give the universities more money, to tell the boards of governors to pay the employees what the employees were demanding and thus settle the wage dispute. You know, so they spoke out of both corners of their mouths at that time.

**A MEMBER:** All four.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** And at this particular time, I suspect that they still intend to continue doing that. But one thing is quite certain; that here the Minister of Continuing Education is stating that the economic reality may force him to dictate to the universities what level of fees they ought to charge their students. Well, Mr. Speaker, figure that out. Figure that out. An increase of \$50-\$60 per student will cover approximately one-half the deficit that the mineral tax, gift and estate tax legislation will create. So you turn to the poor, the helpless student, let him pay, let him pay for the benefit of the person who today may be somewhere in the Caribbean. Let the student pay; let the student pay and cut out the waste.

**A MEMBER:** Your waste, your waste, not the people's, yours.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** I would be very anxious to see the First Minister's Minister without Portfolio II identify the waste that he's going to recommend that be cut out. —(Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose if one wants to take that approach and have that type of an exchange, I could level the same remark at the honourable House Leader too but I would choose not to. If he wants to engage in that type of dialogue, not unless he really provokes me, I would prefer to steer clear of it.

The Honourable Minister of Continuing Education was asked, what is he going to do about the level of student aid? He says he can't give a definitive answer. He was asked when will he be able to give a definitive answer. Yes, the question is, by when would you be able to give an answer? His answer is, "I really couldn't give you an exact date, sorry." You know, Mr. Speaker, what this means? And students are anxious to know because I am sure, I am sure that

on this very day, at this particular point in time, every minister over there and his department is in the process of preparing estimates for the forthcoming fiscal year. They must be. At least I will give them that much credit that they are preparing the estimates for the next session. Now if the Honourable Minister of Education cannot give a definite answer on whether he anticipates the level of student aid to remain at the same level, be decreased, increased — I would suspect that there will be no change and with inflation, even if the level of student aid remains unchanged, the purchasing power will decrease so hence the level of assistance offered students will decrease. In fact, Mr.

Speaker, it wouldn't surprise me to see a cutback on the level of student aid because that too may be considered by that government as wasteful. That may be considered by them as wasteful.

Then the Honourable Minister of Continuing Education was asked about the building freeze and he said in reply that the whole point is tied so closely to the economic picture today and the employment picture today that in reality whether building should take place or not would have to be considered in light of the economic picture of the province and the employment picture. Well, you know, his answer became a little bit . . . as I read this, I could see a faint glimmer of hope on the horizon, that he is looking at the employment side of the coin, that public capital expenditure must also take into account the employment situation, the level of unemployment and so forth, maybe there's some hope here. So the newspaper reporter attempted to get him to elaborate on this point and said, "What is the tie between the building freeze and the unemployment situation?" Here's unemployment and you're imposing a building freeze. How do you relate one to the other? So he says, "Oh, I think they're related very very closely with the economic situation and the employment situation in the province." I don't quite understand that answer and I am sure that the minister giving this answer isn't quite sure of what he said in that sentence. So he was asked again, "What is the exact link?" So, here's his response. I will leave this up to you, Mr. Speaker, to figure out what the honourable minister really means — and perhaps he may explain what he means at some time before the debate of the Speech from the Throne ends. Here's his response. What is the exact link between the building freeze and the unemployment situation. He says, "Well, I think the amount of money that's available for post-secondary education and so on must vary with the economy. Unfortunately, education must compete with other programs for taxpayers' dollars. The choices are often difficult."

Mr. Speaker, what the honourable minister means goodness only knows but I think that it's coming through fairly clearly that whatever level of support the universities may be expecting, whatever level of support the students may be expecting in the forthcoming year just won't be there, just won't be there.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I could on to . . . he was asked about the funding of research and this was rather amusing, Mr. Speaker, because when it comes to funding post-secondary research, I am sure you will recall — and you, Mr. Speaker, you've been a member of this House for a longer period of time than the Minister of Continuing Education — but the Minister of Continuing Education upon reviewing his estimates book, and he's had ample opportunity to do that, would have found that the bulk of the funds — and I do not wish to get into all the ramifications of some of the problems in the funding of the university research which occur — but the bulk of the support for funding of university research comes from the federal coffers. Now, there are certain spin-off expenditures which are created which the provinces have to pick up which creates a problem but we are not going to go into that. He assumes responsibility for that too. Why he wanted to assume the responsibility for it, I don't know.

And so, Mr. Speaker, . . . Oh, yes the interview went he was asked about affirmative action programs. You know, programs for the disadvantaged. And this is what worries me when I make comment about letting a deputy minister go who was responsible, who was the architect of many of the affirmative action programs now in effect, programs designed to assist the disadvantaged, and I would like to know. I asked the honourable minister in my letter what the future of those programs is going to be because that was my prime concern. And he was asked, "Would you be in favour of affirmative action programs to get more members of minorities into limited enrolment faculties such as medicine or law?" You know what his answer was? "I wasn't aware that that was a great problem."

Mr. Speaker, let him talk to the Minister of Northern Affairs. Let him talk to the Minister of Health who is also responsible for Corrections. Let him talk to the Minister of Labour who has a Women's Bureau in her office which we had set up. Let him talk to them and find out whether there's a problem or not. But he takes the attitude there's no problem. Now, Mr. Speaker, let him check his Estimates book and there he will find programs specifically designed to deal with the matter of affirmative action to assist the disadvantaged, and he says there's no problem. That too, Mr. Speaker, spells a death knell for those programs. That spells a death knell. If he says there's no problem then it follows from that as night follows day that there's going to be no funds for those programs, or if there will be any they will be substantially reduced because in his opinion there is no problem. That too, Mr. Speaker, spells a death knell for a variety of programs designed to assist the disadvantaged, to assist students, STEP, our summer employment program and so forth.

Now of course when he talks about summer employment he is saying, well, that one reason why there are fewer students from the lower socio-economic classes than the higher attending university is because the parents in lower socio-economic groups do not give the students that type of urging and encouragement. Mr. Speaker, I would dare, I would challenge the Honourable Minister of Continuing Education to go to the Burrows constituency in which there are many many sons and daughters and grandchildren of the people living there who have gone through university at considerable sacrifice to themselves and their parents, and let him tell my constituents that they don't encourage their children to go to university, that they don't encourage their children to seek a post-secondary education. Let him go there and make that same statement.

So in summing up, Mr. Speaker, in the fraction of a minute that I have remaining, it has become very very apparent that the road in which this government is heading, that the direction in which the Minister of Continuing Education is heading is to reduce, to cut down, to eliminate programs designed to assist the disadvantaged, programs designed to allow re-entry into the school system, programs designed to assist the students from a lower socio-economic classes, but instead encourage programs to assist the rich.

You know, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Continuing Education wants to reduce education expenses, the best way is to go back to the so-called "good old days" when post-secondary institutions were open only to those who could afford to enroll their sons and daughters there and then those people pay their own way rather than devising programs to open the doors to all. That, Mr. Speaker, is my main concern about the next four years. It isn't about the government but the effect it will have upon the unfortunate victims of the programs of this government that appear to be on the horizon.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Pembina and the amendment moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Are you ready for the question on the amendment? The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, in rising to the debate on the Throne Speech I first of all wish to compliment you, Sir, on being appointed or elected by the Legislative Assembly to the highest office of the assembly. I believe honestly that you will carry out that function in an unbiased manner. I certainly hope that that is going to be the case and I have no reason to doubt that wish.

I want to compliment, first of all, congratulate rather, all the people, the members who have been re-elected. I want to congratulate also the new government on their election. I want to congratulate new members of the Legislative Assembly.

I was somewhat intrigued, Mr. Speaker, by the introductory remarks by the mover and seconder of the speech in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I want to congratulate them on a fine delivery of their contribution.

I was somewhat amused however because the mover reminded me so much of the past Member for Pembina. It was as if there wasn't a change in personality whatever. It was so obvious and the contradictions were also very much the same, Mr. Speaker, and that was most amusing to find that there are at least a number of people emanating out of Pembina that have the same style and the same contradictions within their delivery. I refer specifically, Mr. Speaker, to the various points that were made by the mover and that was that they were very much free enterprisers in philosophy but at the same time seemed to not fully appreciate the fact that within their constituency there is so much public enterprise which they do not want to let go as well. So they are a bit in a quandry but it is obvious to me, Mr. Speaker, that if the government was to pursue a policy, a withdrawal of public support from that constituency, that they would be objecting as strenuously as any other member of the Legislative Assembly would if it happened in their particular area. So those are similarities as between the new Member for Pembina and indeed the outgoing member.

Yes, I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that in that particular constituency they were the second highest of all the provincial employment grants of all constituencies in Manitoba. That indicates their free enterprise approach very well, Mr. Speaker.

I was more confused, however, by the comments of the seconder of the speech in reply because it was truly an NDP speech, Mr. Speaker. Virtually all of the things that he said and urged, commented upon, were really NDP policy for some number of years, policies that have already been enacted. He was simply suggesting that we should continue on with such programs.

I would have to conclude that perhaps he was running for the wrong political party given that he has such strong views on the social questions that he introduced in his speech. Perhaps maybe he is doing something else, Mr. Speaker, which is typical of Conservatives and that he, too, has more than one answer to the same question depending on whom he is speaking with. Perhaps maybe that is the explanation because one would have to recognize that one couldn't talk too much about the need to get government out of the affairs of people if one was talking to the people in City Centre, in St. Matthews, because there is a problem that does require a great deal of public attention.

So in recognition of that I have to conclude that perhaps the Member for St. Matthews is saying the right things at the right time but basically is of a very right-wing Conservative philosophy but dare not allow notice of it. Perhaps that is the explanation, Mr. Speaker.

I think time will determine that for us because people who take on that posture have to maintain that approach. The big lie technique only works for so long and you have to keep on doing it and you have to hope that people will not catch on. . .

**A MEMBER:** . . . It got to be pretty close . . .

**MR. USKIW:** Pretty close but not quite over the line, I appreciate that.

**MR. LYON:** You are usually right over it but it's pretty close.

**MR. USKIW:** You have to maintain that posture and hope that someone doesn't catch you in the act and that's difficult to do for a prolonged period of time. Therefore, I think that the Member for St. Matthews is going to have to re-think his position and perhaps even try to influence his own political party that there has to be a different approach taken with respect to the needs of ordinary people in Manitoba.

It's no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that he is going to have a difficult time in accomplishing that because it is obvious at this early stage in the life of a new government what the priorities are of the new government. But before I get into that aspect, Mr. Speaker, I would like to first of all remind

members that this government was not elected honestly. It was the most dishonest campaign that I have ever witnessed in all the years that I have participated in election campaigns in Manitoba.

**A MEMBER:** You're an expert in dishonesty, you ought to know.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I have been very much involved in about 22 election campaigns of which four were on my own behalf, Mr. Speaker, and I have never seen anything as cynical as that introduced by the Conservative Party in this election. As a matter of fact I think it is worth noting, Mr. Speaker, that the New Democrats didn't have to withdraw their ads. I think that's worth noting. I think it's worth noting. They didn't have to withdraw their ads. They didn't have to have the media cover up for them as a result of those ads becoming an issue in the election campaign either and I think that is on the record.

I would like to indicate just one or two examples of the blatant lies that were introduced into the campaign across the province. —(Interjection)— I think, Mr. Speaker, one of the most blatant ones — and I wish I had a copy of it here, I don't have it — has to do with the advertisement that suggested to the people of Manitoba that in order to get premium free medicare, pharmacare, senior citizen housing, nursing home care, that they would have to vote P.C. That was the most blatant piece of advertising, completely false to the last letter of the ad, Mr. Speaker, because the people of Manitoba already had those things in good quantity, in good quantity, not enough, but in good measure compared to any period in our history. In fact a remarkable record in those fields has been achieved over the eight years of NDP administration. And yet they had the audacity to introduce that as a campaign platform that the Conservative Party would endorse.

But to be more specific, Mr. Speaker, they talked about freeing the people of Manitoba. They talked about the need for more freedom for the people of Manitoba. And in my own particular constituency and in a number of others, because I ran into this in many parts of the province, Mr. Speaker, they had these brochures of their candidates with a little piece of information about changes in regulations with respect to poultry grading. Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to see what they were trying to suggest to the people of Manitoba and I want to quote from just one of these. It says here, "Furthermore a recent directive from the Minister of Agriculture has ordered that as of September 1st, farmers are not allowed to sell off dressed poultry. It is strange indeed that the so-called government of the little man is now preventing the small farmer from selling direct to the small consumer. This means that many small farmers will lose the clientele that they've built up over the years because of a reputation for good products. The government has simply taken away this aspect of their business." That's in a brochure that was mailed out to every household in my constituency and I don't know in how many other constituencies.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what are the facts? They knew the facts. They had access to the Information Services releases, to the newspaper stories that covered the new regulations and I think one has to remind him that those regulations were in effect for many many years, in Brandon, in Portage and in Winnipeg. The only change that took effect was that the rest of the province was now brought under those regulations which were passed by either their government — which I didn't bother to look up — or the government before theirs, way back in the Fifties, regulations that have been on the books for a long long time.

If you go back further, Mr. Speaker, into researching this question of health regulations, marketing regulations, grading regulations, you will find that the Conservative government in 1960 passed a regulation which truly prohibits the sale of any poultry product without the inspection of a veterinarian to anyone. That has been on the books since 1960, and it is still there, and to take issue with a regulation which simply states that as of September 1, anyone wanting to sell poultry or poultry products to commercial buyers that they must not do so unless they are graded. To take issue with that and suggest that that is to deny the freedom of the farmer and the consumer to interact, for the farmer to sell directly to a consumer, for a consumer to buy from the farmer, was a complete false statement.

**MR. EINARSON:** Tell the whole story, Sam. You're not telling it all.

**MR. USKIW:** It is the whole story; it is the whole and complete story, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to read into the record the news release that covered the change in the regulation, that effective September 1st poultry and poultry products offered for commercial sale, anywhere in Manitoba, must be graded in accordance with regulations under the Livestock and Livestock Products Act. Until September 1st, ungraded poultry and poultry products were permitted to be sold outside of Winnipeg, Brandon and Portage la Prairie. The request for the change came from the Broiler Chicken Producers' Marketing Board which said that outside of these three cities, it has been too easy to sell spent Leghorn hens as young three to four pound fryers. So it was really a consumer protection device having to do with commercial sales of poultry. Not sales as between farmers and consumers as has been suggested in the election material that was put out by the Conservative candidates.

Of course, I recall even receiving a letter from the Premier, the present Premier, during the course of the campaign in that connection. You know, I don't know how anyone could describe that kind of posturing in an election campaign as anything other than the big lie technique because the regulations are publicly filed; they are available to all citizens of Manitoba, certainly political people know where to reach public information on a day-to-day basis and how anyone could stoop to that

low measure in an effort to convince the people of Manitoba that there is something drastically wrong with the affairs of the province is beyond comprehension, Mr. Speaker. That is a bottom of the barrel approach to the political process. It's a characteristic of the Conservative Party of Manitoba. It's a characteristic of the present Premier who cares not for the facts . . .

**A MEMBER:** That's getting to the guts of it, isn't it?

**MR. USKIW:** . . . who cares not for the facts, Mr. Speaker, but who has an objective and is willing to achieve that objective, that goal, by any means possible. The end justifies the means philosophy is really what we are talking about.

**A MEMBER:** Socialism, that's socialism you're talking about.

**MR. USKIW:** Not one, as the Member for St. Johns pointed out, smidgen of fact or truth need enter any statement made by a Conservative in Manitoba. That's really the posture and it's a sad commentary on our political process.

But, Mr. Speaker, if that were all, it wouldn't even be that bad but, you know, they went to greater lengths in my particular riding. In the last week of the campaign, they set up a telephone campaign committee and that committee was responsible to phone X number of people in the constituency telling them that if they don't change the government within the week, that farmers will not be able to sell poultry to consumers and they were phoning consumers telling them that you will not be able to buy your poultry from the farmer — this was a telephone campaign.

**A MEMBER:** Those rumours spilled over into my riding.

**MR. USKIW:** The former Attorney-General says those rumours spilled over into his riding.

And then they went to another issue, Mr. Speaker. They had a telephone campaign phoning pensioners telling them if they re-elect this government who was quickly eroding their freedoms that the pensioners are going to lose all of their assets if they participate in any of these programs and that was a campaign on the telephone, systematically. Mr. Speaker, that was obviously a very desperate move on the part of the Conservative election machine in the constituency of Lac du Bonnet. So, Mr. Speaker, it is not an exaggeration to suggest . . .

**A MEMBER:** You're making a pretty gutsy speech, Sam.

**MR. USKIW:** . . . it is not an exaggeration at all to suggest that the present government ran a completely dishonest election campaign and that is the basis of their presence here this morning or this afternoon.

Let's now talk about the character of the present government, Mr. Speaker, because I think I would want to kind of do a quick analysis of what that government looks like to me and to many Manitobans. If you look at the posture of the Premier, I think it is very obvious that we are back to the old theories in terms of the economic conditions and the solutions to those conditions in the province of Manitoba and that is back to the theory which is so often referred to as the "trickle-down" theory, that all you have to do is put a little money into the hands of those that already have too much and somehow through their spending and their program in the private sector that enough will trickle down to the common people down below. We're now back to that position which we abandoned in this province some eight years ago.

I think one would characterize the Minister of Mines as not the Minister of Mines for the people of Manitoba but the minister representing the mining companies. I think that's how one would have to characterize that ministry.

I think you would have to characterize the minister in charge of the Public Insurance Corporation as a minister responsible to the private insurance industry of Canada. I think that would be a fair assessment.

I think you would have to characterize the Minister of Public Works as a minister responsible to the private sector who will be providing the public needs in terms of office accommodation, etc. in the Conservative years ahead. There's no doubt in my mind that there may be a reduction, or at least a freeze, on government office space in the public sector. I'm not so sure that it will not spill over into the private sector on a greater scale than it has been to date.

I think if you look at labour, I don't think you will find that you have a Minister of Labour. I think you will find that you will have an assistant to the Department of Industry in the presence of the Minister of Labour. I think that's how you would characterize that ministry.

With regard to Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, I would characterize Agriculture as a minister responsible to agra-biz. That would be a very good . . .

**A MEMBER:** That's better than having an irresponsible one which was what we had before. You weren't responsible to anybody.

**MR. USKIW:** The former Attorney-General says, . . . description. So that is the character of our present government and I think that is obvious by the statements that have been made by the Premier himself and by a number of his Cabinet ministers. By the way, some of the statements are so

contradictory it's very difficult to follow from one day to the next what it is that they are trying to say. But whatever it is, Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say that in the political process that no government stays in power forever and governments do change for one reason or another, and sometimes for no other reason than to have a change so we have to accept that as a reality of public life, as a reality of the political system in which we live, and that is something that I am certain no member in the legislature would want to change.

So, so be it, and we now have to move along with respect to programs for the people of Manitoba that will increase, improve, their standard of living as a whole. It will be interesting to see, Mr. Speaker, in the years ahead whether the trickle-down theory which was tried so many times over the years, over the 100 years of our history, whether in fact there is anything new in that theory that is going to bring better results in the three or four years ahead than they have done in the past 100 years of our history. I don't believe that too much is going to change. You know, I was very amused about a week ago when I read a statement given to the media by the Premier with respect to a works program to somehow alleviate to some degree the increasing unemployment situation in Manitoba. His off-the-cuff response to that was that that's what you have unemployment insurance for, is to look after those people who don't have jobs. So, when you tighten down the economy you provide unemployment insurance and, of course, if there isn't unemployment insurance you then have welfare, then you have welfare. But you know, on the other side of the ledger they tighten up the UIC regulations and the welfare regulations at the same time, and so it puts some people in a very impossible situation. I suppose, I suppose that's an extension of Conservative freedom because they would argue that one has a right to go without; they would argue that one has a right not to have three meals a day, that would be a basic human freedom in terms of Conservative philosophy. Well, it is something that I don't think the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, are going to accept and I think that that particular position is going to haunt the Conservative government before too long.

Now, I want to reflect for a moment, Mr. Speaker, on the posture of the Premier-elect, the government-elect so to speak, prior to the swearing-in ceremonies and you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that I took objection to attending those ceremonies. —(Interjection)—Well, the Member for Brandon West says he didn't notice. Perhaps he didn't notice, but I would like to point out to him that it was a disappointment to me that conditions were such that it made it impossible for me to witness the swearing in of our new government because, after all, that government was elected by the largest single block of voters, and I think that it would have been nice to participate. You know, Mr. Speaker, whenever there is a change in government it is always reasonable to expect that the outgoing government should, in some way, brief the new ministry, department by department, at least in part to the extent that they have / have a desire to be briefed, and that that would allow for a much smoother transition. Perhaps maybe they didn't want to be briefed, I don't know. But in any event, Mr. Speaker, under our parliamentary system, the tradition has been, the practice has been over the years, that really it wasn't necessary to do that at the ministerial level but certainly at the deputy minister level, that usually deputy ministers carry on after a government is gone and are in a position to advise the new government, the new minister, as to what is going on in each respective department and, of course, that particular minister can assume to carry on or to change what is going on in those departments. But, at least the transition is rather smooth in that sense in that there is continuity. Well, you know, with the arrogance of our Premier there was no way he was going to bring about a smooth transition from one government to another. He decided that perhaps he should fire some people before he was even in a legal position to fire them. That's really what he did, Mr. Speaker. A sad reflection on our democratic system, Mr. Speaker, a sad reflection on our democratic system. A Premier-elect calling in deputy ministers . . .

**A MEMBER:** A black day in the province.

**MR. USKIW:** . . . giving them ten minutes, telling them to pack their because he didn't want them to serve him, not even for one second of his administration, once he was sworn in as Premier of the province. Mr. Speaker, that is arrogance supreme, there is no other way to explain, or express, or describe that action, that is arrogance supreme. The idea that there are human beings involved never entered the mind of the First Minister or the Premier elect. The idea that there has been dedicated service, on the part of these people, for a number of years for which one would normally provide distinguished service awards didn't enter the mind of an arrogant government. Normally, people who work in the senior positions of the government, they don't put in the routine seven hour day or seven and three-quarter, whatever it is — I think it's less than that now — they put in 15, 18 hours a day, Mr. Speaker. They are entitled to some recognition, it should matter not to anyone what their political philosophy is. The fact is that they were loyal servants to the government of the day and that is all that is important, that is all that is important. One doesn't expect, Mr. Speaker, that if there is a philosophical clash that they should remain in those positions. No one is suggesting that but surely they should have been given notice if there was no room in the system for them in a dignified way. That was not the posture of this government. This government wanted to reintroduce the lynch mob society, that's really what they wanted to do. They wanted to put these people out in the public square on display and suggest to people that they throw stones at them. This is the attitude of this government, Mr. Speaker. They wanted to put these people on public display, having no regard for their feelings as human beings, for the feelings of their families. This is incredible, Mr. Speaker, it's

despicable. It's absolutely despicable, Mr. Speaker, to think that in our modern age a democratic society would behave in that fashion. Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't do that to my worst enemy. I wouldn't do that, Mr. Speaker, to my worst enemy. Mr. Speaker, I thought that we had changed our mode of operation over the years. I thought that we had more humane instincts developed over the years than what has been displayed here in the transition of one government to another. I don't think that anybody — I don't think that the new government could find fault with respect to either of those three deputy ministers who were fired on the basis of their performance, their professional performance. What fault could have they found with those three people who have dedicated several years into the public service? True, they were identified as to their political philosophy, but is the First Minister now suggesting to the people of Manitoba that if you identify yourself politically that you excommunicate yourself from job opportunities? Is that what he is saying? Because that is what it amounts to, Mr. Speaker, that is essentially what it amounts to. Where is the sense of respect? Where is the sense of fair play? Where are the human rights that we are supposed to be so proud of? Mr. Speaker, I would hope that there was some way in which we could have a unanimous resolution of this Legislature which would take out of the history books this particular chapter, because it is of no relevance to the future. It is not the kind of thing that one would want to read and repeat, regardless of how many changes of government occur into the future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to take a few moments to suggest to you— to the members of the House — that the deputy minister who served in Agriculture, one of the most dedicated individuals that one could find, philosophically opposite to my friends on the other side, and intellectually honest enough to say so, had no intention, Mr. Speaker, of working for that government. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, when we knew that there was going to be a change — and the people of Manitoba gave us that indication very clearly — we learned that very early . . .

**A MEMBER:** When did you first suspect that that was going to happen, Sam, tell us?

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, when it became obvious . . .

**A MEMBER:** I'll tell you when it happened. It happened on December 5th . . .

**MR. USKIW:** . . . that there was going to be a change of administration.

**A MEMBER:** December 5th, 1975.

**MR. USKIW:** One of the first things that my deputy minister and I did was to sit down and discuss the orderly transition that is going to take place as between the outgoing Minister of Agriculture and the incoming one. And you know, there's a song that perhaps we should recall, Mr. Speaker.

**A MEMBER:** Sing it again, Sam.

**MR. USKIW:** It says, "If I knew you were coming I'd have baked a cake." Well, Mr. Speaker, we knew they were coming, and between my deputy and I, we had baked a cake. Yes, we had agreed, Mr. Speaker, that we would invite our new minister in, we would give him a day, two days, a week of briefing, whatever his wish was, in order to make the transition decent, smooth, and human. And my deputy minister said, "But, you know, Mr. Minister, I don't intend to work for that government." My deputy minister said that "I would not work for a Conservative government because it would be a problem of conscience." There is no question about his dedication, philosophically. But he says, "If they want me to stay for a week or two, or a month, that's fine, I'll help them as long as it takes to bring about a reasonable transition." And, as we were discussing this, Mr. Speaker, there was a phone call — I believe this was a Friday — a phone call from the office of the Premier-elect, who summoned my deputy minister for Saturday afternoon at 3:40 p.m., I believe it was, to appear in his office. And, you know, I said to my deputy, I said, "If it is what I think it is, then I want no part in any ceremonies introducing the new Cabinet to the people of Manitoba. If that's the way in which they function, then I am not part of that."

**A MEMBER:** Degrading.

**MR. USKIW:** I would not participate in that kind of a situation. And, sure enough, Mr. Speaker, the Premier-elect didn't appreciate the fact that it was a weekend — did not appreciate the fact that it was a weekend — did not appreciate the fact that people do make plans with their families perhaps for the weekend — perhaps they wanted to go out to the cottage, or wherever, but he had the audacity to summon three deputy ministers on a Saturday afternoon before he even had the legal right to do so. Supreme arrogance, Mr. Speaker, there are no other words for it. So, there is no question, Mr. Speaker, of decency, no question of basic human rights, there is no question of compassion. Where is the compassion on the part of my friends opposite?

Mr. Speaker, I know of another incident involving a secretary who was given about twenty-five minutes to pack up her gear and get out of her office. And others who have suffered reductions in pay. I don't know what this government is trying to prove, other than to satisfy some ego trip, and perhaps some constituency of theirs, that they are the masters of the province of Manitoba, and that they have a right to free-wheel and disregard all of the rights of man in the province of Manitoba. I don't believe



it was necessary at all to hang these people in the public square, Mr. Speaker, no more than it was necessary the other day — yesterday, Mr. Speaker — on the part of the Minister of Finance to make a public announcement that they have denied a loan to a cooperative in Manitoba. I don't know what purpose that served. I just don't know what purpose that served, Mr. Speaker. So, we have with us the lynch mob approach, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is going to come back to haunt the First Minister and his colleagues.

I believe that the Public Service has views. I don't believe there are many people in Manitoba that don't have a political viewpoint. I don't care who you employ — they all have their preferences, their philosophy. Some are stronger than others, but there are very few neutral types, and for the First Minister to suggest that somehow, with the introduction of new people that he brings in to replace these, that there is some air of neutrality. Mr. Speaker, that's got to be a joke — an absolute hoax. Is this present posture of the government suggesting to us that from here on there is no security in the Civil Service, that there is no means for the professional in the Service to aspire to greater heights in the system? Does it really mean that every time we have a change in government that we should have wholesale firings? Is this really what we are on to, Mr. Speaker?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to leave that one for the moment and now deal with the fact that we have introduced . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. The member's time has elapsed. Is there an indication from the House that they would grant an extension? If not, I would . . . then on the proposed motion of the . . .

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder, on the Point of Order, I thought it was customary for the Speaker to give a five-minute warning in the approach of his time of expiry. — (Interjection) — No, he said it has elapsed — (Interjection) — Oh, that's okay, that's okay.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Pembina and the amendment proposed by the Honourable First Minister . . .

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order, I do suggest, Sir, that usually the member that speaks is given notice as to the time that he has left five minutes before his time expires. Now, I'm wondering whether I can complete my remarks this afternoon.

**MR. SPEAKER:** For the benefit of the Member for Lac du Bonnet, notice

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, it's 12:30. was given to him. Whether he chose to recognize it or not that is his business, but at the same time, perhaps if the member in the future wished to be interrupted in their speech, if all members require that then I will interrupt them five minutes before their time is up, but at the present time it is now 12:30 p.m. The House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 p.m. this afternoon.