



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. 13B

8:00 p.m. Monday, December 5, 1977

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY of MANITOBA

Monday, December 5, 1977

TIME: 8:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER, Hn. Harry E. Graham(Birtle-Russell): The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I frightened my leader when he looked at all these books that I had before me tonight because he thought I was going to read them out, but they are only there as a prop to hold up my remarks upon which I intend to make some comments about the performance of the government, about the Minister without Portfolio II and other members on that side of the Chamber. In fact, I wanted to say to the Minister without Portfolio, that he . . .

A MEMBER: Which number?

MR. DOERN: I don't know whether he had an opportunity of reading some of the debate on the Speech from the Throne earlier because I did deal with his tremendous volunteer concept and it is very interesting to note that some ministers are saying that they want to get the government out of business. This is their whole objective. They're going to sell off and sell out and close up and stop giving grants, take that sort of an approach, and other ministers are welcoming businessmen with open arms. You know, my seatmate from St. Vital is a man with a good voice and quick-witted and he remembers that old song I'm sure called "Shut the door; they're coming through the window." Then it goes on, "Shut the window; they're coming through the door." I think that's what is happening; they're kicking businessmen out of certain areas and then they're running into the Task Force and doing all sorts of wonderful things there. So I'm saying we're not too impressed with the fact that you're getting government out of business, because what you're doing on the other hand, of course, is you're getting business into government, inviting them with open arms and listening to them as they haven't been listened to for some period of time.

Another thing I found interesting was the characterization by the Minister of Finance of the new deficit in an attempt to make the previous government look as bad as they possibly could. The Minister of Finance decided that he was going to lump in capital projects with current budget and give us the highest possible total. —(Interjection)— The new mathematics. I would simply ask of him and some of the other businessmen in the government, whether they never heard of the word amortization or the concept of amortization. When you are investing in capital goods and so on. Can this really be considered a negative form of investment or a dead-loss or a detrimental expenditure? —(Interjection)— Well, this is exactly right. What they are attempting to do is to turn what was formally thought of as an investment into some sort of a negative, unfortunate, untouchable thing and, you know, let them try but I would have to point out to them that this, of course, will apply to themselves but I suppose the trick is this: that what they want to do, of course, is to stop a considerable AMOUNT OF CAPITAL EXPENDITURES AND THEREFORE THEY ARE NOT CONCERNED ABOUT THAT IN THE SHORT RUN. They want to cut back and they want to provide a rationale which can put their performance in the best possible light, all the time, of course, masking or trying to mask the fundamental reality which is a poor picture of unemployment.

I think that they are correct in saying or thinking that there are areas in which there can be improvements made, but I think that they are in their zeal to balance the budget, to become fiscally responsible, when they are doing, in effect, is creating a monster of unemployment and that is, I think, where there is something fundamentally wrong and I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, but an apparent blind spot on the part of the administration, something that they are unconcerned with and apparently blithely adding to the roles of unemployment, blithely laying people off, making new announcements every day about how many jobs they have eliminated, as if this were something to be proud of rather than ashamed of.

I tried to ask some questions today of the government members about contradictory speeches and we're getting this all the time, where it seems that the front benches are contradicting each other. We have the spectacle on Friday of the First Minister and the Minister of Municipal Affairs making either contradictory announcements or statements. The First Minister attends a meeting of the heavy construction industry and he makes the comment and then the Minister of Municipal Affairs does something in total contradiction of what the First Minister said. Now, apparently over the weekend, unless it was today, but I believe in the last couple of days, for the first time there was some meeting of the construction industry never before held to express their concern about the outlook for construction in Manitoba and this apparently has never been done before. These people I do not believe are the labour people but these people were the people who in effect employ skilled tradesmen and would fall under the category of developers and general contractors, people who would be, I suppose, more sympathetically in tune with the government than the opposition, at least at first glance. . They're concerned about the future. They think that if something isn't done soon, that they are going to face the worst year in decades. They also pointed out with the aid of an economist, that some of the measures taken now will not really hit until 18 months to two years down the road so that some of these decisions that are being made now, even if they wanted to turn it around, do something about employment, the government which is creating unemployment and adding to and aggravating unemployment, even if they want to turn it around, they can't do that in a few months. It's going to take a considerably longer period of time.

So we're treated to this spectacle. The Firstminister appears before the Manitoba heavy construction industry and says that public works are fundamental to a healthy economy and more emphasis should be placed on them by the government. Well, you know, can you believe that? That was said by the First Minister of this government. One would have thought that came from this side of the floor because that's what we've been saying. That's what they said, that there should be, in effect, more public works for the government. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, what have we had? I mean, what have the announcements been in the past seven weeks since this wonderful kiln-dried Cabinet and caucus came forth? They announced a freeze of public works in housing of the order of some \$50 million, then they announce a freeze of \$130 million of health care construction. Then they announce that they intend to close Flyer and I suppose to some extent shocked or maybe shattered by the fact that Flyer appears to be picking up a few orders and will continue. They put the Lord Selkirk up for sale. You know, anything will do, \$10,000 and up. What's a million?— (Interjection)— Well you know, the Minister without Portfolio here, he's behind the times now, he's acting like C.B. Howe, he says, what's a million? You know, there's a man behind you— (Interjection)— there's a man behind you with a moustache, he says what's a billion? I mean, he plays fast with billions— (Interjection)— no just one row back. He is a much bigger spender than on the other side. So, these are some of the things that they announce. Then we get the Minister of Municipal Affairs.— (Interjection)— He's peachy dandy. And, he announces that they're going to take our Municipal Loan Fund and cut it 90 percent. I asked him, "I still don't understand why they retained the 10 percent." I mean, you're going to have, in effect, a million people, in dozens of municipalities throughout Manitoba, vying for that half a million dollar grant, you know, I can just see how municipalities are going to get all excited about a \$5,000 grant. You know it is better than nothing, I will admit that. I am glad they did not eliminate it. They just cut out the heart and the soul and the guts of the program, and they left us with half a million dollars. So I am saying this is the kind of activity that we are getting from the government.

Now the man, I think, Mr. Speaker, who best summarized the position of the new administration the other day, or perhaps it was today in fact, it was the Minister of Finance, because he came out with the following truism which should go down in the history books of Manitoba and in Colombo's Canadian quotations and so on. He said something like this, "that the main objective of government is to balance a budget". You know, I listened to him as carefully as I could. He said, "that is in effect the goal of government, you must balance the budget." Well you know, Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting concept. I personally think it is not difficult to balance a budget, but I thought there were other goals of government. I was taught that there were, I think that there are, and I thought that the Conservatives had other objectives as well. But the Lyon government, its objectives, stated objectives, stated I think in the campaign, stated in this House, stated freshly by the Minister of Finance, is, "We must balance the budget, that is the main goal and objective of government and the provincial government of Manitoba in the year 1977".

Well, you know, what happens, what happens to goals like Health and Welfare, what happened to the goal of providing for the social and economic well-being of the people of the province, what happened to taking care of people who are unfortunate or down-trodden? The Conservatives, you know, in the old days, the old Tories, English Tories or Canadian Tories, they talked about something called *noblesse oblige*. That was, I suppose, a duty of the upper class to take care of people— well I'm made nervous by the comments of my seat mate— but they, never the less felt that they had an obligation, a moral obligation, to take care of the less fortunate in society. But not this government, no. They're going to balance the books, that's what counts. You know, Mr. Speaker, you can balance the budget and have high unemployment. You can have a perfectly balanced set of books in the midst of a depression, in the midst of staggering unemployment, dislocation in the economy, great disruption in society. You can have a government which can show in effect that their expenditures equal their income. We've had governments— (Interjection)— well the Minister of Finance says close the Art Gallery.

MR. CRAIK: Your Art Gallery.

MR. DOERN: Close our Art Gallery— (Interjection)— That's one approach. Cut out the aesthetic or freeze the aesthetic side of society, that's one particular approach.

But you know, what about in times of high unemployment. I can see the Minister of Finance saying, well you know you've got to balance the budget, I mean we can't be concerned about these people who are demonstrating on the legislative grounds. I mean, don't they understand anything about economics? Don't they know that responsibility is very plain? We have to make sure that we don't spend one penny too much. Well, I mean, what would he say in war time? Would he say well even though the country is involved in a complete war, even though our country is in danger of invasion, we cannot gear up to a war economy because we have to be concerned about taxes. What will the people say when they get their mill rate increase? We've got to keep things down here. We have to make sure that we don't have too many soldiers or too many tanks, too many bullets. Wars are expensive, we can't afford to fight this war. We might win but we don't want to win and have a deficit. You know, we— rather lose and have a balanced budget because then, at least, we would have a chance of getting re-elected because we were elected on the notion that we will balance the budget, therefore, if we balance the budget that's all that counts. The war doesn't count, unemployment doesn't count, none of that counts. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, if they want to balance the budget then let them cut out a couple of departments. If they want \$50 million, you know if that's their

hang-up then let them cut out a couple of departments. Cut out tourism and recreation, 23 million, and the Attorney-General's department and you get about \$50 million. Nothing to it, very simple. Well, you know you have problems, problems of law and order and that, but I mean, what's worse. Is the Attorney-General now trying to tell me that it's more important to be concerned about law and order than about balancing the budget? Because, the Minister of Finance doesn't say that, he says it's most important to balance the budget. And, of course, their goal, the ultimate goal, you know they said this, Mr. Speaker, and we never believed them, and, I think this is where we went wrong and this is where the public went wrong. They said certain things and we didn't believe them. We didn't take them at their word. They came out with all this old philosophical . . .

MR. ENNS: Our word is our word, it's sacred, it's gospel, it is to be believed in this province. And that is the law, not of Moses, but of Harry Enns, and you've just heard it.

A MEMBER: Axn, Harry.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how I triggered the religious experience on the part of the honourable member? You know the Conservatives said, we've all read our history — we used to have a superb historian sitting on the other side, the Member for St. Matthews. Well, you know that was a sad day when he was defeated, Mr. Speaker, because the former Member for St. Matthews was a learned and intelligent spokesman and a scholar, a scholar would be appropriate. —(Interjection)— And all of us who studied history know that the Conservatives have said for years that that government is best which governs least. But, you know, Mr. Speaker, they said that in the '77 campaign and I didn't believe, I could not believe that they would try to implement that old dogmatic Tory philosophical statement.

I didn't really believe that they would do it. But, you know, they did. They did try to do it. And they are trying to do it. They are trying to do it as much as possible cut back the government and perhaps destroy the government, because they want small government.

I wonder whether the Minister of Tourism, who prides himself as a self-made man, who was in the car business — that most honourable profession — I wonder whether when he was selling cars — he's a man who believes that you should balance the budget — I wonder whether he would say to his customers, "Now, are you sure that you can afford this car, sir? You know, this car costs \$8,000, and I don't want you to . . . (Interjection) — that what he was selling VW's? Well, all right, I don't know what they cost — \$6,000? Let's say \$6,000 for the sake of argument. Did he say to them, "Can you afford this? Do you have \$6,000 surplus dollars in the bank?" Is that how he sold all those cars? One a day or whatever it was. Or did he just —(Interjection)— two a day — or did he just say to those people, "Look, we've got this easy credit plan — you know, low interest, 24 percent. You can either take it from us or from somebody else, and just \$20 a week, or \$40 a week, or whatever it is — \$100 down." Is that the way you sold the cars? No, being a Conservative, being a man who believes in balancing the budget, not buying a house until you've saved up the money and bought the house. You don't buy a washing machine until you've saved up the money and bought the washing machine, everything you buy is PAID FOR IN ADVANCE. If you save it up and you buy it — that's the way business is done today, right? And when someone comes to you to purchase something, you say to them, "Can you afford this, sir? Are your personal finances in order?" That's the way businessmen do business today, right? No repossessions, no financing, careful scrutiny, and rigorous examination of the balancing of the budget so that the individual has no debts whatsoever.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are many interesting points that have come out in the Throne Speech debate. The leader of the government, the First Minister, you know, he would have us believe that people in the lower classes should feel privileged to give tax cuts, grants, concessions, special treatment to people in the upper classes, because those people know how to invest money. The guy at the bottom, you know, what does he know about investment, stocks and bonds, capital, and so on? He doesn't know anything. So you take it away from him, because he's stupid. You give it to the person who's rich, because he's smart, and then you ask that person to invest it and it'll benefit that little guy, because he'll learn about how happy and what a good thing he's done with his money for the economy and the people at the top of it. Well, that's the kind of stuff that we're hearing in this particular Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

Well, I could go on, but I think I'll conclude at this particular point. My honourable colleague, my old colleague, the old war horse from Inkster here, he was telling us a story about —(Interjection)— no, no, he's old politically /y, I was just referring to him politically, he's an eleven year veteran and, you know, there's a couple of older veterans —(Interjection)— well, I'm a veteran as well, —(Interjection)— That's right, and same as you, not like some of those whippersnappers in the front row there. My colleague told a story about envelopes and, you know, I think of envelopes too when we come to the question period every day, Mr. Speaker. You know, I'm reminded by the performance of the government in the question period about envelopes, because whenever possible I try to watch the Tonight Show with Johnny Carson, and every now and then he does this stunt with the envelopes where he gives the answer and then he opens the envelope — blows it open — and then tells you the question. And, you know, I think that's about the way we feel on this side, Mr. Speaker. There's so few answers. I mean we ask these questions and questions, we sit up all night long, we work night and day to ask questions of the government, and nothing comes back. Now, I would suggest a new procedure, Mr. Speaker. I think we could have a five minute question period instead of a forty minute question period. We should have a five minute question period. If the government would only adopt

the following procedure: Could they tell us what they know, and then we will think up questions to that so that we can give them the proper questions. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. LLOYD G. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, I am one of those whippersnappers that our honourable friend from the opposition referred to. Mr. Speaker, may I, on my maiden speech, take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election to the high office you hold and the dignity that you are showing to your office. As a new member to the Legislature, one looks for the respect that is much needed to hold the respect of the people of Manitoba towards the governing of our province. I do want, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate as well the new members elected to represent their constituencies, whether they are in opposition or part of the new government of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the honour to represent the old historical constituency of Portage la Prairie, a constituency from which a number of citizens have given their time to public life, some of which have served this province to high office. One I want to pay tribute to — Mr. Douglas L. Campbell, a man who served as Premier of this province for many years. Mr. Speaker, this gentleman is one of the highest regarded and respected citizens of the day in this province. Besides Mr. Campbell, Portage has supplied many more men and women who deserve the same recognition, but time will not permit me to acknowledge them. Mr. Speaker, the boundaries of my constituency has in the past, I'm sure, been described in this House many times, so I will not go into that in detail. Mr. Speaker, Portage is growing, and will continue to thrive under proper government from its local council. During the past few years, more industries have established themselves in our area — Campbell Soup, Phillips Cables, Berkley's, just to mention a few. McCains from the province of New Brunswick is presently constructing its first plant, I believe, in western Canada. Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, is still the major industry in Manitoba, the backbone to the economy of the Portage constituency and, indeed, the entire province of Manitoba. The Municipality of Portage la Prairie is probably the richest municipality in the province, along with some of the best farmland in the province — land that can produce well with good practice and good management.

We have had rural councils that have seen fit to respect the tax dollars and the taxpayers as well and would not attempt to carry out programs that would lead to unnecessary general high general taxes. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope as one new member of the government that there will be some relief to the taxpayer when it comes to educational tax. 74.4 percent of my total tax bill has been going to education. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that I will be able to serve my constituency as well as my predecessor who served and represented the people of Portage and surrounding areas for 14 years. I thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak again in this debate because it gives me, I would thank, my last opportunity in this session to express concern about a few matters and in particular what I consider to be the undermining of the Civil Service by this administration. And I say that with some regret. Although I am a newcomer to this legislature I certainly am not a newcomer to the study of political science and public administration nor am I a newcomer to being a civil servant. I studied political science in a great part of my academic career. When I went to England I spent a great deal of my time studying the practices of an impartial bureaucracy in Britain and indeed a number of my professors had been members of the British Civil Service and in that period I came, I think, to know and respect to respect traditions of an impartial civil service that has competence. I returned to Canada and I worked in Ottawa as a civil servant for the federal government and I worked in that capacity with all ten provinces. I worked in every province in this country and I worked with their bureaucracies. I had a chance to be working for the federal government in 1969 but I was working in Manitoba. I worked in Manitoba through the last election and I worked through that transitional period when the past administration was replaced by the New Democratic Party government. I worked as part of a federal-provincial review of the DREE programs in Manitoba but I was here for that transition and I had a chance to witness it. A few months later, I joined the Manitoba government as a civil servant and I worked until I resigned to run. I resigned to run, Mr. Speaker, because I was a deputy minister at the time and I wasn't hiding behind any legislation in order to run. I believe that a deputy minister should in fact resign if he or she is going to run for electoral office. And, if you'll notice, I've made no comment about the three deputy ministers being fired. I think that is fair game. I have made some comments about the fact that they, in fact, have not as yet received any settlement. I don't think that is fair game. However, I do rise today to comment on the fact that . . . — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Does the member have a point of order?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS, MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Lakeside): Well, Mr. Speaker, only this point that the honourable member has suggested that while we're agreeing with unnumbered of fair game propositions that were going on, that there was not a fairness involved with respect to the separation agreements arrived at with the deputy ministers and I'm suggesting that the member is not in a position to comment that that was not fair game. Because, neither he nor anybody else in that House, as far as I'm concerned, is prepared to suggest that the settlement agreements aren't in fact

eminently fair and propj.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I want to mention to the honourable member that he had no point of order. And now the Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To use to words of the Honourable Member for Lakside, that too is fair game. But I do rise to say that I agree with the wtempmts on the part of this government or the past government to improve performance of the bureaucracy and to improve productivity. I think they should do so objectively according to criteria of qualifications, experience and performance and that they should no cut a swath through the civil service on the basis of arbitry decisions that aren't related at all to criteria. Because, Mr. Speaker, we listened this afternoonto the speech of the Honourable Member for Morris when he talked about ideology and dictatorships. Dictatorship is the arbitrary use of power and it's dictatorial if it's applied to civil servants, even though publicly it might be a bit nice to kick a few civil servants around, but that still is an arbitrary use of power and that still is very dictatorial.

I think that the past administrapon, in which I was a civil servant, probably tried to bend over backwards too much to preserve the integrity of the civil servant. In fact, when it came in in 1969, there were a number of incompetent people in the civil service who hadn't performed well, who had in fact poor qualifications, and I think that administration should have done a review in terms of improving the performance and productivity, but I think that they bent over backwards. I think that the present attempts to review the operations of the civil service can be a good thing and I wish the task force well in that endeavour. However, I look with some shock and I must say some disgust at the recent firing of two civil servants who have gone through regular civil service procedures for no apparent reason whatsoever. I think that that is a type of witch hunt which should not be pursued in the Manitoba Civil Service and, in fact, I want to bring these attentions. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Ordj please. I want to caution the member that he may very well be prejudicing the cassof civil servants who do have the right to redress and they have the apeal system. Now if the member wants to pursue the issue in the House he may very well be jeopardizing the case of civil servants who he the proper channels open to them.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to name the names but I do intend to read into the record a letter that was sent because I think it's indicative of the arbitrary nature of the dismissals. The letter is to a civil servant and it says: "Dear X: I have been instructed by Management Committee of Cabinet, on behalf of the employing authority, to give you official notice that your employment with the province of Manitoba is being terminated effective December 2, 1977. You will receive two weekspay in lieu of notice. May I take this opportunity to wish you every success in your future endeavours and thank you for the services provided to the province of Manitoba." That is the letter.

MR. ENNS: What's wrong with that?

MR. PARASIUK: It doesn't give cause. That's what's wrong with that.

MR. ENNS: How many people get terminated that way in this province, that's the normal . . .

MR. PARASIUK: You give cause —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, you know, one of the things thw I've noticed about this government, and it surprised me from time tohime —(Interjection)— I was surprised why a second term banker would not make it to the front benches in place of a first term auvioneer and, Mr. Speaker, I think the comments of that banker proved to me why he was not selected to the front benches. —(Interjection)— That's right there is bitterness if peoplsare fired arbitrarily and that's the case in this instance. —(Interjection)8 is that a promise? Because, that is exactly what I'm raising, Mr. Speaker, is a concern, because that is a threat. . . —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, we have legislation on books which allows someone to be a civil servant and also carry on political activity in that person's spare time because that person can, in fact, be a proper citizen, and that is the legislation that exists federally, Mr. Speaker, . . . —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I would like to let one member of the Chamber speak at one time. If everybody wants to speak at one time then I suggest that the place to do that is outside this Chamber. The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, the legislation giving civil servants political rights is a fairly old legislation in Canada. It's not proved to be any type of impediment to the effective operating of the Civil Service in Ottawa and they've had that legislation on the books for a long time. It seems to be some type of bug bear in the minds of those members opposite who, in fact, are starting to promise that there will be a witch hunt amongst the bureaucracz in Manitoba. And, Mr. Speaker, I say that looking across the way at possibly a present civil servant. I know that the Member for Swan River was a civil servant. I know that he has run and has been elected and that is his right to do so. I wonder whether, in fact, he has taken a leave of absence to do so or whether he had resigned to do so. But, I do note that he is sitting in the House and he is acting in a normal responsible manner and I trust that he wasacting in a normal responsible manner when he was a civil servant. And, if in fact, that right

Monday, December 5, 1977

exists for the Member for Swan River, surely it exists for other people as well. I know that there were members of the Liberal party Party who ran as candidates and were, in fact, civil servants and there were members of the New Democratic Party who ran as candidates and were civil servants. And, I don't think that hurts our democratic system one bit. What hurts it are arbitrary actions taken by a majority afterwards. Because, these are, in fact, undemocratic and they run very much counter to the type of concerns being expressed by the Member for Morris today. And, they are, in fact, steps towards totalitarianism and that's why it is important for people to get up in this House and bring this to the public's attention and have it debated here and I would hope have it stopped. If, in fact, people do believe in democracy. If, in fact, they do believe in certain traditions. Because I have said, Mr. Speaker, that this is okay for Deputies to be fired. I think that's a normal thing that will occur when there is a change in government. I think it's okay as well to review the qualifications, experience and performance of civil servants. I do think it's wrong to fire someone, as this person has been fired, because of an arbitrary reason, and the arbitrary reason would appear to be that this person is related to a politician. That would seem to be the only substantive reason, although no reason is stated here.

That's very damaging to the way in which a civil service operates. It's very damaging to the morale, not only of these particular people, but to the people around them, and that hurts, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't just hurt them, it just doesn't hurt the civil service, it hurts us all as Manitobans. I think it's quite important to go back and start establishing criteria for dismissal, and not use cute little games whereby a function or a position is reviewed and the position is declared redundant.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Roblin on a point of order.

MR. MCKENZIE: I wonder if the honourable member would table the letter from which he is reading.

MR. GREEN: I didn't hear the honourable member refer to any letter. —(Interjection)— Pardon me? I'm sorry, I didn't hear him read a letter. That's fine.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker I will scratch the name out of the person, but I will table the letter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

A MEMBER: You people table letters that are not even signed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There has been a request made for a tabling of the letter. After the member has finished using it and has completed his speech, I suggest that is the time for him to do the tabling. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe that it is customary to do so, however, my recollection is that it has not been done in every circumstance. I believe that there is a reason, which perhaps you should be apprised of, Sir. The Honourable Member for Transcona may wish to apprise you of it and you may wish to take it under advisement as to whether it would be appropriate in the circumstance. I invite you, Sir, to ponder on the fact as well that it has not been done in every specific case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin on the same point of order.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I think the honourable member has referred, on several occasions, to this document that he's reading from under the name of some Mr. X, and I think the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, are loud and clear that he must table it if it's requested by some member in the House, and I'm requesting that the member table the document when he is finished reading it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster on the same point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Member for Roblin indicated from his seat that every New Democratic Party member, card carrying member of the civil service will be fired, would the Member for Roblin agree that the letter could be tabled without naming the person who he says his government will fire if they are card carrying New Democrats.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps I should take the whole matter under advisement and review the whole issue. I believe, if the letter is not tabled, then I think it has to be stricken from the record, but I'm not positive on that. The Honourable member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I recall an incidence last spring when we were involved in an altercation over a particular land deal. It was demanded that we table the letter

immediately, and there was no ifs, ands or buts. We're making the same request tonight. The Member for Transcona was reading from a letter, we're asking that it be tabled right now, as is the custom in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster on the same point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member may recall that that letter was not tabled. We had to come back the next day and decide on the question of order as to whether it should or should not be tabled. It subsequently was, but it wasn't on the ruling of the Speaker. There was a voluntary submission to table it. I think, Mr. Speaker, particularly in view of the fact that the Member for Roblin is requesting the letter and had previously indicated that any card-carrying New Democrat will be fired, is sufficient reason for trying to protect the anonymity, which is all that's being requested.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. ILL DECLARE A FIVE MINUTE RECESS WHILE I take this under consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been pointed out to me by the Clerk, under Section 159(3) of Beauséjour, and I will read from that: "It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the table of the House, if it can be done without injury to the public interest. The same rule, however, cannot be held to apply to private letters or memoranda."

It is my belief that this may possibly be of some injury to the public interest, and therefore I rule that it is not necessary to table that document.

The Honourable Member for Roblin on a point of personal privilege.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, the Honourable House Leader of the New Democratic Party has implied that I made certain remarks. Mr. Speaker, I think the record will show, and you will know that I never rose to my feet and said any allegations or charges of such nature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I concede that. The Member made those remarks from his chair.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (CONT'D)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, now that we've got some procedural wrangles out of the way, I'd like us to get back to the substance of the matter. And the substance surely is that two people were arbitrarily fired. That is the substance of the matter. Not whether any letters should be tabled or not. And furthermore, when I, in fact, brought this to the attention of the House because I thought it to be a very serious matter, since an impartial civil service is, in fact, part of the underpinnings of our democratic system, honourable members opposite says, that's right, we will in fact endeavour to fire every NDP card-carrying member.—(Interjection)—Mr. Speaker, I will get on with my speech. I have had a number of interruptions by people with irrelevant points of order and I will proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. James on a point of order.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a privilege as a member of the government. I have never interrupted a speaker in the four years that I have been in this House, but when a member of the opposition stands up and says that members of the government have said they will fire any NDP card-carrying member of the civil service, that is not correct, and I ask the member

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Green on the same point of privilege.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, we are very happy to hear that you don't intend to fire every NDP member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona. It has been requested of him on a point of privilege that he withdraw that statement.

MR. PARASIUK: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, now that we've got a clarification from the other side. I'd be delighted to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that when the task force on government efficiency conducts its operations, it certainly will establish criteria for determining the effectiveness of a civil servant, because in the letter that came across my possession, no criteria were established and no grounds were given. And

Monday, December 5, 1977

this is a very, very serious matter, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly don't think that any of us can afford to be muzzled on it. —(Interjection)— I can't hear you again. I would hate to make a comment about what you said if you don't have the integrity to get up and state it from the floor. I am quite prepared to debate something that anyone says when they get up and say it from their feet but when they say something from their seat and then when one makes reference to it, they demand a retraction because they didn't in fact say that, then I think something's strange.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister responsible for that task force will in fact carry that out. Because if there in fact is the beginning of a purge taking place, we certainly will have to stand up on behalf of the civil service generally, on behalf of the people of Manitoba, to stop that.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the subject of ideology. The Honourable Member for Morris spent some time discussing that subject this afternoon, and his reading of J. B. Priestley proved that he read. But his comments showed that he was certainly not well read. We have had ideology at work here over the last five weeks and it's been for ideological reasons that this government has increased the deficit. They've increased the deficit to reduce taxes in an inequitable manner. They've done this for what they blatantly state to be symbolic in ideological reasons. They have no idea whether in fact this ideological act will in fact create jobs, will reduce employment, and will in fact add to the gross provincial product. They admit that their act is based on ideology and that their objective is a hope that things will somehow improve. They hope it will. Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that their actions will add to the employment in the province. But I've looked at this exercise and I find that just like the federal tax cut which didn't lead to a reduction in the unemployment rate, and which the federal government turned around and said that those types of tax cuts to stimulate the economy haven't been successful, and rather what in fact is required, is some system of direct intervention into the economy, which this government has turned its back on by cancelling programs like the Municipal Loans Fund, by freezing hospital construction, by freezing the construction of nursing homes, for ideological reasons again.

Mr. Speaker, it is these types of direct interventions which have kept our unemployment rate in Manitoba quite low over the last eight years, relative to the federal rate of unemployment. We have been able to document that that relationship between the provincial rate of unemployment and federal rate of unemployment is. We certainly will be able to monitor the extent to which the provincial unemployment rate in Manitoba diverges to a greater or lesser extent, from the federal unemployment rate over the course of the next one year, two years, and three years.

Mr. Speaker, a Succession and Gift Tax is being abolished, again for symbolic reasons without any direct determination as to what the effect on the gross provincial product and levels of employment will be. And I've indicated to the Minister responsible for the task force that it is possible to monitor whether in fact this is successful or not. Because although it's difficult to monitor the flow of investment capital in or out of a province, it isn't that difficult to monitor what is called venture capital formation in this province and compare it to previous years. The Minister responsible for the task force on government efficiency has indicated that this seemed to be a reasonable request, so therefore I would hope that in pursuing his efficiency measures, that he will in fact, undertake to establish that monitoring mechanism with respect to venture capital formation, because this is the best way in fact to end these types of speculative arguments. That again, was an act undertaken for ideological reasons.

Mr. Speaker, what I have had take place which is of direct relevance to my constituents, is again an action undertaken directly for ideological reasons. While increasing the deficit, while giving away tax money in a very inequitable manner, this government, and I repeat, this government has turned its back on attempts to act as a catalyst in putting together a bridge financing package for Canadian Co-operative Implements Limited, which would have the effect of keeping 800 manufacturing jobs going in the province of Manitoba. These aren't "make-work" jobs, these are jobs in the manufacturing sector. What is required is a bridge financing package that has been undertaken in the past with respect to loans or guarantees, in one instance with Versatile, and the other instance with Canadian Co-op Implements, and sometimes that type of intervention by the government is necessary when you have a manufacturing sector so badly affected by international commodity pricing that occasionally firms like this and of this size in Manitoba and in western Canada, can run into working capital problems. But this government has turned its back on that company because it states that the deficit is so large that it couldn't afford to expose itself further.

Now, this, Mr. Speaker, will cancel out 800 jobs which, if in fact you use federal DREE figures with respect to new job creation at \$50,000 a job, would require replacement investment of the order of magnitude of \$40 million. So that's why it is often very important, especially with respect to manufacturing jobs, to ensure that that plant keeps going. Because Versatile does not need tax cuts which will provide extra investment capital for its firm; what it needs is working capital. It needs working capital for a one or two-year period, not to develop and produce harvesting machinery but rather to produce cultivating machinery for next spring. If it is not able to get this working capital then it will virtually have to close down the plant entirely. Then I argue that setting up that plant again will be extremely difficult and in fact there will probably be great pressures on that company to move the physical location of that plant to a spot probably more central than the prairie provinces.

So, Mr. Speaker, again, for ideological reasons we are turning our back on something which will hurt this province very badly over the course of the next four years. So when the honourable members opposite speak to us about ideological narrowness and ideological blindness I would hope that they would look very very carefully at their own actions, their own actions over the last five weeks, with respect to the economy, with respect to the principle of fair taxation based on ability to

pay, with respect to fair play within the civil service. I think, Mr. Speaker, if they look very closely at their actions, they will find that they have been horribly lacking over the last five weeks. I hope that for the good of us all that they might attempt to correct their actions over the course of the next three years. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, my first comments, to speak briefly this evening, would be to say to you, Sir, I extend my best wishes in the deliberations that you may share with all members in this Chamber for this short session that we are supposed to have and as I understand, for the coming session in the year to come.

Sir, I would like to say as one who has been here a few years and spent some years on the other side of the House, and having had the experience of others in your position, Sir, I would say, and I'm sure honourable members opposite would agree with me when I say it must be a breath of fresh air to those honourable gentlemen opposite when they have a Speaker who is being what I consider very fair to the opposition as well as the government.

Mr. Speaker, I have always realized that the governments have the authority, they have the power, they control the purse strings and what have you, and the Speaker is there for the purpose of defending the opposition members. I want to say to honourable members opposite I hope you realize how fortunate you are, up to this point in time, to have a Speaker who recognizes that very principle.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the comments, I think from most honourable gentlemen opposite, and as I understand it we were called in here for a special session to deal with a particular problem that honourable gentlemen —(Interjection— Just a minute, hear me out . . . that honourable gentlemen did not seem to be able to take care of when they were government, namely, was to ratify an agreement under the Anti-Inflation Board between the province of Manitoba and the government of Canada. You know, when I used to sit on that side of the House I always had the greatest respect for the ex-Minister of Mines and Resources, I thought a very capable person in his own right as a lawyer and also as a very capable orator in this House and one who could use the English language to be able to distort and probably conks those of us who were from the farm community, who were from other walks of life. But you know it amazed me, Mr. Speaker, to find out that between him and his Leader that the Supreme Court of Canada had to tell them that what they did through Order-in-Council rather than if they had had the intestinal fortitude to bring the kind of legislation that we are now bringing forth, should have been down in the last session. I haven't heard anyone at this short session, Mr. Speaker, make that comment but I think now when we are talking about real things and the reason why we are here, I think that should be said, Mr. Speaker, to honourable gentlemen opposite: You know, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I think that while the Throne Speech is drawing to a close I don't think everybody should try and get into the act in the last few minutes. If we can have one speaker at a time we'll try and accommodate as many as possible but there are only 20 minutes left. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't really bother me and as a matter of fact I'm delighted when I get some reaction from honourable members opposite when I do rise to my feet to speak briefly — I don't do it all that very often.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the comments from honourable gentlemen opposite in regard to the civil servants and how terrible we have been to a few of them. Mr. Speaker, I'll throw this at their leader, the Member for Rossmere — I'm not just sure where that was said but I believe he did say this, Mr. Speaker — that "I will forsake principle for power, for power's sake." Mr. Speaker, I believe that those were the words that their leader, the Member for Rossmere, said but I'm not sure where he said it. It goes back a number of years. —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. The honourable member is presuming to attribute those words to me and in effect saying that he is quoting me. I deny that I said anything of that kind and accordingly he should either withdraw or produce the quotation along with the document, newspaper clipping or whatever that he feels that he has as a basis for saying that that is a quotation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake has heard the request from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Is he prepared to accede to that request?

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I can go back a number of years when I was debating in this House and the then First Minister took a dim view of what I had to say in this House and he asked the Speaker at the time if I would withdraw the comments that I made. You know, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the comments that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition made were not in the exact context but as I understood it, and if my memory serves me correctly, those were the comments that the Member for Rossmere made. I have had the experience of having him ask me to withdraw before. —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake has been assured by the Leader of the Opposition that he did not make those comments and has asked that you take that into consideration and either produce the evidence or make a withdrawal. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I believe, and I'm not going to swear on the Bible that I can produce the document but until such time I'm prepared to withdraw that comment, until I can produce that document.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to relate one other thing. In my political history in this Legislature . . .

A MEMBER: Tell us the truth.

MR. EINARSON: Well, the Member for Point Douglas is one who should not make that kind of comment, who wears the cloth, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that he makes sure that he tells the truth when he rises in this House.

You know, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately or otherwise, honourable members opposite didn't see fit to challenge me so much in this last election and they were using the last election campaign in their speeches so many times. But my colleagues behind me had the experience of having to put up with, not just probably members opposite, but people whom they had working for them who were going around this province telling the kind of stories, and honourable gentlemen opposite should not say one word about telling the truth, Mr. Speaker. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, anybody who campaigns on my behalf, what he says I take full responsibility for it. But you know, the Member for St. Boniface, he sat in his chair and he spoke this afternoon, but just because he thought that we were challenging him about what he said personally, we weren't entitled to do that. But he could have had — and I don't know — but he could have had somebody in his constituency doing the same thing that was being done in the Roblin constituency, being done in the Speaker's constituency, telling the kind of things that were anything but the truth, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: Give us examples.

M. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface on a point of privilege.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, I have, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member is now accusing somebody that worked for me in St. Boniface for making that statement, or is he just saying that it could have been done? I think he should clarify that. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I think the record will show that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface could have had someone campaigning, I don't know, I wasn't accusing him at all. By the same token I am aware of those who campaigned in the Honourable Member for Roblin's constituency. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, they had to bring them in, import them from Saskatchewan.

A MEMBER: Ontario, B.C.

MR. EINARSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, because they couldn't handle it themselves.

So, Mr. Speaker, getting back briefly to why we're here, to deal with a matter that the government, the past government, should have brought into this House in the last session. The agreement that was ratified through Order-in-Council by the government of Manitoba and the federal government. This case was taken to the Supreme Court of Canada, as I'm given to understand, Mr. Speaker, and they won their case.

A MEMBER: What was the vote?

MR. EINARSON: That's immaterial. The case was won. The case was won, Mr. Speaker, and what I was going to say earlier, that I've always had the greatest respect for the ex-Minister of Mines and Resources and for once somebody pulled the wool over his eyes, because I thought he was a very capable individual and I look forward to seeing him be the next successor to the leader of the NDP Party.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear to the people of Manitoba, that had the past government brought in legislation to deal with this particular matter I don't think we would have been here today. I don't think we would have. There are a number of issues on this Order Paper now and I think my leader, with prudence, good sound business, would deal with a few more matters since we had to come into this House and deal with matters that were the concern of many people in Manitoba. I give you The Mineral Acreage Tax Act as one example. I go back on the ex-Minister of Finance — and you will remember so well, Mr. Speaker, one evening at 5:30 when you and I were walking down the staircase after the House closed and we met the Honourable Member for St. Johns, a gentleman I have known since the last war years and have always had the greatest respect for. I said Hi to him and you know what his reply was, "I shouldn't be talking to you fellows." I said why? He pulls out a photostatic copy

Monday, December 5, 1977

of an ad we had in the Manitoba Co-Operator in regard to his Mineral Acreage Tax Act and he was unhappy because he knew what had happened. He knew that it was going to be an issue for him in future days. Mr. Speaker, it's not so much the money involved but it's the principle. It's the principle, Mr. Speaker, that honourable gentlemen don't seem to appreciate nor do they respect, and a good many people in the province of Manitoba have a much better understanding than honourable gentlemen opposite have in regard to that very fact.

A MEMBER: What principle are you talking about?

MR. EINARSON: If we had socialism for another four years in Manitoba, heaven forbid what would happen.

When we dealt with that bill, I voted against it in second reading, but there was an amendment to it and the Honourable Member for St. Johns who piloted that bill thought he was doing a wonderful thing. I stand to be corrected, Mr. Speaker, if I am wrong but I believe the word "corporation" was changed to "persons" and we were given to understand that no farmers would be taxed insofar as this bill was concerned. I'm now getting into the bill here, probably we'll be repetitious again later on. But you know, we found out, Mr. Speaker, that farmers who still own their land but who were not actively farming were going to be taxed. And that's what happened, Mr. Speaker. You know, this government thought because they were providing our retired farmers who lived in the towns and villages, they were providing them with a grant, say from \$150 maybe to \$500 to paint their house or to do a little bit of repair work, that this would sort of be a compensation for what they were doing to them on The Mineral Acreage Tax Act.

I tried to explain, Mr. Speaker, that those who owned their mineral rights to their land were not acquiring any wealth from it. There was no money involved as far as their rights were concerned to own those rights. I couldn't understand why that past government would want to tax the people for something they weren't earning. If an oil well was struck on their farm there would be income, then I would say they were justified in bringing in that kind of legislation. But it didn't happen that way.

So, Mr. Speaker, that's another reason we are here. The other matters about succession duties, gift taxes, honourable gentlemen wouldn't understand anyway because I don't know of any of them, really, that have any understanding of the business world. The Member for Ste. Rose, I believe it was last year or the year before, we were debating on a particular problem in agriculture, he said he owned 1,000 acres of land and he said that he had a heck of a time to support his wife. Well, I thought, my goodness, if that's the kind of standard that the honourable gentleman was establishing for himself, socialism isn't doing him much good.

A MEMBER: You don't know his wife.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, no, I must confess, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in his comedy says that I don't know the Member for Ste. Rose's wife and I must say that I don't. I probably would be very nice to meet her. I always say that it's always nice to meet the better half.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Member for St. Boniface as well and I was listening, I thought close enough to his comments in regard to — he was accusing us of the kind of irresponsible attitude we were taking. You know, Mr. Speaker, I would like to just tell him of one example, and probably we'll deal with this the next session, of how responsible they were. In my constituency, I have knowledge of — he was talking then — he said he knew more about his own department than he did of others — and I can refer to one particular area where one town was supposed to get acute care beds for a hospital, another one a personal care home. Four years ago, I believe it is about four years ago, they started to work on a hospital between the two towns. And, you know, Mr. Speaker, it went so far that the local people spent almost \$9,000.00. Having done that, and having agreed by the honourable gentleman that he was talking about the government that he represented, agreed on the whole concept of a hospital between the two towns — I don't know whether it was the Minister of Mines and Resources — got the Health Inspector to write a report giving the various reasons why that hospital should not be put there. As a result, Mr. Speaker, the local committee had to go to a lawyer to try to defend that position. Net result — that's one of the reasons why it cost them between \$8,000 and \$9,000, which was right out the window. That was about 1975. 1977 come along, they had gone through establishing a hospital area. The local municipalities, and the towns, and all concerned had established their board.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a matter of privilege, and I want the honourable member to clarify. Did he suggest that I got a Public Health officer to write a report that was against, or in any way relating to health facilities in a hospital, that I induced a public Health officer to write a report which was to the detriment of somebody, that it was done at my instruction?

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, under the Clean Environment Act, which I think was the responsibility of the Minister of Mines and Resources — am I right? All right, under the Minister of

Mines and Resources, under the Clean Environment Act, we have health officers throughout the various parts of Manitoba, and as I was given to understand, it was that individual acting under the Clean Environment Act who drafted a letter giving various reasons why that hospital should not be put there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: On a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I wish the honourable member to disassociate himself from any suggestion that I had anything to do with what was contained in that report. Mr. Speaker, of course it is my staff and there is one thing about permitting my staff to express their professional opinion and it is another thing to suggest that I told those staff people what to put in their report. And, if the honourable member doesn't understand that, then it's clear why he has not been made a minister, because he doesn't understand ministerial responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please. The honourable member, I believe, is going beyond the area of his point of privilege. Now, the point of privilege that the Honourable Member for Inkster has, would he please restate it to me very concisely.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I want the honourable member to concede that the report that he is talking about was drawn within my department but that I had nothing to do with the contents of that report, and if he suggests that I did have something to do with the contents of the report, then I'm going to ask the Speaker to refer this matter to the . Committee on Privileges and Elections to see whether I interfered with what was contained in a Health Officer's report, which is the inference that the honourable member makes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I fully understand the point that the Honourable Member for Inkster makes, and I want to say to him that I'm not concerned whether that inspector made a report, whether he made it on his own volition, want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the minister under . I jurisdiction that falls has got to be held responsible. Mr. Speaker, I want to make one other comment.

MR. SPEAKER: Tue Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of privilege.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the same point of privilege, I've clearly indicated that it falls within the responsibility of my department and I would have accepted responsibility for it. But it is one thing to suggest that something was done within a ministerial responsibility, as a matter of ministerial jurisdiction, and another to suggest that the minister directed a Public Health Officer as to what to say in his report, and I think that the honourable member should recognize that distinction. Otherwise, he is saying that the Attorney-General is directing his Crown attorneys as to the opinions that he is to receive, that the Minister of Agriculture . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. Again, I ask the member when he has a point of privilege to make it brief and concise. I think the Member for Inkster is straying from the point. The Honorable Member for Rock Lake on the point of privilege.

MR. EINARSON: No, Mr. Speaker, I want to carry on and I hope then — I'll make this comment, Mr. Speaker, to the Member for Inkster — that he then consults with the ex-Minister of Health and Social Development, and I think he will get his answer and get it cleared up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member insists that he will not disassociate himself from the suggestion that I told a health minister what to put in his report, then I want this matter referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections to investigate, to call the health Minister, to see whether, in fact, I in any way had anything with a health inspector, had anything to do with what is contained in that report, which I know nothing about, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake on the point of privilege.

MR. EINARSON: All right, Mr. Speaker, I'll speak on the point of privilege. I take the honourable member for his word. He knew nothing about it. If he says now he knows nothing about it, I will accept that. That's fine with me. That's fine with me. All I'm saying is the responsibility falls on gentlemen opposite.

I want to make one other comment, Mr. Speaker, because I only had a minute or two when the Honourable Member for Inkster got up on his feet and interrupted me. I want to tell honourable gentlemen just exactly what I had to put up with over the years. And I can go back a number of years when I had three councils from my municipality come before the ex-Minister of Mines and Resources, the Minister of Agriculture, or the Minister of Highways — and you know, Mr. Speaker' there were people also represented from two towns in that area — and before we really got going at

Monday, December 5, 1977

the meeting, because those people came in for a purpose, to get some information, and the ex-Minister of Mines and Resources said to his Deputy Minister, "Do we know anybody in this group?" So, is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, I say to you why the Honourable Member for Inkster rises to his feet and wonders why, you know, he doesn't — he's concerned because I am throwing responsibility at his shoulders. After all, we've only been here a few weeks. They still must be held responsible for their actions and this is one of the reasons why we're here, Mr. Speaker.

I think, Mr. Speaker, for those comments I have made, I think it should be known and made abundantly clear to the people of Manitoba as to why we are here. One of the reasons is to ratify an agreement that wasn't legally done by the past administration. We now have to do it in the proper manner and deal with other tax concessions. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Is this a question?

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SCHREYER: A point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, quite apart from the point of privilege raised by my colleague, the Member for Inkster, which I believe was a very clear matter, but I should like to ask you, Sir, whether it is permissible to allow to stand on the record without challenge the statement made by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake that the agreement was invalid and that we knew it to be invalid at the time of the last session of this Legislature. I wish to point out, Sir, that at the last session of this Legislature, we had as information standing before us the fact that the judge of one of the superior courts of Manitoba ruled the agreement to be valid. That is a matter of fact, Sir. It was ruled at that point in time, during the last session of this House, that agreement was held by the superior court of Manitoba judge to be a valid agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member for Rock Lake permit that correction to be made to his remarks?

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, as I was given to understand and I'm prepared to be corrected if I am wrong, but the understanding that I have, we're here to ratify an agreement and when labour organizations go to the Supreme Court of Canada, as I'm given to understand, and they won their case, I would suggest — my point that I was making, Mr. Speaker — that the ex-First Minister should have come into this Legislature to deal with the kind of legislation we are going to do now, rather than Order-in-Council. Is that not correct, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: My point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is that it is just incorrect for anyone to state or even insinuate, Sir, that at the time of the last session of this Legislature, that we knew that we had an invalid agreement, because, Sir, I repeat, Mr. Justice Nitikman of the Court of Queen's Bench of Manitoba had in his ruling found the agreement to be valid. It was deemed on appeal, Sir, some months later, to be deemed to be invalid, and even that, Sir, on a five-four decision, so I reject any suggestion that we knew we had an invalid agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, just thirty seconds. I don't think my comments were in such a way to give an understanding that the ex-government knew. I don't think so. I didn't say that. I was talking about the qualifications of the ex-Minister of Mines . . .

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (CONT'D)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The hour being 9:30 p.m., according to our rules, we are now voting on the motion by the Member for Pembina in reply . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: That motion. If you'd read that motion into the record.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you want the full motion read? Moved by the Honourable Member for Pembina, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that a humble address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor as follows: "We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address us at the opening of the present session." Is

it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion?

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: On division? Before we proceed with the Order Paper, I would like to make a few comments.

MR. GREEN: I'm sorry. I believe there is a motion that the speech be engraved, put into gold seals, wrapped with ribbons, sent to the Lieutenant-Governor. I believe there is a motion. Maybe they left that out.

MR. SPEAKER: While this motion is being drafted, may I address a few words to the members of the Chamber? This evening, I was asked to make a ruling on whether or not a document that was quoted from should be tabled in this House. May I point out to you also that no documents in this Chamber should be read which are not signed. A signature is very essential. I also want to point out to you that it may be that at some time the tabling and the reading into the record of a document may at sometime prejudice the case for an individual, a company, or some other member of the Legislature, when that is done. So I would suggest to all members of the Chamber that whenever they are thinking of tabling documents or reading from documents that they consider carefully what it is that they are doing.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Education, that the speech of His Honour be engrossed and presented to Honour by such members of the Executive Council and the mover and seconder of the address.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you want to proceed with the Order Paper as drafted?

ADJOURNED DEBATES — SECOND READING

ANTI-INFLATION ACT (CANADA) AGREEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I actually adjourned this from my colleague for Churchill, but I would like just to say a few words on it. Famous last words of a politician.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Logan went through a bit of a history of why he is not in favour of this bill. I'd just like to go back in history a few years also. The members of this House that I know in the 1960, 1961 bracket, 1959 — that era — who worked in the good old days — that was \$1.00 a day — we all remember those days. I was working for a farmer and a construction person at the age of 15. We worked all day on construction and then at night we went and worked on the farm when it was too dark to see.

A MEMBER: How much did you get?

MR. BARROW: That was included in your \$1.00 a day. Now, the Minister of Public Works, he said, you know, we're not familiar with farming. Well, Mr. Speaker, he was never familiar with mines, but he held that portfolio. Now I'm sure some of us here are familiar with farms and farmers. I know any farmer is willing — if you're willing to work, they're willing to let you. By the way, Mr. Speaker, at the age of 16, in those days, I went to work in the mine, the coal-fields, and the salary was \$3.40 a day. Mr. Speaker, we went on a five month strike, and what we accomplished was 13¢ a day. We got about \$3.53. I'm trying to show you, Mr. Speaker, that these strikes, you know, they didn't actually benefit us, but they did in time, because the strikes we had — as long as 11 month strikes — the militia was called in. What we wanted, Mr. Speaker, were working conditions. We didn't want to have to work 12 hours a day for minimum wages. We wanted the eight hour day. We wanted compensation. We wanted sick benefits. But, most of all, Mr. Speaker, we wanted decent wages. You know, Mr. Speaker, a miner's life is not an easy life. You talk about a farmer and I think a farmer and a miner are very similar in some cases.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is the honourable member talking on Bill No. 2 or on Bill No. 6?

MR. BARROW: On the Anti-Inflation Board, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, I wish the member then would confine himself to the content of the bill.

MR. BARROW: Well, Mr. Speaker, this ties into the anti-inflation, if you'd just bear with me a little while. A miner's life, Mr. Speaker — you take a young man now, 18 years old, and put heavy underwear on him, heavy boots, heavy slickers, coat, and jacket, they put glasses on him, and they

Monday, December 5, 1977

say, "Go in there and make it." Now what he does, Mr. Speaker — if he's lucky and he doesn't get killed, or crippled, or injured, if he doesn't have rheumatism, or asthma, or bronchitis, or silicosis, they may live to be 65, enjoy a few years of retirement. Now, Mr. Speaker, let's give some examples on the other side of the picture, on the anti-inflation thing, that bothers miners. As the Member for Roblin says, "us little people." Mr. Speaker, how do you relate Otto Lang's three-quarters of a million for air service back and forth to his home, how do you equate that when he's going to have wage controls? Mr. Speaker, and he went further. He sent his nanny home at government expense, adding insult to injury. Mr. Speaker, if you remember that federal election, the Conservatives, one of their planks was wage and price controls, and they lost that election. And the Liberals took it, but surely before they took it, let's see what they did, Mr. Speaker. Their indemnities was before the old scale — 18,000 plus 6,000, which gives them \$24,000 annual. They voted, Mr. Speaker, for a raise of \$24,000 plus \$10,600 for the grand sum of \$34,600. I say that's a difference of — what percent is that — 45, 50? And, Mr. Speaker, there's no Conservative who didn't get up and vote for that. Mr. Stanfield still has a ruptured disc — he got so quick to vote on this thing. No Conservatives voted against it, Mr. Speaker. Anyone that voted against it was NDP.

Mr. Speaker, if you're going to go and cut wages and prices, let's take a look at that Senate. How many people are in the Senate? 100? Say 100. That's \$40,000, and I think that's \$4 million that can be saved right there, Mr. Speaker. And give them some beef to cut prices and wages.

Mr. Speaker, let's look into the bank situation. Where a working man can place money in the bank at seven percent, he can turn around and lend it to someone else for 14. Where are the controls there? Where's the controls for professional people or corporations? And the banks are non-producers, Mr. Speaker, and that's why us little guys are mad. We talk about the Member for Roblin. Mr. Speaker, the little guy today, he wants to buy a house. My young fellow bought one in Thompson at \$40,000 at 14 percent interest for 39 years. He will pay over \$120,000 for that house. Let's do something in that direction, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Roblin always accuses us of not looking after the little guy. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Roblin gives some very impassioned speeches on Autopac. He was against Autopac, not because he was saving the little guy, Mr. Speaker, but because he sold automobile insurance. He shouldn't have been allowed to speak, he had vested interests. But, Mr. Speaker, let's go after the little guy, the kids. You know, if you give a kid \$1.00 today, Mr. Speaker, he sneers at it. You know, it has no value. Mr. Speaker, the little guy that doesn't have much money, and he goes to get a cup of coffee. It used to be 5¢. You know how much it is now, Mr. Speaker? 35¢ for a cup of coffee. Another example, Mr. Speaker, is the little guy when he buys a chocolate bar. It went from five, 10, 15 — now it's 35¢. There it is, Mr. Speaker — it's four inches long — 25¢, and it isn't all chocolate — this much is taken out — now there's your 25¢ chocolate bar, and that's why the little guy will never agree to have wage and price controls, Mr. Speaker.

What the controls do, Mr. Speaker, is throw all the work and suffering and agony by unions, they put all down the drain at one stroke. Mr. Speaker, this wage and price controls, the way it's working, I think you'll agree, it's making the rich richer, and the poor poorer. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I can support the bill only if the government would indicate that wage and price controls would be lifted at a very early date, preferably the day after it receives royal assent. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill (No. 3), an Act to amend the Gift Tax Act and the Succession Duty Act. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we can call it 10:00 o'clock, and I will speak to this tomorrow. If you don't, I'll speak for 15 minutes — you won't hear anything.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there agreement o'clock? then to call it 10:00 The hour being 10:00 p.m., the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow.