

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock Thursday, April 4, 1974

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery, where we have 40 students of Grade 5 standing of the Athlone School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Applebaum. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. On behalf of all the honourable members, I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet) introduced Bill No. 43, an Act to amend The Farm Machinery and Equipment Act, and Bill No. 42, The Veterinary Medical Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Well, Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines, Natural Resources and Environmental Management. I wonder, Sir, if he would consider informing the House about the contents of the most recent correspondence with respect to the American State Department to the Governor of North Dakota having to do with the Garrison project.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN Q. C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Well, Mr. Speaker, we have received a letter from Governor Link addressed to the Premier, enclosing a copy of a letter which Governor Link received from the United States State Department. Apparently the contents of the United States State Department letter to Governor Link are public, although I have not made them public, and indicate that the United States State Department is taking the same position vis-a-vis the State of North Dakota and Governor Link which they have undertaken to take with respect to the Canadian government. In other words, they are advising him of the adverse effects, they are advising him of the obligations of the United States, they are advising him of the Boundary Waters Treaty, and would indicate to me that in every way the strategy that the Government of Manitoba has been involved in with the Government of Canada, that is, getting the United States State Department on our side in connection with this question, appears to have been a very satisfactory one.

I do not want to under estimate that I also believe that Governor Link and the State of North Dakota are very conscious of the obligation of the United States and wish to see them complied with. So, in short, the statement that has been made to us by the United States that there will be no construction - repeat, none - that will adversely or that will pollute Manitoba waters to the injury of persons or property, is one that appears to be being followed through by the Government of the United States.

Now, with regard to Governor Link's letter, I believe that that probably would have to be an Address for Papers and we would probably have to get his approval to have it made public. It's slightly embarrassing to myself personally, but if there is an Address for Papers put in and it has to be made public, that will be done.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, not knowing then exactly or not being in a position to know the exact contents of that letter, I ask the Minister directly: Did the contents of the letter, the copy of which the First Minister received from Governor Link, that is the letter coming from the American State Department, specifically ask that the project be now stopped in view of the possible deterioration of relationships between Canada and United States?

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, as I read the letter that is not specifically requested, but the nature of the letter would be consistent with the undertaking that we had from the United States State Department. I believe that that letter has been made public although I don't know through what means, and if it has been, then there would be no problem in my tabling it in the House. If it hasn't been, then a simple Address for Papers - and perhaps I can do it without the Address for Papers; I will ask Governor Link whether he objects to my tabling his letter plus the accompanying letter in the Legislature without an Address for Papers, and if he agrees to have me do so, I will do so.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. My question to the First Minister is simply this, that in view of the growing concern in Washington, in Ottawa, about the project, is he now, as the Leader of our Government, prepared to state unequivocally his opposition to this project?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, we have indicated our position in the past and that is that on the basis of information we have received to date, it would seem that the project, if proceeded with, on the basis of present information would have an adverse effect on the province of Manitoba. We have made representations, we've been advised by the State of North Dakota, by the Government of the United States of America through the Canadian External Affairs Department, that no work will be proceeded with if it results in effects that are adverse and in violation of the Boundary Waters Treaty. That kind of confirmation and assurance having been received, it would seem that the matter and Manitoba's position is well secured. There will be no proceeding with the project, according to the solemn assurance of the United States, until all safeguards have been met in order to live up to the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Can the First Minister indicate whether or not he has any information as to any positive advantages for Manitoba with respect to this project?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is a converse of the kind of consideration that has been given to the matter up to now. I believe that the Minister of Mines and Resources has, on repeated occasions now, stated very clearly what the current status of the entire matter is. Manitoba's interest would not possibly be better protected than it is now, because we have, Canada has the firm and complete assurance of the United States and the State of North Dakota that there will be no proceeding with the project until there is complete assurance that the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty and the protection of it are completely respected.

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

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Will the Minister advise whether the government intends to implement the recommendations of the Association of Professional Engineers of Manitoba contained in their study of the collapse of the Powerview Arena?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I presume that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is just as knowledgeable as I. There was some reference this morning in a news report - I haven't had an opportunity of studying the same, and certainly the Association of Professional Engineers have made no representations to me.

MR. MARION: Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that the balance of my question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. MARION: My second question in this respect, and it will follow after the Minister has been made current of the recommendations of the Professional Engineers: Does the government accept the recommendation that regular engineering supervision, in addition to the required building inspection, would further assure the safety of public buildings in the province, and does the government intend to take action to make this a requirement throughout the construction period of public buildings?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, one of the difficulties in this particular instance was that the Department of Labour, which is charged with some responsibility, didn't even know that construction was going on. As a result, the Department has requested the cooperation of the municipalities to inform us, as indeed they are required to do, when construction takes place.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . . Regarding the second part of the suggestion or question of my honourable friend from St. Boniface regarding supervision, I believe that I would be on firm ground to say that where there is contractual agreements entered into - for erections of such facilities as the one that collapsed at Powerview, the responsibility is to the contracting parties at this particular time.

MR. MARION: Unfortunately in this construction program, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. MARION: . . . it was voluntary work. My question, Sir, the third question, would be: Has the department's investigation of the Powerview matter resulted in any aspect of the matter being referred to the Attorney-General's Department for consideration?

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labour and its responsibility in this particular area is such that being unknowledgeable of what was going on, there seems to be no reason why we should turn this matter over to the Attorney-General's Department for any violation. I would suggest that this is in the hands of the municipality construction company and possibly the Power Engineers Association if they so desire.

MR. MARION: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in this matter. Are any specific steps being taken by the Department with regard to the safety of public buildings, aside from the recent circular letter which was sent out by the Director of the Mechanical Engineering Division of the municipalities, or for municipalities?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labour and the Mechanical and Engineering Section of the Department of Labour, has certain responsibilities in areas where there are not established boards or commissions dealing with building construction and inspection. For instance, in the City of Winnipeg it is the City of Winnipeg's Engineering Department which has this responsibility. In the areas where it is defined as provincial responsibilities, the Department of Labour are doing what is required insofar as inspections are concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the Minister for Environmental Management. Pursuant to earlier questions and answers on the Garrison Diversion project, would the Minister now agree that the time is overdue for an independent study of the effects of the diversion to be undertaken in Manitoba, and with Manitoba interests as the primary concern?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the information that we have available to us indicates adverse effects from the completion of that project to the stage where waters enter the Souris or Red River. Having that information, we feel that we are justified in asking Canada to protect its rights under the Boundary Waters Treaties Act. If in fact we receive that protection, it does not occur to me at the moment that it would be wise to spend money on a program that is not going to be proceeded with. If during the next little while, while we are discussing this matter with officials from the United States, there is reason to believe that more information should be sought and Canadian money spent in obtaining it, then we will again pursue our representations to Ottawa for them to participate in the Souris River study which we have already asked them urgently to participate in.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it not a case, then, at the present time we're relying rather heavily on this Bureau of Reclamation report, and the report tends to ignore the possible adverse effects in Manitoba because it's, I imagine, tended to promote the Garrison Diversion with respect to the State of North Dakota.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, our first reliance in 1970 was based on our study - and I use that term not in a formal sense but in the sense of officials of the department which was then headed by the Member for Lakeside - that there would be heavy salination from the run-off of irrigation waters used in the United States into the Souris River, and that that information indicated the need to ask the United States to stop the project. Now if the United States was now taking the position that there are no adverse effects and that we should be proceeding, then the honourable member's question would be relevant. The United States is now taking the position that we will not permit any such adverse effects - which we are aware of, "we" being the United States - and therefore they are completely in accord with our position

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . and there is no need for us to further substantiate that which they already take as given. If that situation changes, then certainly the changes would have to reflect changes in our present outlook.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I direct a further question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. It has to do with his suggestion as to when it's prudent and not prudent to spend money, and I really would ask him to take this argument out of the realm of academics. He is aware and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. ENNS: I ask him, does he not consider the millions of dollars that are being spent right now; the machines are digging the canals right now, does he not, in view of that information which I know he has, consider it prudent for us to spend some money in studying the possible adverse effect that that project is going to have on us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm trying very hard to find a reason for spending money. The honourable member knows - he says that our government has that propensity and therefore I'm trying to fit his image, but at the present time we are told that the adverse effects have been identified, that they are acknowledged by the United States, and therefore no construction will take place which will have the effect of polluting Manitoba waters to the injury of persons or property. The first phase that could have such an effect would not start until 1979, and as long as the United States takes the position that they are not going to proceed, I do not have the urgency to the spending of money on studies. However, we are flexible, we still have an ongoing request to the government of Canada to participate in what is their normal responsibility, a water study of the Souris River, and when that request is met and even if it is not met - if we have to go it alone - such studies as are deemed necessary by any change in circumstances or any new ones will be undertaken.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Would the Minister not agree with me that one way of course to make absolutely sure of no adverse effects on Manitoba would be to convince our American friends to have the diversion going south into South Dakota and complete a loop, rather than north into Manitoba? Now, my second part of the question to the Minister is, has representation been made to the American authorities in their ongoing discussions, that this avenue, this turnout of waters which, despite the First Minister's refusal, I understand the Americans are resisting, that that could take place?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The honourable member is debating to a question.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, our sole position has been that we do not want dirty water from the United States to be coming into Canada. As to how the United States intends to proceed in order to prevent that water from coming in, which they say they will do, we leave that up to the elected representatives of the people of the United States and of the people of North Dakota in particular. And may I say, Mr. Speaker, that it would appear that the strategy and the method of dealing with it which we have adopted has led to very productive results; and had we adopted some of the silly propositions that were being suggested, such as calling them liars, calling them deceitful, and threatening all kinds of reprisals, it would have resulted in counter-productivity. So I think that as a result of the United States State Department's note, that we should feel rather confident about the approach that we have taken.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. For the record, I wonder if he could indicate to this House the results of the vote taken on the ballots he sent out pertaining to the marketing of feed grains in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the information the honourable member wants has had wide circulation throughout the media, but for the benefit of the members I am prepared to repeat those. The total number of ballots that were mailed were 30,834; those returned numbered 15,450, for a percentage return of 50.1 percent; 14,278 voted in favour of retaining the present Canadian Wheat Board system of marketing of grain, for a percentage total of 93.1 of those

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . . . voting favouring the Canadian Wheat Board system.

On the second point, there were 1,055 votes opposed to the Canadian Wheat Board for a percentage total of 6.9 percent opposed to Wheat Board marketing, for a total number of ballots on that question of 15,333. And there were 42 spoiled ballots, and those were ballots that could not be distinguished as to the way in which those people would vote on the question.

On the second question, there were 7,449 voting "yes", or a percentage total of 51.9 percent, 6,905 voting "no", for a total of 48.1 percent; total ballots, 14,354, and there were some 1,000, in other words, of the total ballots received that didn't respond to the second question. There were 62 spoiled ballots of the second question, and the ballots were counted by the Returning Officer of the Manitoba Marketing Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition asked me if I could confirm that my office received a report of one Manfred Keil with respect to R & M Construction in December of 1973. I indicated I would have the office check the file room and see if this was the case, and I am provided here with documents which indicate that on January 24th a letter was directed to me by Mr. Keil with respect to a housing co-op at St. Laurent, and that letter I note the route slip was referred from my office to the Minister of Industry and Commerce by the Clerk of the Executive Council, Mr. Bedson, on the first of February. A second letter was received from Mr. Keil with respect to personnel classification adjustment and problem. This was referred by the administrative secretary to Mr. Gordon Holland, secretary of the Management Committee, and that was on the 15th of March. Those are the only documents or materials relating to Mr. Keil that were brought and filed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he can inform the House, in view of the increasing number of reports coming in of starvation in the deer of the wildlife population, I wonder if he could inform the House of what steps his department has taken or might be taking in order to airlift some feed into them or provide some assistance in some way as this, as I understand, is a very critical time when the deer, especially the deer population are moving from winter graze to summer graze. I wonder if he might give us some idea of what's happening.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I thank the honourable member for jolting our attention to this matter by his question. I'll take it as notice and find out what is going on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Labour can advise the House if he ever gave permission to the Women's Tri-Service Veterans Association to erect a statue on the Legislative grounds near the proximity of the Cenotaph?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, that is not within the jurisdiction of the Department of Labour. I would suggest that my honourable friend should be knowledgeable that this is under the aegis of the Minister of Public Works, and when that gentleman is here I suggest to my friend that he ask the question, or I will take it as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for -- order please. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Another question to the Honourable Minister. I wonder if the Minister in his recollection can remember if in fact he suggested to the ladies that the government might provide them some assistance to erect this statue?

MR. PAULLEY: I'll take that as notice on behalf of my colleague, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Minister of Public Works. I do not know who is holding that portfolio - the Acting Minister of Public Works. I'd like to direct a question to him as Acting Minister of Public Works this afternoon, and ask him if in fact his department of the government has given the Women's Tri-Service Veterans Association permission to erect a statue on the Legislative grounds near the Cenotaph? I may also at the same time ask him, in fact, if the government has offered these ladies some government

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd) . . . . assistance in the proximity of \$50,000 to erect the statue?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I've already taken two questions from my honourable friend, under notice to my colleague I'll take the last two as well.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question now for the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, and ask him if his department has given the Women's Tri-Service Veterans Association permission to erect a statue in the Legislative grounds in the proximity of the Cenotaph?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, my respected colleague has taken the question as notice and that should suffice. But really, the reason I got up is that I'd like to answer a question that I took as notice back a few days from the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. It was in regards to the proposed bill before us and what would happen if the Manitoba Golden Sweepstakes for 1974 . . . and I guess the honourable member is now aware that the Manitoba Derby Sweepstake is under way and no matter what happens to the permissive legislation before us, this will be completed.

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

MR. MCKENZIE: One more question to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise the House if his department has assured the ladies that they will get a grant of approximately \$50,000 to erect their statue.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, again, Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Minister of Labour has taken the question as notice. I, as a Minister of the Crown, have not made such commitment.

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

MR. MARION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Had the department received a request from the Inter-Mountain School Division for a thorough inspection of the Roblin Primary School which was evacuated on Monday on the discovery of a broken roof beam?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of representations being made but I would be more than pleased to take the question as notice and check the incoming mail to see if such is the case.

MR. MARION: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. What procedure is presently being followed generally in the province for regular inspection of school buildings or other public buildings in view of this kind of closure?

MR. PAULLEY: Well really, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the school buildings are concerned, that I believe is within the competence of the Department of Education, who from time to time, which Department from time to time uses the expertise within the Department of Labour and in particular the mechanical and engineering section. And the responsibility, as I indicated a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, for inspections of safety in public buildings rests primarily with the municipalities, and the Department of Labour supplies the technicians in order to assist them.

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

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this next question to the Honourable the First Minister in his capacity as Minister for Urban Affairs. Has the First Minister now received the report of the three-man commission appointed to study the ward boundaries in the City of Winnipeg, and will be tabling the report in the House shortly?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from the Commission indicating that they have completed their consideration and their report. The report is in process of being printed, should be available shortly, and when it is it will be tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable the Minister of Tourism, Recreation & Cultural Affairs. Does the fact that the Manitoba Golden Sweepstakes Lottery on the Manitoba Derby is going ahead on

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . . schedule reflect a change in the timetabling of the West-Can Lotteries setup?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: No, Mr. Speaker, it does not. If the legislation before us is passed in time by this province and by the other participating provinces, it is intended to launch the interprovincial lottery commission by, say, June 1st and have the first draw by October, 1974.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has there been any further indication from the Province of Alberta as to its intentions?

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I related to the House when a similar question was posed, that there was a letter of intent by Ontario tabled at the meeting in Regina; there is a letter of intent before us of which I gave a copy to the honourable member, from the Foundation in Alberta who will be acting on behalf of the Government of Alberta. They have a different system in Alberta so to that extent the Province of Alberta by means of an agency, a foundation, will be participating with the Interprovincial Lottery scheme.

MR. SHERMAN: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister saying that the Alberta Lottery Foundation Incorporated, a private enterprise, is the agent of the Alberta Government in this connection?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, that is the intent as related to us at the meeting in Regina, and that is the intent of the Alberta Government as we see it. In other provinces it could be somewhat different, depending on the legislation that they pass and as accepted by the participating provinces. It will be different in B. C. as compared to Manitoba, and that can be spelled out either by regulation or by -- that is, by the Act presented and by regulations thereto.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for Environmental Management. I wonder if the Minister could advise if the report that he requested, General Effects of the Garrison Dam Diversion on the Province of Manitoba, has been received as yet. I'm referring to his answer, I think on Page 1058, March 5th, to a question I raised in regards to freshwater fish effects. You indicated you had requested a report generally on the over-all effects. Has that report been received as yet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker, and I acknowledge some delay in this connection. I did speak to the Director-General of Water Resources and he mentioned a report to me. I will again see whether I can get it and have it for my honourable friend. I believe that the Member for Fort Rouge also asked for the same report.

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

MR. MINAKER: Yes. My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the same Minister and it relates to a different item. Has the Minister made a decision on what type of mosquito abatement will be allowed in the City of Winnipeg this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, any decision I make in this regard is subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council did consider the matter yesterday; there is a decision; but I feel that in courtesy it should be first reported to the City of Winnipeg and I hope to have a letter out to them this afternoon and then I will report the matter to the House tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Honourable the First Minister. In light of some substantial increases in property taxes due to the increase in the special education levies, is the government planning some financial relief for municipal governments?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye will appreciate that it's only approximately in the last two weeks to three weeks at the most that the school division budgets have been finalized - I would say perhaps even less than two weeks. It's only in recent days that we have got some appreciation of the order of magnitude of school costs, school cost increases, and we are in fact taking a careful appraisal of the over-all

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . province-wide implications to all school divisions and municipalities, and a policy decision will be taken if -- not if but as to whether, and the extent to which any special course of action is warranted under the circumstances.

MR. BANMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Premier had requests from different municipal officials from rural Manitoba for special assistance, and would he confirm that some of these municipalities are facing an increase in excess of 40 percent on the special levy?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, on the special levy it may be. The over-all increase in education costs are drastic enough but they're not anywhere near that order of magnitude. It may well be, however, that a limited number of municipalities may be experiencing what seems to be anomalous increases in the mill rate. This happens from time to time as a result of reassessment taking place in one municipality that is only a component part of a school division, while the other municipalities in that same school division have not had reassessment in that same year, and that would cause the mill rate in one of the municipalities to rise disproportionately more than the other. However, I think I'm aware of the particular geographic context that my honourable friend in referring to and we are considering it in the context of the over-all pattern.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the House Leader. About a year ago I -- a year ago he was presented with a delectable Cohoe salmon fish in this Chamber, which I understand he enjoyed later on, he and his family. My question to him is: having thus enjoyed it, can he indicate what his Department is doing or is planning to do with respect to the introduction of that most desirable species of fish into some of our waterways and lakes?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, in light of inflation I don't see why the answer should come cheaper this year than it came last year. Last year I was presented a fish. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that there exists a considerable difference of opinion between one individual in particular -- and I'm not confining it to one individual but one individual in particular -- and other people who have petitioned us relative to the feasibility of culturing this type of fish, and our departmental officials, and to this point our departmental officials do not see this as a feasible type of activity. I will again go back to them, because the question is always open, and indicate whether there is any change of thinking from last year to this. There certainly has been a change of offerings.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Just by way of notice, would the Minister undertake to perhaps have additional information on this subject matter available to him at the time his estimates arise?

MR. GREEN: No later than that, Mr. Speaker, because it may not be this year that we'll get to the Estimates of the Department of Mines, but they'll be at least at that time.

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

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources -- it's with regards to the mosquito abatement. In the decision that was made by the Order-in-Council, is there any significant changes in the present method of mosquito abatement City of Winnipeg and that that's being recommended. Is there any significant changes?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's of no value to give my honourable friend an answer through the back door to what I already refused to do through the front door. This matter is not being kept a secret but I think out of courtesy to the City of Winnipeg, that they be informed before the Legislature. That will keep you waiting for one day, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MINAKER: A supplementary question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Will this decision that's been made, will it apply to all rural areas, not just to the City of Winnipeg but to Brandon and other urban areas -- correction, not rural areas, but to all urban areas that have a mosquito abatement program?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it will apply to the applicant. May I say with respect to anybody else who wishes to engage in a program which would pollute the atmosphere in a manner contrary to the Clean Environment Commission that they would have to make application to do so.



## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, another supplementary question. Is the Minister indicating that a private individual who wishes to fog his own property for mosquitoes will have to apply for a license to do so with the Clean Environment Commission?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, theoretically the individual who smokes a pipe would be probably in the same position. I am dealing with the practicality of the situation and the practicality of the situation is that when there is an intention by anybody to undertake activities which would have the effect of polluting the environment, contrary to the provisions of the Clean Environment Commission, that they have to apply for limits to be set. If an individual person did this, I doubt whether the practicality of the case is such that he would be prosecuted, but I assume that it is theoretically possible.

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

MR. MARION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Honourable the First Minister in his capacity again as Minister for Urban Affairs. What is the position of the First Minister and his government on the decision by the Municipal Board, an appointed body, to hold back approval of one-third of the 1974 capital budget of the City of Winnipeg, an elected body?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is out of order. It's asking for an opinion. We could be here all day. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I had intended my question to go to the Minister of Industry and Commerce as the Minister responsible for the operation of McKenzie Seed Limited, Brandon, but in his absence, I'll direct the question to the First Minister and ask him if he could tell the House which Standing Committee of the Legislature will receive the annual statement of McKenzie Seeds and review the operating results?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, to reply to the Honourable Member for Brandon West, I should indicate the Minister of Industry and Commerce had an important phone call to deal with. I'll take the question as notice. It's my impression offhand that it would be the Committee on Economic Development but I'm surmising - we'll check it specifically.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister as Minister for Urban Affairs and ask him if in view of the commitments of a number of large private firms on the east side of the Red River, near the proposed St. Vital - Fort Garry bridge, whether the government might consider, before holding out on approval of this bridge, whether they might consider investigating the number of private financial commitments to construct on that side and see if it will not offset some of the thinking that would be opposed to the bridge based on the government's cost alone.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it sounded like a reasonable question but very complicated. I inferred from it that whether it's the government's attitude that because there are commitments or impending commitments for large scale development by private sector . . . shopping centre, etc. that this would cause . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would kind of sympathize, I was trying to catch the gist of it, that I think it refers to a matter which is not urgent and can also be placed in another form on our questions and then have clarification. The Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't debate with the speaker on the matter but might I simply rephrase it and ask the government whether they will consider the private commitments as well as the government commitments before making their final decision on the Fort Garry - St. Vital bridge?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is basically correct. As the Honourable Member for Riel no doubt knows, there have been discussions with the City. There is a mutual realization that there are certain aspects of land use and land acquisition that ought to be considered before, not after a commitment is made to proceed with any significant construction at the St. Vital bridge area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I would like to ask him whether that phone call to which he just attended was

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . . in any way connected with the application of Frontier Airlines to serve Winnipeg from Denver and whether Frontier has been given the green light to fulfill that service?

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East):

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is old news. When the bilateral negotiation outcome was disclosed by Ottawa, it was announced at that time that Frontier Airlines would be given rights under these negotiations, or the agreement, to fly from Denver via Minot or Bismarck up to Winnipeg, and although the bilaterals have not been finalized, I believe that is about to come to pass. An official of the airline will be meeting with me on Friday to tell us of their plans. As you can appreciate, we would like to see as much activity by a Winnipeg based carrier but failing that, not obtaining that, I think the people of Manitoba would welcome additional competitive service to points south.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his answer, but that was at the root of my question, recognizing . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question

MR. SHERMAN: . . . what the bilaterals said a year ago. My question is, has the bilateral been finalized, has Frontier been given the green light to serve Winnipeg out of Denver? I presume the answer is no. Now could I ask a supplementary question to that. And that is, Mr. Speaker, whether the meetings that are scheduled for the latter part of this week have been arranged in order to initiate and launch that service?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, what I was indicating to the honourable members was that to the best of my knowledge the documents have not been signed, but my information is that it looks as though that particular route will be finalized and that the Frontier Airlines Company will be servicing these points. That is the best information I have; that they will be going ahead, they will be getting permission by a joint Canada U. S. agreement. We made our position known on this some weeks back, or months ago when the announcement was first made and my information is that there has been no change substantially in the bilateral negotiations.

MR. SHERMAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister have - outside of what was said in the new bilateral agreements announced last year, does the Minister have any firm indication of a starting date for that prospective service?

MR. EVANS: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, we haven't been given any indication. Perhaps by next week I'll have some idea, but it will be unofficial; I'm not able to give you that information because I don't have it.

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

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. My question is why was the \$30 million cut out of the borrowing authority for the City of Winnipeg when the First Minister in his Budget Speech the other night indicated that Winnipeg had the lowest per capita debt of any city over 500,000 population?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't understand the extend to which the honourable member feels that there is a problem here, because in fact, that part of the capital budget relating to shorter term requirements has been approved by the Municipal Board. That part of the capital budget relating to longer term implications and larger capital costs has been deferred and is under continuing consideration because it requires further discussions and understanding between the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba.

MR. MINAKER: Another supplementary question on the same subject to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Was the \$30 million cut out because the \$30 million of projects are such projects that the Province of Manitoba would share 50 percent of the cost of?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would have to ascertain the stated reasons given by the Municipal Board, but certainly there is no problem in my indicating to the Honourable Member for St. James that long-term, larger scale capital projects on which there is an expectation on the part of the City that the Province will cost share on something major of that kind, that we want ample time and opportunity to discuss and to understand fully. I don't believe that the City of Winnipeg in the discussions to date have any expectation of imminent approval on something that has all of the implications that attach to those particular projects.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. MINAKER: Another supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the \$3.3 million transit subsidy a replacement for the \$15 million share on these particular projects - the \$15 million provincial share?

MR. SCHREYER: If the honourable member is suggesting is this part of a horse trading operating, the answer is no, there's no connection in that sense.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is it customary for the Department of Industry and Commerce to ask for prices from dealers in the province of Quebec for equipment to help new business set up in Manitoba when this equipment is available in our own province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce

MR. EVANS: Well I'm not sure what the honourable member is specifically alluding to. The industrial consultants of the department as you know are available to help build enterprise in Manitoba and we tend to give as much as we can - steer possible purchasers to Manitoba suppliers to the greatest extent we can. But on the other hand, if you're a good sound businessman you're always looking for the best possible deal you can get and there may be some occasion to make comparisons by getting prices outside of the province. If the honourable member would give me some particulars we can look into it.

MR. MOUG: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, for clarification. I mean a direct request for prices from the province of Quebec for products that are handled, and the same trade name, in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. EVANS: I'll just repeat, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would give me some specifics I'll be very pleased to look into the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister pursuant to the questions regarding the Municipal Board. Could the First Minister please inform the House as to whether the government is instructing the Municipal Board as to what to do and what not to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's a very specific and terse question and I can give a very specific answer. It is no.

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

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister again in his capacity as Minister for Urban Affairs. Will the Minister in his next meeting with the City of Winnipeg official delegation be advising this delegation of its personal feelings with respect to beltways and bridges that would be used as connections for the beltway?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the province, if it is being requested to participate on whatever formula of cost sharing on major capital projects, there are various stages, one of which is the Municipal Board and decisions are taken there. But further to that the province surely has to reserve the right to decide whether or not it will participate on any given capital project, and that's really the stage we're at.

Insofar as expressing an opinion as to the relative merits of freeways as opposed to subdued arterial street extensions, it's a matter of considerable importance. We do have a position, Mr. Speaker, of not being in favour of beltways and freeways and we have articulated that position a number of times.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I had a supplementary question on the subject of McKenzie Seeds and now that the Minister responsible is back in the House perhaps I could proceed with that and ask him, with reference to an announcement he made two years ago in the Manitoba Government News Service on the appointment of Mr. Guillermo Berentsen to the Board of McKenzie Seeds, Mr. Berentsen of Mexico. I would ask him if Mr. Berentsen is now or has ever been a Director of McKenzie Seeds.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Berentsen, the gentleman to which you refer, is not now a member of the Board and I don't believe that he ever was appointed officially. In fact, I am pretty positive,

## ORAL QUESTIONS PERIOD

(MR. EVANS cont'd) . . . . Mr. Speaker, if my memory does not fail me on this matter, I don't believe he ever was a member of the Board of McKenzie Seeds.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I may have missed a correction then on this statement in the News Service. But could you tell me then, or tell the House whether or not McKenzie Seeds have an equity position in Bon Jardin of Mexico?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Yes. Mr. Speaker, McKenzie Seeds a couple of years ago did engage in a joint venture with a Mexican partner and set up the company to which the honourable member refers, Bon Jardin was meant to be a trading vehicle to enable McKenzie's to sell in the Latin American common market area, I guess you can refer to it.

MR. MCGILL: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could tell the House then approximately what the loss was sustained by McKenzie Seed as a result of this equity position which no longer exists.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge that company still exists and the equity is still there, and I don't believe it involved any cash or if it did, it involved very little. I believe our input mainly was a quantity of seed inventory that was unsaleable in Canada.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would now be in a position to say which of the standing committees of the House would receive the report of McKenzie Seed and consider the operating results.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, McKenzie Seeds since 1945 has been owned by the Government of Manitoba and I believe no information was ever made available except in 1947 when there was a strike. Since we've come to office, we have issued consolidated statements indicating the highlights of the performance of the company over each year, and we will take under advisement this question that the honourable member raises.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Minister to say that the consolidated statements have been made available to the members of the Legislature?

MR. EVANS: No, Mr. Speaker. I said the highlights of the consolidated statements of the company have been made available through press statements issued each year as soon as the audited statement was prepared to the general public of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would now proceed to the Orders of the Day and Bill No. 34. But before calling the Bill I would like to advise honourable members that I would like to call Public Accounts Committee for Tuesday next at 10:00 o'clock, if that is satisfactory. So next week we would have Public Accounts on Tuesday, Communities Economic Development Fund on Thursday. The Minister of Finance indicates that he doesn't have confirmation of the Auditor but I take it that will be forthcoming. If it isn't, I'll announce it tomorrow.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS - BILL NO. 34

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 34. The Honourable Member for Roblin has ten minutes left.

MR. MCKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, since I last spoke on this bill certain changes have been made. The Honourable Minister of Finance has come out with a press release condemning us in opposition for attacking this government and for using our parliamentary rights - for using the rights of the people of this province to find out what this government is doing. And I'll deal with that in my remarks this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and show the people of the province what kind of a Minister of Finance we've got.

But, Mr. Speaker, there was a classic example of how uptight this opposition is with this government. The Minister of Industry and Commerce was just asked some legitimate questions about McKenzie Seeds, and what kind of answers did he give? A bunch of junk. A bunch of junk. Where can we in opposition, Mr. Speaker, stand up and tell the people of this province that our government, our government, the government of the people of this province, is credible when you get answers like we just got from the Minister of Industry and Commerce relating to McKenzie Seeds.

Mr. Speaker, let's deal with this bill. Let's deal with the rights of the opposition . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Would the Honourable Minister of Industry

## ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS - BILL NO. 34

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) . . . . and Commerce state his matter of privilege?

MR. EVANS: The matter of privilege is that the honourable member refers to my recent answers as so much junk, and I would infer from that that he was suggesting that I was giving untruthful answers and trying to mislead the House. Well if that is not the case I would like him to explain what he meant, because I tried to give you honest, straightforward answers to those questions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I can answer him real quick. My colleague the Member for Brandon asked for some specific answers: Where's the books? Where's the records? Did we get answers, Mr. Speaker? We got nothing but there'll be some consolidated statements of the "highlights" of some corporation that this government owns, known as McKenzie Seeds. Now why can't we have those figures? Do you mean that the opposition are not entitled, that the people of this province are not entitled to that type of answers to the questions that we're raising? And we're not going to get them from this government, Mr. Speaker, and all the other things that we raise in this House and I can . . .

But, Mr. Speaker, we in opposition let this government function for four years to see if they could put their books together and see if they could look after the people of this province. We gave you four years to be credible, to be honest and have some integrity, and show us how you can run this province. Mr. Speaker, we got the answers loud and clear. We're not going to let you off the hook in this session. No way.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the press release that the Minister of Finance released this morning. And, Mr. Speaker, I refer the Minister of Finance of this province to the Financial Administration Act which is on his desk, and I refer him to Section 42 (1) which he had quoted, and let's read that. And why he said he's only going to - - he has the rights, Mr. Speaker, of special warrants but he comes out with a press release that he says, "I'm only going to go for a special warrant for one twenty-sixth." So I can embarrass the opposition, that I can come out with a press release. Yes, you could have went for one-tenth, you could have went for any figure. Why did you pick one twenty-sixth? To embarrass the opposition and again draw red herrings across this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, and like all the NDP over there they blamed the Roblin Government, they blamed the Weir Government for days like that. You're not the Roblin Government; you're not the Weir Government; you're the government of the day of this province. You sure are. But, Mr. Speaker, they don't act like the Weir Government acted, nor do they act. I'll just spell it out.

In those days, Mr. Speaker, did you ever see the Roblin Government going for Capital Supply for General Purposes? Not one cent was borrowed by that government for General Purposes. Not one cent was borrowed by that government for General Purposes. The Weir Government, did they borrow anything for General Purposes? Not one cent, Mr. Speaker. But this government came to office in 1969, they borrowed \$7 million for General Purposes; in 1970 they borrowed \$30 million for General Purposes. Why? Mr. Speaker, in 1971 they went for \$21,252,000 for General Purposes. Mr. Speaker, in 1972 they went for 45 million for General Purposes. Mr. Speaker, in 1973 they went for 24,182,000 for General Purposes; and, Mr. Speaker, in 1974 they go for another \$33,650,000 for General Purposes. And I say to you today, Mr. Speaker, and I say to the people of this province, the Weir Government never done that kind of borrowing, nor did the Roblin Government, and you can pat your desk over there and you can pat one another on the back, but I say, Mr. Speaker, that the government of this province is not credible and you're not telling us the answers and you're not telling us what you're doing so we can pass these Estimates.

A MEMBER: You don't even know what you want.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, we don't know what we want. I'll spell it out. Do you want me to spell it out again? I want to know why the questions that's been on the Order Paper since the day this House opened aren't being answered. My questions, dozens of them on the Order Paper. No answers, Mr. Speaker. What happened to the co-ops? We got no answers, Mr. Speaker. The Wabowden thing? No answers. The mineral taxation problem? No answers. The W.I. thing, Mr. Speaker? No answers. The problems of people of this city and our other communities in Manitoba? No answers. The problems of the City of Winnipeg? No answers. And so it goes on and on. I asked you to spell out the gasoline prices for the people of this

BILL 34

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd). . . province. Surely you must know now what we're going to have to pay for gas. And that affects every citizen in this province. Every citizen in this province wants to know, what's the price of gasoline going to be? No. They don't know, Mr. Speaker. That's a patchwork type of government, and you mean to tell me that we in opposition haven't got the right to debate and fight these issues on this Bill 34? Well, Mr. Speaker, why did the Minister of Finance make that press release and blame us? I tell him again, read Section 42(1) of The Financial Administration. If he doesn't want to read it I'll read it for him.

Mr. Speaker; it says in this Act, "Where an expenditure not unforeseen or provided for, or insufficiently provided for, is urgent or. . ."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Finance state his point of order.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure he would appreciate being told he did not read that fifth word correctly; he read the negative instead of the positive. I'm sure he'd want to read it correctly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: If I did not read it correctly I will read it over again and apologize to the Minister of Finance. Mr. Speaker, Section 42 (1) under Special Warrants: "Wherein an expenditure not foreseen or provided for, or insufficiently provided for, is urgently and immediately required for the public good, upon report of the Minister that there is no legislative provision or sufficient provision therefor, and if the Member of the Executive Council having charge of the service in question that necessity is urgent and the expenditure is for the public good, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may order a Special Warrant to be prepared and signed by the Lieutenant-Governor authorizing it."

And, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has that right and the government has that right, but you know, Mr. Speaker, what the Minister of Finance did today, he comes out with a press release and he drags red herrings all over the place, referred back to the Roblin days, referred back to the Weir days, I forget. But he goes and he says he is going to - under Special Warrant he's going to draw one twenty-sixth. And I ask him why he selected--that's his figure, that's not ours. Why didn't he say one-thirteenth or one-tenth? But, Mr. Speaker, he is blaming us, he is blaming us because some of the civil servants such as social assistants, salaries of public servants, subsistent payments will not be met. Again, Mr. Speaker, I proved the bungling of this government and the mishandling of the public funds. Why does the Minister of Finance want to use a vehicle such as a press release like this to blame us in opposition when we're only fighting for the rights of the people of this province? And, Mr. Speaker, if nobody's going to fight for the people of this province I'm darned sure this government isn't going to fight for them. They're not for the people the way they're bungling and spending money like it's going out of style, telling the people of this province that inflation is not a problem; that a 10 percent, 11 inflationary factor, we're going to have to live with it forever.

Mr. Speaker, I tell the Minister of Finance and I tell this government, that we're not going to accept that type of inflation for the people of this province - at least I'm not. Because the days that we were government we were talking two and three and four percent. But is this something that we're going to have to tie around the people of this province forever? That they're going to have to accept ten and eleven percent inflation forever? Mr. Speaker, I would be a poor member of this Legislature if I'd stand up here and accept that.

But Mr. Speaker, this government's accepting it, because they're not doing a darned thing about it. Nothing. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance comes and makes this press release to the people of this province today and blames us. My gosh, we haven't got the treasury. We're only the opposition and we only have certain vehicles that we can attack government and try and make them credible and honest to the people and to the opposition. And because we're using our rights as legislators in this province to fight for the rights of the people, the Minister of Finance goes to the press--I know he's real friendly with the press. I hear some of the parties he puts on at his home for them, and I know, I've watched him as he--it's an interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, to watch the Minister of Finance operate in this House, how he'll spin his chair around and he'll spin and grin up at the press gallery. Well, Mr. Speaker, he can grin all he wants. But, Mr. Speaker, I was never more serious in my life than I am standing here in this Legislature this afternoon of the tactics of this government,

## BILL 34

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd). . . who now when they find themselves in trouble all over the place they've got so many things they've swept under the carpet or are trying to sweep under the carpet blaming us, and now the Minister of Finance comes out with a press release, Mr. Speaker, and says the opposition is to blame for their bungling. Do you believe that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is up. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to add some comments while we're on Interim Supply, Bill No. 34, but I understand it's not maybe as urgent to pass it as it was a while ago because I understand there's an Interim Bill being passed that will provide financing to meet the government bills temporarily.

I want to make one or two comments although I don't want to belabour a lot of points that have been covered in the past. I want to make one or two remarks of some previous contributions to the House and I would--I couldn't resist making reference to the speech the other day of the Member for Emerson, which I think is typical of members opposite. He attempted to blame us on this side of the House for some of the conduct in the House and I don't think he was being entirely fair in his remarks on blaming us for the state of debate of the House, because I would hasten to assure him that I don't think it started over here and I can go back to remarks of the Minister of Agriculture prior to the last election where it was attributed to him as saying that when the election did come it would be one of the dirtiest elections that he had ever seen. I think he carried that on into the Outlook Conference in Brandon where he took the opportunity of a public forum to personally attack several members of this side of the Legislature and provide the farmers with a message that I don't think they were looking for. I think the farmers wanted something a little better. So I say to the Member for Emerson, I certainly wasn't elected to the Legislature to mud-sling either but when you're dragged down to the only level when you can't get questions and that answered, it becomes a little difficult not to slide down to that particular level.

I think the problems in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, are normal problems. I think being an agricultural or rural area, I think our economy has boomed on account of the grain situation, but I know the other area, the livestock area, is certainly suffering and the people in the hog and cattle business are looking for some direction and for some assistance from the Minister of Agriculture, and they're not asking for that much, Mr. Speaker. They have been before him on many occasions and he is one who claims that he listens to the voice of the farmer, and I really can't find evidence of that being the fact, although I must admit in recent weeks he has listened to the pressures of the Women's Institute and provided some assistance to them that they were certainly concerned was going to be taken away from them. And while I am mentioning that particular fact and while I know that there has been some assurance that this assistance will be reinstated, I received a letter this morning and I want to read it into the record, Mr. Speaker.

This letter is from the Minnedosa Association of 4-H Leaders, it's dated Sandy Lake, March 26th and addressed to me, and I don't know whether the Minister got a copy of it or not so for his information I would like to read it into the record. It says, "The members of the Minnedosa 4-H Leaders Association at their annual meeting on March 25th, in Basswood, Manitoba, unanimously supported the following resolution: We, the Minnedosa 4-H Leaders Association, hereby protest the removal of the home economists from the Department of Agriculture and rural Manitoba. We accept the need for home economists in the Department of Health and Social Services, but we of rural Manitoba have an urgent need for them also. Through past experience we have seen the benefits that their services have accomplished, not only in the 4-H movement but also with adult education and leadership. We hope you will reconsider and continue to provide home economists for rural Manitoba." And it's signed, "Yours sincerely, Peter Coulson, Secretary-Treasurer."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know the Minister has assured the Women's Institute and those other people who have been concerned that they're not removing economists from the rural scene, but he has indicated that seven have been removed and their services are being provided in northern Manitoba, and we certainly don't object to that. We know that services have to be provided in northern Manitoba equal to what we get in the south as far as possible, but we don't want to see the services of the 4-H leaders in Manitoba diluted any further. I know we

## BILL 34

(MR. BLAKE cont'd). . . have lost one in our particular area, and any time you lose an employee from your town it is one more payroll that is lost to the business people of that area. So we would urge the Minister to listen to many of the pleas that he is receiving and give it due consideration.

I know that he has received a lot of representation from the concerned A. I. users and they certainly aren't asking for much, Mr. Speaker; they're asking for a small change in Bill 120 that will enable them to carry on and earn their livelihood and maintain their dairy herds or beef herds in the manner that they have become accustomed to over the years, using the freedom of choice to select whatever semen they might use to breed their animals artificially, and our particular area is fortunate in having a technician that's highly regarded in the area and has done an extremely good job.

I attended a meeting, I mentioned earlier in remarks I made, at Portage la Prairie where there were farmers from all over Manitoba and concerned dairy and beef people there, and their requests were certainly ignored because the Minister has given no indication whatsoever that he would accede to their requests. I would think from that, Mr. Speaker, that there is a good indication the farmers have lost confidence in the Minister and the Department of Agriculture, particularly with some of the appointments that he has recently made to his department, and that concern has been expressed to me also with the 4-H specialist that he has assured them will be provided throughout the province to replace some of the advice and assistance that the home economists used to normally supply. Now I don't know what he might consider a 4-H specialist, Mr. Speaker. I know that we have a group of people attached to the Extension Service Department now, that they call themselves Community Affairs Specialists - and I know that for the most part they are strong party supporters or defeated candidates and have received those jobs for what might be obviously a little reward for past services. I know they're certainly on a fairly acceptable salary scale. And I would certainly hope that when the 4-H Specialists are appointed throughout the regions of the province, Mr. Speaker, that they are not chosen for that same particular reason and that they will be fully qualified to provide the assistance that is needed in the 4-H movement because it is one of the finer movements in the rural area.

I attended a meeting in my constituency last Saturday night, Mr. Speaker, attended by in excess of some 100 local people, and I would say 95 percent of them farmers. The main purpose of the meeting was their concern with rail line abandonment and the grain problems, which I realize a good portion of it is a federal responsibility and there is not too much that this House might do, but we haven't seen too much evidence by this government, Mr. Speaker, in really putting pressure on the Federal Government to state their policies and let us know exactly where they stand on rail line abandonment; whether they favour it or whether they don't. I think this is extremely important to the rural people and it's something that the Minister must be fully aware of.

My colleague from Swan River mentioned the other night in his remarks the concern of the ambulance services throughout rural Manitoba. We certainly have that facility in my particular area. I know what it costs the rural municipalities and I'm well aware that they are expending considerable funds at the present time to upgrade their equipment, providing two-way radio and what not. I had an opportunity to speak to the president of the Ambulance Association of Manitoba in the last few days, and he tells me that they have heard absolutely nothing of the government's intention or what the two million dollars announced in the Budget might be provided for. I think if this government claims to be an open government and concerned with the welfare of all the people of Manitoba, that it should certainly listen to some of these organizations that are also concerned with what is best for their citizens and for the people, and I think there is no problem in sitting down and discussing these things openly, and I'm sure when they get the views of many of these organizations in the rural area, that they will come out with a service that is best for all of the people of Manitoba.

I think also, Mr. Speaker, I should make a remark about the development of business throughout the province. I think with many of the government actions lately they have weakened rather than strengthened the rapport with the business community. I know this is particularly the case in the recent announcement with the new mining situation. It's not too long ago - as a matter of fact just before the last election - when the Premier said the Kierans report was far too radical and that many of the mining companies in the province were certainly good



## BILL 34

(MR. BLAKE cont'd). . . corporate citizens. I know on more than one occasion I have heard him commend the mining companies for their service to the province and to the areas and that they were being good corporate citizens, and it's a little hard to really feel that he was sincere in making those remarks when we look at the full implications of the new mining regulations, because this has no doubt created a fear in the mining community. They certainly can't plan ahead for one year or two years, they have to make longer range plans than that.

I know in the remarks of the address of the Chairman of the Board of Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting to the Faculty of Management Studies in Toronto last December, he mentioned politically, however, the mining industry is very much geared to shorter term influences. And as mining executives ask themselves where they should direct their prospecting next year, whether to go ahead with the development of a deposit or where to put a new refinery, they're probably looking harder at the speeches of politicians, the draft legislation and the tax proposals, than they are at the forecast of the economists, the bankers and the market analysts. And this would give us an indication, I think, Mr. Speaker, of some of the concerns that they are experiencing.

He goes on to mention another area which the mining planners will be looking at, is the confusion which appears to exist in the mind of political Canada and in some parts of the press about our natural resource policy, husbanding Canada's natural resources for Canadians and resisting the rape of our resources by grafting foreigners who plan to hold us in thrall as hewers of wood and drawers of water, and so on. So there's a real concern, not only expressed there but by many of the leaders in the mining industry, Mr. Speaker, and it was certainly evident for anyone that has been in the north and has seen mining operations, that they cannot plan on short term bases, they have to make as long term plans as they possibly can. And I don't think anyone, including the Member for Flin Flon, can honestly stand up and say that the officials of the mining companies in northern Manitoba aren't concerned with seeing those communities continue. There is no one, I am sure, that wants to see Thompson become a ghost town, Lynn Lake, or any of the rest of them; and those people are taking a realistic and as businesslike a view as they possibly can in order to maintain the growth and the life of those towns to provide employment, not only for the people that are there now but for their sons and daughters, and they want to project this as many years ahead as they possibly can. And I don't think there is any member on the opposite side of the House, if he is being responsible, Mr. Speaker, would say that that is not true.

I think to further indicate, Mr. Speaker, the loss of confidence of the business community I could cite the insurance industry. We have two real good corporate citizen insurance companies in the province; nothing has been done in the last couple of years to certainly bolster their confidence in business in Manitoba. In fact they just recover from a staggering blow of auto insurance and build up the other phase of their insurance in fire and casualty, and now they're sitting on shaky ground there, thinking maybe that's going to be knocked out from under them also.

But I go on to say, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get back into the Autopac debate; we may have another opportunity for that because the resolution is coming around again. I might make a comment on a remark that was made by the Minister of Agriculture the other night that a ten million dollar loss really wasn't a loss, it was an investment, because it had been paid out to fix bent fenders and what not. And I think that may be some indication of why our farmers are lacking a little confidence in the department. With that type of thinking, Mr. Speaker, I'm not too sure I'd want him running my business very long.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that there are many areas where the government has tried to get involved to stimulate the economy. The results in many cases haven't been favorable and there's no point in dragging out the long list of the MDC involvements, but I should mention Saunders Aircraft probably. We found out this morning that we're 16 million involved there and by any stretch of the imagination, Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that we're throwing a lot of bad money down a dry hole, much as we might be doing in the mining industry as we get involved to try and develop the industry in Manitoba and take up the slack that we may feel when some of the private developers fail to spend the exploration money that is necessary to find mines and to find oil wells in the province. I think the indication of the experience with some of the NDP companies would be a good guideline to follow and suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government would just possibly not manage this particular phase of our economy as

## BILL 34

(MR. BLAKE cont'd). . . well as it would be managed if it was left to private developers and the old hard-line prospectors that had the incentive of finding something over the years and possibly being rewarded for their years and years of labour. I think with Saunders, Mr. Speaker, sooner or later somebody is going to have to make the decision and say, "It's a bad deal and let's get out of it." It was the government some years ago that had guts enough to scrap an aircraft program at considerable loss to the taxpayers, and it certainly wasn't a politically good move either, but it was certainly done and I think something like that might be a little bolder than suggesting that we can maybe make some additional revenue for the province by establishing a bed tax in Manitoba. If those are the taxes we have to resort to, Mr. Speaker for revenue, I'm just afraid to suggest what they might think of taxing next.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the changes that those of us on this side of the House are looking for are certainly not out of the ordinary. We have suggested to the Minister of Finance that some small changes are required in the Mineral Tax Act. He has indicated to us that he is prepared to make some changes. We would like to maybe see what they might be. The Minister of Agriculture has been asked to make a small change in one of his bills. I see he is making some changes in the Farm Machinery Act, and it's certainly not before time because that is one area where many many problems have been created for the farmers, and many problems that I'm sure people aren't completely aware of. . .

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . only take a couple of minutes.

MR. BLAKE: Yes. Sure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I ask sincerely, I'm not aware that the honourable member has made a suggestion for any changes which he suggested for the Mineral Acreage Tax Act, and I'd be anxious to hear specific suggestions. I may at the same time point out I did not say I would make changes, I said I wanted to consider proposals, and that's. . .

MR. BLAKE: Yes. I apologize, Mr. Speaker, that my play on words there maybe wasn't just correct, but--no, I realized that, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister was going to consider making changes, and I thought when I spoke on it earlier that my position, and I'm sure that of my colleagues, was clear, that we felt the clause to tax the individual, we didn't feel that when the act was brought in that there was an intent to tax individuals such; it was an all-encompassing thing. We realized the intent of the act was to tax those who, of a corporate nature, who were holding larger tracts of land under lease in northern Manitoba and in the oil fields under lease for speculative purposes and tying them up for a considerable length of time.

The individual--I think, Mr. Speaker, there are so many individual problems that it would be difficult to tie down every specific case that might, or maybe should be exempt. So in order to eliminate all that, if they use individual, that solves all the problems. I realize Mr. Speaker, that the Minister feels someone like myself who might hold land and am not particularly engaged physically in farming that land, that if I own the mineral rights, that I should pay tax on them. But I'm saying there are many people and particularly in my area who are still living on the farm through health reasons or incapacitated in one way or the other through injury, aren't able to physically farm that land, and they lease it out to their son or brother or farmer; they still hold the mineral rights, and I don't think the intent was to tax them. But in order to try and eliminate someone like that and tax someone like myself, it would be an extremely difficult administrative problem, and I don't think there is that much money involved so that if they eliminate the individual, I think that would solve the problem. It's a consideration such as that, that I think I would look at and our party would look at. We certainly don't want to destroy what we thought was the intent of the whole bill, to tax the large type speculators, the oil companies who were tying up leases and the mining companies who were tying up large tracks of land. If that's not clear, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to maybe discuss it with the Minister at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, I know, I mentioned some considerations that we were asking of the government and some of the Ministers and I mentioned what we thought the Minister of Agriculture should consider. I know he has bowed to pressure from some of the women's groups in connection with the removal of the home economists and their part-time secretary and hopefully that will not be a temporary move, it will be something a little more permanent.

I know that the Minister of Agriculture has again made some changes in the grazing land rates. It was announced in the paper today and I'm sure that there will be a public

## BILL 34

(MR. BLAKE cont'd). . . announcement of it at a later date. But this, Mr. Speaker, was brought about as a direct result I'm sure of pressure brought to bear on the Minister by those people actually concerned with leasing grazing rights in our province and the rate was exorbitant to say the least, and now these people have protested loudly throughout parts of the province where they lease a lot of land and the Minister apparently has listened to their wishes; and it alarms me that he doesn't listen to some of the other representations from farm groups that are equally as important and have been protested equally as loudly. It may be the large areas of land in the province are occupied in areas possibly where there may be a member sitting on the government benches but I would hate to think that that is the reason why he has chosen to reduce the grazing land rates.

Another item that concerns us on this side, Mr. Speaker, is the charges that have been made in this House of irregularities up north. All we're asking for is an investigation to turn up any wrongdoing; if there is no wrongdoing, there is no problem. It would seem to me that that certainly isn't something that the Ministers involved could look into without any problem. It's a duty on this side of the House, those of us in opposition I think to point these things out to the Minister and to lay it on the table and inform the taxpayers of the province of what is going on and if there is wrongdoing that it certainly should be cleaned up, and the only way we can do that of course is to take the tack that we have done in this particular instance.

It was expressed earlier today, Mr. Speaker, the increases in school costs and I realize also that the budgets are just coming down because ours, in my particular school area, was just brought down a week ago and I think there is an increase of 30-some mills in our particular area. The increase in school costs I know are alarming to the government and they are considering ways and means to alleviate it, but when it is stated at one particular juncture, Mr. Speaker, that hospital costs must be limited to an increase of eight percent and we find what school costs are doing, I don't see any reason for making the statement that hospital costs have to be maintained at eight percent. There is an area here where I think they have to really sit down with the people involved and take a real completely new look at the taxation at the local level and provide whatever assistance the rural areas might need to bring them into line with their counterparts throughout the other parts of the province that may have superior education facilities.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, the passing of Interim Supply is possibly not as urgent as it was, because there has been temporary measures taken to bring the funds to hand to pay the immediate bills. However, I wanted to make these particular comments before the bill was passed, and with that I'll turn the floor over, Mr. Speaker, to someone who may have further contribution to make.

. . . . Continued on next page.

## BILL 34

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to make any remarks on this bill I have to consider why I should vote in favour of this bill, if I vote in favour of it. A government that has spent \$329 million in 1969 who now has a budget of \$834 million which is a terrific raise in the budget. I know that we're living in times of inflation and that things cost more, but I have a feeling that this government is spending money like as if it's going out of style and in many cases foolishly, and in cases where they are even unwilling to give a good account of how it's spent.

So we come back to whether we really have confidence and trust in the people on that side who are the Ministers who are really doing the affairs of the province; and not only do we come back as to whether we have trust in them or not, we know that they have a difference in their outlook, that they want to pretty much end up with the government looking after everything, they believe that government can do things better than people, and for this reason, too, we also have to consider whether we should support the budget at all, because in many cases we just don't agree with their basic principle and philosophy.

MR. GREEN: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister state his point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is reflecting on a vote that has already been taken, the budget has been passed. The honourable member is now saying he is wondering whether he should support the budget or not and I would like to indicate that we are debating Interim Supply not the Budget, the Budget has passed and it's contrary to the rules to reflect on a vote that has already been taken.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is right. However, I know that he knows I'm speaking on Interim Supply and that it's passed. This is what gets me when we get educated men, whether professors or lawyers, they're always trying to trip somebody up on something, just for a technicality; sometimes I feel we have too many people who have a lot of brains and gift of the gab that don't make much of a contribution.

Now I'd like to go over my opinions of some of the Ministers over there and what they have done in helping to make up my mind as to whether I should vote for Interim Supply.

We have the Premier of the Province who actually went out before the election and said that insurance rates wouldn't be going up until 1975. He must have known better but he said this, he didn't care that he was misleading the people with these statements at this time. We know how he handled Hydro. We know that probably the Premier of this province is costing people more in what he did than anybody else that's ever been . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister state his matter of privilege.

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Minister responsible for Manitoba Public Insurance Corp.)

(St. George): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has indicated that the Premier of this province led the people astray in his comments regarding insurance rates. The honourable member well knows that the statement made by the Premier was a prediction in which he indicated that he could have been proven wrong.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Well we also, Mr. Speaker, we also now not only have the educated people that can come up with a different outlook but we have some others. Because what's the difference if he said it? What's the difference if he said it? - he was creating that impression and that was what he was trying to do. So what's the talk about. It was misleading the people.

We have the Minister of Labour that gets up and waves his arm all around, you'd think he was the only man that cared about Manitoba and the labouring man; and if we watch the Minister of Labour from time to time we know that his main concern is to keep the support of the people so he can stay in power.

The House Leader, he was looking after the Manitoba Development Fund which has showed a loss of \$56 million in the last four years, although I must say that it isn't all attributed to him, but the loss is there. He's a very capable man, got great use of words and he's very capable in debate; but we know after we're through listening to him that if we just sit down and think for awhile, that we know he's trying to lead us down the garden path.

He believes that the government should control everything. He believes that they should.

## BILL 34

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) . . . . I give him credit for standing up for his convictions, and possibly if that particular Minister while he was in charge, I believe possibly that he would be as just as any person who has a monopoly - I was going to say another word but I won't use it - I believe he'd be as just as he could be. But this state of a thing where government becomes a control leads to corruption, which does lead to more abuses and I'd be awful afraid as to what would come next. And you will not last forever.

The Minister of Health has come in to bail out another Minister who got himself into an awful mess. We feel that they didn't deal with the doctors in good faith, because I can think back of even statements that the Minister of Finance made on the radio at the time when the doctors were talking about going on strike. He stated, made it sound over the radio as if it was a matter of wages now that meant that they could be going on strike and it could be interpreted this way. It actually wasn't that but he was using it this way.

So I say that actually the doctors weren't dealt with in good faith. The people--(Interjection)--Did you have something you wanted to say or . . . ?

A MEMBER: Carry on George.

MR. HENDERSON: They'd been in a mix-up with the hospitals, they haven't had enough beds for emergency cases and the Minister of Health says it was this way, it will be this way and so on, he doesn't really seem to be too concerned. They'll plan it out and then it should be right.

I'm not in favour of the way the welfare system has been handled in this province as I've said before, a number abuses it's had. It's not that I'm against people in need getting help but I see so many abuses going on, and you people know of them too, and now you're coming along with what we call a guaranteed annual income for everybody, a system which is going to cost us over \$17 million in the next three years. Frankly it's something that I don't believe I'll ever support because I don't believe in guaranteeing people income if they don't try to produce and I believe this work incentive that they talk about could have been brought into the present health system in a different way. But to set a group of people up that they'll be guaranteed an income whether they work or not, is just something that I cannot agree with. --(Interjection)--It's not the Christian way of living? --(Interjection)--Well I'm sure that the Minister himself has voted for many things himself that he never thought was a Christian way of living, so he doesn't lecture me on this.

We have the Minister of Tourism and Cultural Affairs handing out grants in all directions and yet when we go to this government for a good cause like a diversion of the Boyne River around the town of Carman we are told, oh no, no money, it's not economically feasible or something like this. Or if we want to include extra water storage for Morden which is a - no they can't spend money like that. Possibly if there was a chance of them gaining votes in my area, they might, but you know they just know that there's no hope. They'd like to buy votes so they're going to spend their money where they think they can get them, because they know they're not going to hoodwink the people of Pembina.

No, there's no doubt about it and you'll hear people who were taking these different grants and using them in the municipalities, that the different types of grants have got out of all proportion. You will hear many of the municipal people saying that the reason they are taking them is because other areas are taking them and they don't believe that a government should be carrying on with a program like this.

The Minister of Northern Affairs has also made a terrible job of dealing with his department; his winter road business has turned out to be nothing but a fiasco. All he's doing up there is, it seems to me, is trying to turn the government office into an NDP propaganda agency. --(Interjection)--Where did I get that idea? No problem, it's been stated many times. No, the Minister of Northern Affairs has made a flop of his department too, so as I go over these different ones, I see so many people that have made a bad job. Now we come to the Minister of Autopac. Yes, the Minister of Autopac - another department which lost over \$10 million, but they're wanting to run everything - this is another department. They are going to want to go into general insurance too but --(Interjection)--my honourable member says that wasn't a loss that was just an investment in fenders.

A MEMBER: That's what he said the other day.

MR. HENDERSON: But you know, you know, they were so sure they could save people all this money, but when they get in there - they're down \$10 million, our rates are going up

## BILL 34

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) . . . . 20 percent, and now they've got a monopoly we're not going to have any way of comparing it. They're going to fix - get people like - well I won't quote the name from out of the jail there, and give him a training course and set him up, and how do we know how he's going to blend this into Autopac. I'm talking about the program - well I know his name, I don't want to mention names because I don't like to operate that way. So we're going to spend government money training him and then have him operating and then we're - indirectly we're going to try to cut Autopac's rates down some way. But I sure wish he'd left it so we had a form of comparison. --(Interjection)--Sure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Insurance.

MR. URUSKI: In his statement that Autopac was financing an individual into the body shop business, is the member recommending that the body shop industry be looked into by the Provincial Government or by Autopac in research and the like?

MR. HENDERSON: Well I know if you get your way, you'd like to run the whole show right from one end to the other, so there'd be no check-up on you at all. You'd like to have it right from one end to the other, there's no question.

Now we have the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, which - what will I say for sure? I'll say he's a do-nothing Minister for sure. It's a good thing that the department that he's looking after has the Consumer Protection Bureau which is turning out a good job and the Better Business Bureau and the Rentalsman and these things, but as far as that Minister's concerned, it's a good thing that those offices can operate by themselves. Where he could make some contribution like when we have a different price of sugar across the line than here, or in antifreeze, he's very reluctant to come out and make an objective study of it. Well it's just, as I see it, for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, it's another way of giving him a supplementary income, because he's a do-nothing Minister.

And actually then we have the Minister of Public Works who can't build a biffy without even getting into trouble. He couldn't even build a cross walk from one building to another without getting into trouble. I wonder how he can justify spending that type of money that was spent on that biffy out there for the number of months of the year that's used.

Yes, and actually I wonder what he really is capable of because our House Leader went over different things with him that should be done in our caucus room, in between sessions, renovations that were to be made, and they aren't made yet. So what is he really capable of?

The Minister of Highways hasn't been doing too much for the highways in the south that's for sure and our provincial trunk roads are getting worse. Now maybe he's putting the grader over them as many times but he's - it bothers the traffic or what I don't know, but we have our provincial trunk highways which are really in worse condition.

We have the office of the Attorney-General who believes that that government over there is so good that it shouldn't even be criticized. And then if it is to be criticized it should be by an internal study where we have them being judge and jury and accused all in one. I don't believe this is the position that the Attorney-General should take when there is actually good reasons for an independent inquiry.

The Minister of Education, our present Minister, he's having a lot of trouble with his work. As long as the Minister from Seven Oaks or the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks is sitting in front of him you may get an answer but I don't think he's too aware of his own department.

And now I'm taking on the dangerous one, the Minister of Finance. And he's lost his cool; he became like a sulky boy that would like to take his ball and bat and go home or else just hit somebody over the head with it. He actually became a little arrogant and possibly may have some reason for it, but I think myself he could take a much more objective look at a lot of these things than he does. I have to agree wholeheartedly with the Minister of Minnedosa here in his remarks about The Mineral Acreage Tax Act, and that is just my opinion; that there may be some individuals that could be taxed but if you're going to try to single out those individuals you're going to find that in the application of that Act you're going to have so many troubles that you would be better to leave individuals out.

There's one left that I certainly don't intend to miss--(Interjection)--Well I won't say anything about him, he's not a Minister in the terms of the government so I'll miss him out. All they have to do is stand up when they're supposed to and sit down when they're supposed to and I think he's doing his job that way.

## BILL 34

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd)

And now we have the Minister of Agriculture, and if there ever has been a Minister that has gone down in public opinion that's him. Because when he went in he put on this here program of trying to help the livestock men in the farm diversification programs, he was gaining some acceptance. It must of went to his head and he thought everything couldn't turn against him but if there's ever a Minister that's went downhill in the respect of the rural people it's him. --(Interjection)--I'll get to that yet, I'll get to that yet. Well I'll come to that.

He started off - and the way he brought in the removal of the home economists from certain areas and the letting go of the Provincial Secretary is just not right for a Minister to do it. I've talked to the people out in the rural areas how it happened and I don't believe it's right. The 4-H programs and all the work that was associated with the Women's Institutes in the rural areas was very beneficial to the rural areas. They made the people feel they belonged and they taught things. It was a very good program. That program should not have been lessened in any way at all. If anything it should have been strengthened and the same pattern moved north. But to take people from these groups and put them even under the heading of Health and Social Development is a let down to this type of people and that's why you've got this trouble.

He came along with his land lease policy which I differ very greatly with, and I'm sure that you have many other farmers, but you're going to have some unfortunate farmers that are going to take it but they're never going to be able to buy that land from him, because the policy is that when they get it back they have to pay whichever is the higher, present day value or the cost--anything in between the difference of the interest rate they paid and all the other costs to bring it up-to-date, whichever is the highest. So they've lost their chance to buy it.

As I said before, he had the idea of centralizing and putting artificial insemination under one program. There wasn't any need for this and he's displaced a lot of good technicians and the rural people are very angry about it. He's got a lot of nerve to turn up at other meetings but when he's asked to come to the meeting like he did in Portage he doesn't show. He hasn't been popular on the Hog Marketing Board in the different things that's happened in there. He hasn't been popular with some of the people associated with him through the Manitoba Farm Credit Corporation either, and I don't choose to name names. He became mixed up in the Federal policy on the rapeseed vote, which was really none of his business to be spending the taxpayers' money of Manitoba just to expound his own idea. I've heard him talking to different meetings, he has a good gift of the gab and he gets up and he tries to brainwash the people into his way of thinking. I think some of the times when he's there as a government representative he would be better to be there as a government representative without trying to convince everybody in that crowd that he's a superbrain.

Now I'll come to this here feed grain policy. And I wonder why, even if he differs with the Federal Government or any program, that he feels he can spend taxpayers' money just to put over his idea. And when he interfered or when he took this vote I wonder where he got the right to take this vote on this feed grain business. And he's blowing about the results of that vote. Well we all knew before this poll was taken that people are in favour of the present system of the Canadian Wheat Board being in charge, but they don't sell all their grain like that way either. And the way his letter went out and the statements that were in it were definitely misleading and they were definitely trying to get you to vote very highly for the second question. And the very fact that they only voted 51 percent in favour of the second question actually is a slap in the face to the Minister. Because they are in favour of the principle of the Canadian Wheat Board and if it hadn't been for his letter where he exposed his own ideas worded in such a way as to make it sound like as if you voted "no" for either one of them that you were voting against the Wheat Board, it would have been even more so.

So I say that the Minister of Agriculture has went down in the estimation of all farm people and if he's got any notion of going further why he's due for a big surprise. I'm sure right at the present time that if there was an election called in the rural areas the NDP would have less votes than they ever had, and in particular on account of that Minister.

So now to somewhat summarize some of the things I've said, in considering whether I should vote for Interim Supply and how I should vote, I'm thinking of the way the northern roads were handled; I'm thinking of the way the fisheries were handled; I'm thinking of the way the co-ops in the north were handled; I'm thinking of the government wanting a monopoly even in the aircraft business where they lose 16 million and that's all right. They want a

## BILL 34

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) . . . . monopoly in auto insurance. Losing money in the Manitoba Development Fund; not all their fault but they're losing money too. So they're no better than anybody else as far as that goes. They're already in the mining and they're not producing anything, they're not showing any good results. They want our farms through their Manitoba farm credit system now. They passed a bill last time where they were actually wanting our mineral rights, and they think that the government should be in control of pretty near everything, even to the press, which has been said over there on that side from time to time. Not by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources but by other people on that side. So they believe that the government is the one to be in control and that they are the best.

Well when I try to consider as to whether the government should be in control and whether the Ministers over there have done a good enough job that a person should think they should be in control, I have no bother at all in making up my mind and saying that I will not be voting for Interim Supply. Thank you. (Applause)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments to make on the Interim Supply bill before us at this particular time. Of course they have been made you know much more--or the bill has become much more interesting since it was last before us. We were given to understand it was somewhat of an important bill the last time, it now in the Minister's own words is a mere routine matter to tidy up the financial requirements until after the current session is ended.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me assure the Honourable Minister of Finance right at the outset that it will of course be our intention to give this bill a hoist so that he will have the benefit of listening to at least another 20 speeches or 21 speeches. Let me say at the outset also, Mr. Speaker, that I have from time to time made some remarks, expressed some concern about erosion of our democratic system where I see it. I have commented on the specific actions of certain Ministers when I believed I and the people of Manitoba experienced it. I refer of course specifically to the Minister of Agriculture.

But, Sir, there has probably never been in this Chamber shown such an utter contempt for this Chamber, such a complete and utter lack of parliamentary integrity in this Chamber, than has been demonstrated by the present Minister of Finance. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to argue and I'm not that good of a parliamentarian or that good of a reader of laws to know whether or not his exceptionally broad interpretation of Section 42 (1) of The Financial Administration Act covers the kind of extraordinary action taken by this government. Section 42 of The Financial Administration Act deals with the powers given to an administration for the issuance of Special Warrants. Under most normal circumstances, certainly by all past precedents, that was a device used, legitimately used by governments to meet unexpected contingencies when a session of the Legislature was not in operation. Any government that used the vehicle of Special Warrant was always to some extent under some pretty close scrutiny, because after all, Mr. Speaker, as the Member from Morris from time to time likes to point out, that is the whole purpose of this sitting and this gathering. The administration has the power and the influence and the mechanisms to collect the taxes off the people, and once a year there is supposed to be an accounting for that money as to how it was spent. That's why the Ministers present their departmental estimates to this Chamber and we examine them to the best of our ability.

Mr. Speaker, what the Minister of Finance, what the Minister of Finance has just done yesterday was simply to rule out that whole exercise as a--well merely utter "small matter to meet his financial requirements" you know, until the current session. Mr. Speaker, let me attempt to be so bold to lecture the Honourable Minister of Finance on at least my position and at least my thinking as to the courses of action open to the Minister. Mr. Speaker, there are particular responsibilities in a parliamentary system that different groups within that parliamentary system have to accept.

The Minister of Finance correctly pointed out to us in opposition, and indeed correctly pointed out in his news release, that we in the opposition, we in the opposition were holding up an important money bill which was required by the government to meet their obligations, to meet their obligations, to meet their payroll, to the Civil Service, meet the payroll with respect to the Social Allowances, or whatever. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance didn't have to tell us that. We were of course aware of it. We were also prepared, Mr. Speaker, to



## BILL 34

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . accept whatever political consequences arose out of our action. That, Sir, in my judgment is a responsible accepting of the system of government that we operate under. The Minister has first a much better vehicle at his command to inform the public simply through his position as government, through his position as Minister, and of course with the aid of the massive propaganda machine available to any government this day and age but particularly to this government, to explain to the public clearly what is taking place in this Chamber; that a group of irresponsible opposition members are using a technique to hold up their social allowances payments, or to hold up the salaries of the public servants. Mr. Speaker, that would have been a situation that we as responsible opposition would have been faced with and we would have had to deal with. Mr. Speaker, despite what the Minister of Labour or anybody on the other side may want to think, it might well have been in the best interests of Manitobans to do precisely that, and to hold up some cheques, and to stop some payments.

A MEMBER: You don't give a damn for Manitobans.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm just attempting to indicate to the Honourable former House Leader some of the options, some of the positions that heretofore at least have been accepted as the way that the parliamentary system deals with the fiscal matters of governments. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that my honourable colleague, the Member from Morris, when once again it will be his opportunity to speak on this bill, can indicate precisely the kind of situation that from time to time does rise, for instance in the Federal House of Commons. I believe one of the last most notable ones was in 1968 when a similar situation arose.

Mr. Speaker, you see this government is not prepared, is not prepared to play the game by the rules that have proven themselves so durable over the years. This government will run roughshod over those rules at any given time. It's this kind of an attitude, Mr. Speaker, that permits Ministers of this government to suggest that if 99 percent of the people want to do it this way, I'll do it my way. Which is what the Minister of Agriculture has been telling us during this session.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we have a display of contempt for this Legislature that has seldom, if ever, been displayed. Mr. Speaker, you know we've thrown that word around to some extent in this Chamber, and perhaps we've abused each other from time to time in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, the actions of an individual member, whether we are polite to each other or not, while it may not raise the level of debate at any given time to a level that some people think it ought to be, although I always find any of that kind of criticism somewhat hard to take because I accept the fact that we are not supermen elected into this Chamber, we do under the representative system of government that we have inherited from the British Parliamentary system, do represent the broadest cross-section of the people in Manitoba, and as such we are no better or no worse than any of the people that we represent. So it's really, it's really in my judgment somewhat infantile to expect some super level conduct of behavior in this Chamber which one would not normally expect to see in society as a whole.

But, Mr. Speaker, any of that kind of action referred to can come or go. What we are experiencing at the hands of this Minister right now is, you know, a deliberate subversion of the Manitoba Legislature, as I have been led to believe it should operate, and it brings a whole array of new questions into being as to how we should conduct ourselves in the future in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Finance has no compunction about issuing Special Warrants for millions of dollars, even while we are all assembled here to do precisely that job, then why are we talking about the taxing of the individual estimates, why are we talking about the passing of Interim Supply? Mr. Speaker, one questions whether a new and broader interpretation of some other piece of legislation will not be - take a look at by this government that would suggest that well perhaps it's not necessary to call us into session every year; may be once in two or three years would be sufficient. Mr. Speaker, you know the Honourable Minister of Finance may smile all he wants at me, but he can't point to any precedent in this province where this kind of an action was taken. --(Interjection)--

Mr. Speaker, never was this kind of an action taken by this government. This Minister - this Minister - this Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

## BILL 34

MR. ENNS: . . . knew the consequences of it. He wanted to get the politics of the situation out of it, which he was not prepared to live with, however. Is it perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that having some second thoughts about it, that he thought to himself, you know, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Conservatives are correct; perhaps there is a growing number of people out there in Manitoba that are becoming concerned about how this government spends money; perhaps there are an ever-increasing number of Manitobans out there that think that some checks and balances should be exercised on this government. Mr. Speaker, that's precisely how checks and balances can be exercised under a parliamentary system. Mr. Speaker, if precisely the question would have been asked, do we get a judicial enquiry about the whole damn mess up north or do you get Interim Supply - and that's how parliamentary system can operate, up until somebody weakens, and it might well have been us, if the political pressure and the consequences of our actions was too costly in political terms. That's my understanding of how the parliamentary system should work. I think if I asked the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that is surely his understanding about how he feels about labour negotiations, about the necessity of binding arbitration being imposed on certain portions. Well, we are negotiating in this Chamber.

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh, is that it?

MR. ENNS: Yes, we are. We have limited positions to negotiate from as in opposition, but we do have some, we do have some. The British parliamentary system gives us some. Mr. Speaker, what I am pointing out to the Honourable Minister of Finance is he is not prepared to trust the democratic process to the extent that they have been in the past and to the extent that we - and he backs us into a corner and makes us accept our responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the question is very clear. Just read the release of the Minister of Finance. And aside from going through the initial information as to how often this bill went through with little or no interference, the fact of the matter is though that "The Government of Manitoba" - this is the Minister of Finance speaking, or indicating in his press release - "cannot permit such a situation to frustrate the proper management of provincial financial affairs." This is the kind of statements that this government is prone to make. You know, it's like another Minister of Agriculture says, the government cannot permit just anybody being elected to a board. The Government of Manitoba cannot permit just any municipality taking on certain decisions. The Government of Manitoba cannot permit the Fishermen's Association, something like that, from making certain decisions that they think they have been given a legal responsibility for making. The Minister of Finance cannot permit a situation from arising for which he is not responsible, but the parliamentary system is responsible for, for which the opposition is prepared to accept the responsibility for. So he transgresses that long held tradition and he moved in an unprecedented manner - in an unprecedented manner, Mr. Speaker - I would challenge the Minister of Finance - and I'm speaking from the top of my head, not having done the research - whether in any legislative assembly across the width and breadth of this country, this particular course of action has been taken by any duly elected government in Canada.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would I be permitted to answer . . .

MR. ENNS: Certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, with the help of the honourable member I can put it in a question so that it should be proper. I would ask him as a question in response to his question, can he name on any occasion in the precedence of Manitoba, or any other province, when Interim Supply was prevented from passing before the end or before the beginning of a fiscal year?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Finance protects his particular responsibility and his responsibility to the maintenance of the parliamentary system. I can name him many ways and instances that he can deal with it. He could have brought closure of the House, for instance. He could have brought closure to the House, as has been done in other jurisdictions. Or, as I have already suggested, he could have accepted - he could have accepted the situation, and possibly if he felt secure in that position, been prepared to accept the political credits owing to the present government and the political discredits to the Opposition for doing such a dastardly thing.

## BILL 34

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, I don't have to apologize to the Minister of Finance or to this government for legitimately using mechanisms that have been provided for in this Chamber through long-standing tradition to debate points of issue with this government. It's up to the government, Mr. Speaker, to so run their affairs (Applause) that certain things aren't happening in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that it's an indication - and, Mr. Speaker, you know, I've indicated on other occasions that this, you know, this all too often growing feeling that I have with this government, with the way it's prepared to erode our democratic base, that it has spread, you know, to the very senior members of this administration. Mr. Speaker, if they can't accept, and if they regard this Chamber and this House as merely a little game that we play and if they can read or re-read and re-interpret a section of an Act that will avoid them from facing responsibility in this House, that they've won, then, Mr. Speaker, then we are indeed on a slippery slope.

Mr. Speaker, I want to challenge the Honourable Minister of Finance not to hurl back rhetorizing questions at us, because all that will encourage - and I'm sure it will encourage, further debate and debate that will be illuminating. Because, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the kind of contempt the government, the Minister of Finance has shown for some of the very legitimate charges, allegations that have been made by the opposition party, with particular emphasis on the manner and the way in which they have handled money, that at least, at least this government owes the people of Manitoba some deference to those charges - even if they think that they are wild and that they are slanderous and everything else - that it owes the people of Manitoba the kind of looking into, the kind of enquiries that have been requested from time to time by my Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I don't mind telling you, Sir, I don't mind telling you at all, Sir, that we had looked upon this bill, this bill as being one of those few levers that opposition parties have from time to time to exercise a greater degree of influence than we can by virtue of our numbers, which of course are never enough. We actually thought, Sir, that we were dealing with a government that was still concerned with playing their role in the acceptable parliamentary manner, the way it's done in the House of Commons, in the way it's done in the nine other jurisdictions of this country. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we believed the Minister only a day or two ago when he chastised the Opposition for delaying this bill, and suggested that we would be responsible for any hardships or frustrations that delay of this bill and the subsequent delay of moneys that the government could pay out would bring upon certain people within our community. Mr. Speaker, we were aware of that. Mr. Speaker, for his benefit we used to caucus that every day too, because it was a concern to us. We are not completely political neophytes. Mr. Speaker, we were prepared to accept that position, we thought we were dealing with a government that understood democracy more or less along the same lines that we did. Well, Mr. Speaker, how wrong we were, how wrong we were.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so that we are completely clear about this - and that by the way of course is also a commentary on how, at least in this Chamber, where we have unfettered freedom, you know, democracy will find itself way out. We have on many occasions expressed displeasure, discontent with the manner and way in which the matter of debates on estimates are handled in this Chamber. We've had no legislative reason to do so. There's nothing in the Legislature that prevents the government from using up half or more of its time on estimates. We can't prevent a talkative Minister from using 20 minutes or 30 minutes to respond to every single question put to him during his estimates by a member of opposition, and in that way curtailing the amount of time we have to delve into the estimate and into the financial affairs of this government. But, Sir, you know, if you push the balloon hard one way, you know the bulge comes out in another direction, and this is what happened. This matter of passing Interim Supply now has passed into history as ever being an important matter. This bill is now merely another mechanism, another tool for opposition to use, in which we have the latitude of being able to debate in the broadest manner the performance of any government official, government Minister and treasury bench. And, Mr. Speaker, this is precisely what we now intend to do. There is no urgency on Bill 34 any more, there is not political problem involved in holding up or not holding up Bill 34 any more, Interim Supply.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister has forced upon us and we have found another mechanism all too helpful to opposition where we can as individual members of opposition take on the

## BILL 34

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . government in its broadest range, full latitude as if we're dealing with the Minister's Salary. That, Mr. Speaker, is precisely what we intend to do. I think we owe the people of Manitoba to do that, Mr. Speaker, particularly in view of how this government handles its financial affairs in the cavalier manner and way which it brings them into this Chamber. Special Warrant, Mr. Speaker - I don't even know for how much, but 126 of 800 million, about 30, 40 million dollars. I can remember, Mr. Speaker, with some trepidation, I as a former Minister of Crown used to ask permission to have a Special Warrant brought in - while the House is not in session - dealing with several thousands of dollars, because inadvertently it had been left out of my estimates.

Mr. Speaker, when you think of the many different ways the Minister and the government has open to it to bring its financial requests before this Chamber and have them discussed, have them debated, and in due order passed, then you really have to ask yourself why this government chose at this particular time to be so insensitive to what has long been accepted as a proper way of dealing with this matter in the House. This government brings in its departmental estimates, it brings in its supplementary estimates in case anything has been overlooked, and the vehicle that provided to the Department of Finance or to the government under Section 42(1) of the Financial Administration Act, surely is there to look at those unthought of contingencies that could arise during the time a session is not in actual place. That, Sir, I think is the kind of interpretation that most people would place on that particular section of the Act.

This Minister of Finance, this government, has just thrown the book out, and said: Boys, if you don't jump when I say so, I'll just sign an Order-in-Council and we pass thirty millions of dollars. That's Mr. Speaker, a vastly different thing, Sir, by circumventing the House in this way, than whether or not we pass in a matter of minutes amounts equal to that in Capital Supply; or, Sir, if because of time limitations, at the end of the estimate time we pass millions of dollars in departmental estimates that we have not had an occasion to examine. Sir, we had the occasion to examine all those estimates. It's only because of perhaps our injudicious use of time that we didn't get to a particular department. But that's our responsibility, Sir. And if we didn't get around to examining all the estimates and as a result passed with a snapping of fingers a great number of millions of dollars in departments that we didn't get to, that's our responsibility and we accept that responsibility. And, Mr. Speaker, don't think from time to time we don't get political criticism for it. Certain people back home, they read in the paper that we didn't get to the Department of Health or we didn't spend sufficient time with the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, we as politicians, as oppositions, are chastised for not so husbanding our time that we brought to bear the proper scrutiny on all aspects of government. Well, Mr. Speaker, as practical politicians, we also know, those of us in the House, that that isn't always possible, but we will fight and we demand that right at all times.

Mr. Speaker, all that has kind of become a meaningless exercise in my judgment as a result of the Minister of Finance's action.--(Interjection)--Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, the Honourable House Leader, feels that the responsibility lies on us. One of our problems, one of our problems of course has always been with having this government accept the full responsibility of government which is theirs and which I'm prepared to accede to them, because I appreciate, understand, live and hope to die by the British parliamentary system of government which we have in this country.

But, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, I suggest, Sir, that it's going to become harder and harder to recognize it as such if we take the kind of leap frogs that is now being taken by the Minister of Finance. Mr. Speaker, I think that the ensuing debate that we will have on Bill 34 will be a most worthwhile debate in this Chamber. Certainly, certainly one that should be paid a great deal of attention to by all members opposite. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Bilton): The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all congratulate my friend from Lakeside for his oration here this afternoon. I think he spoke well. I think that he, in his own opinion, is of - he arrives at a conclusion that he is correct and that there is a possibility, again in his opinion, that his conclusions are correct and that this government is proceeding with something, with which basically they haven't the authority so to do, namely to pass a Special Warrant at the time the House is in session. I'm not going to dwell on the point, Mr. Speaker, but I do draw it to your attention that this government could not have done what it is doing by way of a special warrant unless the opportunity to so do had been endorsed and passed by this Assembly.

## BILL 34

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . .

Now my honourable friend in his discourse, Mr. Speaker, constantly referred to responsible government. I think where my honourable friend has strayed from the basic concept of British parliamentary procedure is that not only do we have to have responsible government but also responsible opposition as well. Now, Mr. Speaker, we've been sitting in this House since the last day of January of this year. In accordance with British parliamentary tradition this government laid before the House on opening day, by way of the Throne Speech, its proposals for the conduct of government for the next ensuing year. This was done. The Opposition quite properly debated the contents of the Throne Speech and it passed resolutions, amendments, condemning the government for certain attitudes. First of all, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, in quite a lengthy oration condemned this government for its principles and its policies, its shortcomings in the past, and because we haven't taken a look at what was to happen in the future.

Following the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the third party, the Leader of the Liberal Party, did likewise. Then for a period of days, Mr. Speaker, we debated the proposition; and this government. Mr. Speaker, after all of that was done was sustained by a majority vote of this House. Now I know my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside could say, well after all you have a larger number of NDPers in this House than we do in opposition, but notwithstanding that, Mr. Speaker, any member on this side of the House is at liberty, in a democracy, to say that he agrees with the propositions or the condemnations of our procedures as indicated by the Opposition. Such did not happen, and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and I say to my colleagues here in this Assembly, that any member of the Opposition likewise had the same opportunity of turning around and saying the government is doing a good job. I have seen that happen, Mr. Speaker, I have seen that happen, and when we got down to the final days of the debate really there wasn't a debate, or at least a vote taken on the final proposition of acceptance of the Throne Speech. But, Mr. Speaker, we went on from there, we went on from there, and my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Finance, as is a requirement in our democratic parliamentary procedure, laid before this House consideration of ways and means by which this government intends to raise the moneys necessary for the conduct of the government of this province. And accompanying all of this, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance, in accordance with tradition, laid before this House the estimates of expenditure for the fiscal year that we're in now.

You know, Mr. Speaker, ample opportunity has been given to the Opposition, the Throne Speech, the Budget Speech, and also in consideration of the Estimates, to cover the waterfront, to criticise and to condemn this government - and I recall on one or two occasions over a few years as I was on the other side of the House I criticize the government too. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that I am absolutely correct that this year is the first year in the history of the Province of Manitoba that an irresponsible opposition have used as a device a request for Interim Supply to go over the whole gamut of a lost election as my honourable friends opposite are doing in respect of Bill 34.

My honourable friend from Lakeside as he was speaking a moment or two ago made reference to curtailment of the opportunity of considering Estimates. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the Honourable Member for Lakeside would do me and others that have been around here a little while - to go back over the records to see whether or not there hasn't been greater curtailments by a government to the Opposition to give consideration to having a real check on the Estimates for the next ensuing year.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when I first joined this House estimates took around 30 hours or so; Interim Supply when it became necessary was passed in around about maybe three or four hours. Opposition at that particular time never ever thought that their opportunity of assessment and investigation was curtailed. We eventually arrived through our Rules Committee, established by this House, rules of procedure, and while we were compelled by a majority government, and I'm thinking particularly the government that was headed by the former Premier Dufferin Roblin, that we in opposition had our rights and privileges restricted to around about 60 hours, and they called the tune at that particular time, Mr. Speaker, as to what departments would be considered. It took a long fight, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of some of us to convince the government of that particular day that changes should be made, and we fought, and we fought hard without avail.

## BILL 34

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)

When we became the government we did set up once again a committee on the Rules of the House. We listened very intently to the arguments of the Honourable Member for Morris that the rules that were imposed by a Conservative Government in Manitoba were too restricted, that they didn't have the opportunity of being able to criticize the government of the day under a time restraint, and we listened to our honourable friend at that particular time, and we changed the rules of the House to give them greater opportunity. We extended, if memory serves me correctly, Mr. Speaker, the time for consideration of the Estimates from 60 hours to 90 hours; we gave to the Opposition an undertaking, which we have adhered to, that they would be consulted with the order of procedure, the consideration of the Estimates, and this is a game, or this is a procedure, under which we have been operating, and now what's happening Mr. Speaker? They are calling, foul ball!

I appreciate, I appreciate the chagrin, the disappointment of the Member for Lakeside and his colleagues that the people of this province of mine decided a year ago that they --(Interjection)--yes it is my province because I was born here; I'm very proud of my province. "This is me ain, me own land," and don't you ever try to take that away from me. The only time, the only time, Mr. Speaker, that I can listen to the Opposition is when they attempt by their methodology in this House to make me ashamed of the democratic procedure that we're undergoing at the present time. And it might well be, it may well be, Mr. Speaker, that if they continue to do what they are doing, the threats that they are making upon us to change the basic concept of parliamentary democracy, then it might be that I as a native son of Manitoba would say a pox on the whole works of you, and move out.

But I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the ideas of the Member for Lakeside and the Opposition will not prevail because there are more sane people in the Province of Manitoba, there are more sane people in this Legislature, than they are attempting to give credence to today. --(Interjection)--When I'm finished.

This then, Mr. Speaker, is the situation as I see it in respect to the Rules of the House: What are we being condemned for? We're being condemned because as of March 31st the previous fiscal year ended, and that outfit over there, Mr. Speaker, are attempting to use verbiage, and some parliamentary device, whatever that is, to prevent many people whom I have the responsibility for, namely the Civil Service, to receive their wages.

What did the Honourable Member for Roblin say this afternoon, Mr. Speaker? --(Interjection)--Yes, words of wisdom. What were those words of wisdom? You have used the legislation in order to thwart their opportunity of continually pulling red herrings over a lost cause in the election of 1973--(Interjection)--that's exactly what he said, and the purport of his whole words. Look I'm prepared, and I'm sure others are as well, to accept any challenge from that outfit over there to face the people once again but I would--(Interjection)--Let's go, of course. There you have it, Mr. Speaker, let's go.

We had an election about a year ago at a cost of about a million dollars; the people of Manitoba made their choice. That outfit there are condemning us constantly because of the expenditures we're making, and now they say - because they lost the damned thing, they want to go and let's go again. Well I'm prepared. I am prepared, but I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether they would be prepared, because of their infantile approach to the progress of this province as exhibited ever since we started the session on January 29th, to face an intellectual group of voters.

You know, there is a day I'm sure that we will all agree when we have to finish our course, that when we have to face ourselves in a mirror in a responsible fashion, Mr. Speaker - and I suggest to my honourable friends opposite the day has long passed when in the morning the day arrives and they take a look at themselves in the mirror, whether they should not reflect and say whether or not I am acting in a responsible way.

I say, Mr. Speaker, to the Opposition that they have a responsibility - the broadness of debate. They have used Interim Supply in a way that it has never been used before in any democratic government whose history I've taken a look at.

Mr. Speaker, they mention the fact of the conclusion of Estimates. Certain estimates have not been considered. This is historic, Mr. Speaker. I know from some involvement, and reading of the Estimates of the Parliament of Canada, there are occasions when the estimates of that august body are not considered or finalized for two or three years. And now

## BILL 34

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . the tears are welling out of the eyes of the Honourable Member for Lakeside because it appears that we may not be able to consider all of the estimates of the various departments. This isn't anything new. You have the opportunity. There are other opportunities that honourable members in opposition have of criticism of the government, and I say it's valid criticism. I don't think that this government, that we have at the present time is the finest, the best, and the only government that has made a forward thrust in the history of Manitoba, although I do say, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we need to take a back seat to any that we've had in the hundred and two or three years in the history of the Province of Manitoba. But I say to the member, the Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, he didn't make a case today, and the Opposition hasn't made a case that has any firm foundation since we started in this House on January 29th.

The tears that have been flowing from their eyes are not really related, Mr. Speaker, May I suggest, to the programs, to the policies of this government, but cry, cry, cry because the voters of Manitoba quite properly said to the Conservative Party of Manitoba, you had your chance, you failed us, and you failed us miserably. We kicked you out; we kicked you out in 1969, and we decided that we would have a New Democratic Party Government to govern the affairs of Manitoba.

When the House was dissolved in 1973 my honourable friends opposite, Mr. Speaker, were so damned confused they didn't know what or where they were going. But as is typical of politicians they put their armour on; they forgot that they wanted to get rid of their leader, they took the stiletto--(Interjection)--Yes, at my choice, and the choice of my party. But I want to tell you this: my honourable friend mentions about our party changing its leader. We were open and above - and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that as the Leader of the Party in 1969 I didn't have a stiletto in my back as the Leader of the Conservative Party did at that present time. And I might say, and I might say if we're talking about getting rid of leaders, Mr. Speaker, I suspect, and I think there is justification for my suspicions, that the members of the Conservative Party would still like to get rid of their present leader in order that they may have a firmer foundation for operation.

Such is not the case within our--(Interjection)--It's not worrying me at all. Such is not the case, Mr. Speaker, with our Leader, the Honourable Premier of this Province who is doing such a worthwhile job for Manitoba. He is not . . . , he is not . . . , he is not going to the four corners of this province to find what scum and muckraking can be achieved in order to try and make an impression in this House. He is responsible, and all I'm asking the opposition, the whole caboodle of them, will you please not accept your responsibilities as elected members of this Assembly; will you not stop your muckraking? Will you not stop digging into the dirtiest cesspools that you can in order to try and impress the people of Manitoba with your ineffectiveness? That's what you're doing. That's what you're doing.--(Interjection)--Yes, if my honourable friend was in his seat he might learn something too. Matter of fact the honourable member apparently doesn't want to be seated in his seat to give him the opportunity in a democracy for a reply. They're flying me all over the place, Mr. Speaker, even insofar as their own seats are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, we have our responsibilities in government.--(Interjection)--Muckraking? No I'm not muckraking at all. I'm just trying to say to the Opposition that we used the legislation of the Province of Manitoba to achieve for the citizens of Manitoba, the Civil Service of Manitoba, what that outfit who call themselves the opposition wanted to prevent - how glorious, Mr. Speaker - history might record that that outfit prevented the forward thrust of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Manitoba. They don't, they don't have to agree with the policies of this government, but surely to goodness, Mr. Speaker, they ought to have the intestinal fortitude and the parliamentary knowledge to know that in order to continue our procedures, in order to continue--(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, I suggest . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: I suggest, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: I suggest, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: You know . . .

## BILL 34

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe I have given everyone the opportunity to speak when it came to be his turn, and those who have spoken should at least be generous and let the others have a chance to. If they have something to say that is important it shouldn't be done from their seat; they should take the opportunity to get the attention of the Speaker and then they can have the floor again if that's possible under our rules. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I hope I'm not charged with the time used by the outrage of the Honourable Member for Lakeside but I think, Mr. Speaker, he has by his last interjection confirmed completely the position that I am taking. He started out, Mr. Speaker, by saying, pass the bill. We can pass the bill in the last three or four minutes before we adjourn for the supper hour in order that Interim Supply is passed officially by this House, and that is what we want. That is the purpose of Bill 34. But, Mr. Speaker, my crafty friend, the Member for Lakeside, says in order to pass it, why don't you introduce closure? Mr. Speaker, there is provision in our rules for closure. Now what type, what type of an approach is being used by my honourable friend. He says, try us, as far as passing the bill is concerned and then at the same time he says, we want you to introduce closure so that they can continue their muckraking, so that they can condemn this government for being autocratic. That is the intelligence of my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker. That is what he would like, Mr. Speaker. I've never known closure in this Assembly but here, here--and I've never known, I've never known, Mr. Speaker, that Interim Supply was denied from one fiscal year to the other and here my friend says, try it on for size as to whether or not we'll pass Interim Supply - at the same time he and his muckraking group says, bring about closure so that we can accuse you the Government of Manitoba of preventing us from being able to express our opinions. How idiotic? How stupid? And how typical of the approach of the Conservative Party today, Mr. Speaker. And I bet you (Applause) I bet you, Mr. Speaker, a bottom dollar that if the Honourable Member for Lakeside and some of the other honourable members would dare to call a public meeting in their respective constituencies and say to their electorate, do you know what I tried to do on the fourth day of April when we were discussing Interim Supply? I tried to give two alternatives to the government, pass the bill for Interim Supply or bring in closure, so that I can stand on the hustings and say this dictatorial government wanted to deprive me of an opportunity of being heard in the Assembly . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Would the honourable member state his matter of privilege.

MR. ENNS: . . . this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member state his matter of privilege.

MR. ENNS: Well the privilege is, he's imputing that I have suggested that we want to pass this bill. I thought our actions made it very clear that we do not want to pass this bill. I have suggested . . .

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a matter of privilege.

MR. ENNS: . . . that if they want to pass the bill they can.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, here again, here again my honourable friend is talking with forked tongue. He says we're not going to pass Interim Supply; we're not going to pass the piece of legislation to give to our creditors, to give to our civil servants an opportunity of being awarded a cheque for the purposes of government, and at the same breath he again keeps on repeating, closure is what we want. We want to be able to say--(Interjection)--Yes, Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the Honourable Member for Lakeside is such that maybe he should get what he deserves. And personally I'm not prepared, at least at this time, to flatter my honourable friend so that he can go out crying in the wilderness, and I'm sure he will do one of these days, cry in the wilderness because nobody will have any confidence or faith in him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister will have--order please. The Honourable Minister will have an opportunity to conclude his remarks after the supper hour. I am now leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock.