



Fourth Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

29 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



VOL. XXVIII No. 93 - 8:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 3 JULY, 1980

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty - First Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, A. R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANDERSON, Bob	Springfield	PC
BANMAN, Hon. Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BARROW, Tom	Flin Flon	NDP
BLAKE, David	Minnedosa	PC
BOSTROM, Harvey	Rupert's Island	NDP
BOYCE, J. R. (Bud)	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
CHERNIACK, Q.C., Saul	St. Johns	NDP
CORRIN, Brian	Wellington	NDP
COSENS, Hon. Keith A.	Gimli	PC
COWAN, Jay	Churchill	NDP
CRAIK, Hon. Donald W.	Riel	PC
DESJARDINS, Laurent L.	St. Boniface	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOMINO, Len	St. Matthews	PC
DOWNEY, Hon. Jim	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
EINARSON, Henry J.	Rock Lake	PC
ENNS, Hon. Harry J.	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FERGUSON, James R.	Gladstone	PC
FILMON, Gary	River Heights	PC
FOX, Peter	Kildonan	NDP
GALBRAITH, Jim	Dauphin	PC
GOURLAY, Hon. Doug	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Hon. Harry E.	Birtle-Russell	PC
GREEN, Q.C., Sidney	Inkster	Ind
HANUSCHAK, Ben	Burrows	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd G.	Portage la Prairie	PC
JENKINS, William	Logan	NDP
JOHNSTON, Hon. J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
JORGENSEN, Hon. Warner H.	Morris	PC
KOVNATS, Abe	Radisson	PC
LYON, Hon. Sterling R.	Charleswood	PC
MacMASTER, Hon. Ken	Thompson	PC
MALINOWSKI, Donald	Point Douglas	NDP
McBRYDE, Ronald	The Pas	NDP
McGILL, Hon. Edward	Brandon West	PC
McGREGOR, Morris	Virten	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., Hon. Gerald W. J.	Osborne	PC
MILLER, Saul A.	Seven Oaks	NDP
MINAKER, Hon. George	St. James	PC
ORCHARD, Hon. Donald	Pembina	PC
PARASIUK, Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PAWLEY, Q.C., Howard	Selkirk	NDP
PRICE, Hon. Norma	Assiniboia	PC
RANSOM, Hon. Brian	Souris-Killarney	PC
SCHROEDER, Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SHERMAN, Hon. L. R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
STEEN, Warren	Crescentwood	PC
URUSKI, Billie	St. George	NDP
USKIW, Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, D. James	St. Vital	NDP
WESTBURY, June	Fort Rouge	Lib
WILSON, Robert G.	Wolseley	PC

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Thursday, 3 July 1980

Time — 8:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, awaiting the appearance of the Minister of Agriculture, I would direct a question to the Minister of Health. Oh good. Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture, in view of the announcement this afternoon pertaining to new federal government initiatives pertaining to drought relief, could the Minister advise whether or not the program, announced this afternoon by the federal government, includes any assumption on their part of the costs that were being encountered pertaining to the transportation costs involving movement of hay to Manitoba and other western points.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I would assume that the question that he is asking me is in reference to the announcement made by the federal Minister of Agriculture, not the federal Minister of whatever may fit his needs, who has been making certain comments about agriculture-related programs. Our indications are that there will be cost sharing of the provincial programs that have been announced. To what extent is not fully clear yet, as far as we're concerned. We have been told by the federal Department of Agriculture staff that they will have a senior officer in Manitoba for the next while working with the province. Cost sharing of those programs we've already announced and we have had indication from the federal Minister of Agriculture that they would participate if the programs we've announced were acceptable to them. Now for other statements made by other provincial Cabinet Ministers who are speaking out on whatever issues they feel fits their particular fancy, I can't make any comment.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, then I would ask the Minister if we can then assume positively, without any doubt that the federal government will be participating in the cost sharing, or is the Minister simply assuming that there will be cost sharing?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, as the Premier of the province some week and a half ago

suggested, or didn't suggest, he said in a statement to the people of Manitoba the importance of agriculture to Manitoba that we couldn't wait on the federal government to suggest or to commit themselves to what we considered the most serious problem that our agricultural community faced in well over a hundred years but in fact we were committing the money to help agriculture. We have had indications from the federal government that they would support provincial programs. They had suggested they would help to the tune of 7 million, initially. We anticipate and have had indications from the federal government staff, in particular, that they would help with the programs we have announced and I will be discussing tomorrow with the federal Minister of Agriculture, his plans and get indications from him to what extent they will be cost sharing. But at this particular juncture, Mr. Speaker, I would indicate we have assurance that they will be participating in the programs we've announced and have no reason to assume otherwise.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the Minister of Agriculture advise whether or not he was consulted, prior to the announcement this afternoon, by the federal Minister of Agriculture pertaining to their drought-related programs for western Canada?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, after the meeting with the federal Minister of Agriculture last week and the indications that I brought to his attention, the seriousness of the drought that was affecting our agricultural community and the spinoff of that problem affecting all of the economy of Manitoba, there was a response from the federal Minister that they agreed with the programs that we had introduced. He further discussed some of the plans that they intended to introduce, in not too specific way but in a general sort of a sense, and also informed me, some week ago, when he apologized for the way in which he attacked the Premier's announcement — the federal Minister that is — apologizing for the way in which they attacked our programs. Again suggested to me they were looking at other alternative programs and this is one of them that he suggested. And I suggested to him that a support program in that nature would be of benefit to the farmers of Manitoba.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have some difficulty in ascertaining the answer to my question from the Minister's remarks. The Minister indicated that some programs were discussed, in a general nature. Precisely then, to the Minister, can the Minister advise whether the programs announced this afternoon by the federal Minister of Agriculture, Eugene Whelan, were discussed one by one with him and that there has been the fullest of consultation in advance notice to him from the federal Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I can understand the Honourable Leader of the Opposition having difficulty

in ascertaining or understanding anything to do with agriculture. But further to that, as far as to specifics of any program, no, we didn't discuss any specifics but we talked in general terms of the magnitude of the problem that was affecting agriculture; we talked of the transportation program; we talked of the grain feed program, which I again indicate was one which was very well received by the federal Minister and he indicated to me a type of program that they have announced, a subsidy to each livestock producer in the form in which they announced. But to talk in specific details, no, we didn't talk in specific details.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it appears that the consultation that's been going on is the same type as the province gave Ottawa with respect to their program.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether or not the province is considering or is going to provide any assistance to farmers who have to construct temporary fencing and remove it in the eight-week period like the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in reference to building of private fencing, no, we have no program and don't intend on implementing the program to help individuals construct fences on private property.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't referring to private property, Sir. I asked the Minister whether or not, on the lands that the Minister spoke about six or eight weeks ago, that were available and weren't made available until about a week ago, Crown lands that were either management areas or adjacent to management areas, Crown lands where the government has put on severe restrictions on the length of time for grazing, will there be assistance provided to individuals who have to put up the fences and within eight weeks remove those fences?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I guess the member is referring to either Crown land or wildlife management area land that he's questioning me on. If that is the case, I'll refer him back to the 470,000 acres that they took the fences off. If they hadn't of removed them, then we wouldn't have had to incur expense, either by the public or by the private farmer, an irresponsible move of which he was a member of the government. Now he's standing up trying to take credit for making big moves that force government to do things to help the farm community. Mr. Speaker, the ongoing policy of the Crown lands department is where farmers put in fences they will be credited with that particular fence installation, that is, in the long-term program. At this particular time, Mr. Speaker, as far as the short-term fencing requirements are concerned, we will be working with the farmers to work out who should pay for the fences. We have made the move, first of all, to make those lands available the farmers, not worrying about who is going to pay for the fence, but make the

lands available to them. And it was a move by government, Mr. Speaker, not a move by the opposition that forced us to do this.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister. He is trying to now lambaste a program that his colleague, the Minister of Government Services, wants to take credit for and wants to take credit for for many years; the FRED program within the Interlake, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a matter of privilege because the Minister of Agriculture and his colleague . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. ORDER please. The Honourable Member on a matter of privilege.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is this. We have one Minister of the House indicating that the FRED program, within the Interlake in the province of Manitoba, was very successful. We have another Minister, the Minister of Agriculture, getting up from his seat and indicating that at one aspect of the program, of the FRED program, which was totally detrimental to the well-being of the province of Manitoba, and trying to indicate that the opposition had something to do with the program that the Minister of Government Services was part of the government who signed the original agreement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. It is traditional whenever a matter of privilege is raised, that it be accompanied by a motion for the House to deal with it. Since the member did not have a motion accompany his point of privilege, I have to rule the point of privilege out of order.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister of Agriculture, has he removed, in consultation with the Minister of Natural Resources, what one could consider Draconian measures in terms of allowing leased land for the use of farmers for a period of only eight weeks, and is he prepared to remove those measures and allow those lands to be leased for a longer period of time and allow the grazing to go on those lands. And, as well, Mr. Speaker, what kind of co-ordination is now going on by the province of Manitoba, in terms of assessment of the overall needs of the farmers of the province; what kind of crops are going to be available; what mechanism is in place today to make sure that we are not caught in the position of last minute looking for hay, as we have done in the last two months by this government, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to just refer to the availability of land and referring to his FRED, ARDA program. I happen to represent a constituency in the southwest corner of the province where there wasn't a FRED or an ARDA program, where his government took over 11,000 acres of farmland, prime pasture land, to put into a Wildlife Management area, which the municipality lost the tax base to build the roads, to educate the children, to help pay for the medical expenses, that he as an

irresponsible Minister was a part of, 11,000 acres and he tells me it was a FRED, ARDA program.

Mr. Speaker, further to that I would like to address the rest of his question. As far as the pasture and the assessment, we had an inch and a half of rain throughout rural Manitoba, which I think was a blessing, the good Lord blessed us with something we've all been waiting for. We've had a bit of time now to reassess the programs that have been put in place, we are saying the pasture lands that farmers traditionally use to pasture their cattle, the pressure is off as far as the immediate need to continue to look for new lands. We, Mr. Speaker, plan, plan to look after the farmers of Manitoba and if we have to extend —(Interjection)— if we have to extend the date I'm sure my colleague, the Minister of National Resources, will be a part of the decision of extending that particular period of time. Mr. Speaker, he will be a part of that decision and it will be dealt with when the time arises. But no one, Mr. Speaker, will be forced into a difficult situation because of an act of God, which we've all had to deal with very responsibly.

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture, if he can come down to earth, from where he's flying. I would ask the Minister if he could advise the House if the hay that's being purchased in Ontario is being bought . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if you could afford the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose the courtesy of asking his question. I have difficulty hearing him.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking the Minister if the hay that we are purchasing from Ontario is being purchased by the ton, or by the bale?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the hay that is being purchased in Ontario is being purchased by the ton.

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture, since I perhaps missed his answer, Mr. Speaker, at least I think I did. The Leader of the Opposition asked him two or three times as to whether or not he has a definitive or definite commitment from the government of Canada, with respect to the cost sharing of a program that was announced by this government, here, only a week ago. Either it has escaped me, Mr. Speaker, or the Minister has evaded the question. I wonder if the Minister can give us that answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the question is repetitive but in case the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet did not get a clear answer on it, is the fact that we are further discussing with the federal government, senior staff from the Department of Agriculture, not the Minister responsible for Manpower and Immigration, we are dealing with the Minister of Agriculture. I plan to meet with him tomorrow to further discuss their intentions of cost-sharing those programs. They have indicated to us they think they are good programs and we feel, at this particular time, that they will participate with them. On the other hand, I would like to say that we have committed ourselves, as a province, to supporting the agricultural industry, and if the Liberal government want to renege on their support for the farm community of western Canada, then, Mr. Speaker, we'll let them answer to the farm community of western Canada, I'm not speaking for them.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether anyone is going to renege on anything since I don't know that there was a commitment, at least, I couldn't extract that from the Minister of Agriculture, so I don't know how any government can renege on something that this Minister hasn't admitted that they have committed themselves to.

I want to ask the Minister of Finance whether or not he now has to revise his particular budgetary position, given the fact that we don't have a commitment from the Government of Canada on cost-sharing the recently announced drought measures by this province

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, no, as a matter of fact, if we revised them, it would be the other direction, because this federal government seems to have no depth to which it can dig itself into in getting into a problem. I look forward to even a better cost-sharing split than we had before.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance a totally unrelated question and that is whether he can determine, or at least advise the House, why it is that people who instal double-slider windows are not exempt from sales tax under his new exemption program, but where people instal storm doors, storm windows, which is not the most modern thing today, Mr. Speaker, they are now exempt. I wonder if the Minister would review that and perhaps update his policy in that regard.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'm still adapting to that quick change-up from the 60 million agricultural program to double-slider windows, but I'm working on it, Mr. Speaker, and I'll take the question as notice, but I will, as a preliminary answer, say that triple glazing was exempt from sales tax a year ago, perhaps two years ago, when the program was first brought in. Storm doors were added this year and the member is now asking about double-slider

windows. Perhaps I can take his question from the Hansard, Mr. Speaker, and get a definitive answer for him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, in view of the federal government announcement that they are going to spend 60 million on drought in the province of Manitoba, why are we still talking about spending provincial money? Why are we talking about them cost-sharing the provincial program? Why is it not the fact that the federal government should spend the full 60 million and Manitoba should have a reduction of 40 million in its deficit? Why are we talking about cost-sharing for a person who comes to Manitoba, says he is not interested in what the province is doing and wishes to pay 60 million in federal money to the province of Manitoba? Why is the Minister still insisting on cost-sharing with provincial funds? Why is he not accepting what the federal Minister has said and ask him to pay for the whole program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer for the New Democratic Party across the way. It would appear that they have chosen the wrong leader and should have the Member for Inkster as their leader, because it was the Leader of the Opposition who asked me the question whether or not they were going to cost-share. It should be him asking the Leader of the Opposition, not me, the question. I have assumed that the federal government have a responsibility in paying for the drought in Manitoba. I have no question about that and that is the route in which we're pursuing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know the Honourable Minister of Agriculture has announced many many programs for farm assistance but I'd like to ask him a question which was posed to me by a farm family in Brandon East constituency and who alleged that there are many other families in similar situations. They have asked me to ask the Minister of Agriculture what assistance is there for farmers who are not cattle producers, secondly, who do not have crop insurance because their crop is not insurable, such as lentils and thirdly, who may have little or no inventory from last year and who are apparently suffering a great deal of hardship right now and the question is, is there any program that can help farmers in this particular category such as a loan program with reasonable interest rates attached, or whatever?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, to the Member for Brandon East. There is a program which was announced by the Premier some week and a half ago and that's called the Green Feed Program. If those individuals want to participate and sow a green feed which will add to the supplies of feed in the province, they can guarantee themselves 15 an acre if they sow that crop, that they would get a return of 15 an acre; if they grow a ton of grain feed to the acre, they can get 15 a ton subsidy for each ton that they grow. So there is a program to help those grain producers who do not have crop insurance or in fact, don't have livestock. We don't discriminate against them and it is a program that is to help them in times of helping to provide livestock feed. So it is one that the grain farmers can participate in, if they have not got crop insurance or if they're not livestock producers.

MR. EVANS: I gather, Mr. Speaker, that there would be a pamphlet or a statement or a leaflet or something that would be available for such farmers so they might follow up then. I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, regarding this category in farmers and that is, is there a possibility or does there exist now a program of direct financial assistance — and I'm thinking of assistance, the suggestion was made to have assistance by way of loan that would be paid back — to help such farmers who, for whatever reason, have to pay out a lot of money right now, or had paid out a lot of money for seed and fertilizer and find themselves in a very very short cash position at the present time? Because I gather, again, that there are some farmers in this particular category being short of cash and is it possible therefore — I guess I'm repeating, Mr. Speaker — for farmers to get some type of loan assistance at reasonable rates of interest and which they would, of course, pay back in due course?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a loan program through the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation which would be available to or is available to farmers who qualify and there is an interest subsidy for those farmers under the age of 39, a 4 percent rebate up to a maximum of 10,000 over a period of five years. There is also a bank guarantee on a Comprehensive Loan Program that would guarantee a loan of up to 200,000 that is available to farmers such as the member refers. So I think that there is a broad range of programs through the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, which I would advise the farmers that he is suggesting to me to contact the agent which is in Brandon, there is an agent there.

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

MR. EVANS: Yes. One other question then to the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise the House whether there is any backlog of farmers awaiting visits from farm insurance inspectors to assess the situation on the various farms that may have been distressed by the drought, so that those farmers can get on with the job of plowing under whatever they have and then perhaps get into summer fallowing, or what have

you? Is there a backlog and if there is a backlog, I'm not sure, will the Minister assign more staff to get rid of the backlog?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the member brings up a good question. We have, in fact, several requests or a large number of farmers who are desirous of doing something else with those lands that are presently under crop insurance. They either want to turn those lands into forage or livestock feeds or work them up for summer fallow or sow them to another crop. It's one of the issues that I brought to the Board of Directors and the management of Crop Insurance and suggested they get on with the job of implementing an emergency training program for farmers or qualified people who they could add to their staff and I understand the crop insurance — and I stand to be corrected on the number — but they have put out applications for an additional 175 staff people to help in the adjustment of the crops. We hope we can accommodate the farmers as quickly as possible because I know that it is urgent when they do want to take advantage of the recent rainfall to, in fact, either grow more crops or conserve that moisture for next year's production.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Attorney-General. We'd ask, Mr. Speaker, whether in view of the fact that the city of Winnipeg is now considering the use of attack guard dogs for the purpose of police patrol in city parks, whether the Attorney-General can advise us whether any guidelines or general policy has been established in order to assure the public interest in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I took as notice a few questions this afternoon from the Member for Inkster with respect to that matter and I think the Member for Wellington's question covers the same area and I will be enquiring into that matter and responding to the Member for Inkster and now Wellington, as soon as I can, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I don't mean to be repetitive and I did come a few minutes late for the Question Period today. I don't know whether the Member for Inkster asked this but I would ask whether the Minister will consider sending this matter to the Manitoba Police Commission for formation and creation of appropriate policy guidelines in this area?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I undertook to enquire into the matter. It hasn't been brought to my attention up until the time of Question Period this afternoon and I'll enquire into it and determine on the basis of the information that I received, what, if any, action can be taken.

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

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for MHRC and Housing. We would ask, Mr. Speaker, whether that Minister has had the opportunity to peruse the rent monitoring reports that the Minister of Consumer Affairs has said he will table in this Legislature and, on the presumption, Mr. Speaker, that he must have had such access, we would ask him whether he feels that they justified the repeal of rent controls in the city of Winnipeg?

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

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, we addressed the question to the Minister responsible for Housing in this province and I think, with all due respect, he should provide us with advice in a reply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I was perusing a note that was sent to me by one of the honourable members when the question was asked and I didn't hear what he said. If he'd be kind enough to repeat it I'll try to answer it.

MR. CORRIN: In brief, Mr. Speaker, we asked the Honourable Minister whether he had an opportunity to peruse the rent monitoring reports which have been referred to by the Minister responsible for Consumer Affairs and which form part of the basis for the repeal of The Rent Stabilization Act and rent controls; and we would ask the Minister responsible for Housing whether those reports, in his opinion as the Minister responsible for this important area, justify the repeal of rent controls?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I believe that question was taken as notice for the benefit of the Minister of Consumer Affairs today and I'm sure he'll have the answer for the honourable member. As far as the Housing, we have in the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, a standard rent program which is according to income and it's on a sliding scale from 16 to 25 percent as I mentioned today. Our increases in Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation in our public housing will be on the basis of rent to income on the sliding scale.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether or not the province is in the process, seeing as there is such great co-operation now between the federal and provincial governments, that there is a drought relief office being set up, a joint office being set up, to monitor the situation in the province of Manitoba on a joint basis, to assess the feed supplies, to assess the crops and to have a joint monitoring program in the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, some two months ago we set up a co-ordinating office in Brandon to facilitate the allocation and the distribution of feed in the province. As far as any federal program or any federal office, he's indicating to me that is being set up, he's providing information to me that I don't have. But we've also got an indication from the federal government that they are prepared to now send a senior staff member into the province to work out some of the details on the programs that we've already announced. That's what I've indicated to him.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm hoping that the Minister of Agriculture can indicate that he has asked federal participation in this office and that the province is, in fact, doing an ongoing monitoring program with respect to the assistance that is required by producers, to assess the situation in terms of feed supplies and the like.

I'd also like to ask the Minister if he can indicate the extent of claims that the crop insurance has received to date and the type of losses that are generally being sustained, as of June 30th.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information available to me immediately, as far as the amounts of crops that have either been written off or adjusted. I can provide that information for him. But the assessment of a 50 percent crop loss in the province has come from — and part of that information has come from the crop insurance agency. So that is the main information that I have to provide him with at this particular time. But I can provide the member with an update on the amount of adjustments that have taken place and the percentage of crop losses that have taken place on an actual basis.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George with a final supplementary.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope that the Minister will provide us with an update of that information because that will better reflect the nature of the payout that the crop insurance and the province will be facing in this area.

Mr. Speaker, on another matter, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture to what degree has he altered the provincial land use policy dealing with subdivisions of farmland within the province of Manitoba.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure. If the member could be more explicit on what he's talking about as far as altering the policy. As far as agriculture is concerned, our concerns are still the same as they were and have been since Day One, that we want to preserve agricultural land for the production of agricultural goods. We also want to facilitate the development of the agricultural communities which are going to support the farmers in those different districts.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George with a fourth question.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be more specific and ask the Minister whether he has

directed his staff to lessen their objections in terms of subdivisions of rural land over the objections of farmers with respect to playing havoc with their operations, similar to the situation that we encountered with the Springfield Hog Ranch over a number of years ago, where the province now is not objecting to subdivisions in areas which encroaching on existing agricultural developments and production.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I guess probably one of the major changes that the member might be talking about is in fact one that instead of having our resource people working in opposition to the rural municipalities and the rural councillors that they are working as resource people and supporting what they think is in the best interests of their local communities. Not, Mr. Speaker, to act as a stone wall or something that isn't going to facilitate development but to work with those municipal councillors and those local people to see that the development takes place in their communities that they themselves want.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: I wonder if the Minister of Resources could give us some information regarding the fire situation in the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the fire situation has been considerably improved because of the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I would hope that members that want to carry on private conversations do so in a quiet tone of voice.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the precipitation that we had generally across the province the past weekend had helped considerably in gaining control of the fires in the province and the number has been reduced from the 80s down to 65, I believe, was the count today. They are reasonably well under control. The warm weather of the past few days is starting to move us back towards the situation that existed previously, but we anticipate that for the next few days that it will remain reasonably stable.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to address my question to the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if he can indicate whether he's had any assessment as to the vegetable crop production this year, and if it's low, what kind of assistance the market gardeners are receiving.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I haven't had any direct communication with the Vegetable Producers

Association but I have been in consultation with my colleague, the Member for Portage, where the majority of the vegetables are grown in the province. He has indicated to me that the vegetable growers are having as difficult a time as any of the other producers in the province. I think we all have to appreciate the fact that when you're in production of anything that depends on moisture that we are having some difficult times. However, some of the vegetable producers in a large part of the province that have irrigation equipment and water available, they have been carrying on and, because of the progressiveness of the individuals who are in that industry, I would say that they are protecting themselves with the irrigating equipment and the water that they have available to them.

MR. FOX: I wonder if the Minister has any conception or knowledge of how many of those farmers are protected by crop insurance so that we do not lose them to the industry.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, there are very few vegetable crops that are covered by crop insurance. The majority of the crop insurance is for the cereal crops, sugar beets and those types of crops, but I think that as we develop our crop insurance program to come into line or to give support to the more specialized crops that it would give those particular individuals more assurance of returns for the investments that they put into the production of vegetables. It's one item that I think it's important to further assess and try and develop programs for crop insurance to give them some assurance that they will get returns for their efforts.

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

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, the reason I asked my question is because as long as there are sufficient farmers to produce the vegetables and they do not go under, the consumer may have some protection in respect to rising prices. Again, I say is there any means that the Honourable Minister is looking at in respect to helping out the market gardeners?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated, there has been no direct request from the vegetable producers but I have had assessments on the situation from the members who have vegetable growers in their areas. I think that probably the ones that are irrigating their crops can be assured of reasonable production, but those people who do not have irrigation available to them will suffer the same hardship as those other producers of agricultural crops.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Economic Development and also responsible for Transportation. I would like to ask the Minister if he has any information regarding the wharf at the Port of Churchill, as to what the condition is and if it's in

satisfactory condition to be able to load ships at the port.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have no reason to believe that the port is not in good condition but I'll certainly take the question as notice and find out if it's ready for loading and is doing so. I'll have to take the question as notice.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if I could have the permission of the House at this time to introduce a distinguished visitor, Mr. John Mathwin, Liberal Member of Parliament of the House of Assembly of South Australia and a Member of the Executive Committee of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Branch. Mr. Mathwin is visiting Manitoba, and he's studying juvenile delinquency and correctional services for juveniles and parole systems.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this evening, Mr. Mathwin.

Order please, the time for question period having expired, proceed with Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

BILL NO. 19 — THE EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION ACT

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 19?

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 19, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this bill this afternoon because I wanted to make an inquiry, and I have not yet had the opportunity of making that inquiry, but I will speak with several contingencies in my mind on the basis that it's what I consider to be a serious matter. It's not a matter that relates particularly to this Minister of Education or to this government, but it's one which has been a problem vis-a-vis governments generally.

Now if the Minister will look at the Education Administration Act, he will see that he and the government are given numerous powers and these powers are specified and the Act, of course, specifies many things that can be done, and then under one of the sections, and I won't refer to it by number, but the Minister is given a power to make regulations. This, Mr. Speaker, is not new but many other parliamentarians who have preceded me, and many who will follow me, will indicate that sometimes the government, in giving power to make regulations, gives a Minister powers which, if he sought to get through parliament, he would not be able to get through parliament, because they would arouse controversy. Now I think it would be a surprise to the Minister if I told him that it is possible that under

these regulations he could, for instance, give much more authority for people within one system of schools to use another system of schools; that he could do many things which are not enumerated in the legislation that he has enacted and which two Acts are brought in.

But, Mr. Speaker, this particular Act, after giving the Minister numerous powers, numerous discretionary powers by regulations, seems to outdo itself. I discovered this, Mr. Speaker, in other statutes that I have found. I think I can remember, and I think perhaps the First Minister will remember, that the first Sales Tax Act had a provision in it that, by regulation, the Minister could define any word in the Act. This is sheer bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker, sheer bureaucracy. After putting into the legislation everything that they want, they think that they have forgotten something, so they put into the Act that the Minister is able, by definition, by regulation, to define any word in the Act. If the word said black, the Minister could define it my regulation as meaning white.

I want to indicate to the Minister that the regulation that I'm now referring to is contained in the present Act which is being repealed and I'm not even certain, and that's one of the things I wanted to research, as to how it got there. It could well be that it was there before 1969, or it could well be that it was brought in between 1969 and 1978 because when people bring in a whole series of Acts, although there are numerous Cabinet Ministers who would want to know what's being brought in, especially in a session like this, and that's why it's good to discuss this thing, at this session, because if it slipped by me when I was in government, and we didn't have nearly as rough a session as we're having now, it could slip by the First Minister. I do not think that the First Minister, who I know something about, and his history with respect to trying to control government by regulation, would say, after giving all of the power to regulate, that the Minister may make regulations generally respecting all matters having to do with education. After everything else, after trying to have covered the waterfront, the Minister is given the power, and I repeat, he has it now, so don't misunderstand me that I'm suggesting that he is now taking it, I'm suggesting that once it slipped by, that the Minister would probably get up in the House and do what the Minister of Labour did, say, "it was in the old Act, I don't know that there's any change". Well there is no change, it is in the old Act but what does it say to us as parliamentarians, Mr. Speaker, that we say that the Minister may pass regulations — just listen to the scope of it — the Minister may pass regulations, generally may make regulations — I wish the First Minister would listen to this, as to what he is passing — make regulations generally respecting all matters having to do with education.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wonder that they have any other sections in the Act. Why are there any other sections? What other sections are necessary? And if there are other sections, the only ones that this will be effected by are the expressed prohibitions. Because the regulations can't be contrary to what is already contained in the legislation, but if it's not contrary to what's contained in the legislation, the Minister, under this section, needn't come to the

Legislature, again, does he? I mean do you ever have to come here again? If you have the power of enacting laws without parliament, laws having the effect of statutory provision, the violation of which is punishable by fine or imprisonment, what's the point of ever coming back to the Legislature? We have made you, excuse me in saying we have made you, you are now the Czar of Education because the present Department of Education Act says that you may make regulations generally respecting all matters to do with education.

Now I wonder what the Attorney-General would say about that section? Is there anything that he cannot do by virtue of that section? Put into regulation form, pass laws, the violation of which makes a person subject to fine or imprisonment. I am pointing this out because I don't think the Minister has ever thought about this and I'm not criticizing him for that because somewhere or other, it could have been passed during my administration, a similar provision, or if it wasn't, it was done in 1969, but I don't think that parliamentarians want these things. I think these things are put in to make sure that the bureaucrats who draw it get the impression that if they've left anything out and they want to do it, they put in a specification that that be done.

Now I've referred, Mr. Speaker, to one specific part of the legislation. I honestly believe that I am performing a service in referring that part to you. Because I don't believe that the philosophy of the government, any government, is to enact that kind of broad regulation. I believe it's in there because it was there. I believe that the Minister of Labour ran into the same thing at the Industrial Relations Committee, and is now correcting — something was wrong for 20 years till it came forward in a new piece of legislation. Some member of the Legislature had to give his attention to it; found something which he believes, really the legislators don't want. And I ask the Minister to go back and see whether he did want that, or how it got in there — and maybe he's going to embarrass me by saying that some Minister in our government asked for it, which I don't believe. But there it is. I believe that regulations should be limited rather than expanded and they should be specific rather than general and therefore, I ask the Minister not to be giving himself more power in that particular section than is contained in every other section of the Act and every other section of the other Act because if you wanted to govern, under the philosophy of this section, you could pass an Act saying the following: The Education Administration Act; Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly, enacts as follows: (1) for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act the Minister may enact regulations respecting all matters having to do with education.

That's not the type of legislation that you would commend to any government, to your own, and I therefore ask the Minister to look at that and see whether that's a section that he really wishes to continue when the bill gets to committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education will be closing debate. The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's necessary to speak at length on this particular bill. It's the companion bill to Bill 31. I think the debate has dealt at some length with 31. However, there are three or four points that I would like to touch on. One of them is the continuing concern that some members opposite have with the particular powers accorded field representatives in Bill 19 and also in Bill 31. I have pointed out in Bill 31 that these powers are the same powers that existed formerly under the field inspector category and under the previous government, there is nothing new, nothing startling in this regard. I point out to honourable members opposite that if field representatives did not have this particular jurisdiction in this particular power, then it would be incumbent on me, as Minister, to delegate that particular power to someone else in my department. Of course, if honourable gentlemen opposite would feel better if this was delegated to certain other employees within the Department of Education, I suppose that might solve part of their dilemma. It certainly is necessary that certain people would have this jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker.

The other area of concern that was mentioned by the Honourable Member for St. Vital was the Certificate Review Committee, it was formerly called the Discipline Committee, and I think that was a misnomer, Mr. Speaker, and I feel that certificate review is a much more applicable name for this particular committee. The Honourable Member for St. Vital has drawn attention to the fact that we have limited the size of that committee. It formerly composed 11 people and now composes 8; and he pointed out, in particular, the fact that the teacher representation on this committee previously had been some 4 people, identical with the representation of the Trustees Association. I point out to him that in the new proposed committee, the Certificate Review Committee, the teacher representation will be the same as the Trustees Association, both major groups within the educational community will have two representatives. However, Mr. Speaker, if this is a problem it is certainly something that we can look at and perhaps, as we are moving the bill through committee, it's something that would be worthy of further consideration. If the member is suggesting that we expand the size of the committee, that's something that can be considered. If he is suggesting that we expand the representation of certain groups on the committee, that's something that can be considered as well.

The other area that the Honourable Member for St. Vital mentioned this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, was in the area of the teacher education programs where he points out quite correctly that within this bill the Minister is given responsibility in this particular area, and I only say to him, Mr. Speaker, that if the Minister of Education is charged with the certification of teachers, then I think it only follows that it would be expected that the Minister of Education, in turn, would have some jurisdiction in the area of the teacher education programs that lead to the certification of those same teachers.

I have listened with some interest, Mr. Speaker, to the comments of the Honourable Member for Inkster as he refers to the particular powers of the Minister

in regard to regulations. He points out an interesting section, Section 41 (x). I'm quite prepared, Mr. Speaker, to have a second look at that particular section and if it is not applicable, if it does abuse the rights of this particular House in any way, I would be quite prepared to look at some revision in that case.

Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, I think those are the main points that have been touched on in the rather limited debate on this bill and I say that in no way being critical, Mr. Speaker, because I think the majority of the debate has been on Bill 31, as it should be. However, I look forward to this particular bill going to committee and the consideration that we will give it there as well, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, would you call second reading of Bill No. 12?

BILL NO. 12 - THE LAW FEES ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 12 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate for the Attorney-General.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister will be closing debate. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, just a brief comment. The Member for Wellington, in speaking to this matter, made a point that the Crown should be liable to pay costs under this Act, Mr. Speaker. I want to point out to him, Mr. Speaker, that the provisions of this Act are unchanged from the existing legislation which is based on a section of the Act which was enacted in 1975.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, in 1974, the then administration attempted to implement the principle which he was discussing by having the Crown bound by the Act. As I understand it from my department, because of the bookkeeping exercise which resulted, that section was repealed the following year, the department found itself issuing cheques in favour of its own department and it was simply a bureaucratic nightmare to attempt to eliminate, Mr. Speaker. On that basis, we've included in this Act, which is a re-writing of the provisions relating to law fees which have been found in numerous other Acts included in this Act and this section is based on what is presently in existence.

The Member for Wellington referred to a number of other matters which I think would be more appropriately dealt with in committee. He referred to Queen's Bench fees, revenue and expenditures, and I have those figures which I can give to him. Court reporters fees again, which I can give to him, and Surrogate Court fees, which I can provide him with when this bill is in committee, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill 32?

**BILL NO. 32 - AN ACT TO AMEND
THE REAL ESTATE BROKERS ACT**

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 32, An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan.

The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I may. Our Whip, who has the adjournment on a number of these bills, had to leave early; he was not feeling well. If the Government House Leader can indicate to us which ones he would like to be called, I will try to find out for whom the bill was being held and perhaps we could proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'd be interested in knowing if members opposite could deal with any of the adjourned debates on second reading which stand in the name of the Member for Logan.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. FOX: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Yes, we're prepared to go on Bill 61 right now.

**BILL NO. 61
AN ACT TO AMEND THE DAIRY ACT**

MR. SPEAKER: Is there agreement then to call Bill 61? (Agreed) Bill No. 61, An Act to amend The Dairy Act.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our Whip, the Member for Logan, adjourned the debate in my favour, on my behalf, Mr. Speaker, and I just wish to make several remarks to the amendments to The Dairy Act.

I believe the Minister of Agriculture, in his remarks, indicated that this was to be a consolidation of several Acts. In checking over this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I find that primarily the amendments are strictly to The Dairy Act and, in the main, are housekeeping in nature, although for a government that professes not to want to be involved in the lives of its citizens almost to any degree at all, Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation certainly will bring the involvement of the government into the lives of any individual, be it anyone who has one or more cows or goats that are kept because, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will allow the province or its inspectors to inspect and enter upon the operations of anyone who has either one cow or one goat. So this piece of legislation brings forward wide-ranging powers on behalf of the Minister and his department. So for a government that doesn't want to involve itself in the lives of its citizens, certainly these amendments to The Dairy Act don't hold true to this government's philosophy which indicates its wishes

to inspect upon and check and do whatever is necessary in terms of its regulations that it proposes with respect to the dairy industry and entering upon a person's farm, who has even one goat, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this Act. So this legislation is contrary to everything that this Minister has told us in the last three years that his government stands for.

Mr. Speaker, as well with respect to the cancellation of a licence or registration that the Minister or his Director intend to undertake, we feel and I certainly feel on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that there is in the legislation the right of the individual, who may be having his licence cancelled, to be heard, Mr. Speaker, but in the legislation it appears that the Director or the Minister will be, not only the prosecutor, Mr. Speaker, or the person doing the investigating and then the prosecuting, it's not clear in the legislation that that individual may also become the judge and jury of the hearing.

I would hope that the Minister and his officials within the department would see fit to bring in amendments to this legislation to guarantee that there be an independent body that will hear the complaints of an individual who may have his licence cancelled or about to be cancelled by the Minister or his Director. So rather than placing the Director and the staff in a very awkward position of being both the prosecution but also the judge, Mr. Speaker, I would urge upon the government and the Minister of Agriculture to amend the section, and it's particularly Section 19 of the Act dealing with the right of an individual to be heard in an appeal against the cancellation of a licence.

Mr. Speaker, as well, I would hope that the government reviews, not only in this Act but in other Acts, the wide powers that it is giving to its investigative personnel within the department. I hope that the province looks at the rights of investigatory officers that they have in terms of entering upon the premises of a farmer or of a dairy plant. We're not opposed, Mr. Speaker, to the rights of doing necessary investigations but I believe, Mr. Speaker, I think in this legislation and in many other pieces of legislation, the powers are very wide-ranging and, of course, the penalties along with them for not complying with the requests of the inspectors and the investigators, as the case may be.

We feel that the government should look at the powers here in Section 24 and, really, if they are intent on making or allowing as much freedom in the industry as possible, they certainly aren't being true to their words with respect to the amendments, Mr. Speaker. For a Minister, especially the Minister of Agriculture, who has time and time again got up in this House and said, we don't want to involve ourselves in the lives of the citizens, we want to have them free to operate as best they can, Mr. Speaker, this legislation flies in the face of those comments, Mr. Speaker, of a Minister who — and he went like this as if he was milking a cow, Mr. Speaker — he's going to be the guy that will be, as one could say, sucking the hind tit, Mr. Speaker, because he will be the Minister that will be going out to farms of one cow or one goat. He will be the Minister that will be goading all the farmers in Manitoba by the amendments that he's tossing in this legislation and I

would hope, Mr. Speaker, that he will take the constructive criticisms and suggestions that I've made in respect to the right of an individual to be heard and bring forward the amendments, to possibly use the Natural Products Marketing Council, to hear the appeals against the director rather than have someone from the department hearing those appeals.

The Minister shakes his head in the negative. If he does not take that suggestion, the Minister should be able to appoint someone outside the department, possibly even the Milk Control Board, Mr. Speaker, to use the Milk Control Board as a hearing mechanism against an appeal. The Milk Control Board certainly has all the evidence at its hand in terms of the operations of dairy plants and farmers, since it's had the experience in having both groups come to it for increases, so they've had to look at the financial positions of both groups and look at the operations and how they're handled by those two groups. I would hope that the Minister will agree that it should not be either he or his departmental officials that will also do the hearing and the adjudicating on investigations that they handle.

Other than that, Mr. Speaker, those comments, the bill we find is primarily housekeeping and we're prepared to see it go to committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Order please. The question has been called. Is there leave for the Minister? The Honourable Minister will be closing debate.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, in closing debate on the amendments to the Dairy Act, as I indicated in my opening comments, the main thrust of the bill, of course, is to assure the public that they will receive top quality milk, so that they do not have to fear contaminated products; that they can be assured that when they purchase the product from the source of supply that they can be assured that it is of top quality. The other amendments as I indicated, were mainly of housekeeping, the fact that it now reports to three ministries and will now be responsible only to the Minister of Agriculture. The administration of it will be somewhat more simple and as the Member for St. George has indicated they recommend it to go to committee and so do I and I would like to request support of the members in passing of this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George with a couple of questions.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether it is the intent of the government, because of the way the amendments have been drawn up, to in fact, require information and inspection of farms that have only one cow or one goat, as is indicated in the legislation?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the protection of the health of the public if, in fact, those particular individuals are producing a product that could affect the health of any individual, then if there is one cow or one goat that has to be inspected, then I would assume that the same principle would apply. Now there is an area of common sense that

would apply, but again, it is in the best interests of the consuming public that these amendments be made and that is the principle on which this bill is being amended.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George with a final question.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, just on clarification. The Minister indicates that its to protect the public and there's no argument on this side. I just want to make sure that I understand this. I know in the farmer to consumer direct sales of meat, or of milk, there is primarily no inspection made and that process is continuing. I believe, there's no restriction, no change in that process and that's the reason for my question, is that in terms of milk or cheese, in terms of a very small operator that may have his clientele . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe these questions could better be asked at committee. We have had the debate, members have had the opportunity of raising them, the Minister had the opportunity to close debate.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

INTERIM SUPPLY (2)

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This Committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Interim Supply (2)—pass; — the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to deal with a number of points pertaining to the present management of government. The affairs in Manitoba by the government, specifically dealing with three areas. Areas pertaining to the economy, the handling of the internal fiscal management of government and thirdly, dealing with health care.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us, released today, the figures from Statistics Canada dealing with the number of building permits issued throughout Canada. Questions were raised earlier of the Minister of Economic Development pertaining to those figures. I think it is important, Mr. Chairman, that at this point, when the Minister of Finance is asking for Interim Supply, we again draw to the attention of the Minister of Finance the absolute and dismal failure, on the part of his government, in ensuring that there is any stimulus to the economy. Mr. Chairman, we

have again and again, both in the present year, 1980, and in 1979, pointed out to the government that they were failing and failing badly insofar as stimulating the economy of the province of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, the figures which we have today, dealing with building permits, dealing with residential, industrial, commercial, institutional and government, to April 1980 compared to April 1979, demonstrates that Manitoba has declined by some 65 point some percent, 65 point some percent decline 1980 from 1979. And in case members feel that is not too serious a situation, Mr. Chairman, 1979 was about at the bottom, that we thought it would have been possible for the economy of this province, demonstrated by the issuance of building permits, dollar wise, to have slipped. But to slipped a further 65 percent, Mr. Chairman, up to April this year, compared to last year, one of the worst four-month periods in the history of Manitoba, is really beyond any explanation, except to again indicate utter and complete failing on the part of this government in economic management of the affairs of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the propaganda across the way is to say this is part of a Canada-wide situation; that Manitoba is but an island in economic recession which is taking place throughout Canada. Mr. Chairman, while we witness this decline in Manitoba, Canada's increase was 10.5 percent in building permits, all of Canada 10.5 percent of an increase.

Mr. Chairman, the figures are here in each and every category and I'll be forwarding a copy of this to the Minister of Finance in case the Minister of Finance would like his colleague, the Minister of Economic Development, hasn't seen these particular figures. What they do show, Mr. Chairman, is that insofar as each individual province, Manitoba's record is the worst the first four months of this year compared to the first four months of 1979, the worst, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister of Economic Development responsible for housing would like to suggest that, well, it's a decline insofar as residential construction. Mr. Chairman, there is a decline, yes, in residential construction, 1980 from 1979, but there is also a decline insofar as industrial in Manitoba, not an increase but a decline. In commercial, there is a decline and insofar as institutional and government, as well, a decline in all categories.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to burden members with statistics because the Minister of Finance loves to say, well, statistics lie. But what does not lie in Manitoba is the increase in the number of foreclosures, the increase in the number of bankruptcies which are taking place in 1980 compared to 1979. I know that the Minister of Finance, in his ivory tower type of approach from his office in this building, attempts again and again to ignore the reality of the situation that there is need in Manitoba for a government which is prepared to stimulate the economy of this province; a need for a government which is not tied to dogmatic right-wing views; a government that is not tied to laissez-faire Adam Smith ideology of past centuries but a government that is prepared to assume an activist role insofar as stimulating of the economy, Mr. Chairman, insofar as housing is concerned.

The Minister of Economic Development attempts to suggest, well, there's a surplus of housing. Mr. Chairman, there is not a surplus of housing, affordable housing, for those in low and middle income groups in many parts of Manitoba. But this government has eliminated the family public housing program; elderly persons' housing programs have come to a virtual halt under the argument that, well, there is really no need for housing. There is surplus housing in Manitoba.

There are many other areas as well, Mr. Speaker, that an activist government, a government that is affirmative in approach would be attempting to bring about a stimulation of the economy so that Manitobans would have the option of remaining in Manitoba. I know that the Minister of Finance doesn't take this too seriously. He dismisses all our suggestions involving Manitobans, sons and daughters of this province, being required to leave this province for east and west. He dismisses the figures which prove conclusively that there has been population decrease last year and so far this year. He dismisses figures indicating that there has been net out-migration of Manitobans to other provinces. So that all we can do, Mr. Chairman, is continue to bring these points to his attention. We know that this government won't do anything. We are prepared and committed to bring about a regeneration of the economy in Manitoba within the total context, to ensure that there is improvement in the economy of this province.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, we have a second breach in credibility and that is insofar as the deficit is concerned. It was interesting, Mr. Chairman, that in 1977 so much was made of the size of the provincial deficit, a provincial deficit which had not been budgeted for, but a deficit to a large extent which was brought about because of the then existing circumstances. The fact that, number one, Ottawa had miscalculated considerable sums of moneys that were to be available to Manitoba by way of additional equalization payments. Moneys which were required and were spent in 1977 in order to deal with what then was the commencement of an employment problem insofar as Manitoba is concerned, employment programs, to deal with the drought of unemployment in Manitoba. We initiated programs but in some way or other in the double standard that this government applies, that deficit was wild, reckless, bureaucratic expenditure by big government. They describe that deficit as one which was reckless and irresponsible but some way the deficit which they have budgeted for — and dear knows what their deficit will end up by — is sound fiscal management by a sound Conservative government. That is a double standard that they are attempting to portray in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, they have lost their credibility. They were elected on the commitment which they gave to Manitobans that some way or other a Conservative government in office would provide sound fiscal internal management to the affairs of Manitoba. Instead we find, Mr. Chairman, the largest budgeted deficit that I believe Manitobans can recall in the history of this province, the largest, after three years of their government. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but we are faced with a situation pertaining to the debt of this province increased by somewhere in the

neighbourhood of 750 to 800 per man, woman and child in Manitoba from 1977 increase in the provincial debt of this province. And yet, Mr. Chairman, it was the Minister of Finance and the then Opposition Leader, the now Premier, who suggested this province was in virtual bankruptcy in 1977, in virtual bankruptcy with a debt which was considerably less than the debt which we are faced with presently in the province of Manitoba. But, of course, Mr. Chairman, again their hypocritical double standard that yet in 1977 was reckless and irresponsible but of course their debt today is something which is quite acceptable and sound. Mr. Chairman, again, they have lost their credibility.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to the area of social. We've just gone through a lengthy work stoppage in the health care institutions in this province. Mr. Chairman, I attribute the worry and the strain suffered by thousands of patients and residents of our personal care homes in which that work stoppage occurred as directly attributable to the government across the way. It was the bungling and ineptitude of the present government which created the situation by which that work stoppage occurred, Mr. Chairman, and this government must bear full and complete responsibility for that work stoppage and the agony and concern that was felt as a result.

The imposition of the budgetary ceilings insofar as the hospitals are concerned, vagueness insofar as what the government would do pertaining to payment and responsibility for any deficits encountered placed both the hospital administrators and the workers in the health care field in the impossible vice, a vice which was being tightly squeezed by the government of today, Mr. Chairman. So again, when it came to health care, we have a loss of credibility on the part of this government. Failure in the economic front, failure insofar as fiscal internal management of the affairs of the province of Manitoba and, Mr. Chairman, a disaster in the field of health care. I could go on and on dealing with the field of health care tonight, Mr. Chairman, what is happening insofar as the personal care homes are concerned, but I will leave that to another occasion.

Another area, Mr. Chairman, where they have lost their credibility is Manitoba Hydro. How we recall the months and years in which we were bombarded with their nonsense about the reckless expenditure pertaining to Manitoba Hydro, Jenpeg and Lake Winnipeg. My colleague, the Member for St. Vital, I think demonstrated a service to all Manitobans when he caused it to be revealed in the committee to become known to all Manitobans that over 30-some million were saved this year because of Jenpeg and Lake Winnipeg Regulation.

Despite the attempt to discredit, the attempt to bully by the Minister of Finance of the officials of Manitoba Hydro that had the integrity to reveal straightforward honest answers in that committee, the Minister of Finance, who always liked to talk and rave in past years about non-interference, Mr. Chairman, I suggest attempted to intimidate without success the officials of Manitoba Hydro that were prepared to reveal the truth. He attempted to tongue-lash them for being loyal, committed public servants of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, they have lost their credibility. We'll be supporting this bill for Interim Supply. It's a matter of some formality. Certainly we're not going to hold up the payment of expenditures; we're not going to hold up the payment of the commitments by the province, but I believe it is an opportune time to point out these four areas where this government, three years after its election in 1977, has lost credibility. I believe that is becoming more and more apparent to more and more Manitobans. We don't expect the government to change its ways. We've been proposing, urging and suggesting for the past three years but, Mr. Chairman, all we can call upon the Minister of Finance at this late point, at this late point, for the sake of Manitobans, to review the direction which he has undertaken and, along with his government colleagues, to provide some better leadership to the people of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I had started to speak briefly before the adjournment. Time has been saved because the Leader of the Opposition raised a couple of points much better than I, but I was prompted to speak in the first instance to put on the record in a juxtaposition to some of the remarks of the Attorney-General when he, in self-righteous indignation, suggested that they actually cut taxes to the people of the province of Manitoba. But, Mr. Chairman, everyone knows that — nearly everyone knows now — this government has not decreased the cost of public services in the province of Manitoba one whit, not one whit. They have decreased the level of service. Actually people are paying more for worse services and it's finally getting through to the public that this is the case. But what prompted me to — not just that — was the Minister of Finance in chiding the Member for St. Johns of how he could show chagrin at the lateness of the hour in bringing in a request for additional Interim Supply.

Mr. Chairman, a few years ago the Member for Inkster told a story in the House which epitomizes the attitude of the Minister of Finance. He told the story about the gladiators of old in the days of the Romans where they used to throw Christians to the lions and the rule was that if you survived you got set free. So they threw this one to the lion and he whipped it and he said, oh, no, no, you can't do that, you have to tie one hand behind your back. And he whipped another lion, so they tied both hands behind his back and he whipped another lion. So they finally said, no, no, you're buried in sand up to your neck. So this lion come charging down there and the poor guy reached up and he bit him and the lion took off over the stockade and the Conservative crowd screamed, fight fair, fight fair. For 12 years I listened to those people. I listened to the Minister, fight fair, fight fair. I listened to the speeches from him about the black days in the province of Manitoba when one civil servant resigned and I hold up the performance of that government in juxtaposition to this one. One of the reasons why many people think the politicians are phoney baloney is, be honest with people, and when somebody starts chiding the Member for St. Johns in

saying that the reasons that he wanted to speak to the Member for Seven Oaks, because he's a reasonable man, and by saying so implies that the Member for St. Johns is not a reasonable man. In this House I don't think that there's a more gentlemanly individual or more reasonable individual. He's a tough adversary and when in an adversary position with him, once in awhile, I have an inclination to fight especially when I'm losing the debate.

But, Mr. Speaker, for the Attorney-General to expect people on this side of the House, after being subjected to cash registers dingling and birds flying free and the Member for Tourism and for Fitness and Amateur Sports saying, a billion dollars has left this province, and this government is spending 2 million for the Tritschler report, the Tritschler report that didn't prove that we wasted five cents — (Interjection)— and then the Minister of Finance here recently, not liking the opinion of the Hydro officials that Lake Winnipeg regulation did have a net worth. We make our debates on this side of the House when we get the opportunity. When the Member for Inkster said earlier, the responsibility of the opposition is to defeat the government, perhaps this is the issue over which we should defeat the government, I don't know, that's up to the opposition not to myself as an individual. But to suggest the opposition has to abide by the rules of the government, I have said in my initial remarks that it's a good thing that perhaps this happened because the government has finally realized that there is a Legislature. I said also before supper, if the federal Conservative government had realized that we probably wouldn't have had an election.

But the idea, Mr. Speaker, that we're going to get in an argument that your mistakes are worse than my mistakes, I don't think that does anybody any good. The role of the opposition is to challenge the government and to force them to face issues and be honest with people. We heard a great dialogue here between a couple of members yesterday on a misunderstanding and questioning people's honesty. I don't know how people can honestly say that they've reduced the cost of public services to the province of Manitoba when this is not the case. They reduced estate taxes. They took and helped those people who had left estates of over half a million dollars, this is true. But what did they do in the very first session? They started to jack up every fee, every permit, Red River Community College, university, park fees, every other thing that you could imagine this government jacked up.

So for them to stand in their places and say on every occasion that they think they should say it and expect us not to respond to the fallaciousness of their argument, that they have reduced the cost of public services. I expect every man and woman on this side of the House to draw to the public's attention that this is not the case and the public is finally waking up to the fact that the health services have deteriorated. The representations which are being made to the Privileges and Elections Committee vis-a-vis the educational Public Schools Act, is demonstrating that the people in the province can see that the public school system is being given a short shrift. Because why, Mr. Speaker? It's an attitudinal thing. The nobles must

protect the state against the fickleness of the people. They have no use for the public sector and it permeates everything that they do.

They expect this House to vote in another Committee — and I don't want to reflect on the deliberations of another committee, Mr. Chairman — but they want this House to put in regulations that some poor woman can't get a 400 gift. They want to put it in there. We can't do that. But yet other people in the economy, when they need help, open up the pursestrings and I don't deny it to them. I said on one occasion here, on beef stabilization, if it costs us 100 million it would be to the advantage of the people in Winnipeg Centre, whom I represent, to stabilize the beef production in the province of Manitoba, stabilize it in the sense that we didn't have it up and down, and up and down. So the expenditures of money to help the agricultural industry find its own way, whether it's through marketing systems, it's through co-operative systems or whatever, I think that us urban members have to support that and will continue to support it. All that we ask is that when the people in the urban communities are in dire straits that the people, many of them opposite — we have rural members here and they support it — they support the urban needs. When the people in the cities need jobs, that's assistance, that's drought, that you reflect on what you do.

Do you want our help in the rural communities? We'll give it to you gladly, whether it's fight floods or drought or pick strawberries or anything else, or fires. But reflect what you ask us to do. When the people who want to work have no jobs, when the construction workers have no work, there are no jobs. In the construction area, Mr. Chairman, it is my honest opinion — I have no proof for it, I haven't done research, I have no capacity to do research, I get 1,000 a year which goes to the group that do research — but in my area where many senior citizens houses were started, prior to the change in government, they are still not occupied. I have no proof. I'm not faulting the Minister. But nevertheless, I think it was slowed down because when those things come on stream they're an added cost.

The progressions that we had left in place, as far as construction was concerned, with the new ReMan Centre, which is needed; the new courthouse which is needed; senior citizens homes, nursing homes, these could have created a hiatus for three years. It's coming back to haunt us, Mr. Chairman, because the expenditures of these moneys would have created jobs. It would have created jobs which would have generated revenues to the public purse. So this anticipated shortfall in provincial revenues would not be as great if this government had proceeded with the well-thought-out economic development of this province. So I implore those members opposite from the rural community, whom I respect. I know the Attorney-General when he thinks, when he says that he has reduced taxes, technically he is correct in that they reduced it by 2 percentage points. But when you follow it through to the man's pocket you haven't reduced the cost of those public services. So when we disagree, we disagree on philosophy.

I would have much more respect for members opposite if they would come out and tell the people, we don't believe in that kind of program. We are

going to stop it. We're not going to deliver it at that level. But that isn't what they do. They have professed for three years that when inflation is 9.5 percent on the average, that a 2, 4, 6 percent increase is keeping it at the same level. The people aren't stupid, Mr. Chairman. So when the rural members who are going through difficult times and need our assistance, which on behalf of the people of Winnipeg Centre, I'd gladly give them, think about the rest of the ramifications in the economic situation in Manitoba, that we have an employment drought. If the federal government is going to solve the drought problem by giving 60 million, which is 20 million more than was anticipated at the provincial level, take that 40 million and put it into works which will create jobs. All I think we should ask, Mr. Chairman, is that when we consider these things, that we be equitable to all citizens in the province of Manitoba.

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

MR. USKIW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I don't want to unnecessarily prolong the debate on Interim Supply but I think it's a reasonable opportunity to ask the Minister just where his projections are with respect to his deficit for this year, given the fact that we've had a number of revisions now and given the fact that the government has provided for some expectation of further programs that may become necessary given the conditions in Manitoba. It seems to me that after having had one quarter behind us, now facing up to the next quarter, that the Minister probably has in his possession some idea, provided to him by his department, some report that would indicate just whether we're looking at 225 million or 250 million of deficit at the end of this fiscal year.

The Minister's own statements now add up to about 190 million and that doesn't account for continuing contingency programs with respect to drought. It doesn't account for the fact that it now appears there may not be any alleviation of costs from the Government of Canada, given the fact that the Government of Canada has announced its own drought relief program, unless of course, there are going to be two programs from the Government of Canada for drought relief. So therefore, there's some 20-odd million, I believe, of expected recoveries that appear to be slipping away very quickly. The Minister of Agriculture this afternoon, and indeed the Minister of Finance, were not in a position to indicate one way or the other. But reading between the lines it appears to me now that the province of Manitoba will likely be shouldering the full cost of their drought relief program. So that, in essence, a recovery factor is going to be minimal if it's related only to that portion of recovery that is based on the refund for the costs of feed supplies at the source and no recovery from the Government of Canada.

The Minister of Finance, I'm sure would want to give us some idea as to just what his expectations are, given the fact that we now know that revenues logically should be away down. Now, sometimes government project revenues very conservatively, they're quite under what they really expect and, of course, if that was the case then the end result could be somewhat different than what I am describing.

But if those projections of the Minister are on target and the changes that have taken place since those projections were announced, then it seems to me that we probably are looking at something in the order of 250 million of deficit by March 31st next and perhaps even more, I don't know. I can't, quite frankly, measure the impact of the conditions in Manitoba, not only the drought but the slowing down of the Manitoba economy, which is obvious to all and certainly a spillover from other jurisdictions. Just what impact that will have on sales tax revenues and on income tax revenues and, therefore, where we will wind up by March 31st. So perhaps in the course of the Minister's remarks he would be willing to give us some indication as to what his expectations are as of this date.

I noted with some degree of amusement, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has now discovered that there is such a thing as inflation, because when he was pressed in the question of the size of this deficit in comparison with previous deficits, he alluded to the fact that you have to consider inflation as a factor. I'm pleased now to know that is part of the government's considerations, given the fact that it has been a factor for many many years. It's certainly not a new phenomena in Manitoba or in North America, and that perhaps full weight ought to be given to the inflation factor when we look at all of the economic indices that we do look at from time to time, in order to arrive at some idea as to how the economy is performing.

I notice in the most recent publication that almost, if not all, well, I believe every indice is down again for the first quarter of 1980, as far as Manitoba is concerned. If you're looking at the value of building permits for industrial development or for public sector development or commercial development of any kind, you see a very huge minus from last year, and last year was not a good performance year, Mr. Chairman. We had a problem last year. So all in all it should indicate, to me at least, that we're heading for a much greater deficit than was expected and that it's perhaps the beginning of a very serious low. Perhaps we're moving from a flat economy to a real dip in the economy in Manitoba. If that is the case, the Minister perhaps would want to consider just what the government is going to do to give it some stimulation in order to offset some of that downturn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Interim Supply (2)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I understand the matter before the committee, the Minister of Finance is asking us for a goodly sum of money to pay some bills which are coming due tomorrow. I was not aware until the Minister mentioned it this afternoon that there was this matter of urgency involved. Some of my colleagues have already commented on the state of management that the government, in giving us such short notice, and the Minister of Finance and his colleague and leader, the First Minister, have asked this side for co-operation in order that the matter may go through. If it is to go through in time for the deadline tomorrow, I understand that leave will be necessary, to put it in plainer terms, unanimous consent by the members in

order for it to pass through the different readings that are necessary for the bill.

The Minister has asked this side for co-operation, Mr. Chairman, and time will show whether or not he gets that co-operation from this side, and indeed, we might question at this time whether the Minister deserves the co-operation of this side, because co-operation is normally a two-edge sword, that when there is co-operation from one side, that person can, in good conscience, ask for co-operation from the other side.

I would just like to give you an example or so, Mr. Chairman, of the sort of co-operation that we have received from the Minister of Finance. It would be two months or perhaps three months ago that the Minister and I discussed Hydro affairs and the Minister provided us around that time with a report from his friends UNIES Company, called, as I recall, The Western Electric Power Study. In the course of that discussion, I had asked the Minister if he could provide me with copies of the missing appendices from the back of my copy of that report. The Minister indicated that would be done. There was also some discussion at the time of a Foster Report that the Government of Alberta had commissioned for its own purposes. The Minister mentioned that and indicated that report could also be made available to this side of the House. I don't recall the date of that discussion, Mr. Chairman. I seem to recall that it was during the first Interim Supply debate which would have been at the end of March, which is at least three months ago. Now I'm still waiting for those two promised documents, Mr. Chairman.

On June 13th, there was a meeting of the Public Utilities Committee and Hydro appeared before the committee at that time. They produced a fair amount of information for the committee but there was one additional piece of information that was requested of the Hydro staff and that was a report showing the value of Lake Winnipeg Regulation for the flood year of 1979 to 1980. This was in follow-up with a similar paper that they had produced for the great interest of the committee showing the value of Lake Winnipeg Regulation for the coming year, the year that we are in now, from 1980 to 1981. Now they had produced that in something like 24 or 48 hours from being asked the first time.

So after a week or 10 days passed following that request of Hydro, I asked the Minister of Finance, as the Minister reporting for Manitoba Hydro, whether he had received that requested report from Hydro. He informed me that he had and as a supplementary question I asked would he make it available to this side of the House or would he table it if he didn't want to go that far, and again I received the reassurance that yes, it would be made available, Mr. Chairman. That is at least a week, I would guess, perhaps 10 days or two weeks ago that request was made of the Minister of Finance and we are still awaiting the production of that particular document.

Let me give you one further example, Mr. Chairman, at the co-operation that we on this side and I, personally, have received or not received from the Minister of Finance. I asked him, again perhaps a week or two weeks ago, for some information having to do with the printing of the long awaited brochure on the government's White Paper. It was called

White Paper Reforms. You will be aware, Mr. Chairman, as other members will be too, that there have been a number of advertisements looking suspiciously like election advertisements appearing in the daily papers for several weeks. We had been asking the Minister on earlier occasions when this particular booklet would be available and we were told it's still in the printing or it's being developed. The question that I asked the Minister again, well over a week ago, Mr. Chairman, was for some details as to the printing, not particularly incriminating questions, I thought, fairly simple ones, such as, who is doing the printing and when did it go to the printers, when is the booklet to be expected. Mr. Chairman, the Minister didn't even get on his feet to give a non-reply to that. He just refused or declined to answer the question.

Mr. Chairman, there you have one further example of the co-operation that we have been receiving, or that I have received, from the Minister of Finance. First of all, the appendices to the WEPS report of some three months ago that I've asked him for, a copy of the Foster report that I'd asked him for, a copy of the report from Hydro on Lake Winnipeg Regulation for the 1978-79 year, information regarding the printing of the government's White Paper Reform, and in none of those of four instances, Mr. Chairman, did we receive any co-operation from the Minister. On one occasion, the last one, we had an example of the Minister's arrogance by simply refusing to get up and speak at all.

Mr. Chairman, the point in mentioning those is that when the Minister asks for co-operation on this side, surely he should be prepared to show a little co-operation as far as his previous commitments are concerned. He is going to be asking me to give him leave in this House to move on a second reading and a third reading and perhaps a committee stage as well. Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether I'm going to give the Minister that leave or not. We'll wait and see and I will perhaps judge by the reaction that I get from the Minister as to whether I am prepared to give the Minister the co-operation he is seeking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Interim Supply No. (2)—pass — the Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. Johns): I hesitated to rise . . . Oh.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Chairman, I'll step down for the Member for St. Johns.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I thought the Minister of Finance was rising but I also thought that you were about to have the committee rise, so I stood in order to ask, but I would like to hear from the Minister of Finance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I thought the Member for St. Johns had some further questions that he wanted to place.

Mr. Chairman, what we've heard really through 90 percent of the discussion on this is what we've heard three times over during the course of many debates during the session. How can you give the same answer four different ways and that's really what it boils down to. The Leader of the Opposition went through the statistics again and he dealt with the most recent productions and again, did the same sort of thing as he did on the CPI statistics about two weeks ago, and gave his version of the interpretation that ought to be put on those statistics, and tried to score a couple of political points and, Mr. Chairman, you know, that's all part of the game here. That's what members come in here for, I suppose, to do a quick trick and walk out. Maybe statistics are, I don't know, I kind of think they aren't, but maybe they are, maybe if he persists, maybe he'll score a point or two out of them. But when he did the CPI thing two weeks ago, he said 14 percent growth in the cost of living in Manitoba, highest in the country, and that was in the question period and before the question period was over, I had the statistics before me. It turned out that Manitoba was 9.1; the Canadian average was 9.3. We were the —(Interjection)— well, you know, 12 months. The Leader of the Opposition says from his chair, that's 12 months. They are annual figures; they are annual figures. They are annualized inflation rates. Most are annualized, and he says, well, that's 12 months. I agree; 12 months is a year. That's an annual figure that's used. This is what happens.

Now let's look at tonight's example. He brings up, he doesn't use again an annual, he used the accumulative January-May percentage change and he comes up with Manitoba at a minus 67 percent of what's happening in the nation with regard to the housing starts in centres of 10,000 population enrolment. Well, you know, it's the same old thing, Mr. Chairman, you come back to it. You know, there's lies, damn lies and NDP statistics. —(Interjection)— Lies — well we'll talk about whether there's a slump or not a slump. We can talk about whether there's a slump or not a slump. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I happen to have the floor now and I'm talking about whether the truth is being presented to this House. Not the truth, because I'm not suggesting that the Leader of the Opposition is dishonest, I think he's intellectually dishonest. —(Interjection)— I see, that's not the first accusation to float across. Another member here says arrogant. Maybe it means the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, we have this over-preoccupation by some members of the Opposition to try and spread the bad news and they come in here with the quick trick, hoping that nobody across the way will be able to correct them and they will get it on the record, if they're marginally successful, if they're half successful it will go on Channel 13 on the television during question period and if they're really successful, it will hit the headline in the newspaper. And that's the name of the game. If you can get in fast, get half a trick. That's it, get her done fellas, that's all there is to it and by and large it's not really much of a challenge to do that. You can do that almost any day in the question period. You can come

in and ask for a denial of the fact that somebody else had his ox gored out in the constituency of the Member for Selkirk and very likely it'll be true, except when you look at the fact that there are no real oxen in Selkirk but there are some gores that happen.

But, Mr. Chairman, let's look at the figures now. The member goes down through the statistics and shows Manitoba as minus 67 on housing starts. Well, Canada is minus 20; Newfoundland is plus 112, I'm surprised that the Leader of the Opposition did not point that out; Manitoba was not only minus 67, it was minus 67, plus minus 112 for a grand total of whatever that makes behind Newfoundland. That would have made an even more dramatic statistic. You go through and PEI is minus 52; there's a minus 42; there's a minus 68; there's a minus 42; there's a minus 13; there's a minus 67, Manitoba; there's a minus 52 which is Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan didn't do all that well either, despite all their natural resource development right now; and Alberta had a minus 36, well dear old Alberta. You know, Manitoba is really looking bad and B.C. is looking at plus 60. That hard right-wing government B.C. produced 60 percent more housing. Well, you know, what conclusion is to be drawn. Are we to really hang our hat on those statistics? I think they probably indicate something. I think that they indicate what's been known for quite a time. But I don't think we have to dramatize it in that respect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. PAWLEY: I wonder if the Minister of Finance would permit a question?

MR. CRAIK: No, that's not a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, since when is a question a point of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: My understanding was the Honourable Minister did not want to answer a question, the Honourable Minister has the floor.

MR. CRAIK: The member knows that he has full opportunity to do that, Mr. Chairman. Let me finish the story. It's the first time that I've heard that a question is a point of order. But let's look at the rest of it. The May over May figures. Let's look at the annual figures if you want. May over May figures. Let's distort statistics in another way.

Canada was minus 38. Newfoundland was plus 53, they've got an oil boom going in Newfoundland, I guess; PEI was minus 86 and then there's a minus 54 and a minus 75 and a minus 54 and a minus 47 and we come to Manitoba — minus 8. And then we come to dear old Saskatchewan that's minus 53 and we come to Alberta which is minus 31 and we come to B.C. and it's plus 9. Now, you know, there's lies, damn lies and somebody else's statistics. They're not NDP this time. But we just did the same thing you did. —(Interjection)— That's right. The Minister of Economic Development and the Minister of Housing

is saying that you're reading from an actual paper. Now how do you want to do that? But the Leader of the Opposition has done the same thing as he's done on the consumer price index. He's marched into this House with bravado and said, "Everything is going to hell in a hand basket, it's minus 14". It turns out Manitoba, in the CP, I was the third lowest in Canada in the growth rate. Now he comes in and says that on a quarterly basis it's all going to hell in a hand basket again because it's minus 67, despite the fact that Saskatchewan is minus 52 and Alberta is minus 36. The national average is minus 20 and again — well, you know, there's an answer in every case. But now why doesn't he just say, "Are things good in construction?" The answer is "No, they're not". But why do you have to overpolish the apple? Why do you feel this great possession? You know I've seen a couple of other people that have come into the Opposition of this House and they've just drummed their way right out with that kind of approach in just a remark. And it's not an arrogant remark to the Leader of the Opposition, it's just a remark made from having sat here as long as some other members have sat here. You don't make marks in this House by overpolishing the apple. You make marks by telling the truth, the intellectual truth. It's not that you're telling lies. —(Interjection)— It's not that you're telling lies, but if you are going to hang your hat on the extension of a Stats Canada figure you are lost. You're not going to win that way.

So, Mr. Chairman, that's twice in a row that the Leader of the Opposition has wandered in here with half-baked statistics trying to make a case and it's not going to wash. And the people of Manitoba aren't going to accept it. There are better cases that can be made. But I'm not going to tell you where they are.

So we had a presentation on construction but we've had a number of other things. We had some comments on Manitoba Hydro, I don't know that this is the place to deal with Manitoba Hydro. It's been raised three times in the comments that were made on Interim Supply. We've had a number of discussions and we'll have more before this session is over.

I will make one comment with regard to that and the presentation of Manitoba Hydro before the committee this year and I'm interested in the reaction. One of the better recommendations or observation of the Tritschler Enquiry Commission was that governments seem to have found themselves obsessed with defending the decisions of the utility and vice versa. Well, Mr. Chairman, something a little different happened this year. The Minister to whom the utility reported did not defend the recommendations of the utility, in fact, he challenged a couple of them and I didn't think — (Interjection)— Well, Frances Russell thinks I attacked them but she wasn't there. Well, the Member for St. Johns says he was there, he must have told her. But I find it very interesting — (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I think that anybody that spends time reading Hansards is lost and again, if the Leader of the Opposition is spending his time reading Hansard, again it shows how lost he is. Hansards are part of the House and read them. That's not the point. I think the interesting point is that we have an interesting thing that has now been

commented on. The fact that a Minister cross-examined, to a certain extent, the people that were presented to the committee. Let me first remind you it's one of the few times — let me go back into history. Did Mr. Cass-Beggs ever allow anybody but himself to be questioned before that committee? Ever, ever? Does anybody here ever remember, when anybody other than the Chairman was allowed to be asked a question in that committee? No. — (Interjection)— When did it start? When did it start? When was anybody, other than the Chairman, ever allowed to be asked a question in that committee? It started, not very long ago. It started not very long ago. An interesting observation was made by the Tritschler Enquiry Commission that governments seem — he didn't say it this way — Judge Tritschler did not say it this way but he did say, in effect, governments seem to have felt compelled to defend any decision that was made by the utility and vice versa.

Well, over the last few years there's been an opening up of that committee and it hasn't been the Chairman only, it has been the other chief people in the top of the utility. There has been a democratization, if you like, in terms of the availability of the members of the Legislature to the top members of that utility. And out of that came a comment which I felt, and other members, the Member for River Heights asked, I thought, a fairly pertinent question that I felt maybe I should follow up on. He said, "What would be the lake level on Lake Winnipeg if there were no control, is it possible that the lake level would not be higher now than under natural conditions?" The answer was, yes. That's a pretty interesting question. You know, the Member for River Heights is not a long-standing member of this Legislature that has sat through that committee for many years. This is his first opportunity to have sat there. He's a member of the government side. He asked what, in my estimation, was one of the most valid questions that was put at that committee meeting. I thought it was worth a follow-up, after the replies that were given by the Hydro personnel, in their free and open way, that was allowed to them, not a la Cass-Beggs, not a la NDP government, but in a free and open way they were allowed to make their comments. — (Interjection)— Provided for. Provided for. Allowed to by the Chairman. There were no restrictions. — (Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we have the very interesting revelation, as far as I'm concerned, that has come out of this. We had an opening up of the committee and we have had a gradual opening up for the last several years and I think that, even under the former government, there were provisions for the comptroller and so on of Hydro to give answers before the committee; it isn't exclusive to this. But it was something that has been on the move and it has occurred with encouragement during the period of this government. And now we have, because there was a pretty head-on direct challenge to the evidence provided there, the suggestion that somehow, somebody was intimidated. Well, let me say this, that if the members of the utility, you know, somehow, some way feel intimidated and threatened as a result of that, God help our system. God help our system, Mr. Chairman, because then we'd better start going

much further than we've gone to this date to examine in what way a Crown corporation is going to relate to a government. That is where the questions lie and that's where the answers must be found in relation to the role of a Crown corporation in terms of the Public Utilities Committee.

The members opposite have interpreted, and I sensed it here three different times tonight, about how some member was somehow attacked or intimidated or whatever the words were. Well, I'll tell you, that in my estimation if that person in that examination was untoward then you're headed right back to forcing the system. Those members across the way are on a policy course of encouraging us to head back to a system where only a Chairman appears before a Public Utilities Committee and that is it. Now why don't they get up and say that? They practised it. Cass-Beggs allowed no one, he allowed not a member of his board, he allowed not his No. 2 or No. 3 man to say anything. He allowed nobody to say anything at that committee. He did not allow himself to be put under oath under those conditions. He denied it, the government supported him.

Now the government is saying that if a member of Hydro appears and is questioned by the board, that that's wrong because that's, in effect, questioned by the Public Utilities Committee. —(Interjection)— No, I'm not necessarily the Minister. The Minister wasn't even a member of that committee but was a member of the Legislature, the Member for River Heights who asked his questions was a member of that committee. Every other member that sits there is equal in asking the questions he wants to ask.

The members opposite are really saying, in effect, that they want to revert back to the Cass-Beggs days; that's really what they're saying. That if a member appears there he can be questioned by the opposition but lo and behold if he's questioned by a member on the government side, that is not fair ball. Now, okay, if we follow that course of action, then a Crown corporation is not a Crown corporation. We're trying to make it a Crown corporation. We're trying to open it up. We're trying to make it available to the committee, which has been done. It has not been done with any outside intimidation. The members come there and, if they do come there, they'd better be prepared to answer questions and defend them, regardless of which side the questions come from. Otherwise we may as well change the system. We might as well wipe out the concept of a Crown corporation; we might as well go to a direct government department; we might as well go to the straight line function that we have in all the other departments of government, and that's it.

But let's not try and play both sides of the table. Let's not try and walk down both sides of the street. Those are the alternatives. This government has taken the course of action where they want to encourage the development of a Crown corporation in the sense of it being a Crown corporation and not a line function of government. Mr. Chairman, that is the course of action that we intend to follow. But if in that we find that the only reaction we really have from the opposition is the fact that they seem to feel otherwise, that when the questions are asked that somehow they should only come from one side of the House. I point out again that one of the more valid comments that was made in observations that

was made by the Tritschler Inquiry Commission was in the presentation of the annual report to the Public Utilities Committee.

Mr. Chairman, we have a number of other questions again. The Member for Lac du Bonnet repeated a number of questions that were asked earlier in the day and I don't think that have to be dealt with again in any depth at this point in time. They did relate to Interim Supply. They related to the deficit that might occur. I dealt with that earlier in the day. There were questions from the Member for Brandon East. The Member for St. Vital talked about a two-edged sword and he mentioned an Appendix that hadn't been received, that I'd undertaken to provide to him with regard to either the UNIES report; I believe the UNIES report with regard to the Western Electric Power Grid. I'll take that under advisement and check on it. Other than that, I don't believe there's a great deal more to be said on Interim Supply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to go through the entire list of complaints which I have against this government. There will be room for that before the end of the session. There was room for that at the beginning of the session. What I do want to say a few words on, Mr. Chairman, is the manner in which the Minister of Finance has tried to make virtue out of his vices. He is suggesting that somehow there has been a difference in attitude at Public Utilities Committee because one of the government members questioned the Chairman, or questioned persons other than the Chairman and cross-examined them, and did so on the basis of demonstrating that the government no longer feels itself bound to support the decisions of Manitoba Hydro.

Mr. Chairman, why is that? Can anybody imagine anything more ludicrous than the Member for River Heights or the Minister of Finance getting up and cheering a person from Manitoba Hydro who said that Lake Winnipeg Regulation and Jenpeg represented a net difference of 33 million to Manitoba Hydro as against it not being there? And the Minister of Finance is suggesting, you see if we were like the old government we would have said, that's right, cheers, hurrah, they're obviously right, they're our Hydro. That's not why the change took place, Mr. Chairman. The change took place because from the mouth of Manitoba Hydro came the lie of the Conservative program, from the mouth of Manitoba Hydro two years in a row.

Dean Wedepohl came last year and said that what the Schreyer administration was doing was right; that we should be investing in power projects. The Honourable Minister doesn't remember that because the Honourable Minister has a convenient lapse of memory but that's what Dean Wedepohl said at the Hydro committee. And this year when the question is asked what would be the difference in the figures of Manitoba Hydro if Lake Winnipeg Regulation and Jenpeg weren't there, somebody says 33 million and the Member for River Heights and the Minister of Finance have been trying to assure this House that an asset which produces 33 million is worth zero. Well, the Minister finally worked it out. It's not 33

million net because you take the finance charges off and it shows a million dollar loss.

Let's assume that figure is correct, and we're dealing with a one-year figure. It means that 10 million has been overspent, 10 million; that produces a million dollar loss. The rest of it is producing its return on its cost and on its interest. — (Interjection)— Oh. At least we have an admission that it's producing that. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is what I was trying to get to with the Member for River Heights when I dealt with this issue in the House last time, how much is it worth? Because you fellows have said it's 300 million wasted and I'm saying if it produces 10 million, it's worth 100 million. If it produces 20 million, it's worth 200 million and if there is a waste, which I deny, because I say that over the long haul if you will find out what it was worth you will find out that it is worth more than we paid for it. But you people, by Progressive Conservative mathematics, have insisted that an asset which produces 33 million — (Interjections) Look, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Justice Tritschler said that the loss over a year by it not being in process till a year late, was approximately 20 million. If he says that the loss by not having it there is 20 million, it means that it would have produced 20 million if it was there — (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, it doesn't matter how you cut it. If it would have produced 20 million in revenue, that's what Mr. Justice Tritschler says, it lost 20 million by not being in place, that it would have produced it.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we will go back to basic mathematics, basic mathematics. The Conservatives say that something that brings in revenue of 33 million is worth zero. I say something that brings in revenue of 33 million, it's worth at today's interest rate, something like 290 million. I am prepared to go to any economic analyst who has a sanity certificate and ask him to arbitrate that difference. — (Interjection)— Here we happen to have a bank manager with us. We have a bank manager with us and I am suggesting to you that if you go to an actuary and find out how much it costs to produce 33 million in revenue, he will tell you something like 290 million and that's the way you measure the asset as to how much revenue it is producing. — (Interjection)— But, Mr. Chairman, now the Member for River Heights has conceded that if it produced 33 million every year it would be worth 290 million. So I had that concession. At least I've got that over the First Minister. We now no longer have an argument that something that produces 33 million per year is worth . . . Mr. Chairman, I know the members would like to move around on this. If the Minister will agree with me, if the member will agree that something that produces 33 million in revenue is worth about 290 million, then all we have to have from Hydro is a figure as to what is the estimated production in revenue over the period of years — not one year — for this facility. Mr. Justice Tritschler and the Conservative Party did not dare to make that estimate because that would have eliminated their statement that it was a 300 million waste.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we're going to get to that because I have given notice that there will be an appeal on the Tritschler Commission. Mind you, the appeal is really superfluous because nobody believes the Conservative Party, nobody. Mr. Chairman, I walk

down the streets of Winnipeg, I go to social affairs of both business people and working people, I go into the country, not a single Manitoban has come up to me and said, your government cost us 600 million — The only people who have said that to me are the Progressive Conservative MLAs — nobody, because they don't believe you and the reason they don't believe you is that it is so false. — (Interjection)— The Honourable Member for River Heights — let's get that on the record — he said that the people don't recognize it. He is smart and the people are stupid, that is what he is saying. Well, I say that the people who know that an asset which produces 33 million a year is worth 290 million are smarter than the politicians who say that an asset which produces 33 million a year is worth zip and therefore, it's the member who, if he insists on that proposition, who doesn't understand and not the people of the province of Manitoba.

But let's go back to this statement about how Mr. Cass-Beggs would not let anybody say anything at the Public Utilities Committee. That wasn't, Mr. Chairman, a decision of Mr. Cass-Beggs, that was a decision of a majority of Public Utilities Commission of which I was proud to take that position and would take it again. Mr. Chairman, I do not deny it; I would take it again. I would take it again. Mr. Chairman, we are getting that criticism from the man. Mr. Justice Tritschler said that the Chairman of Hydro should not be a Deputy Minister. For two years, the Chairman of Hydro has been the Deputy Minister of Finance who is his boss and, therefore, let's not have any talk about the relationship, Mr. Chairman, between the government and the Chairman of Hydro. He says, one year — I guess he has me by six months. Mr. Chairman, Mr. — (Interjections)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of privilege.

MR. CRAIK: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, the period is not two years, it's 10 months.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Bateman was fired, I take it, sometime around January of 1979. — (Interjection)— Oh, Wedepohl was the chairman after that, I'm sorry. 10 months. The Minister is correct because I counted the entire period. I counted the entire period and it's since Mr. Dean Wedepohl left. That's corrected. For 10 months he's kept on that position which was the thing that Mr. Justice Tritschler said was very much against but let's go to the hearings that were held. Cass-Beggs came and Mr. Justice Tritschler said we were right to get him, we were right to get him. And that he came under a period where the previous staff of Hydro — and this is in the report — were very insistent on Churchill River Diversion, the previous scheme. Mr. Cass-Beggs came to review it. That program that Mr. Cass-Beggs came to review, Mr. Justice Tritschler said was a disaster.

Mr. Cass-Beggs is now reporting for Hydro and the members of the Conservative Party are demanding that we have a debate between Cass-Beggs and his staff. We have the differences in the Hydro system argued out by the staff in front of a legislative committee. Mr. Chairman, I have no hesitation in saying that I would not permit that to happen again if I am in government, and if the member permits it to

happen, the sooner will he be out of government. The sooner will he be out of government. It is not a virtue, it is a vice. You cannot run a Hydro system that way. But also, Mr. Chairman, it's not true. Mr. Chairman, it is a Crown corporation. And you tell me which Crown corporation where they report either Ottawa or British Columbia is it not the chairman who gives the report and calls upon the staff, if and when he wants them to give answers. That is the way it is done before every legislative committee. As a matter of fact, that's what Cass-Beggs did.

Now, I'm speaking from memory. —(Interjection)— Not the board, the chairman. The chairman is the one that appears and, as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I am speaking from memory and the member, therefore, can have me at a disadvantage if I am wrong but that's one of the things that bust the thing open. Mr. Cass-Beggs made his analysis of Lake Winnipeg regulation and then offhand said if anybody from the staff wishes to add anything or say anything, go ahead and do so, and Kris Kristjanson got up and said: I disagree with what has been said; I disagree with what has been said about D.L. Campbell and his figures. And therefore for the member to say that Cass-Beggs never did that is absolutely wrong. That's what Cass-Beggs did and it was wrong to do. It was wrong to do. That was one of Cass-Beggs' mistakes which the Minister thinks was a good thing. We, on committee, Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, I said that I would allow the chairman to call on people. I say that he made a mistake. I would never have done it. Absolutely, I would never have done it. Mr. Chairman, it was the committee that voted that it's the chairman that is called upon to report and the chairman will decide who appears and I agreed with that. I was the one who voted for that and I accept full responsibility for it and I would do it again.

Mr. Cass-Beggs called upon anybody from the staff in an offhand way and Kris Kristjanson got up and made his remarks and, in addition to that, Mr. Chairman, although the committee took the position that it was going to be the chairman who reports or the people he called upon him, in another one of these attempts to bend over three times. The committee decided that they would have an informal meeting where Douglas Campbell, a member of the board —(Interjection)— well, Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what happened. The First Minister wasn't here. It was suggested that we call D.L. Campbell to committee. I opposed that, I opposed it and I would oppose it again. Let's not have any doubt about it, I would oppose it again. The committee said that we will not have him before Public Utility Committee but the members of the Public Utility Committee have no objection to hearing Mr. Campbell and in that informal session Mr. Campbell got up and make his remarks. He disagreed with things that Mr. Cass-Beggs said and of which Mr. Cass-Beggs turned out to be absolutely right. —(Interjection)— Well, the honourable member laughs. I'm going to give him something to laugh about. Mr. Cass-Beggs said before that committee — let me tell you what he said — everybody knows —(Interjection)— boy, Mr. Chairman, the record is going to bear me out. Mr. Cass-Beggs said that everybody knows that Manitoba has not had its worst drought and has not had its worst flood. This was in 1972 and Mr.

Campbell came to Lake Winnipeg Regulation Committees and he said Mr. Cass-Beggs has said that everybody knows —(Interjection)— He did sneer. He did, I was there. He sneered and he said that Mr. Cass-Beggs has said —(Interjection)— He was not there, this happened to be in Gimli. Mr. Chairman, this is what Mr. Campbell said, that if the honourable member was there — and this is on the record, it's in black and white, it's transcribed. Mr. Chairman, it is transcribed and therefore we will be able to determine whether I am not telling the Legislature the truth. Mr. Campbell said — it was in Gimli — these people are blocks, stones, worse than senseless things. Never before have the words of Mark Anthony been more exemplified than by these people. Ye blocks, ye stones, ye worse than senseless things. They will not listen because they know they are wrong and that's why we are getting that type of treatment. Mr. Campbell said Mr. Cass-Beggs has told the people of Manitoba, if he used those exact words, that everybody knows that Manitoba has not had its worst drought and not had its worst flood recorded yet. He said, "How can Mr. Cass-Beggs say that? I don't know it. I don't know that to be the case." Mr. Cass-Beggs quite diplomatically got up and said, "It's true; I did exaggerate. When I said that Manitoba did not have its worst drought and has not yet had its worst flood on Lake Winnipeg, I did not at that moment take into consideration of the fact that D.L. Campbell didn't know that."

But, Mr. Chairman, within seven years Manitoba had the worst flood on Lake Winnipeg and has had a worse drought. Mr. Cass-Beggs said that's exactly what would happen and that's why Lake Winnipeg Regulation made sense and that's why it will continue to make sense, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)— Yes, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Justice Tritschler said that there was a cost benefit on Jenpeg. Yes, he did —(Interjection)— well, I will read it for you. He said that their cost benefit on Jenpeg was such as got the recommendation of the board. That they brought it in some time later that the cost benefits had changed and that the chief engineer, I think it was, still said that it was a project that they should be proceeded with even though the cost benefits had changed. But Jenpeg originally had a positive cost benefit. —(Interjection)— Well, then you haven't read the Tritschler Report. You have not read the Tritschler Report if you say that about Jenpeg because the Jenpeg cost benefits came in positive and then were changed and were doubtful and the chief engineer said go ahead with it. Those are the findings of Tritschler. Those are the findings of Tritschler.

Mr. Chairman, I have gone into much more than I wanted to. All I wanted to indicate and I was sort of prompted by the gaiety of my friend, the First Minister. And if it's going to prompt me again, I'll get up again. But what prompted me was this notion that somehow the Conservatives, by having to fight with the Hydro experts to try to sustain an impossible position, have suddenly made the committee somewhat more democratic than it was. What they have done, Mr. Chairman, here is how they made it more democratic. They fired the chairman on the allegation that he misrepresented something to the committee which he never did. Mr. Chairman, Mr.

Bateman came back the next day and indicated what his problem was and indicated that Dick Scott said to him that there was no recommendation and that his use of the word, recommendation, was therefore misleading. Mr. Bateman said, I guess so, but the fact is that the word, recommendation, in the context of the Task Force Report were not misleading and no judge would have found it so. No judge would have found it so. It was the worst form — talk about the Minister of Finance saying that a witness was drawn into saying something by counsel. There was a witness who was drawn into saying something which his lawyer, the very moment that he got off the witness stand and he came back the next day, which the Minister seems to think is all right, and indicated that when he said the recommendations of the Task Force Report, he couldn't have been lying because the Task Force Report was public for anybody to see and the use of the word, recommendation, referred to the Task Force Report. So it was on the record in the open and you cannot say that it's a lie because he characterizes something which is open for everybody to see in a word that Mr. Dick Scott didn't happen to like. You know, I was at a seminar with Dick Scott and I will say this right here, Dick Scott said that if he was examining a witness for discovery and the witness was making mistakes which he knew were mistakes, and counsel tried to indicate that they were in a different area, Dick Scott would protest and would not let that counsel interfere because he's got this guy and he will nail him to the wall. Those were Dick Scott's words at the seminar on Examinations for Discovery that the lawyers held not more than two months ago. So if the intention is to nail somebody to the wall, I suppose that's good counsel work, but that's what he said. Those were his words, "I would nail him to the wall."

Okay, so then we know, we know in advance that the lawyer for the government said that the purpose of the commission is to have a charge against Manitoba Hydro which Hydro will be subject to Examination to Discovery to defend. Not an inquiry, but a charge against Manitoba Hydro. That was the basis of the commission. Now, the member says that he has democratized it. What he has found, and the virtue he makes out of necessity, is that if these findings are going to contradict everything the Conservative Party has been saying for six years, we're going to have to argue with them. Well, I'll tell you something, if I happen to be in government, if I happen to be in government and the chairman of a Crown corporation gets up and contradicts everything I have been saying for five years, you will probably hear me argue with him. You won't hear me defend him. You don't want him to say, "Oh, I have to defend this Crown corporation." I'll argue with him, too. I won't fire him. What we know is that Bateman was fired. What we know is that Earl Mills has stated publicly that he has been pushed aside, that he can no longer say anything because his release is saying that Hydro is good thing, we're not apparently liked, so he has been pushed aside. Well, I read the report and that's probably the worst feature. Mr. Mills remarks came a year after the terms of reference and Mr. Justice Tritschler was so offended by the fact that somebody is going to disagree with what he said, that Mr. Justice Tritschler . . . You know, the First Minister said, in

dealing with this once before when the Member for Selkirk got up and said something about the Governor General can't defend himself, the First Minister said, oh, you can't hide behind those velvet robes of Rideau Hall. Who's hiding behind robes? Who's hiding behind robes? The First Minister is hiding behind robes. He is suggesting to me that somehow I've got to watch myself because I'm talking about Judge Tritschler.

You know, there have been honest people who have been dead wrong, and Mr. Justice Tritschler happens to be totally wrong, which is not unusual. — (Interjection)— Absolutely, absolutely, and I'm entitled to express it, I'm entitled to express it and I will express it and, Mr. Chairman, I will express it in those terms which my friend will understand. The terms by which judges are found to be wrong every day and told by other judges that these decisions cannot stand, and that's what we are going to do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this is what's going to happen. Although it is a waste, it is almost superfluous. Nobody believes the Conservatives, nobody. They've had such a terrible time, Mr. Chairman. You know, every time they thought they've got you by the short ones, it has disappeared. The Conservatives came into power and they said, we've got this 225 million deficit, and it turned out, Mr. Chairman, that within months, it was 190 million. — (Interjection)— You see. They even believe it themselves; 125 million of that 190 million was budgeted, 100 million in capital, roughly 25 million in current. There was a 50 million shortfall. — (Interjection)— They will not listen. They will not listen. Does the Member for Crescentwood want to count? Listen. Mr. Chairman, 100 million was budgeted in capital deficit. — (Interjection)— Are you listening?

A MEMBER: Yes.

MR. GREEN: All right. Well then, listen. 190 million is the total, 100 million was capital deficit budgeted, 30 million was current budgeted deficit; that's 130 million, we're left with 60 million, 55 million was the federal government shortfall, so the difference in terms of overexpenditures was a maximum of 5 million, and these have been related in this House on numerous occasions and have not been challenged by anybody. How did they challenge him? They said, oh, if we wouldn't have come in in October, there would have been another 50 million spent. That's what they said. — (Interjection)— Oh, you see, I gave him the answer and that fizzed out, Mr. Chairman, that fizzed out. Okay, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to give the other albatrosses that they want to hang around our necks. The first one was the deficit. The second one, Mr. Chairman, was the 600 million overexpenditure on Hydro. And then when the Tritschler Report came out there wasn't a cent of that money identified, not a cent. At no time was there any substantiation of the Conservatives main position that the sequence going one way or the other cost 600 million. As a matter of fact, Mr. Justice Tritschler says it's impossible to say how much it would cost and what he would have done would be to go ahead with neither of them, neither of them, and build a thermo plant and take studies. So

that, Mr. Chairman, that 600 million blew into thin air.

So then they had this other political cuckoo last year. They came in with this Hydro freeze. They came in with the Hydro freeze expecting the credulity of the people of Manitoba to buy the fact that the system they got was so bad and so terrible that it permitted them to freeze rates for five years and it had to be either that or it had to be general subsidization of a public utility which my friend, the First Minister, would call Marxism. And the 55 million that they had spent has not been necessary for the freeze because it has raised the Hydro reserves by more than 55 million, so that money, that political cuckoo blew up into thin air. And this year, Mr. Chairman, and by the way, you know, there's a reason why we're here now. There is a reason why we are here now and why we're going to be here for the next five weeks. The First Minister is keeping his options open. When the budget came this year, it was on the basis that there would be a fall election. Mr. Chairman, the budget was introduced this year on the basis that there would be a fall election with a tremendous package — and I'll tell you why, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)— Because, Mr. Chairman, the Conservatives cannot bring in another budget with less than 170 million deficit or an increase in taxes next year, and therefore, Mr. Chairman, they wanted the option of going to the public this year, and they hoped that this budget would be a blue skies budget and that was going to change the picture. And they got blue skies except blue skies meant something entirely different to the people of the province of Manitoba.

So the Minister came out with his other haymaker that missed by two feet, that we caused the people of the province of Manitoba, you know, he couldn't get away with the other 600 million, he couldn't get away with the deficit of 200 million, so he said that we caused them in debt charges, 570 million, and we found out, Mr. Chairman, that those debt charges, 400 million of them, have increased from October 1977 to the present time. Because if the Minister was so smart, he could have converted that money at that time into funds that would pay those debt charges and he would have saved us 400 million and he is a smart fellow. He identifies the Member for St. Johns as a financial ignoramus; he didn't know these things were going to happen. —(Interjection)— Okay, Mr. Chairman, I agree that the Member for St. Johns didn't know. I agree that he didn't know, but he's a bright boy, he knew, he knew that between October and now it's going to cost us 400 million. And he didn't do anything about it. You know why he didn't do anything about it? Because he wanted to cost the people 400 million, so he could refer to the Member for St. Johns as an ignoramus. That's an expensive name calling, Mr. Chairman. That's expensive name calling. That's the luxury. And that, Mr. Chairman, went out the window and now, now the fall election is off, but there's still some hope, Mr. Chairman, still hope. Otherwise we'd be back here, we'd be back here in the fall dealing with a lot of this legislation and the reason we're not, Mr. Chairman, the reason we're not is because the Minister is still hoping against hope that one of these haymakers is going to connect and they're all going to miss, and I don't know what's going to happen to me, Mr. Chairman, I

don't know what's going to happen to me, I could win or lose.

But they are going to lose. The next government in the province of Manitoba will be a New Democratic Party government. Whether it is a good one or a bad one, I don't know, but it will be a New Democratic Party government.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, may I say en passant that Morton Schulman never referred to me by name. Whether he met me or not, that's a matter of interpretation, but my name does not appear in his book and I'm rather sorry. I'd like the accolade that goes with being published and named by a great author and a great financial genius.

Mr. Chairman, in the middle Sixties, the Liberals on this side of the House created a great fuss about a scandal about Manitoba Hydro, called the Grand Rapids Scandal. I think it was Mr. Justice Tritschler; it was the Tritschler Report. You know, Mr. Chairman, it had to do with 1 million or 2 million spend on barges to ensure that, I think, cement could move in case the highway was flooded and unable to manage to move the cement. And I talked to Duff Roblin, somewhere on the sidelines of this room, and I said, why are you sticking your neck out all the way to defend Manitoba Hydro? Why do you assume responsibility for Manitoba Hydro? And he said, simply because we appoint the board and we accept responsibility for a Crown corporation, and so we should. Those were his words.

MR. LYON: As you remember them.

MR. CHERNIACK: As I remember them, Mr. Chairman, and the fact is that the Honourable the First Minister who claims to be in Gimli and to have heard everything that went on when he was sitting on the sidelines collecting his — was it 3,000 a month or whatever — that he remembers everything, Mr. Chairman, as I remember it, and ask Duff Roblin if I'm wrong. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, ask the Honourable, the First Minister who was a Minister at the time, ask the Member for Riel, who, I believe, was a Minister at the time, whether or not they were backing Manitoba Hydro and whether or not they appointed Tritschler to that.

MR. LYON: So was your party.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the peculiar thing is that because our party was not out to get Hydro is not an indication that we accepted responsibility but, Mr. Chairman, we felt it important that the integrity of Hydro be maintained. So, Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Minister of Finance who challenged the Member for Inkster on whether or not Dr. Wedepohl or Dean Wedepohl agreed that the Lake Winnipeg regulation had value, and I happen to have a Hansard here, Mr. Chairman, which I'll give to the Member for Inkster right away because he may be able to find the reference better than I could, but I quote from page 144, June 9th, 1979, Question: "Mr. Green: So that your long-term value, if your load increases, is that Lake

Winnipeg becomes more and more valuable. "Mr. Wedepohl: Yes, this is correct. "Mr. Green: That's all I'm trying to say. And it did generate something in excess of 10 million last year. "Mr. Wedepohl: Yes. "Mr. Green: But that's Jenpeg. I'm not talking about the regulation. The regulation you weren't able to give me a figure on. "Mr. Wedepohl: No. There was value and we don't know what it is. "Mr. Green: And that value increases every year that the domestic load goes up. "Mr. Wedepohl: Yes, all load, I would say."

Mr. Chairman, I just read this because I happen to have it in my desk with the file and the Member for Inkster could have this. As a matter of fact, later on Dean Wedepohl talks about the fact that he would gamble everything he had on building more and more power in order to send more to the south because he said, "which can be sent southwards will be taken in order to keep fossil fuel reserves in the ground", as compared with Tritschler, "that there is almost a paranoia to get as much electricity as they can from us right now, and I think this is not only going to continue, I think it's going to intensify. I would almost be willing to take a gigantic gamble and try to have interruptible power sales in all future developments like we have now". And then I skip a bit, and he says, "You may say, and it's quite right to say in the short term, that by doing that you're going to get less cents per kilowatt hour than you would get if you went in for a firm price contract, but the great advantage of the interruptible is that it's tied to the price of oil automatically".

Mr. Chairman, I just happened to refer to it because I had it in file. I also have on file the transcript, and the Minister of Finance says, "Anybody who reads Hansard is wasting his time". One of the reasons he says that, I believe, is that we, every so often, remind him of what he said about the Property Tax Credit Plan and it bruises something within him to hear it repeated to him. So now, Mr. Chairman, in spite of the fact that I've got Hansard, and he doesn't think much about reading it, I do read it to him and I admit that Hansard on occasion makes mistakes. One of the most glaring mistakes is on page 148, when it says, Mr. Walding made a statement, where indeed clearly it was Mr. Craik and that was a mistake for which the Member for St. Vital may feel bruised about.

Now on page 145, the Minister of Finance — (Interjection)— I can assure the Minister of Health that the Member for St. Vital needs no help from the Member for Riel, except the kind of actions that the Member for Riel does and, Mr. Chairman, I, for one, am still aware of the fact that the Member for St. Vital asked the Minister of Finance to come through with certain promises that the Member for St. Vital referred to, for production of certain documents and the Minister replied only in regard to one, saying I will look into it. But, Mr. Chairman, the question of whether or not he undertook it, I believe the Member for St. Vital cited occasions when the Minister undertook to produce them and I think the least the Minister ought to do is to undertake to produce it if he doesn't have it with him today. But he didn't say that so let's not forget that. The way the Member for St. Vital spoke, I suspect he won't forget to stress it again today. But page 145, Mr. Chairman, I quote Mr. Craik:

"Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a couple of questions about the information we received yesterday on the projections. The rate for, perhaps I think the gentlemen are here that were here yesterday and whoever wants to answer, I presume will. On the projections that were made yesterday, the export sales, can you indicate what the assumed mill rate was in calculating those? There is a revenue item shown of 21,789,000.00.

"Mr. Chairman: Mr. Curtis.

"Mr. Curtis: I wonder if Mr. Gunter could respond.

"Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gunter, would you like to join us at the table and perhaps you could answer Mr. Craik's question?"

Mr. Chairman, what happened is what I heard happened on other occasions. The chairman of hydro, a question was directed to him, the Chairman lead it to him and Mr. Curtis said, "I wonder if Mr. Gunter could respond", and Mr. Gunter then did.

But on page 146, I quote the Minister of Finance, and I quote him just the sentence that I have marked here, "I think subsequently you gave information that would indicate that your assumption, certainly based on your stuff you gave out yesterday, was that they would have been equal on March 1."

Later he says, "10 million is a lot of money and makes a lot of difference to speculation. Don't you think, Mr. Gunter, that before producing something like this that it would be wise to go to your computer and run it properly?"

That, Mr. Chairman, oh yes, one more quote from the same page, "So I think, Mr. Chairman," he says, the Minister of Finance, "that the information that we've got here may have been a little bit misleading in terms of the overall benefits of this structure." That, Mr. Chairman, came from the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro, who I understand has become more and more involved in Hydro affairs than any of his predecessors; who I understand attends all meetings of Hydro and has a good deal to say about it, Mr. Chairman, the Minister said I am "crazy, absolutely nuts". Mr. Chairman, if that Minister says that it is wrong, I will accept his statement. I was not at any meetings but I said I understood and to be told that I am crazy, I am nuts, is typical of the Minister of Finance, whereas I would have expected him to rise and say that's not correct and I would have to accept it because I don't know what is correct.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of . . .

MR. CRAIK: Yes it is, Yes it is, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Isn't that right, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of privilege.

MR. CHERNIACK: Is there is a motion with it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of privilege.

MR. CRAIK: Old smiley across the way suggests I attend all the Hydro Board meetings. Mr. Chairman, I have attended one in my life, for a period of about perhaps one hour.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, that's much more polite and much more unexpected than the statements which he made from his seat, which were expected.

Mr. Chairman, by the way, was that a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman? Did you rule on the point of privilege? I don't know.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I've not ruled on any point of privilege so far.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, the member raised a point of privilege; are you ruling on it, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I've allowed three individual members to rise on what they classified as a point of privilege. I've not ruled on them.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would you rule, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: None of the points that were raised by the Leader of the Opposition and by the Honourable Minister were points of privilege.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I point out the way this Minister dealt with one of the employees of Hydro. And I say, Mr. Chairman, that in the light of the record of this Minister, the way he dealt with Mr. Bateman, in the light of the record of that government, the way it dealt with other senior employees of government, is such as to make anybody tremble in his boots, when a Minister such as that comments the way he did, in the manner he did at that committee. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it ill behoves that Minister to talk that way, publicly, to an employee of Hydro and is damaging to the morale, I am sure.

The Member for Inkster referred to Earl Mills. I don't know what happened to Earl Mills but if he has been set aside, then that's unfortunate, too. —(Interjection)— Oh well, the Minister learned something, apparently, from the Member for Inkster, which is not uncommon. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I'm saying that this Minister is the person that should be watched carefully when he deals with people that come under his jurisdiction. —(Interjection)— The Member for Crescentwood, unlike his usual state, because I think he is in an unusual state, is interrupting all the time; he doesn't normally do that. —(Interjections)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the Member for Crescentwood is talking about but if he is saying that our government sent all board members thank you letters when it was defeated, I would say that was a fine way of dealing with it, but since I was not a member of government I can't vouch for the accuracy of the statement of the Member for Crescentwood. I have to tell the Member

for Crescentwood that he is acting out of his normal way and that indicates something and he should know that.

Mr. Chairman, I now ask the Minister of Finance to refer back to the requests or the insistence of the Member for St. Vital to deal with the reports which he promised to file. I think it's important that we get those answers. —(Interjection)— Well, he was talking to you, you were making notes; you were making notes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Interim Supply No. (2) — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, if I may, for the Minister who obviously wasn't listening when I made the particular reference and the reference, if you will recall, was to the request by the Minister to members on this side to co-operate in this particular request that the Minister has brought before the committee. I had raised the question as to what degree of co-operation the Minister could expect, given the Minister's co-operation with members on this side and requests that we had made. I cited four examples, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister, when speaking subsequent to that, had referred to one of them and said that he would look into them. For the Minister's benefit, I will repeat the four examples that I raised and you, Mr. Chairman, will judge the degree of co-operation that I had received in those requests from the Minister.

I had asked the Minister about three months ago, when we discussed the matter, whether it would be possible for the Minister to supply copies of the appendices to the WEPS Report because the copy that I had received from the Minister did not contain those appendices and there were several references in the text to appendices. At the same time, I had asked the Minister if he could supply a copy of the Foster Report, which I believe he had referred to or at least it came up and was referred to during the debate. I had not received either of those two from the Minister, Mr. Chairman, and I should say, because I like to be as helpful as possible to the Minister, that I did receive a copy of the Foster Report from another source, so I don't hold that as a promise against the Minister. But it was something that he had promised or said that he would provide for me and, as I mentioned, that was three months ago and it was quite some weeks after that, that I received my report of it.

The third thing refers back again to the Public Utilities Committee, when Hydro appeared before it, and a request that was made by myself, and I believe by the Minister, was a request for figures having to do with the value of Lake Winnipeg Regulation for the flood year 1979-1980. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that Hydro officials had produced figures for the present year 1980-81, which is a drought year. Which they did within a very short time of a request, something like 24 or 48 hours. I had asked the Minister a question after a respectable time had elapsed, some seven days or ten days perhaps afterwards, whether he, the Minister, had received this report, since I, as a member of the committee, had not received it directly from Hydro or via the Chairman of the committee, which would have been the more usual

manner in receiving such a report. The Minister told me in the House, and you will find it in Hansard, that yes, he had received a copy of this report and that it showed a benefit of some 10 million and that he would undertake to provide me with a copy of it. I assumed that it was on a single sheet or perhaps two or three sheets of paper, not a particularly big job to have copies and sent over. But again that was at least a week ago and perhaps longer and I am still awaiting that report. That was the third one that the Minister had indicated that he would provide for me.

The fourth item which I had raised as a matter of indicating the co-operation that we'd received from gentlemen opposite had to do with questions that I raised, again about a week ago, having to do with the printing of a White Paper report, I believe it's called, featured very prominently in some advertisements that the government had run. The Minister had previously indicated that it was in the hands of the printer and I had asked him a couple of very simple questions — at least I believe they were quite simple — having to do with that printing, such as who was doing the printing and when did it go to the printer.

Now, I will admit, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister did not give me an indication that he would provide that information. In fact, the Minister didn't give me an indication of anything because he didn't get to his feet to answer the question. So I cannot say that there was any undertaking from the Minister as a display of co-operation involved there. All I can say is, if that is to be any indication of the co-operation that the Minister has extended to us, surely he cannot expect from this side any greater degree of co-operation when he seeks something. At least we had the courtesy to stand and reply to the Minister's request in this regard.

So there were those four particular items there. The first one having to do with the appendices. I don't attach very much importance to them, Mr. Chairman, because I don't attach very much importance to the committee anyway. I think that it was a waste of 300,000 but then again that's not unusual for this particular government. So if the Minister declines to provide those appendices, I won't be really too upset, although it was three months ago that it happened. As far as the Foster Report is concerned, the Minister needn't bother with that because I had received a copy of it from other sources. But for the other two, well I am still waiting for them and still waiting to hear whether the Minister is prepared to be as co-operative to us as he is asking us to be to them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Interim Supply No. (2) — the Honourable Minister.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, let's face what's happened. We had a great grandstand show by the Member for St. Johns, about four outstanding obligations and now we have the Member for St. Vital standing up and saying, well, it's really not four, it's two. Well, that's a fact of life. I agree, you know, with the latter spokesman. He stands up, he makes a big deal out of the Foster Report and I told him at the time, when he asked for the Foster Report, I said we only have one copy, we'll try and get you another. He came back into the House several weeks later

and said, I have a copy of the Foster Report, I got it by other means. He documented that in the House but he's still whining away about the Foster Report. I thought it was all cleared away.

He comes in about the White Paper. Who's the printer? I don't know who the printer is. I don't ask who prints these things. If the member really wants to know and if he wants to use the vehicles of the House to get it, file an Order for Return, but he whines away about who's printing the White Paper. Well, okay, I accept the other two but why don't you say there are two. They're like your statistics. You can't avoid this overweening need to over-exaggerate and they get up and they whine about this, so four becomes two. Well, that's better than a lot of their statistics.

The Appendix to the UNIES Report, I'll enquire again. I've never read the Appendix to the UNIES Report. I don't know what the Appendix to the UNIES Report looks like. But I will enquire and get it. If the member would just stand up and say, I would like to get the Appendix to the UNIES Report, and remind me if I've forgotten it, out of all of the things that he's asked for and he's gotten most of them, I would attempt to get it for him. He absolved himself of the necessity for the Foster Report months ago in this House. This great groping to waste time, the four for two ratio, goes on and on and on.

In 1979 I asked at the Public Utilities Committee as to what the flood year in 1979 would look like. The Member for St. Vital has asked for the '79-'80 projections. I will undertake to get those for him. I undertook to get them for him before, as he said a week or more ago; I'll still undertake to get them. Now we've wasted 15 minutes or so talking about this, Mr. Chairman, I'll get them. But do we have to go four for two on everything we do in here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, all I heard the Member for St. Vital say was that there were different reports which were promised to him and which he had requested, both promised and requested, which weren't received. The Minister could very easily have answered that but he paid no attention to it. He dealt with one of them. He brushed the rest aside and now he wants to excuse his dilatory approach to this by calling the Member for St. Vital, talking about his whining, about making a fuss. Mr. Chairman, I want the Minister of Finance to learn. Oh, Mr. Chairman, that's hopeless.

It would be useful if the Minister of Finance could learn from those who don't even pose as their teachers but from the common sense that should appear in his own mind, that when he is in error he should say, I'm sorry, I'll do it. Instead of that, he has to attack the Member for St. Vital and me in that way, dealing with —(Interjection)— Now he's saying he did, mainly me. I didn't ask for those things but I told the Minister — I heard what the Member for St. Vital said — and I told the Minister it was incumbent on him to respond and he did finally say he would produce it and I'm glad he did because he's learning. When he talks about wasting time, he's wasting everybody's time, Mr. Chairman, but if we have to force him to produce that which he promised to do, then we have to take the time to do it because, Mr.

Chairman, he has to learn; he has to learn regardless of who teaches him. Maybe it's the House Leader who has to start teaching him that to get business done here, one has to have the spirit of co-operation. When the Member for St. Vital asked for it and didn't get it, then I had the right to point that out to the Minister of Finance. If he wants to keep up this debate, it's fine with me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I know very well, having watched the Member for St. Johns for a number of years, year in and year out, he cannot ever get into any debate that he does not get that final last word, that last shaft, that last pin or whatever it is, in. If you wanted to put a researcher on it, you'd find in every committee that ever occurred and where he has ever been involved, he can't take it, he just cannot take it. He's standing up here and saying that we're pretending not to give him information. Well, I'm not going to take that.

The Member for St. Vital stood up here some months ago and asked for the Foster Report. The Foster Report is a report that was done for the Alberta government by an Alberta consultant. That Foster Report was not done for the Study Committee. It was not done for the province of Manitoba. In spite of that, I said I would see what I could do to get him a copy of it. So the Member for St. Johns gets up, and without ever asking for the background information, assumes all this and says, there's four reports and you're not delivering. Now, that's what he's saying. He's got to try and get his last word in. —(Interjection)— He cannot accept what he knows for a fact of life. He's been in this House since 1962, he knows the rules of this House and just because this government has been more forthcoming with information. Mr. Chairman, you should have seen the arrogance of that government when they were on this side of the House. You should have seen them in their last year of government when they spent every day, at one time or another, attacking the media because the media was being unkind to them. —(Interjection)— That's right; that's right. I'm writing a letter and I'm doing it publicly, and I wrote one in disagreement. —(Interjection)— Aha, so this is the difference. Well, a lot of these things come out. Now we've found out there was supposed to be an election this fall. Mr. Chairman, we also found out there was supposed to be an election this fall.

But this arrogance that had set in with the former government, you couldn't get a thing. Let's go back to March of 1974. Talk about information at committees. I said here tonight and I said that I would attempt to get a report for the Member for St. Vital. It was not a report of this government. It was a report of another government but it was certainly germane to the question at hand, the Western Electric Power Grid. He got up in the House at a stage after that and said, you didn't get it for me, I got it by my own sources, I have a copy of it. I thought it was washed, that was it, he got a copy of it, that was fine. He stands up tonight and he makes a case out of the fact I never got him a copy of the report. Well, do you realize how far they're reaching?

Let's go back to March of 1974. I asked a question at a committee. —(Interjection)— I asked a question of this committee. What will the price of electrical energy be in Manitoba in five years? The question was ruled out of order. That question was ruled out of order at a committee by that government. I asked a second question, how long will it take for the power rates in this province to double? The answer: 15 to 20 years. They finally figured they had to answer that one. Now can you imagine, Mr. Chairman, in your experience — you're a new member of this House and others are — that if we got a question in this government like that and we ruled it out of order, what would happen to us?

Mr. Chairman, this government is more forthcoming and provides more information than that arrogant gang ever did. They were a gang, and that's what they were, they ran it that way. —(Interjection)— They ran it that way all the way through. The committees are more open; the information is more forthcoming by far than they ever allowed.

They had their term of government, it's eight years, and the fact that we are spending hour after hour after hour on five opportunities on Supply, five bills, Mr. Chairman, Main Supply, the two Sups, the two Interims, is that they still think they're government. They haven't got over the fact they're not the government and that there are two aspects to government. One is the Legislature, and that is the responsibility of the majority group of the government, and they can't get over the fact that they're on that side of the House. It's still bothering them and they go on and on and on again. Every question has been answered over and over again, and the Chairmen have been exceedingly lenient, the Speaker has been exceedingly lenient. It's gone over and over and over again, the same question and now we're getting questions about why we didn't file reports that belonged to other governments.

Mr. Chairman, they just keep poking and prodding and using up the time and still can't get over the fact that they're not making these decisions. We've been more forthcoming, Mr. Chairman; we've given them everything in comparison to what they never yielded to this House or to a committee. I repeat again and I don't quote it out of the Tritschler Report, I repeat and ask the question: A member of the Legislature that walked in and asked the utility and the government to ask the question, what you thought the power rates would be for your constituents five years down the line, had your question ruled out of order and not to be considered. —(Interjection)— I'm going to say it again. I am going to say it again. I finally got through to somebody because the Member for Flin Flon is just a little more practical than most of those partners he has on the other side of the House. —(Interjections)— So I will repeat it again.

They used to laugh — let's put that on the record too, since there are some members opposite that happen to think that the record is important let's put it on it again — they used to laugh when the Member for St. James, the now Minister of Community Services, used to say, what about the price of power? Everybody on this side of the House who was in government used to say, ha ha ha. They laughed; they thought it was a big joke and it was a

standing joke. —(Interjection)— He used to ask. Well, now they know, now they know that in their free-spending days, their wasteful days, that it all catches up.

They can sit there and ask questions about reports that don't belong to this government; let me remind them that they were the most arrogant government that this province had ever seen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, out of the Minister's mouth he has just demonstrated, when he asks a question for somebody to use a ouija board and predict what the rates will be five years from now, 15 years from now, I would like him to hazard a guess. —(Interjection)— When you take the freeze off five years from now, when you take the freeze which you didn't need right at the present time, off five years from now, tell the people what you need. Four years from now, one year's gone by. That's silliness and we can keep this debate going. The Minister is insisting.

The Minister is insisting. When he says that that government has been open, it has not. Since 1977 I have consistently and persistently asked the Minister of Education to give us the government's position vis-a-vis the "Task Farce Report", for example, and the record will show — I'm sorry I didn't come prepared for this kind of debate, this silly kind of debate which the government persists in pursuing — question after question we have asked the government relative to their policy vis-a-vis education, the soft-belly approach, no comment.

On the T.V. news tonight they're talking about the bill which is before the Privileges and Elections. The government is doing the same thing that they did during the committee hearing. They don't want to enter into a dialogue to see why people are in a quandry about education because they won't tell the people anything. And for those members that weren't here, this open government, in studying Hydro in the north, 30 million worth of study that the former Leader of the Opposition spit on, threw them on the floor. We looked at everything from ducks to birds and everything else relative to the Hydro development in the north. Everything that was asked for was done and the information was made public; it was paid for by the public.

I remind the Member for St. Vital that the Tritschler Report cost 2 million to support this ludicrous position of this government. But if this Minister wants to prolong this debate, I, for one, every time he stands up and makes silly comments like he just made at the present time that this has been an open government, which is not true, then it will be responded to by members of this side because this is our responsibility and we will stay here all night, if necessary, every time that they stand up and we will stay here till fall. —(Interjection)— This is a decision that you make, each one of you, because that is utter nonsense, that this government is open government.

Mr. Chairman, other people will have comments to make but I just couldn't sit in my seat and recall the former Member for River Heights taking all of the reports and saying, huh, throwing them on the floor with utter contempt. But yet this government, albeit

we may have some difficulties, but I'd rather belong to this one with our disagreements that we have because it is an open group. We don't respond to any particular string that somebody is pulling us. We are independent and free-thinking.

MR. ORCHARD: Who is pulling Howard's string?

MR. BOYCE: It won't be you, that's for sure. Mr. Chairman, this debate can go on and on and on, but just as soon as some member stands up over there and makes silly statements just as we witnessed from the Minister of Finance, somebody on this side of the House will respond to it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. 2. Resolved that a sum not exceeding 18,952,909, being 10 percent of the amount of several items to be voted for departments, as set forth in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1981, laid before the House at the present session of the Legislature be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1981—pass.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION COMMITTEE REPORTS

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, directed me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Springfield, that the report of committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Economic Development, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of Ways and Means for raising of the Supply granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means to be granted to Her Majesty.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS INTERIM SUPPLY (2)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Committee come to order. Ways and Means, Interim Supply (2). Resolved that towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1981, the sum of 18,952,909, being 10 percent of the total amount to be voted for

departments as set forth in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1981, laid before the House at the present session of the Legislature, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund—pass.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

COMMITTEE REPORTS

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted a certain resolution, directed me to report same, and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Springfield, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. CRAIK introduced Bill NO. 110, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1981, and to authorize commitments to expend additional money in subsequent years (2).

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, the opposition gives leave.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Economic Development, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. (Friday)