

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan):** Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery where we have 20 students, Grade 10 standing of the R.B. Russell School, under the direction of Mr. nSilver. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Point Douglas. On behalf of all the Honourable Members, I welcome you here.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**HONOURABLE SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet):** NMr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Milk Control Board of Manitoba and the Annual Report of the Crop Insurance Corporation and the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN (Springfield):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Section 13 of The Trade Practices Act, I would like to table the report to December 31st, 1976.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Inkster)** introduced **Bill No. 7, an Act to amend The Provincial Judges Act**, and **Bill No. 6, an Act to amend The Jury Act**, on behalf of the Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**MR. TOUPIN** introduced **Bill No. 2, An Act to amend The Securities Act** and **Bill No. 14, An Act to amend The Landlord and Tenant Act**.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**HONOURABLE BILLIE URUSKI (St. George)** introduced **Bill No. 13, An Act to amend The Municipal Act** and **Bill No. 12, An Act to amend The Local Authorities Elections Act**.

**MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West)** introduced **Bill No. 9, an Act to amend The Brandon Charter**.

**HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY, Attorney-General (Selkirk)** introduced **Bill No. 8, an Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act** and **Bill No. 10, an Act to amend The County Courts Act**.

**HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN, Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Springfield)** introduced **Bill No. 15, an Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act**.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. STERLING LYON (Souris-Killarney):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. I wonder if he could advise the House, and if not at this moment could he take notice and give advice to the House as to the cost of power imported to the present time in this fiscal year from the United States.

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

**HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere):** Mr. Speaker, because there is catorgization involved I will take the question as notice and have the answer in short order.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, in a similar vein then, could the First Minister also advise, from Manitoba Hydro, the cost and the amount of coal that has been imported to fire the fossil fuel stations at Brandon and Selkirk?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, Order for Return, statistical data. The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. SCHREYER:** I can take that as notice in tandem.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister could advise, in view of the critical water shortage we presently have in Manitoba, when the Churchill River Diversion will be fully operational — that's the first part — and secondly, what steps if any are being taken by Manitoba Hydro at the present time to speed up the completion of the Churchill River Diversion in order to make it fully operational. That's the first part.

Secondly, what steps if any are being taken by Manitoba Hydro at the present time to speed up the completion of the Churchill River diversion in order to make it fully operational.

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

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, certainly there is a program and sequence of engineering works now underway to put the final touches on remaining engineering work yet to be done in order to make it possible to take the Churchill River diversion up to its full rated capacity.

I should in all candour point out however, to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that engineering works is one part that's well in hand, but there is also a matter of negotiations with the Government of Canada

relative to the Nelson House band and the reserve.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to that question. Can the First Minister advise whether the Government of Manitoba have moved their air base or so accommodated themselves with respect to their air base on the Burntwood River that that location of the air base would not in any way be delaying the maximum flow through the Churchill River diversion?

**MR. SCHREYER:** Affirmative, Mr. Speaker. While there is a problem it is, I'm happy to say, one of the less difficult problems to solve. That is in hand and in no way would the float base by itself prevent the maximizing of the diversion of the Churchill River, but rather it has to do with the other two points I've mentioned and more specifically with the matter of negotiations with the Government of Canada with respect to 1,800 acres of reserve land.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, can the First Minister advise if arrangements have been made and settled between Manitoba Hydro and the Town of Thompson with respect to the water supply for the City of Thompson and for the International Nickel plant at that location?

**MR. SCHREYER:** That's what I'm advised, Mr. Speaker. That matter is in hand. What is in fact underway for several months now is the completion of the new water treatment intake on the Burntwood upstream from the City of Thompson itself.

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

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, following on the line of questioning I'd like to address some questions to the First Minister concerning the problems caused by the apparent water shortage. Can he indicate whether any arrangements have been made with neighboring provinces or states where standby power resources would be available in the likelihood that there would be power shortages in the Winnipeg region?

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

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, that question is one that doesn't lend itself to a brief reply, but I can indicate to my honourable friend just some of the factors that add to the complexity of the problem. No. 1 would be that it's not an apparent shortage, it's a real one.

The second is that neighboring utilities have for the most part problems of their own for the reason of postponement of capital investment for expansion of system capacity in recent years. Indeed, Sir, in recent months the Ontario Hydro utility in Northwestern Ontario — I'm speaking only of Northwestern Ontario — was on a limited rationing system with respect to power for its own domestic customers. So that there is no reason to believe that any neighboring utility is in a position to help out in other than a token sense in the long run.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** A supplementary then Mr. Speaker. If there appears not to be any alternate sources of power available does the government have any plans or contingencies being prepared for rationing of power uses in our own province and in the City of Winnipeg that could be presented for discussion with City of Winnipeg officials and be presented to the public in terms of restricting uses during peak load hours and other kinds of rationing measures? Are we preparing plans such as this?

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, indeed because an answer to a question of that kind merely bespeaks another question and anticipating that there would be this curiosity, I have arranged that Manitoba Hydro will be available to the Standing Committee of this House about a month earlier than usual, and in this case it would be March 15th, which will mean that there are no other problems in terms of House business management. So, by that point in time, my honourable friend will be able to ask questions to his heart's content, of a detailed nature, which in this context are the only kind of questions that make sense — details.

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

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then, while I would wait with great expectation that opportunity to question Hydro in detail — we've been waiting a long time for that opportunity, a full year — I would like to know if the government has plans to meetings also hold similar with the municipalities in this province, in particular the City of Winnipeg, considering that it has already announced certain contingency plans of its own, from water rationing and shortages to work out, to co-ordinate any arrangements for any plans that might be made. Have such Meetings been held or are they scheduled or will they be held in the very near future?

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

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that is of only recent development in this matter. It is no secret that the Winnipeg Hydro utility, because of the nature of low water conditions at Lake of the Woods, the Winnipeg River, have been in a position where that utility supplied only approximately twenty-five per cent of its own requirements and the rest had to be purchased from Manitoba Hydro. So that there is an awareness, it is not something very recent and I just finished saying to my honourable friend that we are advancing a month earlier than usual the calling of Hydro to the Standing Committee of this House.

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

**MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Thank you Mr. Speaker. A further question dealing with water, this time directed to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Environmental Management. Has the

Minister had an occasion to speak to his staff, the water resources, about the draw-down procedures on the Shellmouth Reservoir? In lieu of the possibly changed conditions and recognizing that in most instances it is used as a flood protective measure we could be looking for a different regime on that facility this year.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, there was some discussion with the department several months ago but I want to assure the honourable member that the facility will be used to its best advantage and in a drought year if it gives us some advantage with regard to relieving that situation that would be the direction which the Engineers would turn to. However, the question has been put and it will be referred to the department so that there be no doubt that is what they are doing.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

**MR. HENRY J. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. The question was posed by my colleague from La Verendrye yesterday, asking the Minister whether or not Mr. Rudy Usick had been replaced on the Manitoba Marketing Board. He indicated the affirmative. My question now is could he indicate who that person is to replace Mr. Usick on the Manitoba Marketing Board.

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

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, as I recall it I indicated in the negative.

**MR. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, we'll have to check *Hansard* but I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that I heard him say that the answer was in the affirmative. However, I would like to ask the Minister another question and ask him, because of the postponement on the vote on the beef plebiscite I understand approximately eight thousand ballots had gone out prior to announcing of the postponement, could the Minister indicate what was done with those ballots as they were returned to the Returning Officer?

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker' the ballots that were returned are in the hands of the Manitoba Marketing Board, the Returning Officers.

**MR. EINARSON:** Could the Minister indicate whether the Returning Officer, the Manitoba Marketing Board, had any indication as to how those ballots were marked.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rock Lake should know that ballots aren't opened until the proper time for them to be opened. —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please.

**MR. USKIW:** The Member for Lakeside, Mr. Speaker, now wants to suggest to you and to the House that the Manitoba Marketing Board is not a trusted group. Well, I suggest to him that some members of that board were their appointees.

**MR. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to, if I may, read the question posed by my colleague from La Verendrye yesterday, and the question was this. I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture and would ask him if he has filled the vacancy left on the Manitoba Marketing Board by the resignation of Mr. Usick The Honourable Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Minister Sam Uskiw, Lac du Bonnet, "yes," Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, I direct my question again to the Minister and ask him who is that person who replaced Mr. Usick?

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

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, this morning an Order-in-Council was passed revoking the appointment of Mr. Usick and there was no replacement to date.

**MR. EINARSON:** Then I will pose another question to the Minister of Agriculture: Is the intention of the Minister to replace Mr. Usick on the Manitoba Marketing Board?

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, that is the prerogative of the Minister in charge and yes, it is the intention to fill the vacancy, but there is no urgency.

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

**MR. A. R. ADAMS:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the question that was raised by the Meer for Rock Lake was asked of the Minister. I have a question to the same Minister and my question is: Could the Minister advise the reason for Mr. Usick's resignation?

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

**MR. USKIW:** I would remind the Meers that the previous member of the Marketing Board upon resigning from the that position, indicated that having been party to the main recommendations to the Minister, he was terribly upset with what was taking place, the course of the referendum and the debate, and that he wanted to remove himself from a conflict-of-interest position so that he can indeed take a part in the debaté.

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

**MR. HARRY J. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Yesterday the same Mr. Usick referred to called upon a private citizen by the name of Richard Klassen in this province in company with several others and demanded a producing of his private books.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Question, please. Question, please.

**MR. ENNS:** My question to the Minister is: Was this done under the instruction by the Minister or by anybody from the Department of Agriculture?

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

**MR. USKIW:** Well, the Member for Lakeside obviously knows the answer. —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please.

**MR. USKIW:** I'm sorry, Mr. Usick is not a member of the Manitoba Marketing Board —(Interjection)— since this morning.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. Order, please. —(Interjection)— Order, please. Let us get together and let me suggest to those people who are asking questions that they keep them short, curt, and precise and to the point. And secondly, if they haven't finished asking a question they should get back on their feet and we'll give them the courtesy to hear them. Otherwise, I'm not going to recognize those kind of people at all.

Number two, the same applies to the answers. I think they should be short and brief, to the point; no opinions should be expressed that are going to engender debate. This is the question period, not the debating period.

If you people want to change the rules, let me know. We'll do it through the proper procedure, through the Rules Committee and then we will abide by those. But otherwise, a chairman cannot conduct a meeting which is out of control.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, again, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the former member of the Marketing Board is not operating under the instructions of the department, nor was he, since he submitted his resignation some two or three weeks ago.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

**MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Attorney-General. I would like to ask the Attorney-General if he can confirm that present bookings in the provincial judges' court now extend into the summer holiday period.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, it is my information that the setting down for trial of matters today would be roughly in a period five or six months from today's date, so the answer would be "yes" under those circumstances.

**MR. GRAHAM:** A supplementary question: Has the Attorney-General considered taking action somewhat similar to that taken in B. C. in cases of undue length before they came to trial, of having them set aside?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, no, the situation in British Columbia is much more critical than that in Manitoba. In British Columbia, all the cases that were considered in that respect were those six months and over; in fact, some were as old as two years. What we are examining in Manitoba is methods by which we can shorten up the processes leading to court trial, eliminating matters that can be readily agreed to, consented to by all parties. That includes an examination of the preliminary and trying to work out by consent of all parties the procedure by which we can reduce the waiting period. That is the process that is presently underway involving co-operation of all interested parties.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

**MR. GRAHAM:** A final supplementary: Can the Minister indicate what degree of success he is having with his new procedures in that respect?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Brief opinion — I say brief opinion, I hope!

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, to properly expand an answer to the Honourable Member's question it is difficult to be brief. But in this case: yes. As I indicated, we are in the process of examining with all parties the methods by which the periods can be shortened. We have not effected a new process yet in that connection because we are going through the organizational discussions as to what steps can be undertaken in order to shorten the waiting period. So, to the present time, the answer is: no, we can't evaluate success or lack of success.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Portage La Prairie.

**MR. G. E. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. What is the current status of the government's attempt to extradite Alexander Kasser from Austria?

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, there has been no success to the present time in efforts to extradite Dr. Kasser from Austria.

**MR. G. JOHNSTON:** Another question of the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Has the government made the decision to proceed with extradition against other persons who have been charged with criminal offences in the same proceedings?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, there are presently proceedings underway involving other principals that were involved in the CFI project. Those are underway, the principle one being, of course, the Kasser one.

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

**MR. L. R. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable the Minister of Urban Affairs. It arises out of a question that I asked him yesterday. I would like to ask him whether in view of the static situation in the City of Winnipeg's land assembly program in which the province is a partner, the province has any intention of undertaking any initiatives to get the program moving.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

**SAUL A. MILLER:** Mr. Speaker, certainly the province is discussing this with the city and will continue to discuss it with the city. As the land becomes available and as the city's plans are firmed up, then certainly it will go ahead. The city is the lead partner in this matter and they are the ones who are doing the actual acquisition of land.

**MR. SHERMAN:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister if the province still stands by its previous undertaking in which it made it clear, or certainly clearly indicated, that if the city gets out of the land banking business, the province intends to fill the void.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Speaker, that is water under the bridge. That was the position taken by the province when the city

was considering giving up the entire project; they then reconsidered and the matter is now going forward.

**MR. SHERMAN:** A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In the view of the Minister, does the delay at the city level at the present time not constitute at least a tacit decision to get out of it?

**MR. MILLER:** Not at all, Mr. Speaker, these things do take time; you cannot assemble that amount of land without a great deal of time and effort and I think the city is trying to move ahead as quickly as it can.

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

**MR. ROBERT G. WILSON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Could the Minister, in light of the fact the City of Winnipeg has placed two Victorian era houses on Edmonton Street on their protected list of historical buildings, tell the House if MHRC will reconsider its demolition order or plans for bringing down those houses?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Speaker, firstly I am not the Minister responsible for MHRC so I can't directly answer that and I am not sure what houses are being referred to. I am not aware that the city has declared any particular homes as protected homes that might be in the way of demolition.

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

**MR. STEVE PATRICK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. In view of the recent alarming statements made by Dr. Roulston, Head of Obstetrics, that some 30 percent of the children in Manitoba live in poverty and 76 percent, I believe, of single

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, question.

**MR. PATRICK:** . . . mothers live on welfare, what is his department doing about it and is he acting on any of the recommendations of Dr. Roulston?

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

**HONOURABLE LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you and the Members of the House will recognize that this is something that would be better dealt with during the Estimates as during the question period.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge asked if the policy of the department was to prohibit Public Health nurses and Victorian Order of Nurses from entering Guest Homes and Nursing Homes. Well, the nursing homes are fully staffed with the appropriate professionals and there is no need to have these Public Health people rendering their service in those facilities. As far as guest homes are concerned, up to now because the guest homes traditionally have been charging residents for some part of care besides board and room, it has not been the policy of the government up to now to provide these services although, when requested, the department will assess the care situation of an individual in the guest home. I must add though that the whole question of guest homes and related residences is quite complex, it doesn't deal only with matters relating to the department and this is being fully investigated in discussions with the city and the department as to the standards and licensing and so on and I hope that this very complex question will be dealt with very soon.

**MR. PATRICK:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate to the House or has his department checked out if the 30 percent figure is accurate and has he received any recommendations from Dr. Roulston in respect to this serious matter?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know exactly what statement my honourable friend is referring to. I don't know if this is something in today's paper that I haven't seen and I would have to check into this to see if there is any direct recommendation from anyone on this.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Assiniboia, a final.

**MR. PATRICK:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Can the

Minister indicate to the House if the department has any plan or program of disseminating family planning information into Winnipeg high schools as was recommended, I believe?

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

**HONOURABLE IAN TURNBULL (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, the latter part of the question I can't answer to. Who the member is referring to when he says it was recommended, I don't know, but the department does have available a guide for family life education; it has gone through two publications. I think the first publication was in 1973, the second was in 1976. That guide is available to school divisions, it indicates to them how best to secure community support for the introduction of such programs.

**MR. PATRICK:** Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister indicated he didn't know the second part of the question, recommended by who. It was recommended by Dr. Roulston, the Head of Gynaecology, I believe.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Riel.

**MR. DONALD W. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the First Minister which he may want to take as notice as well. With regards to the Churchill River Diversion, I wonder if he could obtain for the House, first of all the present flow rate in the Churchill Diversion, to what extent is it presently being used; and secondly, I wonder if he could inquire and advise the House what flow is being lost from the Churchill, over the Missi structure and not being used through the diversion.

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

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, I can take that as notice although, by way of preliminary indication, I can tell my honourable friend that the current diversion of the Churchill River through the Burntwood is at approximately 12,000 c.f.s., it is intended to boost that to the order of 20,000 by mid-year and hopefully 30,000 by year's end.

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

**MR. ADAM:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I have another question to the Minister of Agriculture and I wonder if he could advise the House if it is correct that at a public meeting at Brandon last week, attended by approximately 700 farmers, that Mr. Richard Klassen publicly invited anyone to come to his farm and look at his books.

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

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I wasn't there so I wouldn't know whether he made such an offer or gave such an offer to anyone or not. I do know that there were many people there and there were reports to that effect but I could not verify it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, at this point, reflect on the question and answer of Hansard of February 22nd, with respect to the filling of the position of Mr. Usick. I believe I did answer in the affirmative but I understood the question to be whether it was my intent to fill the position, not whether I had already filled it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

#### HANSARD CORRECTION

**MR. TOUPIN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a correction that appears in Hansard, Debates and Proceedings, Page 50, third line of the second paragraph, where the word "Crescentwood" appears, it should have been "Wolseley".

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Attorney-General. I would like to ask him whether, in view of a serious residential inconvenience and a severe traffic problem existing, the Liquor Commission intends to move forthrightly to settle its rental problems in the constituency of Fort Garry?

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Liquor Control Commission has for some time been attempting to move forthrightly to resolve this problem but, Mr. Speaker, on the other hand it cannot be held up rent-wise by someone who realizes that they have the Liquor Control Commission in a vulnerable position.

**MR. SHERMAN:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the government's initiatives in this field be related in any way to the possible candidacy of one Mr. Frank Syms in the Fort Garry constituency?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. Order please, order please.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to follow, if I might, the statement made by the Minister concerning the home care services in guest homes for senior citizens. Can the Minister indicate whether an order has been given out to nurses under the Home Care Program that they should not visit guest homes when the conditions are of an unsavoury or unkempt nature and that this is one reason why such visits are not being taken? Have these conditions in fact been investigated and has this order been issued?

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

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I must be quite candid and honest. I was very surprised when I asked the question to get the answer that I gave today. This is something that doesn't satisfy me, something that I'm

investigating. I can assure you that this certainly wasn't a directive from myself.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. G. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Minister tell the House why he is including a four-page letter encouraging a "yes" vote for a Beef Marketing Board with the referendum material that is being mailed out?

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

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that anywhere in that letter there is a direction as to how people should vote.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY — THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and the sub-amendment by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Minister of Mines:

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I participate in this Throne Speech debate as I have participated in every Throne Speech debate since entering this Legislative Assembly. I do so with some degree of nostalgia because since 1969 I have run into and from time to time come into contact with my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition. But it's only now that we are together again under circumstances which we found both enriching and satisfying to ourselves in previous years regardless as to the outcome of any particular position. I, therefore, want to welcome the honourable member back into the House. I'm even, Mr. Speaker, constrained to make any nasty remarks. He was so complimentary in his approach towards me when he took the floor that I am completely disarmed and really am not able to deal with my honourable friend in the way which perhaps people here are expecting to hear.

I do indicate to the honourable member that he certainly acquitted himself well. He made a remark, Mr. Speaker, which was rather unnecessary. He indicated that the people of Souris-Killarney, Mr. Speaker, were good people and then he added for gratuitous reasons I'm sure, that he would say that, Mr. Speaker, even if he hadn't won the election, even if he had run third. Well, I really accept that from the honourable member without the closing because I know the honourable member would say that the people are good people and it really is unnecessary for him to add that he would have said that if they had run third. But if he thinks that that is important as an expression of sincerity, Mr. Speaker, then let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I say that the people of Souris-Killarney are good people, and we did run third in Souris-Killarney. And if that, Mr. Speaker, is an expression which indicates greater sincerity on the part of an honourable member then I know that the honourable member will accept that in the spirit in which it is presented.

I do, Mr. Speaker, indicate to the honourable member that we are going to be debating things from time to time in this House as we have done before and it has been my impression that the honourable member is strong and solid in debate. I think that he prefers to debate on things as they are and not as he would like them to be and hope that the validity of his position will carry the day rather than any attempt to improve his position by things which are not so. It was therefore, Mr. Speaker, — and I don't make a big point of it — with some dissatisfaction that I heard him yesterday suggest two things:

1. That I had wrongly attributed the problems of Flyer Industries to the press and then he read what the Auditor had said. I've gone through my statement very carefully. I said that the company experienced a series of problems, some beyond their control and related to an inexperienced and inadequate management. Its major entry into the market was made immediately before the worst inflationary escalation in prices. The arrangement with American Motors General turned out to be unsatisfactory. It had a costly strike with political overtones and management was unable to cope with its problems.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that that's what the Auditor said. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, the Auditor didn't tell us that. We told the Auditor that and we told the House that, Mr. Speaker, before the Auditor's report and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this Government unlike other governments — and I don't have to go back to 1969 — has been quite willing to deal with its problems as they exist and not have to change them in order to suit our purposes.

I also, Mr. Speaker, felt a little bit concerned — and again I don't make a big point of it — the honourable member said I made a speech about an existing company under the previous administration — the honourable member can look back, I haven't, but I can remember and I remember the speech very well — the former Minister of Industry and Commerce, Mr. Speaker, sang "Home on the Range" to us in this House. He said "nowhere is heard a discouraging word" about the business climate in the Province of Manitoba — "nowhere is heard a discouraging word" except in this Chamber from members of the Opposition and it was members of the Opposition who were causing problems for the industrial climate in the Province of Manitoba. And I said, Mr. Speaker, that if the industrial climate of the Government of that day couldn't sustain itself without the Opposition being a cheering section, then it wasn't worth being sustained. Now, Mr. Speaker, it's quite a leap from that to suggest as the honourable member did that I was talking about an existing commercial enterprise operated by the previous administration, because, Mr. Speaker, I never ever said a bad word about a commercial enterprise being operated by the previous administration.

I even had good things to say and continue to say good things about Churchill Forest Industries and I've said why, Mr. Speaker. I said I am the greatest booster of Churchill Forest Industries because they got \$92 million of

my money and if I'm not their booster I'm in trouble and I boosted those companies, and I boosted those efforts. The reason was obvious, Mr. Speaker, that I had never expected that if the public were involved in a commercial operation it would not be treated just as a private company and that it would not have its problems continually being paraded before the House. But the Members of the Opposition are so pathologically opposed to public enterprise that they would

completely different rules in the hope that their attack on it would itself make the enterprise bad. By the way, Mr. Speaker, I never attributed any problems to the Opposition or the press. Read the statement. What I said, Mr. Speaker, was that there were excellent performances in spite of the Opposition and the press and that the company operated well during the past two years; they've produced on an excellent basis and that no private company could have done it. And I repeat that, Mr. Speaker, no private company could have done it. The honourable member is smiling.

The honourable member knows as well as I do that, Mr. Speaker, if I was the kind of foe of private operations that he is of public operations that I could, with the information that I have had over the past several years, have put several private firms into bankruptcy in this province by just one word about what their difficulties were, one call to their suppliers, one call to their customers and the public would treat me accordingly, they would throw me out because it would be a terrible thing to do. Some day, Mr. Speaker, some day the level of public enterprise in this province will move in that direction. It'll move in the direction which is similar to what we have in the private sector, that it will not be considered fair gain to behave that way with regard to an enterprise merely because it is financed by the public rather than being financed privately. Now, Mr. Speaker, those are small matters. I really don't make a big issue of it. The Honourable Member would have liked me to have said things that I didn't say so that he could suggest some inconsistency and he would like me to have said things I didn't say because it is easier to attack in debate something that a person didn't say, which is invalid, which has been contrived in the mind of the attacker, rather than position, to attack the position and the position that he put was that we are going to maintain that operation in such a way as to keep it at its largest operating capacity to give us the greatest possibility of considering options for improvement. The honourable member didn't attack that position because it's the right position and he wouldn't attack.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in dealing with the Throne Speech itself that the Premier has asked me on this motion, the motion of the Member for Lakeside, to speak on behalf of the Party and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will not be limited in time on this motion so honourable members can sit back and relax because I intend to deal in a rather full way with some of the things that have been stated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is the fact with each of us, and let us acknowledge it, that we wonder how things are going to develop in the House. We wonder what a new member is going to say and, indeed, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, an old experienced politician, we were all wondering how he would proceed in this House. I had my own idea as to what would occur. I even had ideas, Mr. Speaker, as to how I would deal with these questions. I really thought, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— No, no, no problems, Mr. Speaker. I can tell the honourable member that however it goes, I am sure that I am going to enjoy it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member left politics in 1969 and I sincerely thought and I think that he will assert that he had left it for good. That he was departing into private life, which is sometimes the secret wish of many politicians and he had his wish granted. And, by the way, he left not through the wish of his constituency but through his own. And I thought, Mr. Speaker, that he had really stayed away from politics; that in 1976 when he was brought back into it, that he had really been out of touch, that he had sort of left in 1966, saw the political world in '69, came back seven or eight years later and saw no change in the political world or really didn't appreciate what was happening. To I started to try the analogy perhaps work up of Rip Van Winkle, the person who went to sleep and twenty years later or whatever it was, woke up and did not really appreciate what had I even, happened in the interim. Even, Mr. Speaker, (and I have to confess this) I even sort of started to make up little analogies that we could talk about, for instance, the legend of Sterling Hollow, and I thought that that would be a good way of dealing with the honourable member's absence from the House. But I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I largely underestimated the honourable member. He has not left politics completely; he did not forget about what was happening in the province of Manitoba. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member kept a closer watch, and in my opinion, has a keener insight as to what was going on in the province of Manitoba than most of the Tory members who are sitting in this House today. That he has followed it very carefully; he has analysed it better, Mr. Speaker, and that he has known what is going on because he has watched and he has looked. When the honourable member was watching and looking, Mr. Speaker, what did he tell us that he saw which some of the other members on that side of the House has not seen? Well, the honourable member looked and he saw that the people of the province of Manitoba had learned of a different system of financing the Medical Care program, that they had come to the conclusion that the way to finance it was out of general revenues which was related in some respects to ability to pay and that this was fairer and more efficient, by the way, than levying it on a per family home on the same basis.



The member looked and he saw what we had done with the Medicare premium and he saw that it was good! The honourable member sat and looked and he saw that the people of this province had found a more sensible way of paying for the unfair and hazardous (because it didn't matter — it wasn't a person who did it, it happened to himself by accident) way of paying for prescription drugs beyond a certain level on a universal basis. He looked at Pharmacare, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member looked and he saw that it was good! Mr. Speaker, the honourable member then looked and he saw that the public of Manitoba had found out a different system of underwriting automobile insurance and that they took the position, Mr. Speaker, that they could underwrite automobile insurance on a fairer, more efficient and less expensive manner than had been done under the previous system, Mr. Speaker, and the honourable member looked and he saw that it was so! Mr. Speaker, the honourable member didn't say it was good, but he looked, Mr. Speaker, and he saw that it was so! And it would not be changed. The honourable member has put the people of the province of Manitoba on notice that automobile insurance, despite what we have said about it and despite what we think about it, is so and will not be changed by a future administration in the province of Manitoba. Read the honourable member's words. Very carefully worded, Mr. Speaker, but no, no, no doubt whatsoever as to what the intention is as I understand it, Mr. Speaker. We would have preferred freedom of choice but let us make no mistake about it, these things cannot be undone or it would be very difficult to undo them. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, no clarion call on the part of the Tory Opposition that they are going to the public and they are going to say that they are going to unscramble the egg and have a return to 50 or 60 private companies engaged in pretended competition operating automobile insurance as against the people who do it better.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member saw many other things while he was looking and watching at what was happening in the political scene in the province of Manitoba. Some of them are very interesting. He saw that support for senior citizens and the nursing home program whereby the public has decided to pay the major costs of people living in nursing homes as against private individuals standing up for themselves and proudly paying these costs. He said, "Yes, this is a more sensible way. It should be done at public rather than at individual expense." He looked at senior citizen's housing and he said, "Yes, this senior citizens' housing should be applied at public rather than individual expense and it is not right that every senior citizen in the province of Manitoba should look after himself." He looked at patient air transportation, Mr. Speaker, which he had voted against on numerous occasions and he said, "This is a good program. They're just not doing it well. We will do it better. We will provide it more efficiently and we will provide more service than has been provided in the past — at public expense, so that individuals in the province of Manitoba will not have to beat their breast and say, "Look, Ma! I'm doing it myself — I don't need the state, it will be done at public expense." And the Leader of the Opposition supports that.

He said, Mr. Speaker, that we should be spending more for arts. You know we have programs which provide for festivals throughout this province at the people's level, not merely at the level of those who go to the Symphony and those who go to the Ballet, which we have given them more than their share and throughout this province they have been getting those things. The Honourable Member says "Yes, the public at social expense should pay for culture and the arts" and, you know, I think that the Honourable Member for Wolseley almost winced when the Leader of the Opposition said that.

And the honourable member said that we should pay for recreational sports, which we have entered into a program and which didn't exist previously in every community in this province. And it should be done at public expense not by the municipalities, not even at the municipal level, but at the provincial level at public expense.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member said that in the area of education we should be concentrating on teaching the french language and, Mr. Speaker, this time it wasn't almost a wince, the member from Charleswood did wince.

He looked at home care. He looked at home care and the Home Repair Program, Mr. Speaker. Where is all this talk about our people being able to look after their own selves and pay for their own homes? No sir. The Leader of the Opposition says that home repair such be paid for at social, not at individual, expense.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Pembina, he says that he is not going to be with us at the next session. I sincerely regret that. I would never regret that we could beat him but I will regret him not being here if we don't happen to win the seat because we, over the years again, have developed an affection for each other regardless of the position. But how did the member for Pembina, "let them starve Pembina" — what did he say when the Leader of the Opposition got up and said that we should have a social welfare program based on generous and compassionate social services, at public expense, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what then do we have as the Tory position — (Interjection) — no, not Red Tory, the Tory position *vis-a-vis* the public. As a matter of fact, I think he put it in words better than I could put it

and that's a terrible admission for me to make, Mr. Speaker. I'm not generally that humble. But he said something about the interdependence of communities and people and the right that we have to rely on each other in a community of interest in a spirit of, he didn't say brotherhood, I say brotherhood.

And, Mr. Speaker, here is the Tory platform as 1977 as against 1968. And listen to it. Listen to it as a composite.

Medicare paid for on the basis of universal coverage out of the general revenue. Pharmacare on a universal basis subject to an initial payment. The continuance of Autopac. Support for senior citizens in nursing homes and senior citizen housing. Public payment of patient air transportation. Socially paid for public support for the arts, for sports, for education in the french language. A program of publically paid for home repair for senior citizens. Public support of day care and a generous and compassionate program of social services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's the program of the Tory Party and I say to the Honourable Member for Wolseley, the Member for Charleswood, the Member for Pembina, the Member for Rock Lake, would you have believed in 1969 that you would be sitting in a Party that was giving testimonial endorsement to a program based on these things.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you something — I wouldn't have believed it. I believe, Mr. Speaker, I think that this province, that this government, has done many, many good things in letting the people of the Province of Manitoba build a slightly better form of life for themselves. In my wildest dreams, Mr. Speaker, I would never have believed that I could see the Leader of the Opposition giving testimonial endorsement to this list of programs. And, if we have done that, we have done more than I ever expected that this government could do.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I tell you that the Leader of the Opposition represents a greater impact that this government has made on the people of the Province of Manitoba, better than any other example of any programs that we have presented. Because, Mr. Speaker, an attitudinal change, an attitudinal change is sometimes far more important than a physical change. Because the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, he doesn't say "let me sit in your seat". He says "let me sit in your seat, and let me wear your clothes because they look better than mine".

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, would retain his antagonism for the word "socialism" if he could embrace everything that it envisaged and I tell the honourable member that it's fair trade. Fair trade. I give my honourable friend the word, throw it out. I prefer the thing. If my honourable friend wants to keep his antagonism to the word, he can keep it. But the thing, the thing which he expressed with regard to Souris-Killarney where he said that the people of this province are a community, that they are interdependent, that they depend one on the other and that it just as much the importance of the people in Inkster to regard the welfare of the resident of Souris-Killarney as his problem as it is for the resident of Souris-Killarney to regard the welfare of the citizen of Inkster as his problem, is far more important than any word "socialism".

And, Mr. Speaker, that is what my honourable friend has adopted.

I note, Mr. Speaker, some degree of concern on the part of some of the members of the opposition as to where the hell this Party is going. Rest easy, I'm going to rehabilitate your leader in due course. He'll be back with you. Don't worry. Don't worry. **ow, Mr. Speaker, you have this word and thing business. The honourable member says that the Souris has flooded every five in the last six years. That's true. The honourable member should also know that I do not have a single engineering report which indicates, at this point, a cost benefit plus in terms of doing certain work on the Souris River. And the honourable member is not suggesting to me that I should, for his constituents, he's not that way, say that we do this merely because it's been demanded. Unless, Mr. Speaker, you know, the honourable member really feels that his constituency is entitled to something that other constituencies are not entitled to. But, he now proposes it on the basis of what I say is the thing.**

And, you know' we've had that example before, where they tell the joke about the Socialist. They say that the socialist was trying to educate another person in what socialism is. He said "Well, you see how it is. If I have two houses and you have no house, I could only live in one house at a time. It is really more fair that you should have a house and I should have a house. So the true socialist would give you one of the houses." Then he said, Mr. Speaker, "If I have two and you have none then it seems to me that I can only drive one automobile at a time, and you need an automobile, why should you not have one. Therefore, I should give you one of my automobiles". And he kept on in this vein. And finally the pupil said I think I have it. You know like in that musical, My Fair Lady. I've Got It. I've Got It. If you have two shirts and I have none, it means that you will give me one of your shirts. And the teacher said, the professor said "Oh, no. No, not that." And the pupil said "Why not, isn't that socialism?" He says "Two shirts, I've got". And that's where we draw the line.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's take the story in reverse. You know nobody is a socialist until they need it. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake he is a terrible anti-socialist. But if blackbirds are eating the farmers crop and the farmer doesn't want to pay for it himself, he says that the public should come in and they should pay for the damage to the farmers crop. Mr. Speaker, that is blackbird socialism.

The Member for Pembina, he says "I'm not a socialist". He says "Let them starve". But, Mr.

Speaker, if the people in his area need a Dam to provide more water or to provide more drainage or to provide for the benefit of the farmers who he represents, he says "Build them a Darn". That's called Dam socialism.

Now we got to the member for Souris-Killarney. He says if the citizens in my area are flooded, then the public should get together and provide money for my constituency. Mr. Speaker, that's called Souris socialism.

That is the antithesis of what has been the case, and I will admit it. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I will concede. That was City socialism. I think nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable members if they are asking me whether the province should, on some rational basis, and I think it has to be rational, provide for flood control measures on the basis of the cost and cost benefits to whatever area of the province, I will endorse it. And not only will I endorse it, Mr. Speaker, I'll endorse the thing and I'll endorse the word. It's socialism. And I am prepared to do it.

But, I am not prepared to say that because somebody is making an awful fuss that I should ignore my engineers and say to them that we are going to do this because I can't stand the heat. I won't do that.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone and the Honourable Member for Pembina, I hope have read wrongly in the newspapers, which sometimes happens, but they say that I should, these people who are opposed to public money going into mining and things of that nature, they say that they're going to come into this Legislature and cause me to give money to a mining promoter in Neepawa to develop the iron ore. And they say that I am not doing it now because he is not represented by a New Democrat. Well, is that the kind of government, and they are both — well' they were reported as being shareholders of the company — said Mr. Speaker, I hope I am not being unfair and I will apologize immediately if that is not what I read and not what they say ' even if it's what I read but it's not what they said — they said as shareholders of the company we will go into the Legislature and we will see to it whether we can push the government into putting public money into this Neepawa iron ore development company. The same Party who say what are you doing in the mining industry. Mr. Speaker, that's Iron Ore socialism.

So everybody gets to the point where he's a capitalist; that's where he has two shirts and the other guy wants one, and everybody gets to the point where he's a socialist; that's when he wants the public to pay rather than paying himself. And I think that there are more socialists on that side of the House, from what I've been reading and hearing recently, than there are on this side of the house. At least they talk that way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this has been, and I indicated to you that there is a little method to this apparent madness. It's not all just as I have put it or just as we have seen. We have to look and see what is really behind this conversion. Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has suggested several main issues in his talk. And I don't want to be unfair. I'm picking ones that I thought were main. He took the Hydro issue as being certainly a main issue. He took the mining as a main issue, and Mr. Speaker, of all things, he took patronage as a main issue. Now, really, I really wonder whether the honourable member is being serious. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has said that when he comes to power, if he ever does, he's going to get rid of all those New Democratic Party supporters who work for the Civil Service. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, he's not going to hire different kinds of people. I suppose the reason for getting rid of them is so that there will be new New Democrats coming in to take those jobs. That he's going to hire new New Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is a former Minister of the Crown. I have no hesitation in saying, I have said it before and I really was surprised that patronage becomes an issue because there was some type of understanding between those people who have a real knowledge of power, that a government is obliged and should hire talented people, and that talent should be the prerequisite of anybody taking any job. But in those issues which are in the area of policy formation and that could be greater steps or lesser steps down the line, that it is very likely, very likely and very desirable, that the people that they will hire will be amongst those who are friendlier to them rather than those who are enemies of them. Because, does the honourable member really say that he who is involved in the preparation of this document which said that here are the constituencies that we can win, here are the constituencies that we can lose, we should put this money here, and figure out what program will win, does he really suggest that he is going to make an issue of patronage.

Mr. Speaker, you know every government, and I have absolutely never complained about this, will fill positions which are involved in policy questions with people who more relate to their political persuasion than do not. And I think that, if anything, we have been less judicious in obeying that rule than have other governments. But, Mr. Speaker, I will not, I give you advance notice, that I will not expect the honourable member if he ever becomes the Premier of the province of Manitoba to be hiring all New Democrats to fill the positions as Deputy Ministers and other Ministers. And, Mr. Speaker, neither will his backbench. Neither will they let him. Neither will the Conservative Party. And I don't blame them! Because that would be a silly thing for it to do. It will have assumed power

and it will have put the means and the tools for attaining that power into the hands of people who are against him. And I don't expect the honourable member to do that if he gets a mandate from the people of this province to run the government.

Mr. Speaker, I will not, I give you notice of it, I will not be able to spend a lot of time on Hydro. I do say that the honourable member's strongest indictment against this government, which I take very seriously, is his suggestion that we knowingly and without care of the consequences, spent \$600 million that need not have been spent in constructing our highway development. And he said that — I think his words were that we were willing participants in this scheme. The honourable member nudged his head. Well, that's a fairly substantial charge. I tell the honourable member if that charge is correct or if it can be shown to me on any basis whatsoever as having a scintilla of endorsement to it by people who are trained in the area of electric development, then, Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of us being voted out of office, I would not be able to exist in a government that did that and did it by means of the political process telling the hydro engineers what to do. I could not exist in such a government and therefore I tell the honourable member that I take that indictment very seriously. Mr. Speaker, at every hydro meeting — (Interjection) — Well, I don't take it seriously and as affecting my action because it is made by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. You know, I qualify that it has to be somebody qualified to speak on this issue and with facts at his disposal will pursue that position.

Mr. Speaker, with regards to Gordon Spafford, he is, Mr. Speaker, one of the people, I gather, who was involved in the Underwood McLellan Report prepared in February 1970, which the honourable member says he would have acted upon eight months before it was prepared and I'll get to that, eight months before it was prepared.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. LYON:** Would my honourable friend agree that Mr. Gordon Spafford is one of the top five systems hydro engineers in Canada today?

**MR. GREEN:** No, Mr. Speaker, I will not agree. I will not agree with that nor, Mr. Speaker, has anything that I read in the papers indicated that Mr. Spafford says that hydro has spent \$600 million which they need not have spent. I go back to my assertion, the honourable member says that this report prepared in February 1970 would have been acted upon by the Conservative administration six or seven months before it was prepared. I am not able, Mr. Speaker, and it will be the Premier's prerogative to deal with the matters that come within his department — I do tell my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — Well, let the debate be carried on by others and there will be lots of time to do it because I do take it seriously. At every hydro electric meeting, at every meeting that we've had since we have been involved in this project, I have asked the Chairman of Hydro, "Has there been anything that Hydro has done which it has been instructed to do by the government for political consideration other than the valuation in their input of something for the resource value of things that will be flooded by Manitoba Hydro?" And, Mr. Bateman has said "No, everything else that we have done has been based on the best advice from hydro engineering authorities within our system".

The Member for Riel, Mr. Speaker, said to the same Chairman, he said "We have no criticism" — and I am paraphrasing now, I can get it from the Hansard — "We have no criticism of anything that has been done by the hydro engineering staff. We have criticism of what is being done by the government". And Mr. Bateman said, "I thank you for saying that because up until now it has been considered by some that you are criticizing our engineering advice and I am glad to hear you say that you have no criticism of the engineering expertise and staff of Manitoba Hydro or what they have recommended. I've got to ask the question. There is no criticism of the engineering advice — is there anything that you have recommended or we are doing which is contrary to your engineering advice?" And he said "no" Mr. Speaker, his answer was "No" and it was no one year and the next year and the following year. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member guessed at a figure of \$600 million. Well, how did he get the \$600 million? He said Lake Winnipeg regulation, the two of them is 300, the Churchill River Diversion is 150 or something, it could have been 400 . . . 47 and therefore there's 400 and I could go on. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope I am not wrong in assessing this but the Conservative Party never ever suggested the figure of \$600 million, the Conservative Party was looking for a figure that was roughly tantamount to CFI and they said that Lake Winnipeg regulation, \$200 million, is a waste. Now, how did it get to 600? Well, it got to 600, Mr. Speaker, by the new maths and you know what the new maths is, Mr. Speaker, the new maths is that we didn't lose \$150 million on CFI, we lost 150 plus the cost of paying 150 over the 20 years which you borrow the money in which to pay it and therefore \$150 million is not \$150 million, it's \$400 million. And the new maths is, Mr. Speaker, that if you have a debt by the government that has to be paid and you take the length of that debt over a period of 20 years and figure out what is being paid, it is not a figure of \$200.00, it's a figure of \$480 million. That's the new maths as conceived by Mike Wart and Ted Stupidly; and that's the maths that is being used. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Campbell never used a figure of \$600 million. Well, Mr. Speaker, if he has used it, he's adopted the new maths and if something is new and it makes the figures worse than they are, why not adopt it? Mr. Speaker, if that is what is being done I suggest . . . because let's look at this figure of \$600 million. It is all based on two assumptions and the honourable member gave

them. One is that there is \$300 million in Lake Winnipeg that should not have been spent at all, that Lake Winnipeg regulation is unnecessary and if that's wrong, Mr. Speaker, then the whole \$600 million is wrong; because if Lake Winnipeg regulation and Jenpeg make some sense then that figure of \$250 million or 268 is taken off the \$600 million. It is also based on the fact that the Churchill River Diversion could have been built at \$47 million and there was never ever a tender picked up at \$47 million — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the project at that time they say was \$47 million — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, was the first tender the entire project? Was the first tender the entire project? You yourself have said it could have been done at 47.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that what the honourable member is now saying is that that program should have been proceeded with on the basis of the plans that were presented to this House in 1969. That is not now the position of anybody and that's why I say, Mr. Speaker, the position of the Conservative Party is that it should have been — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I gave my honourable member credit for having watched, been an astute observer, seen what positions were being taken, and the fact is that the Conservative position as we have heard it in the last two years, unless it has now changed, is that we should be at 754, that that is what was recommended. The honourable member is nodding his head, I'm glad he knows the position. That report was prepared by this government in February 1970. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the honourable member has now given us a distinction which his party sometimes has refused to allot to us. They say everything that we buy is ours and we put our mouths on it.

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

**MR. GREEN:** You know I am spending too much time on Hydro but luckily . . . therefore it is not going to save you at the end of my remarks, it will just extend my remarks. — (Interjection) — That's fine, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member would have done a better job of educating, if in 1969 he had done what we did in 1970. You see this report wasn't kept behind closed doors, not available to anybody to look at, and the fact is that the honourable member in 1969, and you know I agree with him, I hate to go back because that is ancient history, but the fact is that he was one of the staunchest supporters of the suggestion that nothing that went into the preparation of Hydro's final plans was available to the public and they refused to give us, Mr. Speaker, they refused to give us any of that information.

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, the hydro engineering studies, all the documentation that went into it was made public, and was available to the public. What wasn't made public was inter-departmental drafts.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. We shall proceed in an orderly fashion and I would like to suggest to the Honourable Member for Lakeside if he has a point to make if he will wait until he is recognized otherwise he is interrupting the proceedings. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, the fact is that all of those reports were made available when this party came into government and they were laid on the table for the first time. They were laid on the table, Mr. Speaker, for the first time and we had lengthy debates on it as to whether we could get this information upon which these studies were based so that we could intelligently vote on a bill to flood South Indian Lake at 69 feet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition, what we did is every report, the UnderwoodMcLellan report, the Crippin report, the Task Force report — not prepared in three weeks and that is a great misrepresentation. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, in three weeks — if the honourable member will listen for a change . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. GREEN:** I'll return the compliment. Let his ears be as good as his mouth, Mr. Speaker. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the Cass-Beggs report which was prepared soon after he came here, was merely to the effect that we needn't go ahead immediately, we have a right to study it. That was prepared in three weeks, then we had the Crippin report, then we had the UnderwoodMcClellan report, then we had a report from McTaggart Cowan, then we had the Hydro Task Force report, and it is on the basis of all those reports, all of which were subsequently made public and the subject of debate throughout this province in which the Leader of the Opposition participated, and he participated on the basis of open information, not on the basis of supposition and not on the basis of secrets which were kept by the Conservative administration when they were dealing with the hydro project.

Mr. Speaker, was interested to read — (Interjection) — The honourable member has to be able to take it a little better. — (Interjection) — That's right.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I wonder if the honourable members would give the member who has the floor the courtesy so that he can make his debate. I think it is only fair, and I am speaking to all the members of the House, it is only fair, otherwise no one will be able to debate in this House.

**MR. LYON:** On a point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Would the honourable member state his point of order?

**MR. LYON:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am quite happy to abide by your ruling; one would wish that you had applied the same ruling the other day when other speakers were speaking.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I am sorry that a reflection on the Chair is being cast. I thought the honourable member had a better sense of parliamentary procedures. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you — I know you are trying to be helpful but all you are doing is letting me calm down which I have no intention of doing.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member said the other day that he is going to vote for a Freedom of Information Bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is anything that should prove to the honourable Honourable Member for Fort Rouge that a Freedom of Information bill is going to facilitate the hiding of information, it's the fact that the Leader of the Opposition is going to vote for that bill, because the Leader of the Opposition . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. LYON:** On a point of personal privilege I hesitate to interrupt my honourable friend, I really do, but he has the tendency of extending one's remarks. I think the exact quotation was that we have some ideas on freedom of information that we would be letting the House know about. That's a long way from voting for a Liberal bill.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to hear that because regardless of the heat that's being generated at the moment, I have some profound respect for my honourable friend. I believe that my honourable friend would agree with me, I really believe that he would, that such a bill will facilitate the hiding of information; that this government has been required to stand up and face the public for anything that it doesn't produce, and that a bill such as represented by my honourable friend will permit me the luxury of saying, "Well, I consider that to be a sensitive subject and I am not going to release it and if you want it released you will then go to court." And they will go to court, it will cost that person — he won't go to his MLA — they will have to go to court and, Mr. Speaker, there is no guarantee that the judge will be more solicitous of, or less solicitous of protecting the government than the Minister. As a matter of fact — well I'm glad that my honourable friend agrees and I apologize for him — and I'm glad that there isn't that kind of support for what I consider to be, Mr. Speaker, a piece of cop-out legislation by which Ministers of the Crown will be able to cop out and I have no intentions of coping out. I say that the Member for Fort Rouge is either misguided, which is possible, or malicious, that's also possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we accept the fact that Lake Winnipeg Regulation is a valid program and I'm not asking my honourable friend to accept it, but if we accept the fact, that does away with 300 million of the 600 million. Mr. Speaker, that program was recommended by the Hydro Task Force and I say this now, advisedly, it was recommended by Robert Newbury, it was approved by Cass Booy, by Robert Newbury, Mr. Speaker, all of whom were great friends of Lake Winnipeg regulation, have never said otherwise, they signed a document indicating it, and what they were doing, Mr. Speaker, is that they were building up a process for dealing with Lake Winnipeg regulation which they had every approval of and recommended it, privately and publicly, in order to try to build up a process by which they could use the Water Commission to make Churchill River Diversion impossible. Those are the people who are being endorsed. Well, Mr. Speaker, they are being endorsed by a scoundrel, Dennison said, of the Winnipeg Free Press, as being opponents of Lake Winnipeg regulation.

The Member for St. George sat on the Water Commission and I tell you that they were the greatest friends of Lake Winnipeg regulation; that their problem was that they wanted to set up a procedure which would entitle them to act as the adjudicators on the Churchill River Diversion and his government, to its credit, did not permit that program to be put into the hands of the Water Commission nor should it be put into the hands of the Water Commission.

So that program was agreed to by all of those people and it is still agreed to, Mr. Speaker, by all of those people. You know \$600 million will disappear so quickly that it's almost difficult to talk it.

The other amount — let us assume that both projects were necessary, which I know the honourable members do not wish to swallow but which hydro engineers continue to say — and one was \$100 million project and one was a \$50 million project, and they say that costs have escalated on the \$50 million project to \$150 million — \$175 million, I'll accept that from my honourable friend. If you had the two projects — and that's why we lost money — but if we had two projects and one was more expensive than the other and the money was going to escalate, Mr. Speaker, we would have lost much more because the cost of Lake Winnipeg regulation would have escalated at multiplied figures as the cost of Churchill River diversion. There's your \$600 million, Mr. Speaker. It's based on one statement and, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says that these people here — that's a pretty strong condemnation but that's okay — that the Member for Seven Oaks, former Mayor of West Kildonan, that myself, that the Member for St. Johns, that the Premier of the Province, that we willingly suggested that in order to have a Hydro program that would more fit into some ethereal notions that we would be willing to waste \$600 million of the people of the Province of Manitoba's

money.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that that is hard enough to believe that one would have to see — one would have to see, Mr. Speaker — specific facts as to how this occurred and I suggest to you that in every meeting that we've had that the Hydro people have specifically denied that assertion and they've been there free to speak. I don't think Mr. Bateman owes anything to this Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, not only are we stained with that but look at what this horrendous conspiracy, look who it brings in as accomplices, Dean Hoogstraten of the University of Manitoba, former Head of the Engineering Branch. He is so in love with new democracy and the New Democratic Party that he would condone and approve wasting \$600 million of the people's money in order to protect the political position of the New Democratic Party.

Stuart Anderson, the former Deputy Minister of Finance under that government and under this government and a respected citizen in the Province of Manitoba, he engaged in a nefarious conspiracy to waste 600 — he went along — Mr. Speaker, he went along with the conspiracy knowing that this was — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Campbell resigned on the basis that he felt . . .

**A MEMBER:** And don't ever forget it.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, we won't forget it and I don't want to forget it. People resign from time to time but his resignation was based on the fact, Mr. Speaker, that in his opinion Lake Winnipeg regulation was unnecessary. That's all. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Campbell went further. It was interesting when he appeared before Committee. He said at one time, Mr. Speaker, that Lake Winnipeg regulation was not only unnecessary but no government would have the political courage to get it through around Lake Winnipeg. That's what he said. He said that it was a political problem, proceeding with Lake Winnipeg regulation, a political problem proceeding with Lake Winnipeg regulation, that's what he said, Mr. Speaker. That's what he said. — (Interjection) —

All right, let's go through these lists of conspirators, these friends of the New Democratic Party who were willing to spend \$600 million of the people's of this province's money to sustain me in power.

Stuart Anderson, Tom Storey, the Chief Engineer of the City of Winnipeg Hydro Department, all of these people — well, maybe the members on the other side will not pay the same respect to the Member for Radisson — but I pay respect to the Member for Radisson. I don't think the Member for Radisson would waste \$600 million. I don't think the Member for Souris-Killarney, the Leader of the Opposition or any other member on that side would do that type of thing. I don't think so. I think if they had knowledge that one way you saved \$600 million, the other way you spent it, that they wouldn't do it and if he wants to sustain that kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, it's a new thing in Manitoba politics, it's a new thing. But you know things don't stop at any particular position and we will have to combat this and I have no difficulty in it, no difficulty whatsoever, because it's all based, Mr. Speaker, on top-of-the-head supposition, and a desire to blacken the government at any cost such as is now being engaged in by a new process in politics. That a leading newspaper in Winnipeg would want Manitoba's credit rating to go down so that they could substantiate their charges of incompetence on the Government of the province, well that's a new thing in government, Mr. Speaker, it's not the latest thing. In some places they come and put a gun in your throat and put fourteen bullets into your head and they accuse you of committing suicide, democratically elected governments. So, this is not that bad. I mean we're still here. We're still alive and kicking and we're still able to deal with these allegations that are being made on the part of the Leader of the Opposition.

The honourable member says, you know he said "What a good boy am I." I laid a trap and the Minister of Mines fell into my trap. I said to him that mining activity or exploration activity is at a 50 percent figure," and I said the level is the same. He says, "See that's a trap, you're using public money." Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what kind of trap I was in. I willingly revealed that to the House and to the people of the Province of Manitoba, on numerous occasions I went one step further and all the members in the House know it. I said if the mining companies do not respond — and to me it is equal whether they do or they do not because I'm not unhappy with Manitoba being the only explorer the public of this province — but things being what they are and given a recognizable fact that to this date the best aggressive and most qualified people have been in the private sector, that it's good to have these partners, I don't mind that, and they have responded. He says they're spending 50 percent less money. Of course they're spending 50 percent less money. The other half is being put up by the Province of Manitoba, so the level of activity remains the same and this is what we have been saying all along, but the honourable member would lay attack that this is a trap. Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is a trap. It's a trap the other way because the honourable member says that I've taken my long, clammy hands and put it in the people's money to go into mining explorations. Now I haven't made a big point of this because it doesn't make sense to gloat over things and it might not even be anything to be particularly self-congratulatory about, but here are the figures. Here's the member talking about me putting my long, clammy hands into the people's pockets.

In 1965 the profit of the mining companies was \$32 million. The Royalties were \$1.7 million. That's the total rent that we received from the mining companies' location and all.

In 1968 it was \$37 million and we received \$2,000,000.

In 1973 it was \$137 million and we received \$16 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that somebody's got long, slimy hands and making a lot of money and really I do not begrudge it to the mining companies. I say that they have a perfect right to it. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, we have not proceeded on the proposition that we are going to be at the mercy of the mining companies and therefore we have adopted a program which involves collecting a larger tax and which necessarily involves — and the honourable member at least gives me the credit of understanding — he said if you're going to try to have a higher tax you cannot do so without being involved in the industry because if you say that you're going to tax and not do anything then you are completely dependent on the companies

to proceed and you will have to give them concessions in order for them to proceed which is what the honourable member says he is prepared to do. He's prepared to stand on that and I respect him for it. But the trap, Mr. Speaker, is the other way because in the years that the New Democratic Party has been in government we have raised the mining royalties first by 100 percent, from seven to roughly fifteen percent. We then went up to 23 percent and we are now at fifteen plus an incremental and we've never collected yet the incremental.

But, Mr. Speaker, the amount that we have spent on mining explorations has more than been paid for by the increased royalty that we have collected from the mining companies. So not one cent in that respect has been paid out of the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba for engaging in these mineral activities. So the honourable member is falling into a trap. He is saying that you could take that same \$6,000,000 that we are spending on mining and put it into — what did he say — housing and something else. The trap, Mr. Speaker, is that if you did not have a participatory program you couldn't collect the increased revenue and you people have told us that. You have all said that you can't collect this money from the mining companies, they'll leave. Well, we are collecting the money from the mining companies. We are using it for explorations and it's the honourable friends on the other side, Mr. Speaker, who have fallen into a trap.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that he would lay a trap, that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition indeed would lay a trap — you know I forgot one point that I wanted to remark to my friend, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, so exuberated was he by my honourable friend's speech yesterday that when we were talking about Jenpeg which happens to be an expensive site and only makes sense in conjunction with the controls, the Leader of the Opposition said the most expensive power station in the, and the Member for Lakeside said "the world, the world, the world." The Honourable Leader of the Opposition didn't bite. He didn't say "the world", he said the Province of Manitoba. He hasn't checked the facts. — (Interjection) — Well, maybe he should have.

Now here's the problem, Mr. Speaker. The Conservative Party would like to assume power in the Province of Manitoba. I respect that. They have some problems and I think that the Leader of the Opposition has shown more realism and good common sense than has most of the Tory Party and I can see him sitting down and talking to his Caucus and telling us what he has told the people of the Province of Manitoba. Look, forget the fight on Medicare premiums; forget things like Pharmacare and social services. The people have accepted them and you cannot turn the clock back, at least not until you are in power. Let us accept these things as having been accepted by the most of the people in the Province of Manitoba, and his discussions with the power brokers of the Conservative Party have been of the same vein. He has said, look you people — and I know how the honourable member would tell it to them — I want you to be realistic. The good old days are gone. You want to retain some power in this province. You're going to have to accept certain things. You're going to have to accept the good things which we will acknowledge that the New Democratic Party has done and we will go into power on a policy not of reversing Socialism, but constraining it because the honourable member and others on that side have in any case the belief that you cannot turn back the clock; and that we are continually fighting a retreating battle and that what we can do is get in and stop this encroachment of public funds for the good of the many so that individuals will have relatively more power — economic power — in society. I say, Mr. Speaker, that that is a remarkable realism and good sense on the part of the Leader of the Opposition, because if it is possible to turn back the clock, if it is possible to have fifty competing insurance companies rather than one public company, you have to be in power first. Therefore, let's get the power on a very interesting program, Mr. Speaker' one which costs us nothing and which can never be disproven.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has been very astute. He has picked an issue on which you can throw as much mud as you want without having to back it up — and has not backed it up, you that is Hydro — and you could use the figures of \$600 million' can use \$1,200 million if you want to because that makes as much sense as \$600 million, and you could use it without having to change a single thing once you are in power; because when you get the power there you are. The Member for Lakeside recognizes the beauty and the symmetry of it. That when you get to power the Churchill River Diversion is operational, Lake Winnipeg regulation is operational, we will use them for whatever benefit they have and we will continue to say that although they're there we could have saved you \$600 million if they were not there. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, he has chosen that as



the issue and told his fellow Tories and the forces behind the Conservative Party that you will listen to reason, you will become realistic or you will get nothing. If we are put back into power we can at least arrest further encroachments on the economic *status quo* and don't ask us because it doesn't make sense for us to promise you that we're going to turn back the clock.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that that is a realistic position. I think it's a sound position and I think the honourable member made a good speech. He made a good speech for the members of the Conservative Party. He made a good speech for the members of this party. He made a good speech, Mr. Speaker, because this party and this government has to come to realize that we cannot govern merely as an administrative unit; that it is very easy to sit in our clothes and sit in our chairs; and that if this party depends for its support from the people of the Province of Manitoba on merely being nice guys, then I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, we are not nice guys. We have to do something for the people of this province to stay in power. I think that that message from the Leader of the Opposition is a good message for the Conservative Party and it is a good message, Mr. Speaker, I repeat for this party.

Now what is, as we have heard it, the message of the Conservative Party of the Province of Manitoba under Mr. Lyon? Well, there were several hints of it, Mr. Speaker, during his speech and one direct statement. In taxation he has given the indication that we can't levy an Estate tax, it's a savage tax. You know, it taxes a person who has inherited \$250 million, something beyond \$250 million — (Interjection)— \$250,000, excuse me. Yes. That somebody who has inherited \$250,000 and is taxed some percentage of what is there beyond it — and usually this will be a person of relatively advanced years, although not necessarily I concede that — this is a savage, wicked tax.

You know in one-year of the Conservative Administration they taxed the public what was at that time roughly \$60 million in five percent sales tax. A similar tax today would be \$200 million in terms of what five percent brings in. This was a tax imposed on the public of our country in one year in one budget, what would be equivalent to us coming before the Legislature and imposing a \$200 million tax on the people of this province. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know I would really welcome my honourable friend's information. I know that if a person has a farm that's worth \$500,000 and they are imposed a tax of, let us say, \$100,000, that my honourable friend who is a lawyer, would know better ways of being able to deal with that question than to sell the farm. Nobody would have to sell a farm under those circumstances. Mr. Speaker, if they are doing it, they are doing it out of choice, not out of necessity, because nobody has to sell a farm that is worth a half-a-million dollars in order to raise \$100,000 in succession duties! They've got it in the equity in the farm! And if we are talking about a farm on which there is \$250,000 in debts and it is worth \$350,000, there are no taxes payable. My honourable friend knows that. —(Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will check it with the Minister of Finance. —(Interjection)—

Then I ask my honourable friend the next time he gets up: you show me, from a husband to a wife, if the total value of the estate is \$350,000, the mortgage against it is \$250,000, the equity of the estate is \$100,000, what succession duties will be paid by that husband to that wife? The Minister of Finance is saying none. I say none. You show me to be wrong. —(Interjections)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I want to share something with my honourable friends, what the Chaer of Commerce said. This is a very, very astute financial organization. They say that the government should get out of the Manitoba Development Corporation. They say they shouldn't lend any money to anybody. They say, these financial whizzes from the Chamber of Commerce, that what the government should do is that when somebody comes in to borrow money from the bank and is only able to get \$80,000 because their security won't give them more and they need \$100,000, listen to what they said, the government should give them the additional \$20,000, not give it to them, but guarantee the bank's loan so that any risk involved will be by the public, and if anything is earned and the loan is good, the bank will earn interest on \$100,000. Now, you expect me to listen to the Chamber of Commerce? I say: you listen to the Chaer of Commerce.

The Honourable Member said in his talk, Mr. Speaker, at one particular time during his talk, that he would not tax profits. You can't tax profits because that discourages investment. And I think that is a little below the belt. I imagine he is prepared to have some profit taxes, but his inclination is that the profits could be used for investment, investment will create jobs, jobs will produce money, and everybody will be happy, that that is the most glorious of all worlds.

He says that he will not tax the mining companies. OK, Mr. Speaker, he corrects me and it is right, that he would not put a tax on the mining company which destroys the incentive to mining and that our taxes which have had the effect that I have shown, 15 percent on income up to 18 percent on investment and 35 percent . . . will destroy initiative in mining. I suggest that it hasn't. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, the exploration is proceeding. The Honourable Meer is going to draw out of me (which again, I told you I don't like to do) all of the major companies who are now involved with the Province of Manitoba in mining exploration. They consider us to be a very good partner. And we are

proceeding on that basis, Mr. Speaker.

Let's talk about the trap again. The Honourable Meer for St. James said: how can the mining companies enter into an agreement with the government of the Province of Manitoba (oh, here he is, my friend) on the basis that they are only in power for four years? How can they plan any program on the basis of four years? Mr. Speaker, I laid a trap and the Honourable Member fell into the trap. I will tell you why, because they say as follows: the government is a good partner, their money is good, we will proceed along with them as long as we can. If the Conservatives come, they are not going to hurt us. They are just going to give us the money. So we have nothing to lose. You see, the Honourable Member fell into a trap. They have nothing to fear from the Conservative Party. They could enter into an agreement with us on the basis of a normal agreement, 50/50 partners, and it won't change under the Tories. And you know, I really believe it won't change. I believe the Tories will say this makes sense, they've got half our money, they should give us half our program. But if it is not that way, all the mining companies expect from you is not that you will undo it. They will just say: instead of lending you the money, we will just give it to you and you can have it. You have nothing to fear from the Tories coming into power. So we have no problem dealing with the existing mining companies. I tell you, I repeat, I'm not putting that force as a big plus because never should this government or the people of this province say that we depend and are at the mercy of the mining companies of this province for any exploration or development of our mining resources. That is the trap, Mr. Speaker, that is the trap.

The Honourable Member says (and this is important; it is important that we find out what is happening) that government investment cannot replace private investment. Maybe that is the rule, Mr. Speaker, but we know another rule taught to us by the Tory administration and other administrations in this country, that government investment can finance private investment. You see, through some euphemism or gymnastic of the English language, \$92 million loaned by the Manitoba government to a private person on a project which is going to cost \$92 million is private investment. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is publically financed social assistance to people who must live under the fictional notion that they are engaged in rugged individualism which is totally state-supported. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a trap because there is a logical path to my honourable friend's remarks.

The Honourable Member will start out saying that we have to have a climate conducive to private investment because we need them. We need them. And then he will say the climate is not good enough and we still need them, so we have to give them some incentive or exemption from what the normal citizen would pay because we can't do without them. So it will go from a good climate to the giving of exemptions and incentives. And that won't satisfy them because if they are in that bargaining position they will say the incentives are not enough. Mr. Speaker, it will move from a good climate to incentives and exemptions to direct payment to come and do something in the Province of Manitoba.

Am I exaggerating? Mr. Speaker, that has been the logical path which governments have had to follow when they have depended on private investments for the good, healthy economic climate of their provinces. The Liberal government in Ottawa (and we are often made fun of by the Member for Fort Rouge and the Member for Portage la Prairie for bad loans) in one year gave \$96 million to private industries throughout this country without any suggestion that interest or principal had to be repaid.

Why did they do it? Do you know what the Minister said? The Minister of Finance, Mr. MacDonald, was quoted by Mr. Lesage the Minister of Dreams, as saying, "Well, we don't like to loan it because it clutters up the books; it clutters up the books if we show it as a receivable." Therefore, the federal government doesn't lose any money. It is easy not to lose any money; you just give it away. If we operated that way under the Manitoba Development Corporation, there wouldn't be a penny of losses in the development corporation. Ninety-six million dollars in one year. And it has continued year-by-year.

Mr. Speaker, that is the trap that my honourable friend would lay and he says he would lay a trap. He will lay a trap. The trap is the exact opposite of what the Meer for Rock Lake always talks about. The trap is dependence. The Leader of the Opposition said that we are engaged in mining exploration and we haven't got the knowledge of a mole. The government hasn't got the knowledge of a mole to explore mining. Mr. Speaker, the Tory administration would put us into a situation of dependence and we wouldn't have the bargaining position of a mouse. I say that if I am asked if I am a man or a mouse, I prefer to be a man, not a mouse. The trap that the honourable friend is leading us to is a mousetrap, because that is what we will be in. He gave a better example of it than anything that I have ever heard when he referred to the Member for St. Boniface. The Member for St. Boniface and I have arguments from time to time. The Member for St. Boniface was dealing with the doctors and he said, much to the delighted applause of his backbenchers, "The citizens of Manitoba need their doctors. We can't afford to lose the doctors; we can afford to lose the Minister." Hear, hear.

Now the Honourable Member for Minnedosa has fallen into the trap. The Honourable Meer for Minnedosa wants to be a Minister in the new administration. Now I want you to deal with the mentality

of the Tory administration. When the Member for Minnedosa, who as the Minister of Health is dealing with the doctors, and he says that public policy demands the following, and the doctors say, "We will determine what public policy will demand," the Leader of the Opposition will say, "We can do without the Minister of Health; we cannot do without our doctors." And that is so much for the Member for Minnedosa.

When the Member for Lakeside is the Minister of Mines and the mining companies say, "This shall be public policy," and the Member for Lakeside says, "Oh, I can't do that, the public of Manitoba will not accept it," the Leader of the Opposition will say, "We cannot afford to lose the mining companies; we can do without the Minister of Mines." And so much, Mr. Speaker, for the Member for Lakeside.

When the Minister of Industry says that we are dependent upon industry and I am having a dispute with the Chamber of Commerce, the Leader of the Opposition will say, "We can do without the Minister of Industry; we cannot do without the Chamber of Commerce." —(Interjections)— That's the trap. —(Interjections)— That's the trap, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please.

**MR. GREEN:** I say, Mr. Speaker . . . —(Interjection)— Even beyond my wildest imagination, I didn't know that you could fall into that many traps, but you can; you have proved me wrong again.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that what we are talking about is what people have always talked about. They've talked about freedom. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this party and this government and the people of Manitoba will not go into a state of dependence where they can be told by the doctors, "We can do without your Minister of Health; we cannot do without the doctors." I say that all groups within our society, including the labour unions whom my friend the Leader of the Opposition would have no difficulty dealing with. . . he wouldn't say, "We can do without the trade unions." He would say, "Get an injunction and put them back to work or put them in jail." Those are the changes, Mr. Speaker, that he gives us for the Labour Relations Act.

What we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, is whether the people of the Province of Manitoba will opt for independence and an attempt to be to some greater extent the masters of their own destiny. That is all that we are trying to do to some greater extent . . . or whether they will say we are a helpless, subjected people dependent on our economics and good health and livelihood, on the doctors, the mining companies, and the industrialists of our province, the Chamber of Commerce. I choose to fight for independence. We won't necessarily win everything; neither will we lose everything or give away everything.

There is a story that I can tell the Members of this House because it is long ago past, it will not deal with names. The Members of this cabinet were sitting very shortly after being elected. The New Democratic Party government was sitting in cabinet. We had imposed a tax. We said that we would tax people on the basis of ability to pay to pay for Medicare. This would raise the income tax of some corporations and individuals. We received a call from a major institution in Manitoba which said, "If you do this, we will move our institution to another province." We had to discuss this seriously for several weeks. One day, the call came while we were in cabinet. They said, "We want an answer. Are we to move or are you to change your taxes?" I remember saying, Mr. Speaker and the other Members, that what is being decided now is not the tax breaks in the Province of Manitoba. There are two meetings taking place, one in a board room elsewhere, and one in this House. What is being determined now is whether the government will reside in that board room or in this board room. I don't know what they are going to do, but I choose to govern in accordance with the democratic process in this board room. If I am going to stop because the people will say they no longer want self-government, I am not going to abdicate the democratic process of self-government.

Mr. Speaker, during the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, we had an echoing of the jack boots which echo back to the famous speech by the Member for Fort Garry many months ago. They keep raising the spectre of jack boots because there is a so-called socialist government in this province. When has any democratic society moved from socialism to jack boot or totalitarian socialism? We know that the reverse is true. We know that where the jack boots were heard in Germany, it was because of state-imposed capitalism, better known as fascism. We know that where the jack boots were heard in Italy, it was because state-imposed capitalism threw out by violence a democratically-elected socialist government. We know that where the jack boots were heard in Spain, it was because state-imposed capitalism overthrew, with the help of the Nazis and the fascists in Italy, a democratically-elected, popular front socialist government. We know that where the jack boots are heard in Chile, it is because state-imposed capitalism assassinated and removed by violence a duly-elected socialist administration. Those who speak of jack boots know whereof they speak, Mr. Speaker, know whereof they speak. I don't accuse the Tory members for whom I generally have some friendship. —(Interjection)— of that kind, yes. In Cuba, there was no democratically-elected socialist government; there was a fascist dictatorship that was overthrown by another totalitarian regime. —(Interjection)— Well, do you want me to name the names — I'll name the names. Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, the government of Chili and if you want to know the name of the

Fascist dictator of Cuba, it was Baptista. Those were the names.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that they were state-imposed capitalists — (Interjection)— Well, you know, even my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition realizes that the word is not important. Are you saying that Hitler was engaged in a socialist government with . . .

**A MEMBER:** What did he call his party?

**MR. GREEN:** Well, he called it the Nationalist Socialist Movement and he exterminated all the socialists. That's what he did! — (Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the German government was a state-imposed capitalist government and that's where the jack-boots were heard.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, the Franco Regime, throughout — (Interjection)— A Fascist party, that's what he called it. Fascist. The people that were thrown in jail and murdered and executed were socialists. That's right.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we sometimes get carried away even myself. I am not suggesting that the democratically oriented Conservative Party of the province of Manitoba in any way would impose a particular regime on the province of Manitoba. I don't like it being said the other way. I don't like the suggestion of jack-boots. What the Leader of the Opposition has in store for us with the mouse-trap that he has laid for us. He hasn't imposed jack-boots. When the people of this province are subjugated, if they were, under a Tory administration, the Leadership would not be wearing jack-boots, Mr. Speaker. They would be wearing top hats, silk scarves and kid gloves but it wouldn't make any difference whatsoever.

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, it's always somewhat difficult to follow a speaker that has obviously captured the imagination and the ears of most members of this Chamber and then attempt to carry on in a speech where one has, of course, one particular contribution to make with respect to the Throne Speech not necessarily allied with the comments just made in the Chamber. But, nonetheless, always prepared to at least rebut to some extent as quickly as one can to the comments that were made by the House Leader just present, let me, not to completely lose the jist of his comments, say this. And it is with sadness that I say this and I say this because it is characteristic of this government. It is understandable that they do not share the same meaning for the words inter-dependence of the community of people that we do. When the words like the Chamber of Commerce is mentioned in this Chamber, there is derision, howls of laughter, from that side. When labour organizations are mentioned in this House, nobody laughs on this side. When the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources puts the question "What do we want, doctors or ministers?" he is quite prepared to make the black and white choice: "To hell with the doctors."

**MR. GREEN:** I never said that.

**MR. ENNS:** When he makes the decision — well, he just finished doing that, Mr. Speaker, and we all heard him. When the question is asked, "Do we want the mining companies to carry on in our milieu of economic mix — economic activity as the First Minister would say — he is quite prepared to throw out the mining companies. So, Mr. Speaker, I just throw that immediate reaction to the Honourable House Leader's speech at you and at the members because I reject that completely as a concept of the inter-dependence of people within the greater community of Manitoba as one that we in this Party endorse. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is precisely that kind of an attitude displayed in the Chamber this afternoon by one of its most able spokesmen of that Party that has created the uneasiness in the minds of the people of Manitoba. That has created the — and fear is not too strong a word to use, under these circumstances — that has obviously as the honourable members opposite including the Minister, buoyed up the hopes within the official opposition party to the extent that subconsciously, they are beginning to refer to us as the next Tory administration. And I know that that is going to happen, I know that that is going to take place within — (Interjection)— Oh, if you want to check the record, I possibly did not say that four years ago. But I am saying that today.

Well, Mr. Speaker, forgive me the oversight — I of course congratulate you, Sir, on once again assuming the stewardship of this Chamber. You know, Sir, as you have always known, that I at least, if not others' am always prepared to accept your admonitions in this Chamber; will always bow to your stewardship in this Chamber and certainly go that extra mile, you might say, in co-operating in this Chamber to making your job — your difficult job — somewhat easier. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the honourable members, the mover and seconder of this speech, the Honourable Member from Logan, the Honourable Member from Emerson, and I have to also express a certain degree of nostalgia when I recognize that I will be seeing some members on both sides for perhaps the last time as far as this Session is concerned. With some, it is a question of voluntary retirement but undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, for a goodly number of the honourable members opposite, it will be an involuntary retirement come about I would say, June 28th at about 8:30 or 9:30 in the evening. I won't mention the names, Mr. Speaker, I will be charitable in that instance. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you though that I'll be back, as the ad says. . I intend to come back and I will deal with that a little later, more fully, to indicate to you that it isn't just immodest talk on my part.

I have to also indicate to you, Mr. Speaker and the honourable members of the House, that to my chagrin and regret there will be a certain something missing from my contributions in this Chamber during the course of this Session. Some of the zing won't be in my speeches and that comes about because I have, of course, with me that document that has on so many occasions provided me with so much material, the New Democratic Party book, from the convention just recently held on January 28, 29, their

book of resolutions. Mr. Speaker, you can see by the tattered and torn version of this book, that I have perused it from cover to cover and I am aghast, I find nothing about resolutions dealing with flood damages or the repair to roads or perhaps that there should be more help given to certain aspects of the agricultural industry. Mr. Speaker, I am bereft of some of my most favourite sources of research material in terms of helping me in my speeches. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, having watched some of the television coverage of that convention and seeing the leader, the First Minister, address his party as leader of that party, I suppose we might say the only discernible difference between that meeting and a Tory meeting was there were no discernible knife wounds in the back of the Leader of the New Democratic Party. Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to proceed with some of the remarks that I have wanted to make.

I welcome as do all the members on this side, the entry into this House of our Leader, the Member from Souris-Killarney. I have no doubt that the higher level that the House adrenalin is flowing in this is apparent to all members opposite and certainly his keynote address in replying to the Speech from the Throne has set a pattern, set a level of debate that will be difficult for many of us to follow, but we will rise to the occasion as best we can. More important, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that a lot of the fuzziness that has sometimes existed in attempting to more clearly identify them and us I suspect will come more sharply into focus. For that reason, I say the coming election whenever it's fought, will be a more honest one, and I use that term in its most broad meaning, in the sense that the people of Manitoba will have, will be able to come to the decision that they will be requested to make on that day, easier and more than understandably perhaps sometimes in the past.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier just a few moments ago in my remarks that I was pretty confident about my returning to this House because I have, of course, been made aware of a new definition of the word "neutrality" and that comes about by the Minister, shenanigans of the recent the recent beef vote that has been imposed upon by the Minister of Agriculture in this province. Mr. Speaker, I accept, you know one has to adapt, the Minister of Mines and Resources has gone to some length to describe the adaptability of the Conservative Party in his remarks just a few moments ago, but I want to indicate to you how quickly I am prepared to adapt myself to the new procedures that call out and that describe a neutral vote. Now, I have no doubt at all, Mr. Speaker, supported as this new definition of neutrality is by the First Minister, that he would have no objection for me making my private arrangements with our Chief Returning Officer, the Clerk of the House who has the responsibility of running elections in this province, that whenever that election

call comes, I will insist that the ballots in the constituency of Lakeside be handed out thus, Mr. Speaker, within my have. And brochure that I expect the ballots will be neatly tucked in there as is the ballot now to the beef producers tucked in between the two or three pages of neutral information supplied by the Minister of Agriculture.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you it is a very neutral brochure that I have, you won't see it from there, you will note that I have a very sombre expression on my face. I'm not attempting to lure the smile voter with any Jimmy Carter-like vote catching. The comments, the brief letter, the brief note that I have on the front of the brochure merely indicates to my constituents of Lakeside that I promise to do my very best as their member in the next House and certainly a lot better than the crooks that there may be running against me. It's a very neutral type of document that I know I will have no difficulty in having the Chief Electoral Officer hand out to the electors in my constituency. It happens to be that I have an over-run of these brochures, anyway, so I will be delivering them to his office in due course in time for inclusion in the coming election.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, one more thing, also in keeping with the new rules of neutrality. Only the 600 registered Conservative voters, party members in the constituency of Lakeside, will get the ballots mailed to them. All the Liberals and New Democrats, they will have to either come to the Chief Electoral Office here in Winnipeg or to somebody you appoint in Lakeside a Deputy Returning Officer to pick up their ballots and then go to a Commissioner of Oaths and have them notarized before they can cast their ballots, Mr. Speaker. Under these new terms of neutrality, I honestly believe that I stand a fighting chance of being returned to this Chamber whenever the next election comes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can make jest and light humour of this situation, regrettably, to the beef producers of this province it is far from a joke and they see no humour in this situation at all. There isn't a fair-minded person in this Chamber who would, but for a moment, conceive of running an election in the manner which I have just described; yet that is precisely what the beef producers of this province are being asked. And we wonder why the confusion? we wonder why the hostility, we wonder why the resentment. I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that I passed a note previously to

the Minister of Agriculture that I would be dealing with this subject matter 'briefly. But, undoubtedly, he is proclaiming his neutrality somewhere at the 77 Meetings that the Department of Agriculture has sponsored throughout the width and breadth of this province to promote the neutrality of the First Minister, the neutrality of this government, and the neutrality of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, it's that kind of concept of power, that kind of concept of abuse of that power, that is worrying Manitobans. Furthermore, the Minister of Agriculture in this Chamber and the Minister of Mines and Resources sat, as did all other members of that Party sit, and utter not a word when the Minister of Agriculture was allowed to carry on with his feelings about elections. He didn't like elections. The reason why he didn't like elections is sometimes the wrong people get elected. That was said in this Chamber. Hansard has recorded it. And obviously that concept of elections is acceptable to every member sitting opposite.

Not only that, the Minister of Agriculture, when faced with some of these people that he doesn't like getting elected, sees it quite within the realm of his responsibility to write a two-page letter, a vindictive letter, calling for the resignation of that elected person because he happened to step out of line with government policy. I refer, of course, to one of the elected directors of the Hog Producers Board of several years ago.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted that the Minister of Agriculture has cut his Meeting short and is back with us. It is amazing, Mr. Speaker, it is amazing and it is sad that in a year that the farm community probably faces a very difficult year in which every unifying effort possible should be extended and made possible by the Department of Agriculture, by the Minister of Agriculture, this particular Minister chooses to carry on the kind of fight, the kind of confrontations with primary producers in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will address myself to some of the other members of his own caucus. Does it not cross your mind from time to time that the very generous monies that have been poured into and taken from that slice of revenue that you have to deal with, has been expended by the Minister of Agriculture. And, in this particular case, on the particular people we are now talking about — the beef producers in this province.

Now, why is it that this Minister keeps on having his hands bitten by the very people that he is feeding? Surely there are other areas where you could even as political people and we wouldn't even charge you with that, use that money and receive some greater reward. In the area of housing perhaps. I'm sure the member, The Minister of Co-operatives would like to see additional money put in that direction. The Minister of Highways can always use an extra million or two for building highways. But it must surely be sinking home to some members, and hopefully the First Minister, that for all the activity and for all the dollars that his Minister of Agriculture has sunk into the agriculture sector, he has been greeted with outright hostility, in most instances. And I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the rural representation, as top heavy as it now already is, will only increase, will only increase after the next election. There are no inroads to be made by this Minister despite the fact that his budget has tripled in The Department of Agriculture and it is money that is spent in rural Manitoba generally.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you and the Honourable Minister that I would like to give him an opportunity, perhaps sometime in the Throne Speech to refute a rumour that has come to my attention that disturbs me, not in a personal sense, but it disturbs me because the Minister has a particular habit of always being able to dodge when the you-know-what hits the fan and is always able to find a scapegoat for his difficulties. Now, my understanding is that the word has gone out that the Deputy Minister of Agriculture's job is on the line should this beef vote fail. I'm not suggesting that whether that happens or not, how that will be greeted by the general farm population. That's another matter.

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

**MR. USKIW:** I would be very pleased to accommodate my honourable friend when the time arises.

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

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm merely reporting, as I think it's my responsibility, the suggestion that has come to me from different quarters that that is the case. Mr. Speaker, the question surely has to be asked — What is the problem with this Minister with his Department of Agriculture and the beef growers? Mr. Speaker, there has been a series of confrontations with this Minister and the primary producers in this province, whether it was the hog producers a few years ago or the milk producers six or seven months ago. Mr. Speaker, do you recall that debate when with a measure of success we were able to stop this Minister from moving forward with a \$10 million additional dairy facility in Selkirk, when in the last six months existing dairy facilities in badly needed areas of employment like Winkler and other areas have had to close their doors for lack of product. And when the consumers can remember seeing in their daily papers dairy farmers pouring milk down the sewer because of a muddle in the management program that fell between two stools between Ottawa and Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, these are the kind of machinations that are taking place in the Department of Agriculture that make the current people who are being asked to vote on something that they don't know they're buying, nervous and what makes them band into groups. Should it be necessary in this province to band into freedom groups? Mr. Speaker, it has never happened before that a group of primary producers have had to vote on a plan where no plan existed. The normal procedure is for the Manitoba Marketing Board together with producer organizations to develop a plan and then that plan is vented, is taught, is amended, is changed, for months, perhaps years — as was the case with the Broiler Plan — and then it's put to the people, the producers involved: Do you want this plan or don't you want this plan? But that's not the situation here. There is no beef plan. The Manitoba Marketing Board hasn't sat down and developed any beef plan. What this Minister is simply doing is distorting in the most cruel way a genuine situation of distress that the beef producers find themselves in as a result of three years of bad prices, hoping that at the time, or at the moment, when the producers are in severe economic depression, understandably frustrated, that they will reach out for the first carrot that is dangled in front of them.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they well may. I have not attended any Meetings in the country on either side of the issue. The Minister gets very nervous when I and the member for Morris attend these kind of producer meetings. After all, he charged us a few years ago of foisting all the problems of the hog industry on us. And, while I'm flattered with that opinion that he has of the influence that the member for Morris and myself may have I assure the Honourable Minister we were there as observers and as observers only. But to prevent that kind of charge from taking place again, by and large, the members of this group have not been involved politically or actively with any of the meetings that are presently taking place across the province on this question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's look at the other side of the ledger. Having announced the vote and having met with almost instant hostility towards it from all organizations, from every reputable, from every organized cattle breed association across the province, he realized he was in difficulty so that called for (a) postponement of the vote and then (b) there had to be a popular front resurrected somewhere or other. The socialists know all about erecting popular fronts. So they talked to Mr. Rudi Usick to resign from the Manitoba Marketing Board and instantly within the same day in the Minister's office, a new cattle organization is born — a new Manitoba Independent Cattle Organization is born. A resignation from the Manitoba Marketing Board, a meeting in the Minister's office and a new cattle organization is born, overnight.

**A MEMBER:** Sheer coincidence.

**MR. ENNS:** All right. Now that's all sheer coincidence of course, has nothing to do with the breaking of the pledge of neutrality. —(Interjection)— All right, I don't think artificial insemination had anything to do with the birth of that organization my honourable friend, the Member from Now again, Mr. Morris. It was nonetheless a quickie. Speaker, we can see some of the humorous aspects of this situation but I will assure you, Mr. Speaker, it is not humorous to the beef producers of this province. It is not humorous, Mr. Speaker, to any beef producer in this province who received a phone call yesterday afternoon by this same Mr. Rudi Usick demanding that his personal books be made available to him and half a dozen other people of this organization. Mr. Klassen, the main person, a Sanford feedlot operator, knew that it was possibly politically astute not to deny access to them although he had every right to do so. The same Mr. Usick and company spent the following five or six hours perusing Mr. Klassen's farm record books to satisfy themselves about what I don't quite know.

**A MEMBER:** They haven't even got the authority yet.

**MR. ENNS:** But, Mr. Speaker, the question surely has to be asked. This is admittedly as of this morning a private

citizen, I say only as of this morning because although we were a little confused, yesterday he was not a member of the board, yesterday another person had been appointed in his place on the board; today, no person has been appointed in his place on the board and today we find out that the Order-In-Council has just been passed this morning revoking the appointment of Mr. Usick to the Manitoba Marketing Board. Now, Mr. Speaker, those kinds of activities that . . .

**A MEMBER:** Scare the devil out of you.

**MR. ENNS:** Simply scare the beef producers and simply have them in concern about what possibly could happen to their industry in the hands of people that this Minister obviously feels it is entrusted into. Mr. Speaker, I can understand the Minister's difficulty. He answered too quickly and too glibly yesterday about the refilling of this position because having served his job as the chairman and spokesman for this instant cattle organization to head the popular front fight on behalf of the Minister, because that way the Minister can maintain his neutrality, I mean he has only used his office, he has only used the public funds to run the newspaper advertisements, he's only used the . . .

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

**MR. USKIW (Lac du Bonnet):** Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege, the Member for Lakeside has accused the government of funding a private organization in the beef referendum and I want him to

either lay that information on the table or to withdraw it.

**MR. ENNS:** If the Minister is prepared to tell me that within the last two or three weeks, Mr. Usick did not meet in his office together with a group of other cattlemen and that the Independent Manitoba Cattlemen's organization was not born in his office, then I will withdraw that statement.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I am not about to enter the debate at this point in time but the Member for Lakeside alleges that the Department of Agriculture is financing a private organization and I want him to either file the information or withdraw it.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to let Hansard be final arbitrator in this and will make the proper withdrawals tomorrow. I am suggesting that the campaign that the popular front is running is being funded by and aided and supported by government funds through (a) the letter of explanation that accompanies every ballot. Now you don't send two page letters out to 14,000 beef producers without it costing money.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. ENNS:** You don't put ads in the paper . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister will state his point of privilege.

**MR. USKIW:** On a matter of privilege, the Member for Lakeside alleges that government funds are being used to finance a private organization and to fortify his allegation, he refers to a document mailed out before that organization was formed.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to re-define my personal definition of "funding" if in fact that document could in any way be construed as being a neutral one and I am referring specifically to the letter that the Minister is sending out with every ballot. I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that if in fact this popular front wasn't so conveniently and so immediately born within the confines of the Minister's office and I know that is stretching the imagination perhaps to some extent. I know what the Minister is tempting me to say and I will withdraw that aspect and I don't believe — I believe even the Minister is clever enough not to outrightly fund this organization that is to say pay for halls, to pay for travelling expenses, to pay for other additional expenses that the popular front is incurring in their effort to support the Minister's point of view. So as to that extent, you have withdrawal, Mr. Minister, but Mr. Minister, this is precisely again the kind of distrust that the beef producers are concerned about when they see things like this going on. The Manitoba Independent Cattle Producers Association or whatever they call themselves, didn't exist two weeks ago. Mr. Usick was very happy being a member of the Manitoba Marketing Board that is supposed to be kind of an arbiter and a neutral kind of a person and a qualified person to sit on that board, to help producers draw up plans, to help producers who are interested in orderly marketing concepts to define and organize themselves into commodity groups — that's what Mr. Usick was happily engaged in up until the time that it became evident to this Minister that perhaps this vote was going awry.

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

**MR. USKIW:** Yes. Did the Member for Lakeside read the document that was issued to the media by Mr. Usick as to the reasons why he wanted to resign from the Board and why he was involved in the new organization?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I suspect I could find it. I haven't had occasion to read that document but I suspect I could find a copy of it in the Minister's office and I could read it there. —(Interjection)— I suspect it would be in the Minister's files. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are other members in our side and in our group that have already — the Member from Rock Lake, the Member from Gladstone and others that will deal and have dealt and will deal further with the question that is concerning the beef producers at this time. I only raise it, Mr. Speaker, to hopefully, even at this late date, if I can't move the Minister of Agriculture but there are some members opposite who have some concept of what is a fair ballot and what is not a fair ballot.

**A MEMBER:** What's fair play.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, to make the suggestion that a producer's vote has been carried out in this manner in this province, at any time before, is nonsense. Usually, even in the eligibility clauses of who can vote, in the case of broilers it was decided that anybody who raised 300 chickens or less didn't particularly make a great deal of difference in the overall management, supply management, involved in the broiler business, therefore would not be affected by the Board, therefore was not eligible for a vote, therefore didn't vote. In the case of vegetables and the Minister is quite familiar with that scene, it was decided for instance that people that grew a certain minimum amount of acreage, whether it was three or four acres of potatoes, were not major factors in the production problems involved in vegetables, therefore, were not going to be in a major way touched by the Board, so therefore didn't have the ballot, weren't required, didn't have to vote. But that's not the case with beef, Mr. Speaker. There are many farmers that are raising 500 or 400 head of cattle that are ineligible to vote in this vote, where the person that sells one two-week old dairy calf on a part-time basis, that's a Department Manager for Hudson's Bay or Eaton's, is eligible to vote. Mr. Speaker, that is what is disturbing the farmers at this particular time.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, let's leave the agricultural matters aside for the moment and



come back to some of the comments made by the Honourable the House Leader, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I try to from time to time keep up to, even when the Session is not in actual Session, to keep track of what the Minister has to say or the House Leader has to say and I must say that I don't keep a scrapbook on him but I will try to refresh my memory as to something that I believe he did say at a meeting not so long ago somewhere in Northern Manitoba and the slightest nod of his head will indicate to me at least whether I am reasonably close to being truthful. — (Interjection)— Yes, I think it was in a meeting in of his Flin Flon that he was addressing party's association up there. He suggested and I think that one can take as a good portion of the gist of his remarks this afternoon, a carrying on from that remark that he made. He suggested, I believe, to his associates in Flin Flon that a rallying call, a slogan if you like, that the New Democratic Party may well wish to use in the coming election when he faces the hordes of capitalists as represented by the Conservatives, that the public can do it — that the public can do it. Well now, Mr. Speaker, I must agree that while I may have on occasion have questioned that. In fact, Mr. Speaker, on the very document that I referred to earlier I want to indicate that we make mistakes too. You see on this first document that was my own I had in the back indicated after listing some of the business failures, that the government can't run business, why don't the NDP learn? But, Sir, I realize that that was wrong. So the other documents I took that off. You know I said, is that the way you want your tax dollars spent? Because, Mr. Speaker, of course the public can do it. Of course the public can do certain things and of course the public should do certain things.

Mr. Speaker, it's a question of deciding and defining where the public sector is best involved. It's a question of deciding when the public sector should refrain and restrain from interfering; and it's a question on some other occasions of perhaps a happy mix between the two.

Mr. Speaker, if that is to be the call, if that is to be the issue on which an election is to be fought we welcome it on this side, we welcome it on this side.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the House Leader, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, he confuses social welfare programs, social assistance programs with Socialism and that really is an old high school debate. That really is an old high school debate. Mr. Speaker, for my Leader and for us as a party now to acknowledge what is a very logical progression of programs that in many instances were initiated by a previous Conservative administration, and to find it not difficult to see that as a logical progression and to so indicate to all of the members Opposite and to the people of Manitoba, presents no difficulty to us. It presents absolutely no difficulty to us. Mr. Speaker, what is somewhat galling is that the Socialists of this world have somehow acquired a monopoly on compassion, on humaneness and a concern for our fellow man.

Mr. Speaker, they have a penchant for creating monopolies in many directions. But I want to assure the honourable members Opposite that they have no monopoly in the question of human compassion and consideration for our fellow man.

Mr. Speaker, if that is the issue on which we will meet the people and if they want to make that an issue on which we want to meet the people then, Sir, the confidence that we already feel on this side will only grow unabated to the point that we know that we will be successful.

Let me deal briefly, Mr. Speaker, on the question of Hydro that occupied a considerable amount of the Honourable Minister's time in replying to the speech earlier by the Leader of the Opposition.

I will say it quietly, Mr. Speaker, because it's been said so often before, the question of openness of reports and what was secret and what wasn't secret. As the Minister at that time directly and very directly involved let me for the record because simply saying something once or twice or many times doesn't make it so, it doesn't make it true. All of the publicly paid for Hydro engineering documents, Underwood and McLennan reports, the transition reports necessary for depopulation or the dislocation of peoples, all of these reports were available to the public; they were invited at the Public Utilities hearings at that time by the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro for anybody to come and peruse with him. The newspapers did, the news media did and carried lengthy stories and reports on them. The only documents that were being withheld from this Chamber that were not being made public were those dealing with inter-departmental reports largely of the environmental nature within the Department of Mines and Natural Resources which were in draft form.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Would the honourable member not agree that transition for the North was requested to be tabled in the House and before Committee and that I asked the gentleman, Mr. Bowman, to read it and he was denied the right to read it and the report was not tabled.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside has one minute.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I know that the reports were not made as readily and in large numbers as were made available by the incoming government of 1969 and 1970. These were voluminous reports, but the record will show, Mr. Speaker, that both Mr. Kristjanson at that time and others at Public Hearings and in front of the Public Utilities Committee indicated — and the same statement was made in this House — that these reports, these studies were available for perusal by any member, were available for perusal by the media at the Hydro offices, those that were located there. Those that

**Wednesday, February 23, 1977**

were not being made public — and Mr. Speaker, nothing has changed because this Minister supports and this government supports the same concept — that where inter-departmental documents of a draft nature, memos, memoranda, that is not a matter of public domain. These are documents that are required in arriving at policy decisions and documents that by the previous administration and by this administration to this date still are not in the public domain.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member's time is up.

I am prepared to recognize the Honourable Minister of Public Works, but I think I'm also prepared to call it 5:30. Is it agreed?

The hour being 5:30 the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.