

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

10:00 o'clock, Friday, May 22, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. CLERK: The Petition of H. Tregobov and Others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate Manitoba Dental Services Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point, I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have in my gallery 22 Grade 12 students of the Starkweather School of the State of North Dakota. These students are under the direction of Mr. Kukla. On behalf of the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here this morning.

We also have 100 Grade 9 students of the General Wolfe School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Herb Lothar, Mr. Jack Carroll and Mr. Rafnklesson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs. On behalf of the members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here this morning.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface which I am holding. I have considered the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface to the motion moved by the Honourable Member for Logan on May 19, 1970, that the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be received. I have also taken under advisement comments of the honourable members offered on a point of order relevant to this matter.

It has been suggested that our Rule 74 prohibits such an amendment. The rule reads as follows: "A report from a Standing or Special Committee shall not be amended by the House but it may be referred back to the Committee." In this instance the report had been presented to the House as indicated by the Votes and Proceedings of the aforementioned date; then followed a motion to receive the report. A motion to receive is one directing that a report of a committee be taken under consideration with no implication of assent or dissent. The intent of the proposed amendment is to amend the motion to receive, and not the report. Therefore, our Rule 74 is not a bar to such an amendment. On the question of recommitting from a Standing Committee to a Special or Select Committee, may I refer honourable members to May's Parliamentary Practice 17th edition, Page 569, which reads in part as follows: "In 1928 and again in 1930 a motion was made to recommit a bill which had been reported from a Standing Committee to a Select Committee." More recently, April 6, 1965, we had a similar motion in our House, and I would refer honourable members to Manitoba Journals 1965, Page 218. Therefore I rule the proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in order.

Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the motion as amended, and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, could I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand? (Agreed)

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Does the honourable member mind if I say a few words at this time?

MR. FROESE: No. Go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to the Report of this committee, and in particular I want to refer to the hearings which were held, the representation which the legislative members on this committee heard from the Manitoba Hydro, and particularly in reference to the northern power development portion of it. And again, more specifically, I want to refer

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) . . . . to the questions which I posed to the Legislature some time ago on a matter of grievance and which subsequently were forwarded to Hydro and the answers were distributed by the chairman of Hydro at the last meeting at which Hydro appeared before this committee.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, and I just want to clarify that my understanding is from the Clerk, that the committee reported only with regard to the Telephone System and not with regard to the Hydro System now. I appreciate that my honourable friend can probably, if he wishes to, make his remarks relative to the record, but is he desiring to do that or does he wish to wait until the Hydro report is made, because my understanding is that the committee is reporting merely with regard to the Telephone System?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk in general terms rather than specifics on this. I want to talk about the responsibility of a Crown corporation to the Legislature in general terms, rather than talk specifically about the intricacies of diversions, power development, etc., in northern Manitoba. This is my intent at this time. I am prompted to speak because of the background I've given, the questions which were posed and the answers that were received, and I want to express, basically, disappointment in the fact that members of the Legislature, if we read into the types of answers we get, that members of the Legislature basically, if this practice continues, are not going to be in a position to ask any penetrating questions, technical questions, but are going to be left at the mercy of a Crown corporation to pretty well give back to members of the Legislature what they feel should be given to them.

The answers to the questions which I received, without going into detail on them, were very casual and they were very shallow. I requested that the information be given in laymen's language. However, I fear that this is not what has happened. Certainly the answers I received are in laymen's language but they are so shallow that there is basically very little information in them. I have asked for a comparison of the latter reports, that have been done at great expense, to the initial reports that were done, and basically the information has been given back that this cannot be done.

Mr. Speaker, if the members of the Legislature cannot ask for this information and have their questions and requests taken seriously, then I must say that my feeling is that the Legislature is very little more than a mockery in terms of its real role in the democratic process. Are we as legislators to sit here as rubber stamps? And I'm not speaking this way because I happen to be on this side of the House. I feel strongly that the same thing is applying to the government side in that they are to receive information from a very extensive staff, with expertise that cannot . . .

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question?

MR. CRAIK: Certainly.

MR. DESJARDINS: I wonder if the honourable member can indicate what questions he's talking about. I don't know if these questions were asked of Mr. Cass-Beggs or of Mr. Mills and I think that it should be clearly indicated. This report, as stated, is only the report of the Telephone, not the other one.

MR. CRAIK: I think it's quite clear, Mr. Speaker, the questions I'm referring to are the ones that were submitted with respect to Hydro development, but I'm talking in general terms. This could just as easily happen with Telephones if there was an issue that was extremely important to the interests of Manitoba that happened to be current, or it could be automobile insurance if we get a Crown corporation, or it could be any other Crown corporation that is set up. The basic point I am trying to make is that it is extremely awkward for a member of the Legislature to, in fact, get meaningful information back unless you go through a long and protracted, I suppose, exchange of information, exchange of questions and answers, and the member of the Legislature is left completely at the mercy, completely at the mercy of the people who are answering the questions - and, of course, under our system, time runs out; you don't have an answer; you end up in emotional arguments that are essentially meaningless compared to what you are really trying to get at, and I can refer specifically to the questions that I asked that have not been answered, Mr. Speaker - I have indicated that I would not do this.

The point I am trying to make is that if the answers that we got from Manitoba Hydro with respect to the particular question which one member of the Legislature saw fit to ask are to be

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) . . . . the standard that we are going to get from Crown corporations, then I say again that the legislative process is little more -- it's a meaningless operation to go through, and that members of the Legislature are basically wasting their time in trying to be serious and ask penetrating questions of a Crown corporation because we are not getting the answers, and I'm indicating this, that unless we do get more specific answers, then there is very little purpose in us attempting to proceed with what we call a legislative process because it does not exist.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, it's a little early in the morning for me to arise in outrage in order to respond to what has been said by the Honourable Member for Riel, although deep down in me I do feel a sense of outrage at the presumption of the Member for Riel who got up in this House and demanded that ten questions - I think there were ten - be answered, and listed the questions; and as I recall it, either casually, privately or possibly in the House, I said that I would forward these questions on to Hydro; but whether I said it publicly or not, I did do so. And when this member appeared at the committee, he demanded written replies to his questions to become part of the record and to be attached to and form part of the general statement which the chairman of Hydro was making, and to me that is presumptuous because I don't think that he has rights any greater than any other member of the Committee of which he is part, and those rights, as I understand them and have always understood them, are to participate at a meeting of the Public Utilities or of any other committee in which a member wishes to participate whether he is a member of the committee or not, to ask questions at the right time, to repeat the questions, to ask for elaboration, to ask for a fuller or deeper response than the one which he gets on the first occasion. But this member presumed before the meeting to decide which questions he would ask, which is his right, and then to decide that these questions had to be answered and ready and available to him in the extent to which he feels it should have been done, and form part of the report of the manager of Hydro, or the chairman.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, that request was never made by me.

MR. CHERNIACK: As I recall it, it was either the Member for River Heights or the Member for Lakeside, but it was somebody who sat beside him and who felt that we shouldn't even go on until these answers were available.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): . . . . to inform the Honourable Minister I did not sit beside him; I sat on the opposite side.

MR. CHERNIACK: That may be true, that the physical relationship was in opposition, but I can assure you that was the only matter that was in opposition between the two members; certainly they would want to support each other and did, and I'm not critical of the fact that they supported each other, and why the Honourable Member for Riel had to make sure that I wasn't alluding to his having done something that his colleague did, I'm not quite clear, but nevertheless between them they managed to try to insist -- as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it was a remarkable thing to start a meeting and spend 40 minutes debating on whether or not we should proceed, which ended with the Honourable Member for Lakeside walking out in high dignity, saying, "Well, if this thing is going to be reported to us in writing, I might just as well walk out and read it at my leisure," and I hope he did. But the fact is that the attitude of the honourable members I've already referred to would indicate exactly what has happened this morning, and that is an attack before the honourable member had the opportunity, which he knows he is going to have, of exploring with Hydro the answers to the questions which he posed. Had he waited until he had that opportunity and then felt that he had not been answered adequately, then I could understand his justification in standing up here and complaining about something, but the honourable member received every courtesy, and I think beyond that which any member has, and that is to have, in writing, questions submitted, to have those questions distributed to every member of the committee (he could have done it but I did it for him, or Hydro did it for him at my request), to have answers in writing, which I have never seen done before in my short term in the Legislature, but my short term is still longer than that of the Member for Riel. . . .

MR. CRAIK: Did you read them?

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes I read them. They were interesting. And then the answers were distributed, and it is clear to me as it must be clear to the Honourable Member for Riel, who is not an obtuse person, that the next time when we meet with Public Utilities we will then have

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . before us several things. We will have the report that the chairman of Hydro has distributed, rather lengthy, rather impressive. Mr. Speaker, there is no mention made by the Honourable Member for Riel that the explanations in the remarks of the Chairman of Hydro were amongst the clearest - for me they were the clearest I have ever heard - of the whole problem of the development of power in the north and the problems involved with water diversion and water use, and I think that members of the Conservative Party and all other members of the committee privately expressed admiration for the presentation that was made, and for the member now to get up and not comment about that which he had a right to do and which I would have thought would have been at least recognition of something that he might have done, he stood up today and he called the answers shallow and he called our system of legislative process a mockery, and, Mr. Speaker, it's completely unjustified, completely justified, because all we've done so far is to hear the chairman's general review of the problems facing Hydro in quite specific terms; we've had a distribution of a recapitulation of all that was said; we've had his questions distributed to all members; we've had the answers distributed to all members, and that's as far as we got. And all members of the committee who were present, and that of course excludes the Member for Lakeside because he chose to be absent for part of it so he may not know, but all other members of the committee who were present know full well that the Public Utilities Committee is still in being, will still meet, and on that occasion we will all have the right, not only the member for Riel, but we will all have the right to go more deeply into the questions asked by the Member for Riel and others, and more deeply into the answers which were given, and for him now to attack it I think is -- well, I said that it was too early in the morning. It's still too early in the morning for me to be as outraged as I feel deep down -- (Interjection) -- No. No. And I don't want to take up the time of the House any further.

We will have further meetings of Public Utilities. Based on the record of the last couple of meetings, we will spend some time discussing procedures, and having overcome that problem we will then proceed in the usual way, and, Mr. Speaker, there has been no change between the manner in which this committee was handled this session from any previous session that I am aware of, except that there has been improvement in it probably because of the choice of chairman and personnel from all parties, and I think that the honourable member should have contained himself this morning unless he just felt that he wanted to make some sort of attack which gave him a feeling of satisfaction of having completed a week's work. Other than that, Mr. Chairman, what he has had to say so far is complete and utter nonsense, mainly because he has not had the opportunity yet, which he knows he will have, of going further into the questions and the answers, and I for one will still be interested in hearing what the Honourable Member for Riel has to say about the answers to the questions asked in order to get further information, because I think the questions he asked were germane in the main, and interesting, but to presume in advance that this is not going to work out, that this is going to be a mockery, is both lack of knowledge on his part of how these committees operate - and why he shouldn't have the knowledge I don't know, but it's not for me to worry about his educational process - and that having had that opportunity, if he still has complaints, let him make them when he has something about which to talk rather in the generalities that he's had up to now.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, might I ask a question of the Minister? Isn't he making his remarks in light of the fact that he has read the answers to the specific questions that were asked?

MR. CHERNIACK: I make my remarks in the light of the fact that I sat through all of the minutes of the meetings that went on and on the basis of having read the material submitted and knowing full well that the opportunity will yet come to us of going more fully into the entire problem.

MR. CRAIK: I take it from that answer then, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Minister has said he did read the answers and he's in agreement with them.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I said I was in agreement with the procedure to date, and I'm going to continue to be interested in the further development of the questions and answers on the whole problem.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister said exactly nothing.

MR. CHERNIACK: I didn't hear that question. Would the member give me . . .

MR. CRAIK: I said: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister answered exactly nothing.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the only reason that the Honourable Member for Riel

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . . had a right to stand up was to ask me a question, and I gave him that right. If he wants to abuse his privileges, that is his privilege.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the Honourable Minister of Finance that it's never too early in the morning for me to be outraged, and it's never too early in the morning for me to express it, and it's obviously never too early in the morning for that group over there to display the monumental arrogance that has descended upon their shoulders since they assumed office. Mr. Speaker, if ever, if ever you had a display of utter nonsense with respect to a very legitimate position taken by members on this side of the House in order to get some penetrating, some questions that we can attack the problem of Hydro development intelligently, rather than the hysteria which we faced when we were running the committee, we were attempting to do it and the Honourable Member for Riel was attempting to lay out the ground work that we would not be fishing in ten different directions, as they were when they were in opposition, but rather to get some intelligent questions asked well in advance, haveing experts of Hydro be given an opportunity to answer them, have those answers back in our hands so that we could in fact make the hearings meaningful. And what do we get, Mr. Speaker, the reaction from them? First of all, it's a presumption on our part to ask questions. This from this group, this from this group that we had to supply not only the chairman of the board, we had to supply the consulting engineers, we had to have charts, we had to have films, we had to have the recording devices before any committee meeting started.

The Honourable Minister makes a point of why I walked out of that particular Public Utilities meeting. For one reason, because it had been completely established that on the issue of northern development we were having subscribed hearings - subscribed hearings. Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking and I'll be happy to have the honourable member . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of order please, Mr. Speaker. I realize that you allowed the two former speakers to speak, but this I submit is completely out of order. -- (Interjections) --

A MEMBER: That's not a point of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: The report - on a point of order, if I may, if I may - yes, it's a point of order. This is a report of the meeting dealing with the Telephones only and two bills. This other report. -- (Interjection) -- You are no longer the speaker; would you mind if I finish on my point of order? Would you mind, former Speaker?

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Be reasonable.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. present Speaker . . .

A MEMBER: Is he closing the debate?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ENNS: What's your point of order?

MR. DESJARDINS: My point of order is, this is a report of the meeting that we had where we studied the Telephone Report and not the Hydro Report - this is yet to come; and I hope we're not going to repeat the same thing all over again .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I await your ruling, but in the absence of it I assume that I'm in order as I knew I was, and if the Honourable Member for St. Boniface thinks that he now too is going to control . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the rules clearly state that when the Speaker stands then the person speaking shall sit.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, the speaker was on his feet, Sir, when the Member for St. Boniface was up. -- (Interjections) -- Well, why didn't you raise the point of order then? -- (Interjections) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside may continue . . .

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . with his remarks, as long as his remarks refer to the motion before us.

MR. ENNS: Well, I want to deal, come right back to the committee, because I want to assure the chairman of the committee that no reports from that committee are going to . . . through this House because he gets up and says so.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, if we're going to talk on a point of order, I didn't say anything about my honourable friend, and I'm entitled to speak on a point of order.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, . . . I now have the floor, if he wants to express an opinion, . . . has a point of order.

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)

Mr. Speaker, let me get back for a minute. There's no need for me to elaborate at any great length of the point that I'm trying to make. All the members in the House were aware of the kind of demands that were placed on the government of the day when we were last in office with respect to this particular issue, with respect to this particular committee. No. 1 - nothing proceeded. We couldn't even get past the selection of the chairman of the committee without recording devices being on the table, without recording devices being placed on the table. Now very gratuitously they agreed at the first meeting not to have these hearings recorded but that indeed the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro would provide written subscriptions of his submission that day. Well, Mr. Speaker, under those circumstances, knowing that none of the questions that I had to ask of the Chairman or that any other member of the committee had to ask questions, knowing that none of the replies to questions being asked would in any way be recorded for the sake of continuity of the record on this particular issue, then, Mr. Chairman, there was no particular reason for my presence at that committee in the sense that anything that was going to be said at that committee was going to be provided to me in written form as it has been, and which I found, I must admit, most interesting, most enlightening, and certainly a well-prepared position on the part of Manitoba Hydro, a good clarification of the position that Manitoba Hydro finds itself with in Northern Manitoba.

But, Mr. Chairman, we're still hoping to get at the nuts and bolts of northern hydro power development at that committee. What I take extreme objection to is the arrogance of the Minister of Finance, an arrogance by the way, Mr. Speaker, that he displays remarkably well from time to time. He has the necessary facilities to do that. He reminds us, he reminds us -- and I suppose it's certainly within his domain to do so, that he -- and he is, after all, one of the senior members of this House, and that when he speaks to members opposite, particularly someone like myself or perhaps the Member from Riel, that we have to agree that he has years of experience in this House, lots of position, so I suppose the kind of syrupy arrogance that comes from him from time to time is natural and comes quite easily to him. But, Mr. Speaker, on this particular situation, to suggest that it's presumption on our part to ask questions. . .

A MEMBER: Who said so?

MR. ENNS: He said so. He said so -- to presume, to take that kind of a position, based on their performance, based on the performance, not only of them, but of the total Opposition on this particular issue, has to be, Mr. Speaker, a display of arrogance that hasn't been equalled in this House for many a year.

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside said at the outset of his remarks that it was not difficult for him to be outraged even early in the morning. It would seem that that is certainly true, it would seem that that is certainly true and it's also obvious, Mr. Speaker, that he is also capable of being preposterous early in the morning, because if I have heard, if I've heard a series of preposterous allegations and statements, I've just heard them now from the honourable member. He begins by saying that this administration displays arrogance. As one who sat on the Opposition for 12 years, I have some feeling, some sense as to how it becomes possible for government to become arrogant, for a group to become arrogant when they're in power, and if there's one thing that would be entirely alien to the intention of this administration, it is to display the kind of arrogance that was evidenced from time to time in the previous Conservative administration. I think that every member on this side makes, and has been asked to make a conscious effort not to follow the pattern established by the previous administration -- (Interjection) -- Well, if we have, perhaps we should go through a process of introspection. But Mr. Speaker, this charge about being arrogant, I really fail to understand in what particular way we have displayed that attitude or characteristic.

The point before us that's been raised by the Honourable Member for Riel, several weeks ago he submitted a series of 12 or 14 questions - isn't that right? Ten questions. The questions were accepted here, referred to the Manitoba Hydro, and they were answered in writing. If the honourable member thinks that the answers are inadequate, too brief, evasive in some particular or another, he will have full opportunity to pursue them in the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources, Surely he knows that. Every member opposite knows that. The committee will be meeting.

What other point has been raised in the debate this morning? The suggestion that we

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . . were being arrogant and inconsiderate of rights of the Assembly and members of the Opposition by not agreeing to a transcription, to the transcribing of the proceedings of the committee. I understand that the first meeting of that particular committee, that there was some disagreement as to whether or not the proceedings should be transcribed, but in any case subsequent meetings have been transcribed, and the first meeting even, Mr. Speaker, there was a commitment given that the testimony of the Chairman of Hydro would be put in writing, and I believe that's been done, so in what particular way have we in the government failed to respond to the request or the questions that have been filed with us by the Member for Riel?

MR. ENNS: Would the First Minister permit a question?

MR. SCHREYER: Of course.

MR. ENNS: The question is asked in an effort to be helpful more than anything else. Would he not consider that when his colleague the Minister of Finance says that it took 40 minutes to decide to provide that subscription, then we are being, you know, and have that hurled at us for delaying the business of the committee, then, Mr. First Minister, it's that kind of thing that I was referring to.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but the fact remains that the request for transcription of the proceedings has been agreed to. There was a technical problem -- Mr. Speaker, there was a technical problem with respect to the transcription of the first meeting only, and it was felt that it was not desirable to postpone the holding of the first meeting so that the arrangements could be made for transcription, but an undertaking was given that all subsequent meetings would be transcribed, and I believe they have been to date -- (Interjection) -- Well, that was the request, yes, relative to Utilities, that they would be transcribed, and an undertaking was given that the testimony that was being given by the Chairman of Hydro even at the first meeting would be available in writing, and that was done.

Mr. Speaker, I say in all sincerity, I really don't understand what the objection of the Member for Riel could possibly be. I do know this, that for most of the years when I sat in Opposition, there was no sincere, genuine effort by the government of that day to transcribe the proceedings of the committee, and I remember the request being made. I don't think we're in basic disagreement now because I'm sure the day will come very soon when all committee proceedings will be transcribed and recorded. It's a long-standing practice in other jurisdictions; it should be the practice here; we are moving toward it, Mr. Speaker, much more quickly than our predecessors did.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I enter the debate because I was . . .

A MEMBER: Better ask the Member for St. Boniface . . .

MR. SPIVAK: I think I have the permission of the Member for St. Boniface -- because I was, I think, the member who introduced the point at the committee hearings that the committee hearings should in fact be transcribed. I did so because I was aware of the fact that the previous Public Utility hearings had in fact been transcribed with respect to South Indian Lake in connection with the last -- (Interjection) -- Well, let me say this to the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: What about 1960 and '61 and '62? For ten years.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, if we are going to argue the issue of whether in fact the committee hearings should be transcribed, and we were guilty of not having all committee hearings transcribed, then I think possibly the First Minister and some of the members on the other side missed the point of the objections that have been raised. The issue of Southern Indian Lake and the Nelson River project is one of the most significant and important issues facing Manitoba today. The question of whether Manitoba will be able to provide reasonable-priced power for their own consumption and to be able to attract industry and power intensive industries to Manitoba and to be the catalyst for our economic development, without doubt reigns as one of the real problems that must be solved by the government and solved very quickly.

The issue of Southern Indian Lake, no one will deny, became one of the very important political issues in the last election, and while there may be a tendency in some to ignore the historical perspective in which this issue must be viewed, the ability of the people of Manitoba to be able to understand in a meaningful way the details and the timetable and the information so that in fact a judgment could be made now, but not later, as to the right course of action,

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . is without question one of the most significant things that we in this House will have to deal with. And the issue is not whether we did or did not transcribe it or whether we allowed the committee to have transcriptions for the last series of hearings or not, the issue is whether the government is serious in allowing the people of the province to have the matter on record so that in fact a judgment can be given.

Now, I must say that I agree with the Honourable Minister of Finance that we were treated to an exceptional performance on the part of the Chairman of Hydro when he presented his summary. We have not had it completed; we still have a searching examination that I think members on this side intend to go through with him, which I hope will -- which will be transcribed. -- (Interjection) -- No, which will be transcribed. But I hope as well, and I say this because I think the time now is to say this, that the other members of Hydro, not just the Chairman, but the General Manager and the former Chairman, the individuals who were the technical people who were responsible for advising the government on the high level diversion, will be given an equal opportunity to either say that they support the position -- (Interjection) -- Oh no, naturally not. They will be given an opportunity to be able to support the representations that have been made by the Chairman, and we are going to be given that full opportunity for a proper examination to be able to determine whether in fact there is agreement as to the course of action that Hydro is undertaking, and that there is an agreement as well that the information and the judgment and the accuracy of the judgment that is being presented to us -- (Interjection) -- I will after I've completed. Well I will after I've completed. -- that the judgment and accuracy, we will have and the people of Manitoba will have, an opportunity to make that judgment.

I would say this to the Honourable First Minister: that if the other representatives of Hydro, who in fact were the ones responsible for advising the former Chairman and the former technical people - and I don't have to name them; I can name them in the committee and I intend to - if they are going to be in a position to stand up in front of that committee and say, "We agree with the conclusions that have been made by the Chairman and we find no dispute with it; we have in fact changed our mind," then we on this side will have to accept this as a proper judgment. But until that happens, until that happens, we ourselves are going to have to look with a great deal of suspicion and with a great deal of concern to the statements that have been made notwithstanding the fact of how brilliant or how accomplished they may have been presented by the Chairman of the Board.

Now we on this side do not exist or function by the grace of a government. We have an obligation to fulfill. As I've indicated to you, the issue of Southern Indian Lake, the issue of the Nelson River project, is too important an issue to be ignored and to be left to hearsay. One of the problems that we may not have understood when we were a member of the government was the fact of the difficulty of being able to have on the record the statements that are made by experts and by witnesses so as to be in a position, not to recall them from memory, but to be in a position to accurately quote them when necessary. And I can think of the best example because we do not have it on record, although I had asked and hoped that it would have been recorded, was when we had the committee hearing in connection with the fish marketing legislation, because there was a statement made by the then Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, who is now the Minister of Industry and Commerce, who said that we would not accept an amendment that was proposed by myself in connection with compensation which said that the courts were the ones to determine whether a redundancy had occurred and then the procedure would be that there would be a . . .

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's a point of order. I'm making reference to this for a specific reason.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Well, the Speaker will decide whether it is or not . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that if a member rises to state a point of order surely he's entitled to the courtesy to have the opportunity to state his point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise merely to ask you, Sir, whether the most recent references being made by the Member for River Heights are not irrelevant to the subject matter under discussion, and I believe there is a rule about relevancy.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I suggest that it is relevant because my point, if I'm allowed to make it, will simply indicate that there were statements made by



(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . . the Minister at that time in the hearings that unfortunately were not recorded, and had they been recorded they would have been of immense value in the debate that now takes place in connection with the nationalization of the auto insurance industry. And I think it is important, because my point is that in fact we and the government, in their own interest, require information to at least be recorded with respect to the hearing. The statement that was made at the hearing by the Minister of Industry and Commerce was that they did not want to agree to the amendment because they were afraid of setting a precedent for the nationalization of the auto insurance industry and for the compensation. Now that was a statement that was made at the time but there is no record on that, and that statement becomes extremely significant . . .

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): On a point of privilege. I didn't make such a statement.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Minister of Industry and Commerce that he did, and the point that I've made . . .

SOME MEMBERS: Order. Order. Order.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I must insist on rising on a point of order at this time. The honourable member should know by now that when a member rises in his place and says that he did or did not make a particular statement which one alleges that he did, it has to be accepted. One must take the honourable member's word for it.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe the honourable member would agree with the Honourable the First Minister that that is a practice of this House and it's a practice of every Legislative Assembly that that be so, if an honourable member claims, rises in his place and claims that he did not make a certain statement, then that ought to be accepted. May I at this time revert to, or refer to a previous point of order which has been raised a moment ago. I had been listening to the honourable member most intently and I have grave doubts whether speculation on something which may or may not occur in the future in the course of conduct of committee proceedings is in fact relevant to the motion before us.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, there is no better example of the point that was made than the issue that's just developed between us. There's a disagreement as to the fact, and had there been a recording there would have been no disagreement of the fact. All I'm suggesting to you, Sir, all I'm suggesting to you, Sir, is that in fact the necessity for recording is not something that should be ignored. Now the First Minister indicates that we're considering it. Well -- we're considering it; eventually this will happen. We spent 40 minutes at the hearing determining whether there in fact would be a recording device and whether we would proceed with or without the recording device. There's no doubt that there was a desire, because Mr. Cass-Beggs was present at that time and Hydro officials were present, that there was a desire on the part of the government to proceed, but I'm suggesting that there should have been some consideration in advance and some anticipation of this specific request, because with respect to the Public Utility hearings of the previous session, there in fact had been recording, a transcription device. And obviously, as a matter almost of necessity because of the technical detail that was involved, it was important that there in fact be some kind of record that references could be made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been a charge basically levelled against the Honourable Member for Riel for his position at this point, that in effect his ability to be able, and our ability to be able to deal with this matter, to a certain extent is being strangled, to a certain extent is being strangled by the procedures that are being followed and the manner in which the answers have been given so far in connection with the requests made. So far. The suggestion of the Honourable Minister of Finance is that the committee will meet again and we'll have the opportunity at that time to try and in a significant way obtain additional information, but of course that ignores the reality of the way in which our committees work.

First, we really don't know how many committee meetings we're going to have. We may have several more. We really don't know when they're going to be held; that's another situation. The purpose of submitting written questions which the Honourable Minister of Finance seems to think so unusual, or the purpose of submitting written questions because we are dealing with a technical subject, was to be able to get some technical answers, and to be in a position based on the questions for Hydro to do the things, or for the Chairman of Hydro to do the things that were necessary so that in fact when we did meet we would have all the information. And I'd

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . like to refer to the answer to one question, question number 4 -- (Interjection) -- Yes, and I just want to refer to the answer given by the Chairman to point up the difficulty that we on this side find in trying to deal specifically with the issue.

The question was asked, asking for a comparison of the present proposals in connection with low level or middle level diversion with the former high level diversion, and the first sentence of the answer of the Chairman is: "A direct meaningful comparison with the former high level diversion is not possible with the data we have." Now that's an answer. So we are going to be in a position, when we sit in the committee, to then say to the Chairman, "Why?" He'll give us the detail, but actually we're not specifically interested in the reasons why it's not possible; we want to have that comparison, and that comparison is possible if there is an effort put forward. And the problem is: is there a responsibility in this situation? In this issue, is there a real responsibility on the part of Hydro to not answer a question in a one or two sentence answer, but really to deal with it properly and to present detailed information so that the record will be clear?

Now the Minister of Finance indicates we can ask this in the committee, but when we ask at the committee, and even if we do get a request, what will happen is that there will have to be another committee meeting, and how many committee meetings are we going to have? Well I'm not sure that anyone knows. I'm not sure that anyone knows when this session is going to end, but historically -- and we have to go back on precedent -- if in fact this session is going to end in a short period of time, what will happen is that we'll have a series of quick committee meetings and the matter will be over. And this is the practice -- (Interjection) -- No, let me explain something. We only had the one experience from the Minister, the House Leader, we've only had one experience in judging the previous government. We know that in the case of the Standing Committee on Economic Development we had a meeting to decide what we'll do, then we had another meeting to make a report of what we decided to do, and that was all. And that was our committee's report. So I don't think that their practice or their performance is really anything that they can be too proud of.

I must say this, Mr. Speaker. I've had an opportunity of reading the hearings of the Public Utilities of last year, and I don't think that anyone could suggest that in any way we either stifled or controlled or prevented a searching scrutiny of the Nelson River project on the part of the Opposition, and I'm suggesting now that the manner in which the questions were answered would suggest that we on this side are not going to be given the proper opportunity for the review of this matter. And again, on that basis, because we believe we have a complaint, the Honourable Member from Riel was perfectly justified in making his position clear. Because if in fact we do not have meaningful information delivered to us, and if in fact we do not have questions that are answered in a direct manner, and if we in fact do not have the full opportunity to hear the complete presentation of the Chairman of the Hydro Board and all the other officials who have been involved in the project -- and the Honourable House Leader is shaking his head as if it's not going to happen and I wonder if it will happen -- but if we do not have that opportunity, then I say our ability and the ability of the people of Manitoba to judge now, the Nelson River project issue will be affected. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that in terms of history there will be a judgment made and that judgment that will be made will not be to the credit of the present government.

MR. SCHREYER: Well we're confident it will be.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I know that you're confident, but I'm suggesting that all the evidence indicates that it will not be, because you have actually played with the destiny of this province and you've played with the destiny of the province, and your actions so far, without question, are going to affect the ability of Manitoba to develop to its economic potential, because there's no doubt that the ability to be able to provide reasonable-priced power as a catalyst for industrial and commercial development was recognized. What has happened as a result of the course of action, based on the information we have so far notwithstanding the very fine performance of the Chairman, would indicate that the additional costs of the delay, the problems that Hydro have in its financial position right today, the failure to in fact introduce a rate structure to be able to take care of its debt and interest charges now so that they wouldn't consume their own capital, that if you in fact do this, that what takes place . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order. Order please. I wasn't aware that this report dealt with Manitoba Hydro. Would the honourable member please limit his remarks to the motion before the House.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I've made my point. I don't think it's necessary for me to repeat it.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We haven't got Votes and Proceedings where the actual motion of the Report is stated, but if I recall correctly, Hydro was mentioned in the Report, was it not? I stand to be corrected but I think I'm positive that it is.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker the Clerk can read the motion. My "no" was in response to his shake of the head to the House, so he can read the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: I simply suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Minister of Finance brought up the question of the procedural matters, of the delay of 40 minutes, really as a red herring in this issue and was not prepared really to deal with the statements that the honourable member made. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? . . . -- (Interjection) -- no, no I have a suspicion that although the Minister of Finance said that he had difficulty containing himself, that he in fact probably gave the best performance today as far as an act is concerned.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest this to -- the chairman of the Public Utilities is absent but then to the First Minister -- I would hope that we would have no difficulty in insuring that we will have recording devices for the full matters to be discussed by the Public Utilities Committee; and at this point I would hope as well that there will be no question of recording devices for the issue of Bill 56, the Automobile Insurance Act when it is brought up before the Committee. I would hope that this be a decision now so that we'd have full recording so that we will not have to have the 40 or 50 minutes delay on whether we will or not; because Bill 56, Bill 56 is an issue of great significance to Manitoba, an issue in which we should without question, all issues are of great significance, but I have now the assurance of the First Minister that we are going to have recording devices in the Public Utilities Committee for the full discussion in hearings on Bill 56, on the Auto Insurance Bill. I assume that we have that assurance right at this point.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with this matter firstly because the suggestion that has been made by members opposite -- and I regret that the First Minister wasn't here last year so that he would have understood the full preposterousness of the suggestion that there was any attempt not to have recording devices at these hearings respecting Public Utilities -- but Mr. Speaker, just let me -- Mr. Speaker, the question was raised for the first time, when we sat down at the Public Utilities Committee meeting and at that time there wasn't one objection to the inclusion of recording devices. As a matter of fact, the Committee agreed immediately that we would be willing to transcribe the proceedings, and I think that when they talk about the 40 minute argument as to whether we would or would not have it, that that is an outright distortion of what occurred; the 40 minute argument did not take place at all on whether we would or would not have recording devices. -- (Interjection) --

MR. CHERNIACK: If I may on a point of order. I am having difficulty hearing the Honourable Minister who has the floor because of some member or other, who is not standing across the road who is yelling at the top of his voice. Is there not some way we could control him?

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair is experiencing equal difficulty.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that it's in the interest of the honourable member to prevent people from being heard, because he doesn't want the truth to come out and it's to be expected that that kind of thing would occur. But the fact is that he knows full well that the 40 minute argument did not take place. I see the honourable member is leaving again. I commented yesterday that God gave him two ears and one mouth so that he could listen twice as much as he talks but he never took my advice yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and he never . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: A matter related to physiology is not . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, it's not an appraisal of physiology. The House Leader makes reference to the fact of leaving again. I think if he will look in Hansard as of last night, on the Committee hearings, he will have an indication at the time that I made my remarks that I was going to be leaving early, that I in fact, wanted the opportunity of completing my remarks because I had to leave the Chamber. So I think that it was an acknowledgment by me that I would be leaving and therefore on that basis I think that the comments of the Minister here are rather unwarranted.

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker, I find that my honourable friend always does that.

MR. SPIVAK: Well it's not always.

MR. GREEN: Does it so frequently, as to have justified the remark that he was going to do it again just now, because he doesn't want to hear the truth, and the fact is that I ask him, I ask him whether it is not the truth that the argument that took place for 40 minutes - and I don't know whether the time is one minute more or one minute less - had nothing to do with whether or not there would be recording devices supplied? The question was whether the meeting would be postponed until recording devices were brought in. That is the truth, Mr. Speaker; but there was never, Mr. Speaker, there was never any argument with members on this side of the House who sat at the committee meeting that we would have recording devices.

The Member for Lakeside says the fact is they weren't there, and that is also the truth. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that although the honourable members opposite knew and had asked about Public Utility meetings, for days on end, not once did they ask for, as was requested in the previous year, that before the meetings take place, would the members of the government see to it, see to it that there were recording - that is also the truth

Now let's compare, because I assume that when my honourable friend talks about the historical significance, he talks about the historical significance of these hearings, how important it is that all of the words be recorded, how important it is so that there be a continuing pattern of what took place, and I assume that when he makes those remarks that the same remarks were true the previous year. And let's compare with what happened last year and what happened this year to see who is being arrogant. Let's make the comparison.

This year, Mr. Speaker, they asked about Public Utilities Committee meetings - not a word was said in the House about recording devices. I am merely stating the fact as to whether they mean anything or not can be judged by anybody who's listening; but these are the facts, that they asked about Public Utility meeting, no one mentioned recording devices. When we got to the meetings, the meetings opened in the usual way, that all committee meetings are generally, unless it is specified to the contrary, held without recording devices; that at the meeting the members on the opposite side asked whether there would be recording devices; that this request was readily agreed to by the members on the government side; but what was not agreed to was that we would send the Hydro people home and convene another meeting until those devices were brought. What instead was agreed to, was what was said at the hearing would be taken down in writing and provided to the honourable friends. Now I tried, and I haven't had any really adverse reaction, and I assume because it's the truth, I have tried to indicate what happened this year by this, these are the arrogant people.

Now let's go back to last year when the same facts held true. We knew that Public Utilities Committee was going to meet, yes; there were at least three requests in the House prior to the meetings being held. The members of the Liberal Party will recall that they asked, we asked "will the committee see to it that the proceedings of the committee are transcribed?" And the answer from the honourable the former minister of Public Utilities who is no longer in the Chamber, Mr. McLean, his answer was very significant, he said "The committee will decide whether the proceedings will be transcribed or not." And therefore another question was asked - and this is a very significant question and I want you people to remember it - we said, well when the committee sits down, will arrangements be made in advance so that if the committee does decide that they want hearings, that they won't have to postpone the meeting, that they won't have to wait until the material is there, that they will then be able to make that decision and know that they could proceed, so there will be no delay. That's what happened last year and the Minister of Public Works, he then was, said "Well he can't answer that question, the committee will have to decide that question." Then we came to the previous government which was apparently not arrogant, we got to the meeting and we asked for recording devices and we didn't get a maybe, we got a no. We got an absolute no.

At that point, Mr. Speaker, I want you to recall these people who say that the historical significance of the proceedings demanded that they be recorded, listen to what they said when they had control of the proceedings. There were the following state of affairs: a motion was made to the Chair that there be recording devices supplied to the committee. The former Minister of Mines and Natural Resources said that we can't supply such recording devices, it's not the usual thing and we will not have it, and that motion was turned down. Mr. Speaker, what happened next is almost unbelievable; what happened next is that there was a motion put that any member of the committee be permitted to bring a recorder into the meeting. Listen

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . . to this - we said okay, if they won't supply recording devices, we will move that the Members of the Committee be permitted to bring recording devices into the proceedings and the former Minister of Mines and Natural Resources said that he couldn't support such motion. He said that they would not agree to such a motion and I got up, Mr. Speaker, and I remember participating in the debate and the former Minister will recall - I said, look I'm here as a member of the Legislature, I have asked permission to bring in a recording device. I think the Member for Ste. Rose actually got his secretary to bring his recorder and laid it down on the table. I suspect that he wanted to be challenged, to be evicted from that meeting for having a recorder with him, but that's what happened and I recall. But they actually said that they would not support a motion - not that they have a recording device - but that they permit a member of the Committee to have a recording device. And finally I got up and I said, Mr. Chairman, I plead with you, give me a reason. Don't just vote against it, because if your reason really means something maybe I will go along with you. And the reason that the Member for Lakeside gave was that the press is available and can take all the recording material that they want.

At that point, Mr. Speaker, I moved an amendment to the motion that members of the press be permitted to bring recording devices into the studio and record all of the proceedings; and, Mr. Speaker, by this time, well I can tell you that at this stage, the ridiculousness of the position of the government, the then government, became so untenable that all previous motions were done away with; not only did they let the press bring in recording devices, not only did they let individual members of the committee bring in recording devices, but they got Hydro to establish the recorder to do exactly what we said should have been done all along and they then proceeded to record the proceedings. I suggest to you that there was no problem this year, once the request was made it was granted immediately. What was not granted - and I submit that we were quite right - what was not granted was that we would not continue with the business of the committee until such time as the recording machines were installed, which by the way is exactly what occurred the previous year. They had to go ahead with the first submission without the machinery being there and they delivered it to all the members.

The Member for River Heights - well, Mr. Speaker, there's the action of the non-arrogant now opposition as against the arrogant government, but I suspect -- and the Attorney-General has pointed this out to me and I thank him for his attention in this connection -- I suspect that the Member for River Heights still remembers the way they handled things and his suspicions as to what is now going on are really based on their conduct of affairs; that he thinks that we are going to behave like they did and therefore he has got all these problems in his mind which are not really problems. I think the very fact that we are discussing this situation on a debate to receive the report of the Manitoba Telephone System and that the Member for Riel makes an issue of the answers to his question on such a debate, indicates that they are seeking every opportunity, and did seek every opportunity, and I guess that's their job, to try to discredit the government in one way or another - to get information .

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance answered that position and I'm not going to repeat it. He said it very well. The Member for River Heights postulates another position, which really indicates again the difference between our attitude towards what the people have elected us to do here and what he thinks he was elected for. He says that he wants to go through the Hydro staff and sort of canvass them, each one, do they agree with the decision to flood, and I want to know, Mr. Speaker, you know, this is what he calls responsible government. He's going to go through the Civil Service, see whether they agree with what is partly a political -- (Interjection) -- no he said all of the people - he wants to know - maybe there are nine people involved, maybe there are nine people involved - well he says now three. Mr. Speaker, that's not what he said before. But the fact is, I want to know.

Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated to the Member for Lakeside and to the Member for River Heights and I indicated it last year but it bears repetition, that we, unlike they, will not hide a government policy behind the statement of a civil servant. I know that the former Minister of Mines and Natural Resources when he justified South Indian Lake he said my Deputy Minister said this is a good thing and therefore it must be a good thing. Now the fact is that we know that government policy is government policy and it has to be justified, Mr. Speaker, it has to be justified on the basis of what the government wants and what the Hydro can do within the sphere of that information. What Hydro will do to some extent, as my honourable friend must know, depends on what the Department of Mines and Resources is

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . . prepared to recommend with regard to what water they will permit to be diverted or not. It may be that the people in Hydro are entirely at odds with what the Department of Mines and Natural Resources would want with respect to that. I say that the decision that is important is the decision of the government, and we accept responsibility for that decision. We are not going to hide that decision behind Deputy Ministers or officials of Hydro; and also, Mr. Speaker - and this is more important - that we are not going to have a government that is run by the civil service. If we were going to do that - if we wanted a government that was run by the civil service, which is what the honourable member wants, then we would not have run for office. We would say hire a bunch of technocrats and let them run the situation. Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say, and the honourable member is not going to get us to fall into that kind of trap - how many people at Hydro agree with the particular decision, how many people at Hydro disagree. Shall we have a vote amongst -- what if the vote amongst the Hydro civil servants is two to one for a low level diversion, or three to nothing, yes, what if that was the situation, would that mean that my honourable friend says that the government should not make a decision to deal with the situation? -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cass . . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm having the same difficulty I had before trying to hear the person who has the right to speak.

MR. SPIVAK: We're not having any difficulty at all.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well that's because those people are the ones that are yelling so they have no problem.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has the floor.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we have ever made any pretence about our position before the election last year, that we would prefer that it is our preference that there be no diversion of South Indian Lake which would have damaging results both on the ecology or on the people who live in the area. That is our preference. That given that preference are we able to get a program from the various departments involved which can give way to that preference? And those are the terms of reference under which the present people are working, and with all of the people in all departments of government. I say to my honourable friend, I say to my honourable friend that we are not going to go through a procedure where we are going to canvass the civil service as to how many votes are in favour of high level diversion, how many are in favour of medium level diversion, how many are in favour of low level diversion.

Let's look at the requests for information. The Member for River Heights says that they can't get information. Well let's take the non-arrogant opposition as against the so-called arrogant government and their record with regard to information. The Member for Riel got up and asked the First Minister, "Will we be receiving copies of the Crippen report," and the First Minister got up and said "Yes", and the Member for Riel said "When", the First Minister said "Right now." You don't think that that's the revealing of information?

MR. SPIVAK: Have you given us every report that we've asked for?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we have given the opposition the report relative to this matter in infinitely more detail than were given by that government . . .

MR. ENNS: . . . except the interdepartmental report.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the reports relative to this problem were laid on the table, the answers to the Member for Riel's questions were answered in writing, he will have a further opportunity to ask them when the Hydro officials appear before the committee. I've indicated to the Member for River Heights that he will not tell us which officials will appear before the committee - that's right, he will not tell us. You know, he had the opportunity last year of saying which officials will appear before the committee; and it must be obvious to him that the people of Manitoba did not appreciate or approve of the way in which he decided those questions and we are deciding those questions now.

MR. SPIVAK: Do you want to go back to the people now? Let's go back to the people now and see how satisfied they are.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . possible mathematical basis did you have for that . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I've just been given a record of last year's Public Utilities Committee meetings. I notice the first meeting was held on May 15, of '69, last year. That was the first meeting, there was no transcript. My recollection from memory, and I gave it

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . . earlier in my remarks, was that the same thing happened last, that although we had previously given notice that we wanted transcription, when it couldn't be brought in it was generally agreed that the chairman's remarks would be given so that we wouldn't hold up the meeting and that they would then be given to us in a written form. The rest of the meetings were transcribed. The difference in approach apparently which disturbed the honourable members so much is that last year we indeed had to have a drag-em-out battle on whether or not the meetings would be held . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, and I wish you would hear me out on a point of privilege. I've listened with tremendous patience on this particular question of arrogance, something like that. Had the Minister listened to my two brief remarks, my reference to arrogance was principally the direct answers given by the Minister of Finance to my colleague, the Member from Riel when he called him presumptuous for asking questions in the first place . . . never mind demanding that they be answered . . . that was the area of arrogance -- well the question of arrogance dealing with subscriptions of hearings or last year's hearings. The charge of arrogance arose from the performance in the House here today, nothing else.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad my honourable friend directed me back to his remarks which I thought were so insignificant that I didn't really bother dealing with them; but the fact is that that was a great distortion of what the Minister of Finance said. The Minister of Finance as a matter of fact complimented the Member for Riel for the questions which he put. He didn't say that he was presumptuous for asking questions. He said he was presumptuous for two things; for insisting that the questions be answered in writing before the meeting proceeded, which I think is presumptuous; and secondly, for insisting because he didn't like the answer that he was given, for insisting that the whole procedure whereby he will be entitled in the future to deal with these questions was meaningless. I believe that the Minister of Finance who is generally prone to use less critical language than I would use to him was very kind to the Member for Riel when he said presumptuous. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed that the motion stand? The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate as a relatively new member of the committee on Public Utilities, I'm unfortunately not able to confirm or otherwise the recollections of the Minister of Mines and Resources on what happened a year ago in respect to transcriptions or recording devices at the meetings, but I am able to say that his recollections of this year's meetings are fairly accurate as I recall them, and his suggestion that perhaps there was an oversight on ours or some members' part in not asking in advance that these recording devices be provided may be valid, but perhaps to anticipate a similar problem coming up again in the committee meeting, perhaps the Honourable the House Leader could give us an assurance now that these recording devices would be provided for the hearings which would include the hearings and submissions on Bill 56. Could that be . . . -- (Interjection) --

But, Mr. Speaker, my real point in rising at this time was to express some surprise at the early morning position taken by the Honourable Minister of Finance and the Honourable the First Leader in suggesting that the submission of written questions in advance of the committee meeting by the Honourable Member for Riel and his expectation that he might receive perhaps some written replies in advance of the meeting, that this was somehow or other a bit of a presumption on the part of the honourable members. -- (Interjection) -- I would think that my reply will be so brief that perhaps you can have an opportunity in a few minutes to comment. But, Mr. Speaker, the suggestion that this was somehow an improper procedure or that the honourable member was really asking for something that he wasn't entitled to, is to my mind rather out of line. I would think that he was showing in fact some respect for the chairman of the Hydro Board when he decided to put down in writing those thoughts which he had. They are questions I would say to be of a professional nature and ones that as a layman I found very interesting and I'm sure that I didn't get the full import of the questions in reading them over, but I was looking forward to perhaps by putting the answers beside the questions that I might be better able to understand the explanations that were to be given at the meeting. And I might say, too, Mr. Speaker, that I was not disappointed at the meeting in the way in which those explanations were given. They were given in a very scholarly way and in a very

(MR. MCGILL cont'd.) . . . . understandable way for a layman so I was very much impressed with that part of it, but I still felt that I might have been better able to understand what Mr. Cass-Beggs had to say if I had been given the answers to the questions of the Honourable Member from Riel.

I was very early, in my coming to this House, impressed with the importance of the decision which had to be made at Kettle Rapids and the overall importance of the firm decisions which the government must take in order to ensure that the future needs of this province in respect to power would be completely taken care of. I was a little disturbed, more than a little disturbed, I was very much disturbed as we had a series of predictions from responsible members opposite as to when these decisions would be announced, but I was looking forward with a great deal of anticipation to attending Public Utilities meetings and learning at first hand from the man who had been given the responsibility probably in the end of making the recommendation which this government would finally adopt, to hear what he would have to say.

Now it might be, Mr. Speaker, it might be that I would like to submit questions in advance of the next meeting to the chairman so that he -- and I would think this would be a proper way to proceed -- that he would be able to give it some thought and give me the answers then I might be able to ask supplementary questions at the meeting. I hope this would be the way it would take place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this is not the way I'm to proceed I think then that we should have some direction from those in government as to how they feel a legislator on this side should approach the problems as a member in opposition. If this is not the way to make our point and to ask questions of the government and of those senior officials present who are knowledgeable, then, Mr. Speaker, I think we should have a serious explanation of this point. I do not think it was in any way presumption of the Honourable Member for Riel; I think it would have been very helpful to the meeting; it would have been very helpful to me and I am sure to the Province of Manitoba if these questions were seriously dealt with and seriously answered, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in future such questions posed in such seriousness should be given very careful consideration. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed the motion stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

Notices of Motion. Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. CHERNIACK, in the absence of the Honourable the Attorney-General, introduced Bill No. 101, an Act to amend The Intoxicated Persons Detention Act;

And, Bill No. 97, The Suitors' Moneys Act. (Recommended by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council)

HON. PHILIP PETURSSON (Minister of Cultural Affairs) (Wellington) introduced Bill No. 100, The Museums Miscellaneous Grants Act. (Recommended by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council)

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

#### STATEMENT

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I take great pleasure in observing that the Minister of Health and Social Development has issued a release this morning informing the public that the Clean Environment Commission has now given the go-ahead to Macey Foods Limited of Brandon to develop a major plan of poultry processing and duck breeding. The firm which estimates an annual sale of between one and two million dollars per annum will provide jobs for 40 people in the Brandon area. I'd also inform the House, Mr. Speaker, that the ducks and the poultry will be raised on agricultural land one mile outside of Brandon and that a high percentage of this production is expected to be exported out of the province.

As Minister of Industry and Commerce I would like to congratulate the West-Man Regional Development Corporation in its co-operation, in its efforts in helping to bring this industry to that area, and I would like to observe that this is the kind of industry we need in the province to help diversify our food production. The plant will use considerable amounts of surplus grain and straw and will be a very important earner of export dollars. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of members on this side, I'd like to thank the



(MR. MCGILL cont'd.) . . . . Minister for his announcement. As the Member from Brandon West I might say that I'm personally very pleased to hear that this announcement has been made and that there will be opportunities for increasing employment in the Brandon area. I'm sure this information and this news will be received with great enthusiasm by the members in the Brandon area.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wanted to direct a question to the Minister of Youth and Education. Can he advise whether he's yet prepared to take any action or offer advice to the school boards of Manitoba regarding the distribution of literature in the schools regarding the automobile insurance plan?

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I cannot offer advice to the school boards; they're quite capable of running their own affairs in this regard.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister a subsequent question. Is he aware of a particular case where a young girl is under suspension from school because she took exception to the remarks made in a classroom by a teacher regarding this plan, and at the same time the remarks that were made in a pamphlet that was distributed because her father happened to be in the insurance industry? Does the Minister not think that this issue has gone beyond the point of tolerance?

MR. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member has placed his question.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this question is in the hands of the Winnipeg School Board. They met on it yesterday; they had a special meeting. They are taking whatever action may be necessary.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question again. Does the Minister not consider that there is a point where the Minister of Education must take action when literature is being distributed through the public school system regardless of school division?

MR. MILLER: I am not about to muzzle any teacher in his classroom.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The Minister is suggesting that I'm suggesting the muffling of teachers. What I'm suggesting is that there is a point when the provincial government and this Legislature is bound to take action regarding what is happening in our schools regardless of the school division.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I should like to, on a point of privilege in this case, make reference to a publication put out by the Allstate Insurance Company, in the May, 1970 edition, Edition No. 21, wherein there is a statement to the following effect: "Almost coincidental with the announcement of legislation to take over the free enterprise industry, was a comment by a member of the Manitoba Cabinet that the government should take over and control newspapers in the province." This kind of statement, Mr. Speaker, gives cause for rising on a point of privilege because that statement is, you know, entirely incorrect; so much so that it is absurd. There has been no such statement made, nothing resembling it. May I add that no member of the Cabinet has ever made such a statement and if I were aware of such, I don't believe that person would be in the Cabinet very long.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, again on a point of privilege, I appeal to you on a quotation in last Saturday's issue of the Free Press where I was quoted as voting against the resolution making 18 years the legal age in this province. The statement has not been retracted and it has not been corrected to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, and I again appeal to you and the paper to correct that error.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: I would like to direct a question, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the First Minister. Would the First Minister feel compelled to take some action, or advise his Minister of Education to take some action, if that particular document that he just read from was being distributed through the school systems of Manitoba by the teachers?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the procedure to be followed with respect to a problem that might arise within a particular school or classroom with respect to circulation of material, the administrative procedure is clear. The responsibility lies with the teacher, then

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . with the principal, with the superintendent, with the school division board, and I really fail to see in what way the province should attempt to intercede itself when the administrative responsibility is so clear and so long-standing.

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

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the First Minister if he'd have felt better if the article had said a member of caucus rather than a member of Cabinet?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I could hardly feel much better about that. The fact is that the statement is just incorrect, grossly incorrect; absurd.

MR. CY. GONICK (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, I think the Leader of the Opposition was perhaps referring to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. It relates to the water level in Pelican Lake in southwestern Manitoba. Is the Minister aware of the serious flooding problem being encountered by about 60 or 70 lakeshore cottage owners on Pelican Lake?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I met with a delegation from the cottage owners yesterday at my office.

MR. MCGILL: Was the Minister able to determine the cause of the abnormally high water level in the lake, even abnormal for this time of year?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, there's lots of water around this year.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. After investigation, does the Minister feel that there was any conflict of interest between those downstream of the control structure at the south end of the lake and those who have property on the lakeshore?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there are people who want the water high and there are people who want the water low.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Youth and Education. With respect to the student employment program under Mr. Kauffman, what provision is being made to hold some jobs for Grade 12 students? There's a fear that only university students are being looked after through this program and students that will be going on to university First Year will not be getting any jobs.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this is a serious problem because of the great number of university students who are in the market looking for jobs. However, there are certain programs of the province which will require people during the months of July and August and departments, I'm told, plan on using high school students for those particular jobs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. GONICK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. In reference to the question posed by the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to inform him and the House that no member of this caucus has ever suggested that this government take over or control in any way the newspapers in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Honourable the Minister of Finance and relates to the Manitoba Savings Bond issue that is currently being offered to the public. I wonder if, in view of the general interest in this issue, if the Minister is now in a position to report on its acceptance, the degree of acceptance it's receiving in the markets.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that it's advisable to jump to a snap decision on the basis of one day. Now I do have a report of Day One sales received here, but I consider that it would not be of any particular indication of how the bond issue is being accepted because it is Day One, and there may be reasons why it may be good or bad compared with previous issues, and I think I'm hesitating enough that I'd better give the report for what it's worth, having said that we should not place any reliance on it as being a real answer to the question. But if honourable members feel that I've said too much to let it go, then I'm prepared to give a report on Day One. And if the Member for Brandon suggests - and I think he does - that I should, I'll give the report on Day One which really should not be taken as any real indication, because there may be many factors.

Yesterday the amount received as at, I believe, about 4:30 by the Department of Finance - that doesn't mean anything except Department of Finance, the government - the total received

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . was \$3,053,600, and again I don't know what it means in relation to previous practice but I'll make other honourable members aware so that they can draw their own conclusions - and I urge them not to draw any from that. Series Number 1, which was issued, I believe, around 1960 and which sold about \$40 million, sold on Day One \$1,076,900; Series 2 on Day One sold \$170,000; Series 3 sold \$265,600; Series 4 sold \$200.00; Series 5 sold \$100.00 -- (Interjection) -- Yes, \$100.00. That's just Day One. Series 6, which is the last one, which I believe was 1966, maybe '65, I think it was 1966, was \$10,200.00, and I'll just repeat Day One yesterday, for whatever the information is worth, was \$3,053,600.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: I have a supplementary question for the Honourable Minister. I wonder whether he can indicate whether the government has received from customers of agents, any letters giving their reasons why they are not purchasing the Manitoba Savings Bonds?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer this question exhaustively, which means of course that I must report on all the receipts of communications from people as to the reason why they did on Day One buy some \$3 million, in excess of \$3 million worth of bonds, because the honourable member, of course, I assume, would want to know who are the ones and what do they say in support and what do they say in opposition. For example, I received a message a couple of days ago from a certain person who wanted to make sure that I knew that he was buying \$200,000. worth of bonds, and my quick reaction was that I'm glad that he didn't speak to me direct because he's not supposed to be allowed to buy more than \$50,000. So I can report that.

Now, I have not received any - now I'm taking literally what the honourable member said - any answers I received from any person as to why he is not buying a bond, and I thought my wife would tell me she couldn't afford it but I discovered that she could and she has already subscribed for a bond. I have been informed by a member of the back bench that he cannot buy a bond because he can't afford to buy a bond so he's not buying it. I have not yet directly approached the Honourable Member for River Heights but I propose to do so. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this gives me the opportunity to invite every member of this House to purchase at least a nominal amount to show confidence in the Province of Manitoba, and it would be a very nice gesture, it seems to me, if all of us could announce at the same time that we are purchasing bonds to be loaned to the Province of Manitoba for the purposes of growth of the Province of Manitoba.

Now having answered the question as truthfully as I could, I would now inform the honourable member about the information which I believe he is really seeking, and I can only assume, as he often does, what is in his mind. I have been informed by a broker that two persons have written to the broker - not to me and not to the department and not to government - that they would -- well, I won't quote the words, I don't remember them, but to the effect that they would not wish to sell - now the question was not "buy" but the question was "sell" - bonds, because they are in both cases automobile insurance salesmen. Now that is the only negative direct response of which I am aware. Not the question of "purchase" but the question of "sale", and may I again, because this is in the interests of the Province of Manitoba, invite and encourage all members of this House, who I believe applauded the announcement that I made that we are going out on a Canada Savings Bond issue, I believe there was general applause, urge all members of this House to buy bonds, to support the bonds, and to encourage others to buy the bonds because it is important for Manitoba that this be done, and anything that's done in a positive way will be helpful and we are the ones who should do it. Anything that is advanced in a negative way will only hurt the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Cultural Affairs. If that's not the right party maybe the Minister of Finance can answer. Are any, or are the funds of the sales from the lottery tickets, are they invested and are any of them being invested in the Manitoba Savings Bonds?

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): I wonder if the Minister of Finance can tell me what time that report that he gave applied to. It doesn't seem to reflect the \$2,000 I ordered my banker to buy yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. I note by the Gazette of a few weeks ago that the feeding enterprise at Macdonald has been incorporated as a co-op, Portage Co-op Feeders Limited. Can the Minister indicate to the House whether or not, under the provisions provided in the Agricultural Credit Corporation, whether or not there has been any application made by this co-op for funds to further their feeding enterprise?

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac Du Bonnet): I'm not aware of any at this stage, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, if I may. Is the Minister aware of any change in management as a result of this change in company registration, or this change of the co-op? Specifically, I'm asking if Mr. Loepky is still being retained there as the general manager.

MR. USKIW: This, of course, is an internal matter of the new cooperative or corporation, whatever the new structure is, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the last one, I don't particularly understand why the Minister is fencing with me. Is Mr. Loepky still retained as the manager in the Portage Co-op Feeders Limited?

MR. USKIW: Not being a shareholder of that organization, I'm not in a position to know, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Finance. Is he in a position to tell us, of the three million sales how much of that is cash and how much of it is redemption of previous issues?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that at this stage, of course, because redemptions come later and these are subscriptions. Now just -- it's a very short report but it says "received - cheques received for May deposit" - a certain amount, "cheques received for June deposit" - a certain amount, "total". So, since you can only buy bonds for money, then I assume that what may have happened is that a person who wanted to roll over would have to give directions to sell--or to redeem, to redeem, and then issue a cheque on the strength of that, and I really can't answer the question. I would have to get information on redemptions which would probably be substantially related to the sale but I don't know if we'll ever have the exact answer because it's all handled within the office of the agent. If that's not a good enough answer I'll certainly try to get more clear answers if the honourable member wants it.

While I am on my feet Mr. Speaker, I have just, since I last was on my feet, I have received 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14 orders from this side of the House for bonds and - oh, I just got a 15th. I don't want to start an auction sale but if anybody else in this House would like to indicate support for the bond issue, for the Manitoba Savings Bonds, this would be an excellent time to do so. I'm sure that the rules of the House would either permit that or somebody could phrase a question like - "would you like to put my name down for some bonds?"

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question? Would I be permitted to by my bonds through my local insurance agent?

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, absolutely. Your local insurance agent can be appointed a sub-agent of a bank or a credit union or a trust company or any number of the listed main agents and certainly all he has to do is to be appointed a sub-agent, which could well be the honourable member who could also become a sub-agent -- I'd better be careful. I'm not sure of the Legislative Assembly Act. I don't want to advise him to do something that may throw him out of this House because his presence is so pleasant, but subject to that problem, which may or may not exist, an agent could be a broker. But I can also redirect any purchases.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I would wish to introduce to Members of the House, 50 Grade 5 to 8 students of Elgin School under the direction of Mr. Tyerman. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Arthur. On behalf of the members of the Legislative Assembly we welcome you here this morning.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Government Services is not in his seat perhaps I could direct my question to the Honourable First Minister. Now that it's spring house cleaning time, do you think that we might arrive soon and find that the winter's accumulation of dirt is removed from the skylight in this room?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I can get a volunteer from the House it will be proceeded with immediately. I still agree with my honourable friend that it could do with a little dusting and we'll take it under active consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. It's in connection with what the Member for Lakeside already questioned him on, in connection with the Assiniboine Feeders Co-op. Is this an open co-operative or do they confine membership to certain groups? I think under their legislation they have to have an open membership. Is this a fact?

MR. USKIW: I would imagine so; I'm not fully familiar with their structure, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: Would the honourable member permit a question? Is the Minister suggesting to this House that he has not been directly involved in the creation of this enterprise into a co-operative?

MR. USKIW: In the creation, no I think this is a matter that has been supported by local people and has been organized by the people in question and I think my position is incidental to the . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Again, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to frame the question: is the Minister suggesting to this House that he has not been directly involved . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member asked that question.

MR. SPIVAK: No I'm going to frame it a different way, Mr. Speaker. Are you suggesting to this House that you have not been directly involved in this development into a co-operative?

MR. USKIW: Well I think, Mr. Speaker, if someone has been into my office to seek advice or information - to that extent I have been involved.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. SPIVAK: Are you suggesting to this House that you really are not - are you suggesting to this House that you are really not aware of the details or facts in connection with this project?

MR. USKIW: I'm aware of many details and much of the history, Mr. Speaker, of this particular enterprise. I don't know that that adds any significance to the question.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on the same subject then, does this enterprise hold an agreement with the government relative to the property at Portage la Prairie, and has the government insured that the interests of the province are protected?

MR. USKIW: The agreement with the province is still held in the name of Plains Agra Corp. Limited.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if I might reply to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The agreement that was entered into was entered into under the previous administration and there were a number of problems to say the least in connection with that agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary question. Is the Incorporation of this Co-operative subject to acquiring the assets of this other previous corporation?

MR. USKIW: Well I know, Mr. Speaker, that there have been negotiations within the community to try and create a co-operative venture at MacDonald. Now I don't know whether those negotiations have been successful. I assume that if they have that they are proceeding.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the First Minister. He said that there were a number of problems in connection with the previous arrangements, I wonder if he could detail them to the House?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if one were to attempt to detail the problems connected with that particular agreement it would really take considerable time. It could be done during estimates, I presume of the Department of Industry and Commerce. Certainly I couldn't attempt to detail them at the moment. It would really take considerable time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. It's in relation to the statement that he made earlier about a complex at Brandon. Was Manitoba Development funds involved in the development of this particular project?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

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

MR. MOLGAT: I would like to address a question to the House Leader. Could he inform the House how many more government bills we may expect during the course of the session?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, in this case. Have the final arrangements been made with regard to compensation for fishermen in the areas that are affected by mercury pollution and is the government in a position now to tell them what they will be paid and when?

MR. GREEN: The arrangements are not final, Mr. Speaker, but I understand that they are progressing to a point of reaching either a consensus or at least that the areas of differences will be clearly defined to be set by policy.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I believe that in a number of cases the fishing season would normally open on the 1st of June. This means one week left before they would normally be in operation. Will they have an answer as to what they might expect by the opening of the normal season?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I hope so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture, and ask him if he has had an opportunity to go through the reports of the Task Force, and if he is now prepared to rush out and give approval to the recommendations of that task force, particularly as they apply to coarse grains marketing.

MR. USKIW: Well I think my answer to that, Mr. Speaker, has to be that the Task Force report is a document on which we are going to have a great deal of discussion with federal and provincial governments across Canada.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. When are these discussions going to end and we are finally going to get a direct answer from the Minister of Agriculture?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, I have an answer to the question that was raised by the Honourable Member for Rhineland. The answer is no.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Cultural Affairs. Some weeks ago I asked him about the availability of the Blue Manitoba Centennial buttons and he said he would take that as notice. Could he inform the public as to where they can buy these buttons and . . .

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, I gave my last button away just a couple of days ago. But for the benefit of the honourable members, there are more buttons on the way; the buffalo pins, they're on the way.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Also, I asked my honourable friend where the buttons were being manufactured; would he mind telling us?

MR. PETURSSON: I'll take it as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it not a fact that the buttons are manufactured in Quebec where the minimum wage is considerably lower?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a further question to the Minister of Cultural Affairs. The other day the Member for Rupertsland brought in the matter of the comic books that were distributed. Is any action being contemplated? Has the Minister anything further to say at this time?

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, action is being planned by the Chairman of the Centennial Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm prepared to proceed under Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, with the motion, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Elmwood in the chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department of Industry and Commerce. Resolution 62. The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I believe late last evening the Honourable Member from Roblin was concerned about rural economic development and I would just like to assure him that we are most concerned about economic development. To that extent I would remind him that we have now completed the formation of regional development corporations throughout the province. We have them throughout the province now, all seven. No. 2, the province is continuing to provide a substantial financial grant towards the operation of these corporations; and thirdly, there is evidence of action, of some results occurring in various communities. I presume when he meant rural, he meant anything outside of Metro Winnipeg. There was an announcement earlier today and I hope on Monday there will be an announcement of further industry going into the rural areas of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Further to the remark that I related to the Minister last night, that I am aware of a feasibility study being conducted in the constituency with regard to a rapeseed plant which likely the Minister is well, maybe better informed on than I am. I sometimes seem to feel that there seems to be some kind of conflict in the area over, you know, another jurisdiction, one competing with another, one community, which may be a good thing or may not be, but I hope . . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask honourable members to keep the conversational level down, it is difficult to hear the speaker.

MR. McKENZIE: . . . . that possibly through his office and the regional corporation, that you know, the proper direction can be and we will not get ourselves into a hassel over this type of development in the rural parts of our province. I'm sure the Minister will guide them in the proper channel so that we don't create a conflict and leave wounds that it may be some time for them to heal, but I was thinking specifically on that issue and no doubt the Minister is looking seriously at Roblin constituency and in conjunction with Parkland and I look forward to some new incentives or new ideas for the farm economy, which is pretty badly bogged down as we sit here this morning, and no answers seem to be forthcoming. The Task Force has tabled their report in Ottawa and I understand basically all it says is that less government interference, and maybe that is one of the serious problems today. But I hope that the Minister can give us some direction in Roblin constituency as to where we should be going or what we should be doing possibly through Parkland or through the graces of his office and his staff.

MR. EVANS: Thank you. I just might inform the members of the House that the department has recently completed a survey with respect to this particular type of industry, rapeseed production processing, and has sent it to all interested parties in the province. I think this is the only fair way to operate. I would suggest, however, that in cases where there are 2 or 3 towns or areas or jurisdictions as the member put it, vying for particular enterprise, sometimes this has to be resolved locally and it's very difficult for the provincial government to take a stand in favour of one or the other, unless there is some specific evidence showing that one site is far superior to another. I would suggest that this is a terrific opportunity for the regional development corporation to play a role to iron out what may become a very relatively localized regionalized type of conflict.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I haven't been participating in the debate for some time in connection with the Department of Industry and Commerce and I certainly would like to express a few comments and views on the department's operation, and also put forward certain

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . . questions.

The Department has embarked on a new program which involves equity in business. We know that this is done under Part II of the Development Fund Act which was passed, I think in 1966. I took very strong exception to Part II of that Bill at that time, and so did the Honourable Member for Burrows at that time, and now we see this part acted on and we will henceforth see, according to the Minister's own words, an increase in this direction, and this is definitely a new trend in this province of Manitoba.

The matter of equity. I would like to get a much clearer definition of equity when we speak in terms of acquiring equity in the various companies, because under the Companies Act you have definitions of equity as shares, but this can also differ, and as the Minister has pointed out that with some companies for the intervening period this will be probably in the form of a loan and at some future date probably be turned into equity, meaning share capital in my opinion. We know that share capital under the Credit Unions Act is something different from that as prescribed under the Companies Act, because they operate under a special act. Then, too, with this matter of acquiring equity in these companies, we find that the government will most likely appoint some directorates. This is allowed under the legislation that we presently have, but just what course is the government following in choosing directors of this type. Are they looking for certain qualifications? Are they going to use elected members? Are they going to use qualified people from outside the department or will they be using personnel or civil service people from the department? I would like to have some clarification as to what is intended and what the government's program will be in this direction. Because from past performance -- not from this government -- we find that such organizations as Eden Mental Health when it was organized, the previous government put a director on that board having veto powers. Is anything of this nature planned when the government will place directors on these various business corporations where the government will acquire equity, because this can mean something quite different, that even though the company or the government might only have a minor equity in the business that they could certainly control these companies in a major way.

We have been informed by the Minister in connection with certain companies that they're trying to assist and for these companies to have the government acquire equity in a way during the initial period could be a very big help, because what this means is that if the company does not make a fair return or make a return, a profit, that they would not have to pay any interest on the share capital or on the equity. In this way it could be a very good thing for these corporations, for these business corporations; but in the long run whether it will be that good is a different matter as has already been argued by the Member for Lakeside last night. After some years the government can and we as members of the Legislature can be very involved in making decisions on some of these business corporations.

The Morden Cannery has come under discussion. I don't know whether the Minister wants to elaborate further in connection with this enterprise but from past experience that I've had in the cannery business, I was a director and President of the Winkler Cannery at one time, that one of the big troubles we had was the matter of freight differentials and also the matter of marketing our canned goods. That too often the eastern interest dumped large quantities of canned goods on the market and then in order to get rid of our produce we had to meet those prices which often meant we had to sell at a loss. Then too quite often it involved, when a firm was going to make a certain purchase, that they also had to purchase additional products of a different variety in order to get rid of those items that sold much better. So that there are various and different problems involved here, but if, as I understand that privately discussions have been held with CVO, they now have acquired the Winkler Cannery, and certainly these people have had experience now for some years in this, that I think they would be quite able to carry on and assist the area in this way. I am at this point not pushing in any way; I'm sure that the people out there are well and able to decide for themselves. But if any further discussions have been carried on and if the Minister can throw any more light on this whole thing I'd be pleased to get the information.

Before I leave this whole matter I would just once more mention that by these firms acquiring, or having the government acquire equity, they can operate more economical during the period of distress and during the period that they are in trouble, because what this means, by acquiring equity, means that if they do not pay interest then we are in fact subsidizing these corporations because the money that we extend to them certainly we have to pay interest on it,



(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . so that in other words we would then be paying a subsidy to these particular corporations in the way of interest-free capital.

I was quite interested in the discussion and the comments made by the Minister in connection with the possibility of a uranium enrichment plant which has received considerable discussion in past years and especially so by the former Minister of Industry and Commerce of the previous government. I don't think the Minister mentioned though that just how much power is required for such a plant and whether we can meet that fully over the years. Is this the prime reason or is this the big difficulty in getting the plant to Manitoba or are there other reasons that have to be considered at this time?

Then another matter that I want to touch on is the matter of some of the loans of the Development Fund. I did buy a copy of "Canadian Dimension" in which the editor, Mr. Gonick, has an article: "The NDP Meets Big Business" and it throws . . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: Was it worth the price?

MR. FROESE: Well I was interested. I buy these periodicals in order to be informed as to what goes on in the different camps, so that naturally I picked up some information of recent times that I hadn't acquired so far.

I was a member of the Legislature when the deal was made in 1966. I think I'm on record on Hansard of that time as to my position on it. When I refer to '66 I'm referring to the Canadian Forest Industries proposition and I would like to get some more information in connection with Churchill Forest Industries. I'm not as optimistic on the whole deal as the Member for Lakeside when he expressed his views the other day. I would like to be brought right up to the present on what developments have taken place so far, because we're investing huge amounts of capital, and even this matter of capital was not properly defined apparently and the government, while probably not in trouble with this, but I think there were differences of opinion as between the Churchill Forest Industries and the government as to what consists capital, whether it was operating versus capital cost and that more money had to be made available because of them stating that capital included operating costs, or some of it anyway.

Then, too, I understand that certain firms have been engaged to do studies. Stothert Engineering Company for one I think was engaged to do an audit and to inform the government as to the necessary precautions to be taken before monies are being extended for the purpose of setting up the plant, and I would be interested to hear from the Minister whether a report had been made so far and what the report includes and what precautions are being taken at the present time. Then, too, according to the Dimension paper at the time of the passing of the agreement I think it was stated that 4,000 new jobs were to be created by this plant and by this industry. What is the actual figure to date? How many people are being employed and . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: Fifteen hundred.

MR. FROESE: Fifteen hundred says the Minister of Transportation. What is the ultimate as we can foresee it at the present time? And then, too, I would like to know whether any new industries can come about as a result of the additional processing that might come about from the by-products and whether there is anything on the horizon at the present time that any new enterprises can come about in this way. The article mentions the engagement of A.D. Little of Massachusetts and Stadler, Hurter International of Montreal that were engaged by I think -- at least one was engaged by the previous government as consulting firms and are these companies still being engaged by the present government, are they performing any work for us at the present time in this direction or in any other way? Surely enough if we are going to spend this much money I think it should be worthwhile to have some research done in connection with the by-products and see what other industries can be brought in and can be brought about to make use of anything that can be made use of. I know by the discussions that we had with the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and the Finance Minister some time ago in connection with the mining businesses, and if it's a matter of just legislation I think legislation should then be brought in to make this possible.

These are some of the points that I wish to raise at this time. In going over the article in that paper it refreshes your memory on a good number of things. The matter of the two firms which were to receive investigation, namely the Friendly Family Farms and -- oh what was the other one again -- and I think Damascus Steel is another one where people came to me and gave me information on at the time that they were in trouble and I am not satisfied to date that some of these people were wronged and not dealt with properly, that justice should come about. I don't think it's too late yet. I think if we can find through the investigations

May 22, 1970

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . that certain methods were used in dealing with these people that were not just, certainly recourse should be made available for them so that they could appear before the committee that will be investigating them, or the firm, so that proper justice can be brought about.

I know that firms that go into bankruptcy -- not only these parties -- but I know from past experience that the law deals very harshly and sometimes I felt that it was much too harsh and that the government should have powers to step in. Mind you bankruptcy comes under federal jurisdiction and I don't know whether we as a province have any right to bring in legislation that would in any way supplement the federal legislation, I cannot say. Maybe the Minister can comment on this. But I've witnessed other companies going into bankruptcies and people being hurt. This has not only been with companies that are foreign to us, it has happened with companies that were receiving assistance from the Manitoba Development Fund. I know the one from Plum Coulee where the potato growers had formed a company and this went into receivership and the local people, some of them who had put all their life savings into this plant, just lost everything. I thought it was a black mark on the community. It certainly dampened any future effort that can be made in that community to recuperate or to start any new ventures of this type. I feel that if government organizations are involved such as the Development Fund I think these matters should be brought to this House and at least aired so that the members would be aware of what is going on and that if legislation should be considered to relieve people in such situations that we do so. Certainly it should not be beyond consideration of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I note that it's 12:30 so I will not carry on any further at this time and I will have a few comments at some future time.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Your Committee wishes to report progress and begs leave to sit again.

#### IN SESSION

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Russell): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that the report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 12:30; I am leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 this afternoon.