

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

7:30 o'clock, Tuesday, May 14, 1974

SUPPLY - INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce has five minutes.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will conclude my opening remarks by first of all saying that there have been many, many exciting developments occurring on the level of interprovincial co-operation, and indeed to some extent federal-provincial co-operation. I would very briefly refer to the Federal-Provincial Ministerial Committee on Transportation that evolved out of the WEOC Conference in Calgary last summer where a number of meetings have been held with the Honourable Jean Marchand, the Federal Minister of Transport, along with my colleagues concerned with transportation policy in the western provinces. I am very confident, Mr. Chairman, that we have made progress, that at least the existing Federal Government has come around to the point of view that at WEOC, the Provincial Governments of Western Canada at WEOC do have something substantive to complain about with regard to rail freight rates as they discriminate against industrialization of Western Canada, and we have made progress in that field.

I would also mention, Mr. Chairman, that there have been many discussions with DREE with regard to a general development agreement. I am particularly concerned with major industrial projects. Progress is being made in that field.

I would thirdly mention the progress that has been made and future plans for the development of the Port of Churchill, the twelve and a half million dollar federal commitment to renovate and upgrade the port facility. Secondly, the announcement by the Federal Government, and indeed now the implementation of Churchill as a resupply depot for the northern part of Canada, or at least this northern part of Canada. And thirdly, the co-operation of Alberta and Saskatchewan with Manitoba in the establishment of the Port Churchill Development Board which with its executive director is doing an excellent job in promoting the port and in bringing about new commodities. I particularly mention the 50,000 ton shipment of sulphur which will take place this summer through Churchill, and we hope indeed that there will be more of this type of commodity in future and perhaps other commodities.

Other developments have occurred in the field of energy with our Manitoba Energy Council, and indeed with our Manitoba Transportation Economics Council. These are policy councils made up essentially of senior public officials, and together with them we have been doing our homework, our research and planning with regard to energy concerns of Manitoba, and indeed our transportation concerns. I might add that I am going with the Chairman of the - or rather representatives of the three gas utilities in Manitoba, Greater Winnipeg Gas, Plains (Western) Gas of Brandon, and Inter-City Gas headquartered in Portage la Prairie, to visit in Calgary with the Alberta Minister of Mines and Energy on Thursday coming to discuss this entire question of future natural gas supplies for the Province of Manitoba.

I believe my time has probably expired, Mr. Chairman. I would only conclude by taking the opportunity to indicate publicly to my staff, my appreciation for their constant and diligent efforts. I think they have played a key part in the department in creating an atmosphere of development in the province, and I believe that their dedication will ensure that our future efforts will be successful in the future, as they indeed have been in the past couple of years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise today to speak on the Estimates of the Department of Industry and Commerce. This is a major department in the government I feel, not possibly inasmuch as the amounts of money they are spending each year but in the important role that they could play in helping Manitoba's economic growth. I want to stress the point that I say it "could be" for, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Department of Industry and Commerce is not doing the job it should be.

Mr. Speaker, the leaders of the business community in Manitoba are in a real predicament and bind. They want to talk to this government, they want to help, they want assistance, they want an environment which will help them succeed in their efforts, but, Mr. Chairman, they are not getting what they need from this present Minister and this government. How can a government who considers both small and large businessmen fat cats and rip-off artists work jointly with these businesses? How can the business community who has just seen the present government take over automobile insurance, is considering going into the fire insurance

SUPPLY - INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

(MR. BANMAN cont'd) business, doing studies on taking over of cement companies, presenting vague mining policies, bringing in farm machinery legislation, threatening even now to go into competition with credit unions by establishing a provincial bank; and I may add, Mr. Chairman, that the credit unions are quite worried about this particular move. Instead of aligning the business community I feel that this government and this Minister has alienated them.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out several examples of what I feel are attempts in an area which possibly should have been looked at a little differently and where moneys could have possibly been saved and not spent. I take for example the trucking industry in this province. The trucking industry, Sir, is in real trouble, and speaking to the truckers they will tell you this themselves. For one thing they are faced with increased costs such as fuel, labour, and other components, which are necessary in their day to day operation.

Well, Sir, I would just like to point out what this particular department has done with regards to the trucking industry. They have authorized a \$66,000 study to find out if the truckers are really in difficulty and what the problems are the trucking industry is facing. I suggest to the Minister that this could have been done by possibly the people from his Transportation and Distribution Systems Branch talking to these people and coming up with possibly exactly the same results as they'll probably come up with now, because the truckers know what their problems are. They've been in the business for a long time and they know what the problems are.

Mr. Chairman, one of the problems facing us in rural Manitoba is attracting new industry. Now we all realize that every municipality and every town is clamouring for as much business - they want growth, they want expansion - very often their community is right within one regional economic area that are vying for the same industry. I would ask the Minister if he would consider providing more help for towns and municipalities with respect to the development of industrial sites, sites where industries could locate, serviced sites in those particular areas where servicing is available. I find that one of the biggest problems that is facing most of the small towns and villages in my constituency, and I think in most towns in rural Manitoba, is that when a business does want to locate, one of the biggest problems we have is finding a place for them to locate. I think Winkler has been a very good example of what can be done when people go ahead and provide an area where business can develop and build.

I'm not asking for the same kind of assistance that's given to Gimli. I noticed in the Minister of Public Works Estimates that the Public Works Department is running the Gimli Industrial Park. They run a cafeteria, they run several other concessions there. I noticed in his estimates that the salaries for running that park was in excess of 412,000 this year, and other expenditures amounted to 430,000, which brought it up to a total of \$842,000 for the running of that one particular industrial park. Now I don't think that this is the type of thing we want done in every community in Manitoba, but I think the assistance possibly to the location and the planning of proper areas for businesses to locate would be one avenue in helping these smaller communities.

Speaking of course from a rural member's point of view, or objectives, I would like to point out to the Minister that the small businessmen in the communities, in the smaller communities, as well as in Metropolitan or Urban Winnipeg, are faced with the rapid escalation in costs. Now I think it's fine for the Minister of Finance to stand here when he presents his budget and tell us about the wonderful new tax credits that the government is implementing, but he didn't say why, Mr. Chairman, was that most of these tax credits are not finding their way onto the tax bills of small businessmen. These people are really really facing a bind, and I would like this Minister of Industry and Commerce to consider this. In small communities we're facing mill rates in excess of 125 mills on these small businesses. Very many of these small businesses are not manufacturing businesses, they're service industries, and they are having a difficult time with the increased tax burden, municipal tax burden, that these people are faced with. From what we can gather if the present inflationary trend continues their position of course is going to become worse and worse.

Another problem that has been brought forth during this session is the problem of labour. Most everywhere you travel you find that skilled and unskilled labour is becoming heavily increasing harder to get. The other day in the Economic Development meeting even the Crown corporations, the Chairman of the MDC, Mr. Parsons, mentioned that in Western Flyer Coach they're having trouble getting labour. This morning at Saunders Aircraft, the same problem.

SUPPLY - INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

(MR. BANMAN cont'd) I think the Minister should become very active in this role. It also probably falls under the auspices of the Minister of Labour, but this is a serious problem that is facing again both large manufacturer and the small businessman.

The other thing I might add is that during the winter months industry, and again it is competing with unemployment insurance, and in some cases welfare, for labour. Many of the people that do work on seasonal jobs have their whole year figured out; they work their six or seven months and then sit back, and its a lot easier to sit at home and watch colour TV than be out in our blustery Manitoba winters.

Another thing I would like to mention to the Minister, and I hope he can give us some answers on that, is while scanning through the Annual Report last year I noticed that in 1972 the Department participated in four trade missions; in 1973 that number fell to one; in 1970, Mr. Chairman, the department participated in 22 trade fairs, and that number has slowly declined until according to the Annual Report in 1973 that total number has fallen to five. So I would hope that the Minister would explain to the House why the drop in both trade fairs and missions.

The other thing that I'd like to point out about trade fairs is, I'm wondering, we receive the figures and being in business myself I know that we have estimated potential sales. Well I would ask the Minister how accurate he feels these estimated potential sales are under the trade fairs. Under the 1972-73 Annual Report there were 47 companies participating. They sold a total of \$135, 300 worth of merchandise and he estimates, or the department estimates, that there are over \$3 million worth of sales potential.

I would ask the Minister what he feels realistically was achieved, or what can be achieved from these trade fairs.

Manitoba Export Corporation - I realize it's their first year basically in operation - sold a total amount of \$22, 358 worth of goods. The total amount I imagine compared to the expenditures is way out of whack, but I think this is a department that we'll be keeping our eyes on. I notice things like turkey parts were sold, \$250 worth of equipment to Czechoslovakia, some fuel pumps to Latin America. I hope the Minister can see to it that this particular agency is going to look after the investments and get a proper return for the amount of money that we're putting out for this particular endeavour.

Mr. Chairman, I would at this time like to quote several excerpts from an Internal Productivity Audit done on the Department of Industry and Commerce, and I think this document points out the problems and difficulties of the different offices in the department, and the problems that they face under this present government and under this Minister. I'll be quoting some excerpts out of chapter 4 of this document. It's an 83 page document, this chapter 4, and I think it pretty well sums up what some of our misgivings on this side are, the way the present system or the way the department is being run presently.

"Organization: The activities of the department are carried out by a confusing assortment of branches, boards and semi-independent agencies. Information used in the following analysis of the individual branch activities was obtained from interviews with the directors of each of the branches, as well as with some of the departmental consultants. The goals of each branch and its major activities are listed as accurately as possible as they were explained by directors and documented at that time.

"Policy Research and Planning: This branch carries out numerous ad hoc studies on request and is also involved in speech writing for the Minister. The branch is only a little over a year old and was introduced by the present NDP Government. One of its roles has to be to interpret the present government's political objectives as they relate to the department's activities and to concrete policy guidelines. This branch is limited in its ability to effect department programs due to its lack of operational program influence and suspicion of its motives by line branches. This has led to numerous conflicts between the branch and other branches in the department.

"Administration: The administration branch had a number of problems with central government branches, PPCC, Management Committee of Cabinet and the auditor. These problems result in part from the ad hoc and crisis orientated operation of this department. Often programs require central agency approval or involvement, are not scheduled far enough ahead to allow for smooth and co-ordinate action. Some of this is unavoidable due to the nature of the Department of Industry and Commerce programs, but we shall discuss this later. A great deal

SUPPLY - INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

(MR. BANMAN cont'd) of this is due to the lack of direction and general ad hoc operation of the department.

"Industrial Materials and Services: The branch operates in a policy vacuum, the director indicated. There were poor communications and that policy advice was slow in being received. There was little inter-action with other branches except in regard to specific companies. The policy vacuum was due to the rapid change in chief advisors of the department.

"Machinery and Equipment: The director felt that these programs were fairly effective but were limited by inadequate manpower and inadequate guidelines."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister have a point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

MR. EVANS: I have a question really. I notice the honourable member referred to a chapter 4 of some internal document. I wonder if he would be kind enough to give us the title of the document, and the date of the document and where he got the document from, because it's obviously somebody gave it to you on an unauthorized basis, obviously. I would also like to know who gave it to you?

MR. SPIVAK: On the Point of Order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the same point of order. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I'm sure that the honourable member will be in a position to answer for himself, but I think there is an assumption about unauthorized on the basis of the information supplied by the Minister that's not warranted at this particular time, unless he wants to lay a foundation for himself in suggesting that it's unauthorized.

I think Mr. Chairman, you know, the allegation is made by the Minister and before he makes those kind of allegations he should have some basis for it.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, on this point or order, I'm not questioning . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Yes, on this point of order, the member did indicate that he was reading from some type of internal document, and I believe it is an internal document, it was not published, and therefore is privy to the government.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, again on the point of order. I wasn't here when the honourable member began his remarks so I'm not sure how he made reference to them, but I wonder if the honourable member opposite is in a position to indicate now, that from his knowledge there appears to be some internal document that the honourable member is quoting from. Does he know that for sure?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance. On the same point of order.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman on the point of order. I believe it's recognized practice that when a document is being read from, then the person who is reading and quoting the document is required to respond as to the nature of the document, and indeed to table it.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, just as a matter of practice for the House, I think it's true that a document that is quoted from is asked to be tabled if it's signed. If it's not signed, it's not . . . --(Interjection)-- Well, I know, just so we understand --(Interjection)-- Well maybe it is, maybe it isn't but I don't want the Honourable Minister to simply stand up and suggest that the rules of the house are that automatically it's tabled. The fact is, if it's a signed document it's tabled, if there is a reference made to a particular item that can be tabled. There's no obligation on the part of the honourable member opposite. But again you know, the Minister has made certain assumptions; I wonder if the Minister's in a position to indicate how he came to that assumption.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, on the point of order. I was in the House, and I did hear what was said by the honourable member, and he was purporting to quote from a document stating opinions. Signed or unsigned it is obviously a document which he is referring to as an authority. That being the case, then I would ask that he table the document.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman on this same point of order. The member did indicate that he was referring to a report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member did indicate that he was referring to a report which was an internal audit report, I think was the expression used, or words nearly to that effect, and, I think, as a matter of courtesy to the House if not certainly

POINT OF ORDER

(MR. EVANS cont'd) it's a fact it's a matter of procedure, he would give us the title of the document. In fact he should table it and give us the author, the date, and so forth.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister is in a position . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I think we'll try if we can, Mr. Chairman - I think this is the best way of dealing with this point of order to ask the Minister, did he undertake, did he give instructions for his department, or for any members of his department, to do an internal study of his departmental activities?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, on this point of order. The House has the right to know the title of the document, and the author of the document, the date of the document, otherwise I would presume it's been written by the Leader of the Opposition, or some such person.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I again put it to the Minister: Did he undertake an internal audit of his departmental activities? Did he instruct any individual to prepare any documentation? If he did, he then should be in a position to know the references that are being made.

MR. EVANS: Well Mr. Speaker, we did . . .

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

MR. EVANS: In answer to that question, we did authorize an internal audit some three years ago or so, but I would like to know - I don't know what document the honourable member is referring to. So, Mr. Chairman, I still ask the question: it's a matter of privilege of this House to know this source of this document. Whether we conducted an internal audit or not is beside the point. This may refer to that document. There was an internal study done about three years ago. There have been many reviews of organization in the department, which goes on in every department from time to time. I'd like to know just what is this document that the member is quoting from. He's quoting it.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether on any occasion he or official--(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, Order please. That point is well taken.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. The Honourable Minister has given certain instructions, or to this House, or suggested that the honourable member has to respond in a certain way. I ask the Honourable Minister to search his own conscience and to determine whether he has to pose that question to the honourable member, or whether he is seized of the knowledge that he's asking and can basically state in this House that he knows where that document came from, and he knows the references to it, because he himself studied it.

MR. CHERNIAK: Mr. Chairman on a point of order, and I speak on a matter of privilege as a member of this House. The honourable member quoted from a document which I gathered was an official document only from what he said, it may not have been. I am asking that that document be tabled and as a member of the House I believe I have that right, regardless of what the Leader of the Opposition believes anybody else authorized. I believe that when an official document is being quoted, and if it is an official document, which you don't know yet, then it should be tabled that the member purported to be quoting an authority. He was reading from a document as if it was one with some basis of knowledge and fact criticising the department. Now I ask that it be tabled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, at the outset I mentioned that it was: No. 1 - I don't know what the title of the document is. It just says Chapter 4, and I have taken several excerpts out of that document. I haven't got the document with me right now. I think, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to continue.

MR. CHERNIAK: I'm sorry. If the honourable member is reading excerpts of a document which is in his possession, then I don't think he's entitled to read excerpts unless he produces the document, and since apparently he has the document then I would ask that it be produced.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I think one of the problems is, and I pose the question to the Minister. I have the suspicion that the Minister, or some of his department, shredded some of those documents and I think that's one of the problems that we face right now. --(Interjection)--Yes, shredded. I say that for the Honourable Minister

POINT OF ORDER

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) ...of Finance's information. So the difficulty we have at this point is that there's a reference made to a particular chapter of a document which is an internal study undertaken by his department, paid for by the taxpayers of this province, to which the honourable member has made reference. Now he's made reference to particular clauses. He has not made reference to the total document, and I don't think that he is required to make reference to the total document. I ask the Minister to search his own conscience and then to try and furnish that document.

MR. CHERNIAK: Mr. Chairman, on a matter of order and privilege. I don't think the Leader of the Opposition has the right on a point of order to start questioning or cross-examining other members of this House, but indeed he apparently does know something about the source of this document. He already has stated that he believes that it has been shredded, which means it has been destroyed, which I presume anybody who has the control of such a document would have a right to do. But the fact that he implies that it was shredded also means that the document, which is apparently in the possession of the honourable member who has the floor on this debate, is a document, or an excerpt of a document, which was obtained in some surreptitious underhand manner, otherwise it wouldn't be a piece of a document, unsigned or unknown. But the point I'm making is that if the honourable member is quoting it as an authority, and I believe he is, and that's what I heard him do, then surely we are entitled, and I ask again that he be required to table the document whatever it is. He was quoting it as an authority. If however, it is not an authority but some piece of paper found somewhere in some shredding machine by the Leader of the Opposition, or others of his cohorts, then indeed it should be recognized for what it's worth, and that is a piece of scrap paper.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege really, or point of order. There is an assumption on the part of the Minister of Finance that there is a right on the part of the government to shred a document that is prepared for its own purpose. Now I,--(Interjection)-- that's what the Honourable Minister has suggested, and I'm not of that opinion. I ask the Minister, and I think he's seized of the knowledge, I think he very well knows the document that's referred to, to stand up and indicate in this House, as I believe he can because he knows the nature of the document that the honourable member is referring to.

MR. CHERNIAK: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is bringing a red herring in to distract you possibly from the knowledge that I am asking that the document quoted as an official paper by the honourable member be tabled. If you need a citation I can refer to Beauchesne of the Fourth Edition, page 135, paragraph 159 (4), which refers to official papers quoted during a debate should be laid on the table of the House. Now if the honourable member denies that it's an official paper, then we can deal with that under another section. If he claims that it's an official paper, I ask again that he table it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye will table the document?

MR. BANMAN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. You know, if the honourable member chooses to stand before the members of this Assembly and quote some supposed authority, and then expects us to believe that it is from some official document authorized or unauthorized, I don't know, and that is my simple question. This is how this all began, a simple question. I don't believe anybody has a right to quote, and purport to quote correctly, or to purport to quote a document, when he doesn't have the title of the document, or when he is not prepared to table that document. I say, Mr. Chairman, on this point of order that the honourable member's quotations are worthless, and useless, and have no hearing whatsoever on this debate, no bearing whatsoever, and that applies to any subject.

MR. CRAIK:on the point of order, Mr. Chairman. We regularly, fairly regularly, have quotations given by members of the government, and periodically we have asked the government for copies, and it's very unusual when we have asked for it that we got it at that moment. But we have on occasion had the government give the undertaking that they will get copies of the document and table it, and I'm not sure we have always received them. But in this particular case, it's hard to imagine us asking the government to give us a copy of a document that originated originally

POINT OF ORDER

(MR. CRAIK cont'd). . .

with the Opposition, and in this particular case, all the member really has to do is - it is a departmental document; it was initiated by the government. I think he started out giving you the rough title of the thing. It must be your document. So it seems rather senseless that you ask for it to be tabled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable members think that, you know, in the four and a half to five years that I've been Minister of Industry that we've only had one study on organization, only one study on management organization, only one review of --(Interjection)-- well would you, well, Mr. Chairman, on a point . . .

MR. CHERNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry if after some discussion there is just a repetition, then there will have to be a decision whether or not the member has to table the document. Now, I believe it's straightforward. He quoted from what he, and what the Leader of the Opposition now claim is an official document. I believe it's to be tabled. If however the ruling is that it's not to be tabled, then let's get a ruling, let's not keep fishing, fiddling around with this issue.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Chairman, the Minister is partly right but as usual only partly right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris on the . . .

MR. JORGENSON: There is no compulsion on the part of the member to table the document. There is I think an obligation on his part to identify it. And if it happens to be a public document which is in the Minister's possession there is no need for him to table it. And if the document from which he has excerpts and which he does not have in the House, therefore cannot table, he has simply typed out excerpts from that document so therefore he is not in a position to table it. But he is in a position to identify it, and having identified it the Minister can go to his own source and get the document because it is a public one. There's no compulsion to table any more than there is a compulsion to table a newspaper which is public property and which can be obtained by the members themselves as long as it is identified.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now order, please.

MR. CHERNIAK: I do want to say that I appreciate the contribution of the member from Morris and I would like to agree with what he said. And I do recognize that normally he quotes correctly and does know more about the rules of order than I do, it's just that this time I accept what he said. He said that he need identify it and when it is recognized as a public document he doesn't have to table it. I was talking about an official document, and the quotation I gave of Beauchesne dealt with an official document. Now if we find out what the document is, if it is a public document available to the public the Member for Morris is absolutely right, I will go to the sources available to the public and I'll find it. But if indeed it is an official document, and I still don't know what it is, then Beauchesne says official documents quoted from should be tabled on request and I made the request.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So what is it? Well, The Honourable Member of La Verandrye, is it an official document or a public . . . ?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to state what document it is. It's a report done by Hubert Prefontaine; it's Chapter 4 of that report and I've quoted several excerpts from that report.

MR. CHERNIAK: Was it a dated public document?

MR. BANMAN: I haven't got a date, this is all I've got.

MR. CHERNIAK: Mr. Chairman, if we know the dates and then find out if it is public, then I will go to my source and find it, but I am now beginning to think that it's an old document which was an official document and not public and therefore I would now ask the Honourable Member for Morris to clarify whether or not it being an official document it should be tabled. If it's public, then it should be identified so it can be located.

MR. JORGENSON: If the document in question can be properly identified and it's in the possession of the government, which I presume it is, then it is not necessary to table it. In any case the honourable member does not have the document before him so

POINT OF ORDER

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd,...) he is unable to table what he does not have.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition, but I don't think we're getting anywhere.

MR. SPIVAK: Oh, I think on the point of order, its very simple Mr. Chairman... I think the Honourable Minister ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know what your point of order is, but you've had already three I believe, and I don't think we are getting anywhere. We have to determine whether this is an official paper or a public paper.

MR. SPIVAK: Well Mr. Chairman, I would like to assist you in this respect and suggest to you that all the Minister of Finance has to do....

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: ...all the Minister of Finance has to do is ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce whether a study by Hubert Prefontaine ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the point of order. We have to determine whether the paper is a public paper or an official paper.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I would suggest you ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you able to advise the House whether it is or not? The Honourable Member for La Verendrye, I have taken account the loss of time on points of order and I allow you another - you have five more minutes.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to discuss incentive grants and once again I would like to refer to a report by Hubert Prefontaine, Chapter 4. The result is often a confusing picture of what the actual policy of the department is. This confusion frequently extends to the branch personnel resulting in different interpretations of policy between individuals and between branches.

MR. CHERNIAK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Could we have the...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance has a point of order?

MR. CHERNIAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Member has now stated that he's quoting from a Chapter 4 of something - a report by Hubert Prefontaine. I'd like to know the date of that report and I'd like to be able to find out whether he has the other copies, the other chapters of the report, so we can get the continuity of the sense in which he's speaking. But the least I would ask for is the date of the document he's quoting from. Is it yesterday or is it ten years ago? What is the date?

A MEMBER: ... pay no attention to him - pay no attention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member of La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Morris says he's going to try and get the date for us, so ... now we've got to have the continuity of our speeches to suit you.

A MEMBER: Yeah.

SUPPLY - INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE (Cont'd.)

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman it is only lately that even a general evaluation of the program using grossly exaggerated data has been attempted. It would appear that the grant program is operating on an ad hoc basis responding to requests as they arise and is not designed to incorporate priorities and areas of concentration.

I would like to refer now to an Order for Return No. 12 dated February 19th, 1974 where we have the total breakdown of the different grants starting from July 1st, '69 to '70 and on right down to '73 from April 1st, '73 to January 31st, '74. I notice that in the '70 - '71 year we gave grant incentives of 329,000 to different businesses; the next year we gave \$371,547.00. This is another point I would like to make where the Minister I feel is again sort of avoiding the smaller firms - 58 percent of the grants in that '71 - '72 period - 58 percent of these grants went to firms who were employing over 50 people; and firms that employed 50 people or more only make up 16 percent of the manufacturing firms of Manitoba. It would seem that through this action as these figures indicate that the larger corporations seem to be getting the largest amount of moneys and probably what it looks like is that through

SUPPLY - INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

(MR. BANMAN cont'd). . . this the present government is trying to appease the larger industries by providing such things as \$2,750 grant to BACM in assistance to design a corporate...

Mr. Chairman, I think we can see - and from the past performance I think that the department has a definite ineptness, a lack of direction on firm policy, and decisions seem to be made on a rather day-to-day ad hoc basis. And as mentioned in the document which I quoted from there seems to be somewhat of a policy vacuum with regards to the operations of this department. I've raised several questions in the beginning of this speech, I would ask the Minister to reply to those at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I rise on my feet to initiate some comment by our group. Before I begin I would like to indicate to the members opposite that I plan to refer to the Economic Review of Canada, a department report, several scratched notes on a Legislative Assembly note pad, which I am quite prepared to distribute as long as I reserve the right to have expletives deleted and all the other forms of transmissions that are require. And on that we're going on sheer energy, initiative, imagination, whatever other resources we bring to bear, so I hope that this will satisfy the Minister of Finance in terms of our sources. The handwriting I think is fairly legible except in those areas when I became confused about the whole documentation at that point and began to use invisible ink so that no one would know.

I'd like to first comment, Mr. Chairman, on the statement of the Minister in introducing his departmental estimates. I was very intrigued and in some measure pleased with some of the indications that he made about the changes in policy that he has introduced. I noticed that he commented that under his leadership over the past four or five years that he has reversed the trend that was very apparent under the previous stewardship of establishing a very high-flying public relations information advertising policy and that we are no longer sort of in the year of the yum yum days or the other kinds of promotion programs. I would like to point out to the Minister however that he has taken the glamour out of the lives of Manitobans because this afternoon I went through some of the issues of the trade magazines that the department puts out and others, where as I noticed on previous years under the ministerial direction of the now Leader of the Opposition when promotion and different kinds of sales programs are being announced we normally were given a picture of a fairly leggy young lady sort of holding up bananas or other forms of products that we needed to be sold or bought; now I notice it's the picture of the Minister who has replaced it and I must confess to a certain amount of regret that that particular change in policy has brought what used to be a source of some entertainment and stimulus in my otherwise dreary life. So I would --(Interjection)-- That's true, I suppose the Minister knows which constituency he's appealing to. And I would like to say though I would hope he would perhaps try to apply what little budget he has left in the promotion to at least provide a little more colour and flair to these proposals and promotion projects.

Also I took with some notice where he said that the present government has established a strategy I guess, or approach to industrial and economic development that one can label as going from the passive to the active, I think were the words that he used, I don't think I'm paraphrasing him wrong and it seems to indicate to me a trend which has been fairly noticeable, although no one has really put a finger on it, I think as yet - and it is a trend which is if nothing else disturbing I suppose for some of us who believe in a different kind of system perhaps than the Minister. But I notice that what really seems to be happening is that the government of Manitoba is becoming one large scale holding company, that they're no longer sort of simply satisfied with providing certain loans and assistance to agencies, but they want to own those organizations, those corporations. --(Interjection)-- Yes well, it's a holding corporation similar in scope and reach through the power corporation and all the other monoliths that normally the members of the New Democratic Party are decrying and --(Interjection)-- yes please, sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Industry and Commerce on a point of order,

SUPPLY - INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

MR. EVANS: Yes, my point of order is, it appears that the Honourable Member is about to launch into a debate on the Manitoba Development Corporation, and I would remind him that the estimates of the Manitoba Development Corporation are under the Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken. I would ask the honourable member to stay within the bounds of the Department of Industry and Commerce.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well Mr. Chairman, I was just going to say, I don't think the point of order is well taken at all because I must stand in amazement at the prescience of the Minister of Industry and Commerce that he can anticipate what I'm going to say and it must be a remarkable tribute to his powers of telepathy that he can all of a sudden see what someone is going to say. And I would think that it's too bad he didn't apply the same powers to try to provide economic development in the province. We might be in much better shape if he would exercise those mental powers of his more to the task at hand rather than trying to figure out what people might be saying or going to say.

What I was simply going to comment upon, Mr. Chairman, was that this trend towards the holding philosophy of the government is something that I would simply point out indicates I think a misplaced policy that is very indicative of the kind of confusion that the Department of Industry and Commerce now labours under; that I don't think they have really understood the purpose and the objective by which their department should serve this province; that rather than trying to achieve some form of a classic corporate rip-off - and in fact I'm tempted to invite David Lewis into the province to examine the activities of the Government of Manitoba to see how they are doing their own particular form of rip-off - that what we should really be looking at is to what degree are they applying their resources to the basic development of the foundations of economic growth and economic stability in the Province of Manitoba. That to my mind is the primary responsibility of this department. And yet we have seen over the past three or four months at least, certainly within the time I've watched the operation of the department, that that fundamental task is not being met at all. That if you begin to look at first what is one of the major requirements and foundations of economic growth, it is a proper supply of labour for the kind of industries that one would wish to have sort of implanted and growing in Manitoba. And yet we have found continually - that is, we have questioned the Minister about what he is doing to assist industries in the development of trained labour, whether it's in Western Flyer Coach or whether it's in the aircraft industry or even in the garment and fashion industry, we keep finding out that somehow or other he's forgotten or somehow or other it hasn't been done or somehow or other it hasn't really served or been part of the of this new reorganization; that they haven't quite got around to establishing that basic fundamental requirement, and that is to ensure that if you're going to attract industry or try to have it expand that they will be given or make sure that there is a proper supply of one of the basic components, which is the kind of labour force. And I think that particular aspect has probably - and part of the negotiations that have been carried on in terms of the development of the new aircraft repair facilities in Winnipeg has been one of the limiting factors because certainly it's an argument - when I was down east just a week ago, that reading the eastern newspapers - was being used to club us over the head. --(Interjection)-- Well, I know that the Member of St. Matthews doesn't read newspapers or certainly eastern newspapers because they must be tainted or something - but that's what they were saying. Now I think that it is indicative because the Minister in this House admitted the same thing himself, that he really hadn't, really kind of got around to looking into that problem yet. And I think the same thing was true in some of the meetings of the Economic Development Committee when the same kinds of questions were asked.

I think we can look at the same kind of sort of neglect of basic responsibility of developing those foundations of economic growth in the field of energy, when we went through some debate in this House previously about the so-called energy policy of the government. And to our knowledge it is still a hidden energy policy, probably still sort of confined within that extremely energetic telepathic mind of the Minister who seems to be the only one that knows what the energy policy is, because he's not communicating it to anybody else. And as a result, there again is an uncertainty about the requirements for growth, a

SUPPLY - INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd). . . great deal of uncertainty about what are we going to be able to do in terms of ensuring proper and adequate energy supplies and also conserving energy supplies that we have. And again we only get sort of random answers and nothing that can really be detailed, and the Minister had promised us before that we would have statements on energy policy forthcoming. Well, he said, wait for my estimates. Well I'm waiting for the estimates and I arrived here this afternoon with great expectation, and all of a sudden the energy policy that the Minister had said he would talk about would now be finally released to public disclosure - and lo and behold he didn't say a word about energy, which simply indicates that there really isn't an energy policy. And as a result that lack of policy simply means that we will not be able to provide some surety and some confidence for manufacturers and industries that require major energy supplies that they will have such. And as a result I think it just proves once again that the reorganization the Minister wants to talk about should really apply to the reorganizing of the capacity to develop an energy policy which is comprehensive in scope and certainly public in nature so that we can eliminate that problem.

And I think that simply provides again that the basic thesis of all this, Mr. Chairman, is that the Minister of Industry and Commerce is putting great emphasis upon his reorganization. He said he's spending a lot more money to provide for all these new platoons of people who will work for the Department of Industry and Commerce and achieve wondrous things. And one has to ask, how does one achieve wondrous things with all these new people if they don't have a policy to aim for, if there is simply no direction being given. And I suppose it's like the old children's story about the people who had the platoons of armies who marched up one hill and marched back down the hill, and you can shuffle the formations around but they're still going back up the hill and down the hill because they don't have anywhere else to go. But there really is no direction being given other than sort of a fairly nebulous indication that we are now going into an active stance whatever that may mean. And I say that the only active stance that we have seen from the government so far is to become a public holding company so they can take over other companies. I know that's under another ministerial department and I don't want the Minister jumping to his feet to anticipate what I might be saying, but the fact is that's the only indication of any activity that we have seen in terms of promoting economic development in this province.

Then we come, Mr. Chairman, to another issue which has provided some intrigue over the past couple of months from the Minister. He was part of a very interesting and engaging grouping of western Ministers and Premiers, I believe out on the west coast, where they discussed that in this new decade that they were going to establish a form of cooperative arrangements where there would be some attempt to undertake joint planning in the prairie region, in the western region to insure that there was a balance of development, that there would be some kind of specialization in labour. And what Alberta, and Saskatchewan and Manitoba - would make sure that we would parcel out the development and parcel out the growth and ensure that each of us does what we can do best. And that sounded really like a very important and very interesting and a very progressive step. Again until we look at the results. And the results are they - it seems that the cooperation is only one way, out of Manitoba, that the only kind of agreement that has been made is that Alberta gets richer and Saskatchewan gets steel mills and Manitoba sort of signs documents and listens to speeches. I suppose maybe the specialization in labour the Minister was talking about is that they get the growth and we get to make the speeches, that seems to be the kind of division of labour that we've arrived at. But it seems to me it may give lots of growth to the Minister's sort of own ego and it may get lots of growth to the department for new people but it hasn't provided much economic growth to the Province of Manitoba. And I think that again is simply again one more indication of how the department has failed. And the problem with that, Mr. Chairman, is that it happens at a time when there really is a very important opportunity available to the province; that there is no question that western Canada is beginning to open up, that the mineral resource and natural resource development in the northern part of the country, the western part of the country is providing major new initiatives and opportunities for development.

And the critical question is who is going to manage that development, where is the managerial, financial sort of commercial expertise going to come from? Well, as has been the case for so long in this country much of it still comes from Toronto. And yet we could be making a very strong case, that because of the initial sort of advantages that the City of

SUPPLY - INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd). . . Winnipeg has because of some of the major financial institutions located here and some of the strong professional groups, that we could have become the centre of management for western and northern development; that given the proper kind of initiative and incentive, that the City of Winnipeg could have become the spark plug for taking over the management of that new resource growth and new development; that we could have provided countless numbers of jobs for specialists and managerial work and commercial work and mining and resource development; that the offices could have been located here, the Head offices could have been located here. That should have been a proper division of labour for this new western agreement and yet we have heard nothing from the Minister and his department that that would become the ambition and priority of this government to try to attract and bring into the City of Winnipeg, to the Province of Manitoba, the capacity to become the managers of the new western and northern resource and manufacturing development. So that if there is going to be opening up of the oil fields or the mining fields or the development of manufacturing, the management of it could have been here because we had the initial advantage over other western cities. And it strikes me that even in terms of negotiating with the Federal Government in terms of different kinds of developments that we should have been asking organizations like DREE and the kinds of incentive grants they give, not simply to make those incentive grants available to manufacturing and industrial types of activities but the commercial and managerial activities; that the service industry is as important a component, in fact according to the economic review, a much more important component of economic growth in this country now than manufacturing itself.

So what we are simply doing is we are missing a lost opportunity when we are letting that initial advantage pass us by simply because we haven't applied ourselves to the task of how do we develop a managerial capacity and ability and make the demands. We are so interested in this province of putting the, you know, the muscle to the mining companies for example saying: Boy, we want to get more taxes out of you, we really want to get after you and hit you hard. Rather than going to groups like INCO and Sherritt and saying: Lookit, we want you to bring 300 of your accountants to Winnipeg, or your Finance Department. That's the kind of incentive that we require, that is the kind of basis upon which we build growth because the multiplication of economic activity arising from that development would be far more significant than the finagling and fooling around that we've heard in budget addresses and so on over the past three or four months. Because I think the real concern of the people of this province is the product, is the end result; not the theory, not the fine words but the end result. And the end result is are we gaining our fair share of economic development as western Canada begins to sort of accelerate in its larger economic issue? And right now, because I think of that sort of whatever it may be, I guess the telepathic powers of the Minister sort of are not being properly exercised to anticipate how we could be properly exploiting and developing what should be an important advantage to this city, because it's already there.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that when you begin to look at the components as to what provides the stimulus for that kind of location of commercial and managerial services, they look for really what can be called amenities, a series of amenities where you have good educational institutions, sort of good cultural institutions, good transportation and communication networks. That is the kind of thing that Winnipeg now has, it's the kind of thing we should be selling, it's the kind of attraction that we should be exercising. I just don't think we're doing it. And I think that is the greatest fault and the greatest sort of weakness and neglect of the present department and the present minister is that he is not taking advantage of an opportunity which should be staring him in the face. So I would ask him to apply himself to the task of exercising the powers at least he demonstrated for a brief instant this evening, to begin to anticipate, to look at an opportunity which was staring at him about two inches away; to take a look around at the biggest selling point he's got which is the basic. . . and resource of this community to attract that kind of managerial component within it. And rather than scaring him off with the sword rattling and the kind of all the talks about how we're going to get you fellows, we should really be applying is how do we build those foundation blocks. That is the role of the Department of Industry and Commerce, not getting pictures taken, not sort of out kind of sort of wandering around the country sort of talking about all the sort of the findings he would like to do but going back at the basics. That's what this department should be doing; it's an economic growth department, it should be applying itself from the task and I think certainly there's been no evidence over the past year that it has been doing that.

SUPPLY - INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

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

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have enjoyed some of the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. He obviously has a great deal of enthusiasm and energy and some idealism and so on and, you know, he talks very glibly however about many things that we have been batting our brains out about for the last four or five years you know. And as I've told many a businessman in this province, the greatest challenge to us in Manitoba and one of the most challenging departments is the Department of Industry and Commerce because we have many many constraints in the economic growth. And I made this point I think before the supper hour.

Unfortunately though, the honourable member, he's got some good ideas but he got some of his facts wrong and he obviously is not aware of the many programs and the thrust and the philosophy of the government as vis-a-vis industrial development as it is expressed in the estimates and in the activities of the Department of Industry and Commerce. I did not go over these in my introductory remarks. For one thing I ran out of time and this is one reason I didn't talk about energy in any detail; and secondly, I have spoken about these over the many years and the honourable member perhaps should be forgiven because he hasn't been here or he hasn't been reading about them. But certainly we have engaged in many many new programs and we have a very consistent policy, we have a very consistent direction, we have a very consistent thrust.

And you know, for the Honourable Member from La Verendrye to get up and attack us in so many words because we've got the guts to examine our own organization and see how we can improve it, you know, I think is a compliment to us in effect. It is a compliment to myself and to this government that it's got the guts to look at the organization to see how better we may do our job of trying to create jobs, trying to raise the standard of living of the people of this province.

Now the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge made reference to the lack of economic growth and in building on what we have. Certainly I've said this, if I've said it once I've said it, Mr. Chairman, a thousand times, that we have to put more emphasis - and indeed we have over the last several years - more emphasis on helping indigenous, existing Manitoba industries and build on what we have. I've said that umpteen times and, you know, the Honourable Member from La Verendrye talks about lack of communication with the business and industry and businessmen. Well the fact is I've talked to these people at conventions and conferences all over this province, not just in the City of Winnipeg but in the north and the west, in the South. I've talked to all of these people about these problems and we've had many discussions. It's not a one-way street; we've had two-way communication. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, or Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to note that we do have a liaison committee with the Canadian Manufacturers Association, Manitoba Branch. And we're working on something very specific and the specific topic we're working on is the question of manpower, the supply of particular categories of skilled manpower that Manitoba manufacturers want. And this is something very specific. We recognize this, the government recognizes it in having set up a Cabinet sub-committee on Manpower which incidentally spent the supper hour discussing the question of manpower supply for Manitoba.

However, the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge, you know, refers to the lack of growth and, my God, you know I didn't think I'd have to refer back to the figures on manufacturing output. The fact is that in 1973 the rate of manufacturing expansion in Manitoba has exceeded the national average to the best of my recollection. The farm cash receipts have increased enormously, in fact they increased 40.5 percent over the previous year. For the first time in our history our gross provincial product exceeded \$5 billion, an increase of 15 percent over the previous year. You know - and I could go on and on and on and on and on talking about figures. The fact is that 1973 was a good year. Sure we would like it to be better; of course we would like to have greater expansion; of course we'd like to have higher levels of income. The fact of the matter is we didn't do too badly in 1973. But the more important thing, Mr. Chairman, is that I have stated in my brief introductory remarks that we recognize the constraints and the challenges that face this economy of ours, the people of our - we all have to work very hard together in order to achieve and to strive to accomplish even better things.

The Member for Fort Rouge referred to western industrialization, that we made pronouncements, we've had meetings, and where are all the policies? Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable

SUPPLY - INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

(MR. EVANS cont'd). . . member fails to realize that you just don't get together and spend three or four hours and then bingo like magic you have a policy which four governments can agree upon. It was announced by the Premiers, the four western Premiers, when they met earlier this year in Saskatoon that the Ministers of Industry with their staff were to develop a strategy for their consideration for this fall. And that is exactly what we're doing, meetings have been held and they're going on. And this is not, we're not engaged in a Mickey Mouse elementary operation in economics. We are sitting down with experts in various provinces in Western Canada and we're talking and discussing specific points, possibilities of joint purchasing, and how this might effect industry; our whole position towards a general agreement on tariffs and trade which is now being re-negotiated. The whole question of joint trade missions abroad, you know, whether there is any merit in this or not - I'm not saying that there is merit or isn't merit, but this is one area we're looking at. The whole question of federal purchasing, because we all know and I've said in this House and I've said out of this House that we have not had the fair share of Federal Government purchasing in the Province of Manitoba. In fact the Federal Government itself admits this. We want to look at a joint approach here. The Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, again we're looking at how we may jointly work with that department to achieve a more rational approach to economic or industrial development in the west. And I think, Mr. Chairman, we are making some progress and I'm not looking for magical solutions, but at least this is an honest to goodness effort and it's going to take months, not just a matter of days in coming up with some magical formula that's going to remake the rate of economic growth in the province.

The question of energy policy. I too am a little dissatisfied with the fact that we haven't got the document that I promised to table in this House. It has completed the first draft stage, and I hope it will be soon be completed and printed. Now when it's done I will have it available to members as I promised. I am not writing it but we have some very good people working on it, and we will table it as soon as it's available. And furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I would indicate that we have indicated on many occasions, the First Minister has indicated our various concerns, and these were stipulated to some degree in Ottawa at the Energy Conference of the First Ministers, but there are various obvious matters of policy that we are looking at and have to be concerned with. The whole question of a national energy planning board, this is more critical than ever before; the rationalization of energy supply; the whole question of conservation this is an area that we're looking at; the Federal Government has a conservation office. We are seeing how we can fit in a provincial conservation office, to clue in, not to duplicate, but to co-operate and to complement the activities of the Federal Energy Conservation Office. The whole question of a national electric power grid; the question of energy policy as an economic development tool; the whole question of the costing of energy transmission, the allocation of gas to foreign markets, namely the United States; the exportation of oil and gas, we think is at far too high a level, it should be cut back. We've presented these views at many public hearings in Ottawa, and elsewhere in the country, before the National Energy Board, and so on. And on and on and on. There are many topics.

We're also developing - my honourable friend from Fort Rouge may appreciate it - a metric model to see to what extent changes in energy supply and energy demand will have an effect on the development of very particular segments of manufacturing and other industries in the Province of Manitoba. We have retained a very excellent consultant to assist us in this, a person who actually set up the Research Branch of the United States Federal Energy Commission, I believe it's called. But whatever the specific title is - that is, Federal Power Commission, I believe the title is, in the United States.

The question of policy guidelines and the whole role of the department vis-a-vis smaller firms, and I guess I'm getting on to both items mentioned by the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge and the Member from La Verendrye. The fact is that we do have guidelines and the figures do show that a greater percentage of our grants and of our limited resources, they're limited. We don't have multi millions of dollars to hand out, and I'm not sure that we want to hand out multi millions of dollars necessarily, but we do have a modest program of financial assistance, and the figures in the department, the latest figures that we have - which I am prepared to table, I don't have them with me but I will table them, or present them when we discuss the estimates tomorrow perhaps - which will show that over the years a greater and greater percentage of these funds has gone to firms with 50 or fewer employees.

SUPPLY - INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

(MR. EVANS cont'd)

The Honourable Member from La Verendrye, I gathered from many points of order and cross examination by the Leader of the Opposition, etc., and other remarks made, that he was referring to a report that was written by one Hubert Prefontaine who, I must inform members, left the department I believe about three years ago. But I want to say right now that that gentleman wrote many reports, and we've had many reviews of organization; we've had a consideration of management by objectives, and so on, you know, and this is why I asked the honourable member some time ago exactly which one is he referring to. I must say to the honourable members that we, and like any organization, should forever be seeking better ways of serving the community or constituency that you're to serve, in this case the business constituency. I don't apologize for that particular report, if that was the report he was referring to, but there have been many reports. There was one, at least one by Mr. Prefontaine, and in fact Mr. Prefontaine has written other reports, if you want to call them, memoranda, etc., and indeed so have other people. If we didn't do that then I don't think we would be doing our job in administering a particular department.

Again the Member from La Verendrye quoted some figures of the Manitoba Export Corporation which he says was just established for the first time. The Manitoba Export Corporation was established, I don't know, 15 or 20 years ago under - I think it was under the Conservative government I believe. And the fact is that it has not gotten into the business in a large scale, a significant scale of engaging as an agency that will attempt to deliver goods for Manitoba companies, and obtain goods abroad on a pre-sold basis perhaps, but we are going to hopefully discuss later in this session the Manitoba Trading Corporation Bill which will give us the vehicle to do something that we haven't been able to do thus far.

But I want to point out that the Manitoba Export Corporation's main activity has been in the area of general trade development, not in the area of trade per se but trade assistance to business men; and this includes giving advice on tariffs, giving advice on various documentation that's required in foreign countries, and so on. It also is a program whereby we assist Manitoba business men. The Trade Development Branch do engage in programs whereby we assist Manitoba business men to participate in various exhibitions and shows, and so on. Perhaps tomorrow I will have some figures which will show the level of activity. But for the coming year we will be participating in at least one international fair in Europe; we'll be participating in other fairs in North America, including the fields of furniture, industrial and equipment materials a gift show, a recreational vehicle show; we're going to participate in a program for architects and so on. I could read you other figures but I don't want to get involved in reaming off a lot a lot of detail that one could read in annual reports.

But the fact is that while the member correctly observed that the number of trade missions per se has been reduced, that does not indicate whatsoever that we have let up in our activities to promote the sales of Manitoba products abroad. As a matter of fact we have virtually stepped up this activity, but instead of taking large groups of people, we find it far more efficient to take one or two or three people on a very specific project, to talk to a very specific company or two or three, and to go to the particular city in a particular country involved, and a rightful approach rather than a very splashy, a very costly, general type of trade mission. They do have their place, but we do feel that, and as we have indicated by our actions, we do feel that this selective approach, this more individual approach is more effective.

The Honourable Member from La Verendrye referred to assistance to small towns. I must remind him that - and again they say where is our policies, our thrusts, and so on, and I mentioned to members opposite on several occasions that we have a community management development program. It's been eminently successful; we've covered 45 communities virtually involving hundreds of Manitoba business men; and in fact we completed one quite recently at Flin Flon, where we held the windup, the concluding meeting, with the co-operation of the Flin Flon Chamber of Commerce. So much for our concern for the small business man in the small town; that's only one program, it's only one program. There are many programs: there's regional productivity programs, productivity audits on a regional basis which we've completed, one in the Interlake I believe, one in WestMan has been completed. I was in Brandon just a few days ago and had the pleasure of presenting 47 certificates to 47 management personnel in the WestMan area who participated in the program. From chatting with these gentlemen I don't feel any hostility towards this government, towards this department, towards this Minister, as

SUPPLY - INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

(MR. EVANS cont'd). . . has been alluded to by the Member from La Verendrye; in fact I find that we have a great deal of rapport. --(Interjection)--Sorry!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur has a point of privilege?

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): No, I just ask the Minister what the program it is that he's talking about in WestMan that applies to small towns throughout the constituency of Arthur and the surrounding area.

MR. EVANS: Yes. Well there were two programs, one is a community management development program which has involved, as I said, 45 towns approximately across Manitoba. The towns in the WestMan area: I remember Virden was covered, Minnedosa was covered. Those are two that I remember offhand; I can get a list if the honourable member wishes. Also--(Interjection)--Minnedosa is in WestMan.--(Interjection)--I'm sorry, it is. The program I referred to latterly is a management development, is a follow-up to the productivity audit, the regional productivity audit, where one of the requests by the businessmen was a management training course for middle and senior management of manufacturers, and so we have just concluded this program with the co-operation of Red River College and the Assiniboine College in Brandon, and there were 47 graduates of the program.

The Member from La Verendrye also referred to the productivity audits of the trucking industry, and chastised us, and threw a few stones our way about the problems of that industry. Well the fact is that, you know, we've gone out and we've made the moneys available that this department has to assist this industry. The truckers wanted us to do the - you say they could have simply wrote the report, or we could have simply written the report ourselves, or any trucker could have written it himself. The fact is that the trucking people came to us and asked for this particular productivity audit; it was at their request and they shared in the cost of this particular study. It's not a government report; it's an independent consultant report in which part of the cost was paid for by the industry, part of the cost by the government, but it is as such not a government report. I should also state that it was not an over-all industry report but there were also 60 individual reports for each of the 60 participating firms. These of course are confidential to those particular firms, and I would trust the honourable member would appreciate that.

The question of manpower: Again we have added personnel in our manpower development division and we're presently engaging in a manpower project in the Dauphin district, and we have a long list of people and companies that we've worked with, companies that we've worked with who have had particular manpower problems. Again I don't want to bore the House with a lot of detail but we can certainly supply that information if the members of the House would like to have that type of detailed information.

There was reference made to community parks - and I see the time is running out, Mr. Chairman - and reference was made to Gimli. The honourable member must realize that Gimli was a very special situation whereby the Federal Government pulled out and left us with an empty air base, and with some federal funding from DREE we agreed to take it over on a five-year lease base, on a five-year operating base this has been done. At the moment the base is completely filled; we even have a Canadian National Railway, a Locomotive Engineers Training School. But I want to inform the honourable member that we do have modest grants, a modest program available to help plan industrial parks and we have tried to indicate this to the various communities in Manitoba, but it hasn't been very enthusiastically used; but it's up to the community involved to take the initiative in this case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 9:00 o'clock, the next hour being Private Members' Hour. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, directed me to report progress, and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Point Douglas, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Private Member's Hour, first item is adjourned debates on second reading, private bills. Bill No. 35. The Honourable Member for Morris.

Bill No. 39. The Honourable Minister of Mines. (Stand)

Bill No. 50. The Honourable Member for Radisson (Stand)

Bill No. 53. The Honourable Member for . . . Bill 57. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia (Stand)

Bill 23 the Honourable Member for Radisson (Stand)

Bill No. 31 the Honourable Member for Crescentwood (Stand)

No. 47. The Honourable Member for Radisson (Stand)

No. 41. The Honourable Member for Logan (Stand)

BILL NO. 59

No. 59. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM presented Bill No. 59, an Act to validate By-law No. 3269 of the Town of Dauphin for second reading.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The bill that I am sponsoring is a matter of courtesy to the Town of Dauphin, and for the edification of the members, when the Town of Dauphin entered its streets paving program the authority for the same was contained in its by-law No. 2427 and was passed on August 12, 1957, and validated by chapter 80 statutes of Manitoba 1958. The original by-law provided that the cost of pavement could be levied against the lands benefitted thereby with payment over a period of ten years at an interest rate of 5 percent per annum. This interest rate is not now realistic and the town has passed its by-law No. 3269 February 14, 1974, which is a by-law to amend the original by-law and provide for an interest rate to be determined by the council and upon approval of the Municipal Board.

In order to make the amending by-law effective it must be validated by an Act of the Legislature in a similar manner as the validation of the original by-law. The intent of the bill is to allow the town to levy a more realistic interest rate and which would be authorized by the Municipal Board.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 47

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we might have the indulgence of the House to revert back to Bill No. 47. My colleague the Minister of Finance is desirous of speaking. I understand that the Honourable Member for Radisson took the adjournment on his behalf, and if there is agreement in the House that my colleague the Minister of Finance may be able to speak, we would appreciate that, and then I think it would be in order for somebody else to take the adjournment of the debate rather than the Member for Radisson.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed? The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: We have no objection to reverting back to that particular bill, Mr. Speaker, if that's the wish of the government. However, we have reached - I would want to defer to the Member for St. Boniface, because we have reached that portion of the Order Paper now on which a resolution standing in his name would come up, but if he has no objection we don't.

MR. MARION: Agreed.

MR. PAULLEY: It's quite all right with me, we have to have the unanimous agreement in any case.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy extended to me. I did come only some two minutes after 9:00 o'clock knowing - I'd better speak now before I lose my voice completely - knowing that there were a number of bills ahead of Bill No. 47, but I am pleased that I can speak to it today because I have delayed introducing second reading of Bill No. 62 because I felt that I would like to deal with and hopefully have the House dispose of Bill 47 before we deal with Bill 62, which is the second bill on the Financial Administration Act.

Mr. Speaker, I felt that once the bill had been introduced by the Honourable Member from

BILL 47

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). . . Morris dealing with the special warrants section of the bill, that it would be difficult for me to deal with that portion of what I wanted to speak about under Bill No. 62 until we had been in a position to deal with Bill 47.

There has been quite a bit of discussion on the question of the use by this government of a special warrant at the time of interim supply. I think that any effort I would make to review what preceded and what followed the Interim Supply third reading, the decision of the government to pass a special warrant in accordance with the appropriate section, Section 41 of the Financial Administration Act. The subsequent debate of the following two days which culminated in the passing of Interim Supply, to review all that will not serve a great deal of purpose, other than to debate again what has already been debated, and to arouse a little more animosity such as existed at that time. So I will try to deal more specifically with the bill itself and indicate my position in regard to Bill No. 47.

I have today reviewed the debate which took place on Thursday, April 4th, which was the day when we announced that we had passed the special warrant: I reviewed the debate which took place on April 5th, at the end of which, as I say, third reading was given to Interim Supply, and I have reviewed the debate that took place dealing with Bill 47.

In the main, the tone of debate was somewhat different on April 4 and 5th compared with what it was on May 8th when this bill itself was discussed. I don't have too much to quarrel with the statements, the opinions given, the arguments presented by the Member from Morris nor with the comments made by my leader, the First Minister in response thereto. I guess I would only make the point that when there is discussion about tradition, and what was alleged to be a breach of tradition, I must point out, as has been pointed out before, that tradition is something which can be overcome in practice, or it can also be overcome in legislation, and no one, no one can ignore the fact that this Legislature in 1969 did in effect, and deliberately and knowingly I assume, change what was called tradition in that a new bill was brought in, a new Act, which clearly removed any restriction on special warrants being issued while the Legislature was in session. At the time I discussed this feature, I think during the time we debated Interim Supply, I said that I didn't have before me but did have available the notes which were provided for the Honourable Gurney Evans, to be used by him in the presentation of the Financial Administration Bill when he introduced it in the spring of 1969. Well I did bring it with me, and I now intend to read the comment, the comment for the section in particular, section 41, and I quote:

"The provision for special warrants has been changed to provide for special warrants at any time. The restriction that special warrants could not be made while the Legislature is in session has been eliminated." That's as clear as can be.

Now the use of the special warrant is always a case where there had to be certification that there is a need for expenditure of moneys, that the appropriation of such moneys is not authorized or not sufficient, and that it is deemed necessary for the conduct of the affairs of government that moneys be provided, that a special warrant is passed. The position that this government took in accordance with the Act, which was passed in 1969, was that there was a need for government to be in a position to make payments, and there was no provision passed, authorized, for making the payments, and that that need could be met by the passing of a special warrant. Let us consider that the debate on Interim Supply, which lasted some, well I think it was some 20 days from the time it was introduced; it was debated 20 days but it was introduced about April, or rather March 10th or 11th, that the debate had gone to an unprecedented length. If one speaks about tradition then certainly if there ever was a tradition, and there was, that Interim Supply was passed I believe in every year of the life of this Legislature before the end of March, then tradition was breached, but in any event, special warrant was passed.

At the time it was passed, this government considered that it was a serious measure which the government took. It was the first time indeed that a special warrant was passed under these circumstances, but of course, it was also the first time indeed that Interim Supply had not been passed by the end of the fiscal year. So matching those two together, we still felt, and we have said it on different occasions, it was said by the First Minister, it was said by the House Leader, and I said that we considered that this was a serious decision that was made, one for which we were accountable. I remember - I wonder if other members do, and if the Member for Lakeside does - that when he was responding to the knowledge that the special warrant had been passed, that he said there is something you could have done otherwise

BILL 47

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). . . and proposed, and I think almost demanded, the government should have brought in closure. In his speech which I have just reread this afternoon, he talked about the fact that the Opposition intended to continue the debate for a considerable length of time. I think he said we may have 20 more speeches, we can, we will move a hoist, we will use this opportunity to debate the government's actions, especially in the light - and I think there was some reference to the fact that half the time in estimates and committee debate was taken up by government and therefore the Opposition sought this method of further debating but it wished to debate. He did mention closure, and he did mention that the House should have authorized the expenditure, or the warrant. And I'm wondering whether he remembers as I do, that the House Leader kept saying, well let it come to a vote, let's vote on Interim Supply and find out whether the government has the confidence of the House, and if there were a vote then we would know whether the special warrant, the moneys provided for the special warrant were indeed to have been provided in accordance with the will of the House.

In line with that, Mr. Speaker, I feel, as does the government, that the government must be accountable for the actions it takes. I brush aside much of what was said by the Leader of the Opposition on May 8th dealing with this bill, because I don't think that he dealt with this issue in a responsible way, and I differentiate between his contribution and that of the Member for Morris, who was speaking on the basis of what should be the practice and tradition in the House. But the Leader of the Opposition who spoke in such a manner that I don't think warrants any response is one to whom I do not feel we must account, but I do feel government must account to the Legislature for the actions it takes.

Therefore I do propose that we should add a section to the Act which will provide that in the event that government during a session decides that it shall pass a special warrant, must then present itself to the House as quickly as possible, account for the fact that a special warrant was passed, account for the reasons and the sense of emergency it felt, and request of the House that there be a vote in support or in rejection of the government's action. And that would be a vote of confidence it would be a money resolution, that the government would have to stand behind its actions. That is what indeed was being suggested by the House Leader the very day that we passed the special warrant, or the day following, when he said, let's vote on Interim Supply; let's find out whether this House is prepared to approve Interim Supply, and by doing so it will have subsumed the special warrant, because a special warrant in itself had within it a clause providing that in the event, or on the passing of an Act which provided the moneys, and the moneys passed under special warrant would be included.

It is therefore my proposal that when the bill which is in my name, Bill No. 62, comes to committee that I will then bring an amendment to committee to amend the Act to provide a section following the section which authorizes a special warrant to the extent - and this is a matter that could be discussed as to the wording but the draft wording I now have - is that the Minister shall within 72 hours after the special warrant is passed, or if the Assembly is not then sitting, then shortly thereafter, table a copy of the special warrant and introduce a resolution in the Assembly to approve the action of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council in issuing this special warrant, and that the vote shall take place that same day, so that there should not be another extensive debate but that indeed the matter be introduced and dealt with that same day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the way I believe it has to be handled is that this bill before us has to be disposed of first. And since what I am proposing is in contradiction, or in rejection, of the proposal in this bill, then I propose to vote against this bill, and on the assumption that the bill is defeated then when Bill 62 on the Financial Administration Act is dealt with and passed, and goes into committee, I propose to bring in that resolution which will make it possible for us to discuss the wording. That therefore is how I propose that we can deal with it, recognizing, as we did all along, that a special warrant is a matter which does require accountability, and providing that there shall be a means of accountability to the House where the confidence of the government can be confirmed.

At the same time that does take away what apparently the Opposition thought was some kind of a weapon where it appears from what was said by the Deputy Leader on April 4th of the Opposition, and more recently by the Leader of the Opposition on May 8th, was some plan that the Conservative Party had where according to the Leader of the Opposition they knew the moment to which they could drag out debate before it became crucial - and I'm using my

BILL 47

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). . . words not his - that the bill be passed and that they would therefore be in a position to hold up the passing of Interim Supply. As a matter of fact the Member from Lakeside when he debated it, used the term negotiate as being a matter that gives the power to the Opposition to negotiate the passage of the Interim Supply. One of the phrases or expressions used by the Leader of the Opposition on May 8th was, "Mr. Speaker, the honourable members opposite may or may not be aware but we determine the exact time, the exact moment when in fact would be the last moment before action would have to be undertaken by government." I'm sure it was a great disappointment to him to discover that government made that decision and government was prepared to stand by that decision. The Member for Swan River no doubt wishes to make a contribution and will do so in his usual manner. But, Mr. Speaker, the manner in which we propose to make the amendment is one which I believe recognizes the responsibility of government, the maturity of government, and the manner in which this problem, raised by the Member from Morris in an objective way when he did it on May 8th, can be dealt with in a responsible way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you Mr. Speaker. I had not had an opportunity to speak on the bill, Bill 47, currently before us up to now, and it's by a stroke of good fortune I suppose that I have the opportunity of rising to speak right on the heels of the Minister responsible for this bill being here in the first instance I would suspect, and I received some good advice from behind me that says that what we heard from the Minister of Finance right now is out of the old football play book, play No. 4, the double reverse, a variation of the St. John's shift. But I want to assure the Honourable Minister of Finance that indeed. . .

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, could I speak on a point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage state his point of order?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well I suppose it's not really a point of order but the Member for Lakeside brought in sports, so I thought I should announce that Selkirk Steelers have won the Centennial Cup, 1 - 0.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you that further to the remarks made at the outset of the contribution just heard from the Minister of Finance, who indicated that he recognized as somewhat a more, or change in the tone of debate from the time of April 4th, April 5th, when the actual warrant was passed, which precipitated some of the vigorous debate in the Chamber, to the latter times now when we're debating this particular bill and our response now from it.

Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister's performance today and I - well we'll keep the tone at the same level. The Minister's performance today has only brought in a more shocking way possible to me why we were shocked back on April 4th and April 5th. Mr. Speaker, if it were coming from perhaps some other members of whom I have somewhat less respect in terms of their experience in this Chamber, or perhaps of whom I'm not prepared to extend that amount of understanding of the parliamentary system, it's in that context that I say it. But coming from the Member from St. John's who sat in this Chamber, certainly one of the veteran members of this Chamber, let us not be misled, that docile performance by the Minister of Finance just now shook me much more so than the outrageous actions of his deed on April 4th and April 5th. Because what he's suggesting to us in his docile tones right now, and this really is the frightening aspect is what we suggested he was doing on April 4th and April 5th, that henceforth, henceforth the checks and balances that have long withstood the pressure of time and abuse and practice in the parliamentary system no longer will be heeded.

Well, Mr. Speaker, he's suggesting, and it's a bit of a cute reverse play, he's saying henceforth whenever the government requires its moneys it will feel free to pass its special warrant, providing that it will subject itself within 72 hours or whatever it was, to the Chamber and have the matter being able to - presenting the government of the day to a vote. In other words, his whole concept boils down to a simple show of strength. Mr. Speaker, a majority of times we hope, and I hope that we are governed by majority governments, despite what some members of the New Democratic Party may feel about the benefits of minority

BILL 47

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . governments, I and I think a goodly number of Manitobans and Canadians still nonetheless believe in majority governments.

But what the Minister of Finance has suggested to us this evening was that no matter what, no matter what procedure has been set up over the years in terms of the studying of ways and means, and then studying of estimates, that if he gets tired of any kind of prolonged debate the government of the day thinks that the debate has pursued beyond the point of their endurance, he'll sign a special warrant. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would have thought in fact indeed when he started on his speech I would have thought that he might have agreed, as we agree, that you know mistakes are made in the past. I suggest that the amendment brought into the Financial Administration Act by a Conservative Government in '69 was indeed a mistake, and we're trying to correct it now. We're trying to correct it now.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to suggest that that responsibility, that fiscal responsibility, should be taken away from this Chamber, as the Minister of Finance is, and simply being brought to a test of the day as to who's got the greater numbers. Because, Mr. Speaker, that does show a very serious, a very serious lack of understanding of the parliamentary system, and the particular privileges that an Opposition, now matter how small, has in a legislative setting.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister seems to take great offence because we had the audacity on this side to suggest that we would use all our means possible, parliamentary means that is, that we would scheme, and we would plan to do those things that we thought were in the interest of the people of Manitoba as we saw them, and naturally they're not going to be as we see the interest of the people of Manitoba, they're not going to be the same as what honourable members opposite see them to be. But, Sir, that's the business of parliamentary democracy.

The kind of tinkering that we're doing with this system right now is, you know, is even more reason for concern than the initial one act play that was played out on April 4th and April 5th with the special warrant, perhaps under duress perhaps under the other traditional breaking role played by the Opposition of the day in extending the debates on Interim Supply to the point to which we did.

And while we're on that particular subject I make it not as a particular matter of great personal grievance with me, but I do wish to correct the public record that although the word closures was mentioned by members on this side of the House, and I'm particularly--if the Honourable Minister of Finance did go back to my speeches, he will note that the one course of action which I particularly felt was the correct one, you know, never seems to be mentioned again. Well to let the particular course of action take its place, to do nothing you see. --(Interjection)--No, no, as I see it the particular, the particular strength that lies in both the government's hands and the Opposition's hands in playing out the parliamentary democratic approach to the kind of situation that we were locked into, is indeed to let the chips fall where they fall, and let the politics fall where they fall. In other words, we were, we were threatening the position of the government of the day to pay their bills. We were threatening the position of the government of the day to pay their civil servants. Mr. Speaker, I suggested, if you read the speech, that perhaps it was time for precisely that kind of situation to develop. That was what I suggest, among other things, in the debates on April 4th and April 5th.

But, Sir, that is a perfectly legitimate position for an Opposition to take, providing that we were breaking no parliamentary rules, providing that we were playing the game as it has been proven to be correct over the many many years of parliamentary experience, then to devise new rules because the game is getting tight, I suggest, and we have suggested, is a dangerous, is a dangerous course to be on. It is a dangerous course to be on. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of course has the advantage insofar as the fact being that the amendment to the financial administration that enabled the Minister and the government to take that particular course of action was indeed there, and was put there by a previous Conservative administration.

Mr. Speaker, it serves no purpose for me to say, it serves no purpose for me to say, but I can say it to you, and I can swear it on both the Bibles, that no Progressive Conservative administration, no Conservative administration anywhere, no Liberal administration anywhere would have ever have used it in the manner and way in which they used it. Now I can say that only because it happens to be a fact that no Conservative administration anywhere in this

BILL 47

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . country has ever used it, and to the best of my knowledge no Liberal administration has ever used it has ever used it in this country. So I cannot say, however that in defending myself that, well why did you put it in the Act if you didn't intend to use it. I can only plead for some understanding that there was in my judgment a typical, you know, a kind of a bureaucratic tinkering with a pretty fundamental law which led, misled a previous Minister and administration, you know, and anybody that has had a small bit of experience with bureaucracy, anybody that's had a small bit of experience on the Treasury Bench, knows how often the senior bureaucrats try to take the short-cuts, and make their short-cuts available wherever they can shortcut the parliamentary democratic procedure.

After all, all too often it is a nuisance to them. The fact that we debate things here, and hold things up, and go through long arduous speeches here to debate what to them appears to be a small minor technicality, often leads them to suggest to the government and to the ministers of the day and these ministers are only too well aware of it, because it's happening to them every day. It's happening to them every day, as it has happened to Treasury Bench Ministers since the parliamentary has begun, ways and means of circumventing this Chamber.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to dwell on it. I'm simply suggesting that I don't feel any particular allegiance to a mistake or an error made by a former colleague of mine. I can stand pat on my knowledge that we would have never acted upon, or used the financial administration in the manner and way in which this government has done, and I simply ask, and you know I plead my case on that, simply on the record, on the record of performance. For once, Mr. Speaker, it's an advantage that you know, for the past 100 years there have been other governments in this province other than the socialists; and for the past 100 years there have been other governments in other provinces and in this country other than the socialists. And if you examined their records, Sir, they never, never transgressed the privileges of this Chamber or any other Legislative Chamber in the manner and way in which this administration has done.

So on that record I say that, you know, I'm not trying to worry about or cover up the fact that an amendment was made to the Financial Administration Act by our government that made this action possible. I am though, Sir, deeply saddened that this Minister of this government fails to recognize, fails to recognize completely, and deliberately side-steps the issues that were raised, whether they were raised in an exaggerated form or not is really beside the question. We're a month or two away from that particular debate at this particular time, and we can discuss it a little more coolly and levelly at this particular stage, and we're I think, are so doing.

But Sir, instead of looking at the bill before us, Bill No. 47, as a serious attempt to, you know, strengthen, or to bring back where a bit of democracy was weakened perhaps, instead of reaffirming our collective belief in the fact that this Chamber, and really the only job we have in this Chamber is to scrutinize carefully, diligently, the way and the means the government collects and spends money. The only meaningful way to do that is to have obviously some power resting, not just with the government of the day - you know, if the government of the day at any time can call the division bell, stand up and vote, you know, there is really no point in talking about 90 hours debates on estimates, or in launching on a debate on Interim Supply, or on Capital Supply, or anything else. And this is what the Minister of Finance has done to us today.--(Interjection)--Well, not quite. He said he'll give us 72 hours notice, or something like that.--(Interjection)--He said that at any given time when we have, you know, particularly grated on his nerves, or upset him in some manner, or he's run out of his supply of Tums, whatever the case may be, he'll trot up to the Cabinet room sign a warrant and bring it down here, brandish it, and call on his troops to stand up and we'll have a vote.

Well that's really simplifying the whole process, isn't it, Sir? Well, Sir, that is what the Minister of Finance is doing. I'm ashamed of it; I'm ashamed that he should have so little respect, so little respect for the - I don't even like the word "traditions" in this sense - but so little respect for the due process of the Legislature examining how governments tax the people that they govern, and how they spend their money thereafter, and that he surely must have the intelligence to know that if there's going to be any meaningful examination of that process, then there has to lie within the Opposition of the day some power, some means of holding back, and there must also finally lie means within the government to overcome that

BILL 47

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . obstacle. And, Sir, we did not come to that point. There were two or three or four avenues open to the government to meet their obligations. Closure was one of them, but perhaps not politically acceptable to them. They never gave us a chance to know how far we would take it, but they thought that we weren't going to play that game any longer. You know, "they" thought, so they transgressed it.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, the government and its most senior members show the kind of contempt for this Legislative Assembly that only bears truth to the kind of comments that we have made from time to time, understandably the kind of comments that are made under different circumstances, such as the elections, where there is a degree of exaggeration from time to time. But, Sir, they have a kernel, there's a kernel of truth that has to be attached to it, and this happens to be one of those kernels, Mr. Minister of Finance, that you have, you know, contemptuously thrown out to us, one for me, and for anybody that takes the time to examine what parliamentary democracy's all about, a pretty serious one. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a few words on this particular bill. It's rather difficult for me to follow up on the Honourable Member for Lakeside because he has covered pretty well the waterfront. But I, too, must say that I'm disappointed, I'm disappointed with the Minister of Finance in what he had to say tonight, and to me, Mr. Speaker, he's turned the clock back 400 years. He's acting in the same manner as Elizabeth did. When Parliament refused to give her her way, members were sorted out and put to death in many instances to defend the right we're talking about tonight. Her father was just as bad, and down through those 400 years the rights of the people have been defended in this manner and it's been the only weapon that the Opposition has. History has shown --(Interjection)--Yes, that's right. That's where our history began and that's where the common folk, the people that you're supposed to be giving lip service to, finally got their rights and got their privacy in parliament, which is being destroyed by what the Minister had to say tonight. You know as well as I do, Mr. Minister, that that was the only weapon the Opposition had, or will have, in order to hold the government at bay on something they feel they're doing wrong; and our attitude and our speeches were made for one reason and one reason only: We wanted a judicial enquiry and you were refusing to give it to us. We thought that it was important enough to hold back. . .

A MEMBER: But where does it stand now?

MR. BILTON: . . . your rights. Where does it stand now? You did it behind the Cabinet doors, and as far as I'm concerned. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BILTON: . . . under the circumstances, you misinformed the Governor when he signed that document. You should have advised him otherwise. He should have refused to have signed it whilst this House was sitting, and you know it as well as I know it. That's what we're here for. Or are you going to close this House down, as Henry VIII did for eleven years? You don't need us here. You've taken the rights away from us. The only right we have had, or have, and the Minister tonight supports that idea. I never thought I'd live to see the day that the man that I had respect for as a parliamentarian would have got up and said what he said tonight. It's beyond comprehension, and I'm sure in his heart he doesn't believe in that attitude. And you know as well as I do, had you been sitting over here and we had done the same thing, you'd have still been roaring, and you wouldn't have been on Cloud Nine. But so long as we were over there you had no fears, because we respected your rights. A mistake was made, as was pointed out by the Honourable Member for Lakeside. We're all human; and Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Morris, in bringing this bill forward, is to correct the wrong. --(Interjection)--

You had to bring it out into the open, and I appreciate you bringing it out in the open, and you should be assisting us to correct it by supporting Bill 47. This is the last chance, gentlemen, because there's no other reason why this precedent that you've set up can't be used on future occasions, and where does it lead this Chamber at any given time? I ask you to think seriously of this matter because, as I said a moment ago, you've taken away what right we have as an opposition to hold any government at bay; otherwise there is no purpose of us being here at all, is there? Is there any purpose of us being here at all if you're going to run this

BILL 47

(MR. BILTON cont'd). . . province in that manner? It might be my imagination, but think about it; think about what it can mean. We have no rights at all over here. That's the only right that we have is refusing to give this government money, if we have ways and means of doing so, until there's some compromise on the problem that brought that situation about, and that compromise was not forthcoming from the government and we had a right to do what we did, and I'm proud we stood up for it. And I ask you to think about what you're doing, Mr. Minister, think of it overnight and see if you can't change your mind and support this bill, and have this amendment put in the bill so that for all time, all time, for all time, the Opposition still has one right.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. HARVEY PATTERSON (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: That brings us to Private Members' Resolutions. With ten minutes to go, is the House desirous of starting or shall we call it 10:00?

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be fair to the member who has the next private resolution, to proceeding to those resolutions at this stage, I wonder if the House Leader would be prepared to call it 10:00 o'clock.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, we would be prepared and if you require a motion, Mr. Speaker--otherwise call it 10:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The House having agreed to adjourn, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Wednesday)