

BILL 34

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to talk about and review some of the matters that have been discussed concerning northern Manitoba and then, as I have indicated, deal with the question of Interim Supply and the actions of the government and the perspective within which those actions must be viewed and understood.

When we talk about the two issues that are now before us dealing with northern Manitoba, the problem of the fishing co-op and the problems related to two companies financed by the Communities Economic Development Fund, we become involved with a curious set of events, and we come involved with what I would consider is a failure of candor on the part of the government. And that candor is related not only to the answers that were given to the various questions that have been asked, but in the approach the government has made and appears to take with respect to its involvement in both situations. And I think it's necessary not just to review that but in the course of doing - in the course of discussing that to deal with many other additional issues that now have been brought to public attention, and will be brought in the next period of time, which I think concern the whole operation of government and the way in which the present government has approached the problems of northern Manitoba.

I indicated before the luncheon break that in many respects I felt that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in this battle had more or less dug himself a foxhole and was protected and was allowing the two members of the Communities Economic Development Fund to be placed in a position where they were running all over the place to avoid being hit and to find their own foxhole. And I was not only referring, Mr. Speaker, to the question relating to R & M Construction but I also am referring to the fact that one of the Communities Economic directors is involved in another company, which I believe is now in receivership; and further that there are I think questions to be raised about other loans of the Communities Economic Development Fund have given, either by the encouragement or recommendation of the director, and I think this also then deals with the whole thrust of what was attempted with the Communities Economic Development Fund because we on this side are not suggesting that the objectives were not correct but I think we have to now examine the administration and the process upon which decisions were made.

I think further that another issue which will develop and is developing now is the way in which the Department of Northern Affairs handled itself vis-a-vis the communities that are in the developing stages even if they were considered more advanced than remote and underdeveloped in the north. Because if I'm correct, Mr. Speaker, the auditors of the Department of Northern Affairs are now involved in an unsuccessful audit of the Town of Wabowden's affairs, and this relates to the difficulty that any of those communities would have in having the kind of backup in managerial ability to be able to handle the various programs that are brought forward to them. And when one examines the problems of the co-ops one recognizes that one of the problems has been that the government has not really provided the management capability that should have been provided.

And further, Mr. Speaker, he goes into another area in which I think there is and will be a fair amount of attack, and that has to do with the way in which the government handles itself in these communities. The problem as I see now, Mr. Speaker - and I think this is becoming more apparent as information is forthcoming day by day - is that the government has in fact through its Community Development Officers and almost as a deliberate policy become involved in the inner politics of the communities which at this point are difficult, are in a formative stage, and which have very serious ramifications because once the government becomes involved in those inner politics then what really happens, it puts itself in the position where the whole weight of government must be behind the person they choose. When you have people who are the political leaders of these communities being placed in a position where they are receiving substantial salaries, or substantial benefits from government, and who to a certain extent become more beholden to the government than they were before, there are going to be additional issues raised within the communities as to who these people really are working for, and as to whether in fact the community is really benefitting from the structure and from the proposals that have to be dealt with and from the programs that are being involved.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side are going to admit that there is a great deal happening in the north that did not happen in 1969. But, Mr. Speaker, we have in the last four years, and

## BILL 34

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . we're on this fifth year, will be spending approximately in this province about four and a half billion dollars more money when one takes the capital borrowing and the accumulated revenues from income tax, from sales tax, gasoline tax and liquor tax in terms of the total government expenditure. So it stands to reason that the north would benefit a great deal from the additional moneys that are now being spent over and above what was being spent in 1969. And I want to make that point, Mr. Speaker, because what I'm saying is that we are really talking about an accumulation of money, about four and a half billion dollars over and above what was spent in 1969. So a great deal is happening in the north. But having said that, that does not mean that some criticism can now not be levelled at this government and that there is some accounting that has to be given by this government and that they're self-righteous about, that they have done no wrong in this respect is not sufficient to meet several arguments and several positions that we now have established.

The Communities Economic Development Fund objectives are objectives that we approve. But in reality that decision with respect to the way in which it operates is really more of a political decision than in the Manitoba Development Corporation because in effect it is headed by a civil servant and in turn who is answerable to the Minister and in turn, and in turn by a board of directors, whose enthusiasm for what is happening is obvious but whose business ability and business experience I think is subject to be questioned. Now having said that, Mr. Speaker, then one has to say what did the government do or what has the government done in this respect to try and control management with respect to the way in which these moneys have been given--(Interjection)--Yes. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is interesting because now the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is saying we put in a manager. That's the first time he's admitted that we have put in the manager. So--(Interjection)--No, not so now. You just said that we just put in a manager. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that our problems are far more serious than one may realize and my reason for mentioning all of this is because I think that it is unfair at this point that the board of directors who are involved in the allegations made with respect to R & M and J.M.K., well particularly R & M, have been put into the position that they now are fending for themselves on a variety of different situations other than, other than the specific issue that's involved. --(Interjection)--No.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance. I did what? I brought allegations forward, I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . brought allegations forward against what? The Communities Economic Development Fund. I brought allegations by an affidavit, and that affidavit related to the operation of the Communities Economic Development Fund and to certain, a certain procedure. The government has taken the position not of allowing the board of directors to come before the Committee and to explain their situation so that we could understand it fully and understand the truth of the situation, but rather for them to sign affidavits, and I suggest that in the course of signing an affidavit they swore about things they didn't even know about. Now --(Interjection)--Well, Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated that Mr. McIvor has indicated, that to the best of my knowledge two cheques were deposited to R & M Construction. One of those cheques was deposited, Mr. Speaker, not to R & M but to the Communities Economic Development. One of those cheques I think, if I'm correct in understanding the sequence, should have been deposited to J.M.K. Construction to satisfy those creditors of J.M.K. But having said that, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we have a situation in which it is not just the question of R & M, it is not just the question of the company and how it was used, it's a question of the Communities Economic Development Fund, it's a question of how other moneys handled by people in the north have in fact been managed and checked.

When we talked about the fishing co-ops we indicated as an example that the PEP grants to the fishing co-ops were not within the scrutiny of the Provincial Auditor. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I appeared on a program in Thompson which was the equivalent of a by-line program, and to my surprise I received a phone call from a woman who claimed that she was a secretary for a period of time at the Metis Federation, that she has been in Winnipeg to complain to the Ombudsman about the fact that PEP grants, PEP grant money, had in her opinion not been applied for the purposes to which they should have been applied. And she had come to the

## BILL 34

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . Ombudsman for the purpose of trying to see that some justice occurred with respect to this particular situation. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe I'm correct, because I've discussed this with the Provincial Auditor privately, as any member can in dealing with the - an understanding of his area of responsibility, that the Provincial Auditor does not follow these moneys through. And, Mr. Speaker, he does not follow these moneys through, and, Mr. Speaker, because he does not follow these moneys through, and because of the kinds of sums of money we are talking about, there can, and I believe there has been substantial waste of public money and abuse. In the case of the minutes that were produced dealing with the meeting between the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and the Department of Co-operative Affairs in those minutes that were prepared, those minutes that I tabled, that document that I tabled, which were minutes of the meeting . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Finance Minister can continue and can go over and over and over again, the fact is that was a summary and those were considered minutes of the meeting, and they were referred to as minutes of the meeting, and I'm only describing their actual heading. In it they said there was \$50,000 of PEP materials at Southern Indian Lake not being used. Now, Mr. Speaker, that's another reference. I've already filed the letter in which there were two cheques on the PEP account, and I don't think the Minister of Finance has stood up yet to answer that. And I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is a need, a real need now for a review of the way in which the government has allowed much of public money to be dispersed in northern Manitoba for laudable purposes but which I suggest may not have reached or have accomplished what it was--reached the people or accomplished the things that they had suggested.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me deal with just a very brief analogy of what really has happened in this House in connection with these two matters. In the case of the northern fishing co-ops we directed certain questions to the Minister. Had we not known about the situation, and had we not had any documentation, we would have had our investigation stopped because of the answers that the Minister gave. Very clearly, Mr. Speaker, those answers misled this House. The Minister modified, and he continues to modify his answers only because there have been additional documentation provided. He relied on the information that his officials gave him. Those officials gave him wrong information. What action has he taken? We tabled the minutes of a meeting, and at the time, Mr. Speaker, I did not know that those minutes had been prepared by the Department of Co-operative Development, Mr. Speaker, in which we have a conflicting report as to the accuracy of those minutes.

Mr. Speaker, again had we not placed those minutes in this Legislature the matter would have been sloughed off by the government. Mr. Kalinowsky was demoted. He wrote a letter to the head of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, a copy of which went to the Premier, and that's been acknowledged by him now, a copy that went to the Minister. Mr. Kalinowsky was demoted according to the Minister by agreement, mutual agreement I think he said, and then Mr. Kalinowsky appealed this mutual agreement.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the sequence is puzzling; it's a curious set of events, and surely it has to raise some questions among the members in this Legislature. What is the loss, Mr. Speaker? In the first place the government has sort of indicated that there would be some losses but really did not put any amount to it. It would appear from the Minister's latest answers to questions we are talking about a million and a half. It probably is closer to two and a half million dollars. Mr. Speaker, there is no way in which the government can account for the full moneys that would have been spent on the Southern Indian Lake Co-op. Nor is there any way they can justify the administrative decision that allowed the escalation and cost to take place with respect to the Southern Indian Lake Co-op. They realized \$424,000 between some provincial money, very little, and most of it coming from Special ARDA Agreement. Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied having had an opportunity to review the breakdown of the costs relating to a co-op that even accepting the basic tenders that were placed in this House by the Honourable Minister as the basis on which the government proceeded, that they cannot account for more than \$588,000 maximum of the cost involved. And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that warrants an investigation. That warrants a serious investigation. Mr. Speaker, the word I have from some of the fishermen in Southern Indian Lake is they want to see this \$700,000 that was sort of missing because at least if there's \$700,000 as it was to be . . .

## BILL 34

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . down in Southern Indian Lake, they should at least have had part of it. If there is going to be \$700,000 missing or going to be lost, then 50 fishermen could have in fact benefitted by that amount being given to them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has the government done in this regard? What kind of investigation has it made? It's investigating itself and, Mr. Speaker, there very shortly will be a statement made by the Honourable Minister in which he is going to try and prove that everything is all right. But, Mr. Speaker, what we want, and what we are entitled to, and what has to be changed in this House, is an ability for the Provincial Auditor to tell us exactly what is happening. Because we want the Provincial Auditor not to be involved only in Southern Indian Lake and the question of whether the government's undertaking or commitment for \$637,000 to the credit unions is correct and can be at least justified, what we want from him is the ability to know whether in fact the audits conducted by the Department of Co-operative Development, by the same development officers who manage the co-ops, are sufficient to justify a position that the fishermen themselves, who are a minority at this point and who do not understand very much of what is happening, that the fishermen themselves have not been placed in a position where as a result of the mismanagement and incompetence of the government officials they have had a fair amount of their commissions taken away from them. Now, Mr. Speaker, what did the Premier say when we raised these questions? First, he shrugs his shoulders. Second, he says that more is being done in the north; there have been some losses but they can be expected.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I say to you, how much could have been expected if we did not have those losses? Is it necessary for those losses to occur? And surely, Mr. Speaker, is this not a reflection on the government; and surely, Mr. Speaker, is not the fact that the government, or is the fact that the government is not prepared to have the investigation independent of themselves really an indication that they are afraid of the issue of - in management competence being brought up. They have been less than candid with the House with their answers, there is a great deal more information that should have been forthcoming that was not, the Premier's office has known about this matter for six to seven months, and the Premier's office has done nothing with respect to this matter, and the interests of the fishermen were not protected, and have not been protected as they should have been, and it was up to the Opposition to use the means within the House to be able to present that position, and what is warranted on this matter, Mr. Speaker, is not a self-investigation but an independent investigation. And, Mr. Speaker, if the government has nothing to worry about the independent investigation will vindicate them and it will hurt the Opposition. But the government's attitude is no on this matter and on the other matter with respect to the question of R & M Construction.

Mr. Speaker, we want to see justice done to the many individuals who are involved, both in the Wabowden matter and in the fishing co-ops. We want a full public accounting in the handling of public moneys in these cases and it's our belief that this would involve much more than we've discussed, because we believe that an investigation would indicate that there is a whole series of programs that the government has undertaken in which there is not the kind of accountability for the moneys or the handling of the moneys that should be undertaken; moneys which the Provincial Auditor does not have access to to follow through; moneys in substantial numbers which have been used for a variety of programs, whose programs may even be subject to question and review and discussion, but nevertheless whose expenditures or the matter of expenditure really has been running to a certain extent wild.

We want, Mr. Speaker, as well, a whole review, and we believe this is necessary, of the process by which a government examines its own conduct. If anything, Mr. Speaker, in the way in which we've handled ourselves in the matter of Interim Supply, we have tested the government to try and indicate our frustration with respect to the way in which we obtain information for them. The committee system works only to a point and really to a certain extent by the grace of the government. This Legislature to a large extent still works by the grace of the government, and we are in this position, Mr. Speaker, we are in this position, we have the rules, we try to exercise them to the best of our ability; we have had situations in which we believe that, legitimate questioning on our part has been penalized by the way in which the government has acted; we do not believe they have been candid with the House with respect to these matters; we believe they do have something to hide; we believe that they are not prepared for that kind of an investigation, and if that's the case, Mr. Speaker, then the

## BILL 34

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . whole process by which the Legislature and this House deals with the review of the government in connection with those matters that are significant in which there must be some independent investigation other than the cursory investigation that is really given in the way in which we deal with estimates. We believe that there has to be another process. And, Mr. Speaker, if that means in a committee system in which individuals will be prepared or are able to come before the committee as witnesses, if that means that directors of the various government undertakings have to appear and have to answer certain questions, if that means that we have to have, you know, a series of meetings of almost within a given period of a week so that we can review something and not be put in a position of having the matter delayed for several weeks over and over again to delay any ability to be able to take a complete examination or cross examination through, then, Mr. Speaker, we've reached the point where that change must and should be considered.

Mr. Speaker, both the co-ops and the construction company R & M were supposed to be independently and privately owned. But, Mr. Speaker, the co-ops in their operation and in their survival have been dependent on public money and so has R & M Construction. In both cases we believe that the money was mishandled and mismanaged. And, Mr. Speaker, we believe further that it was misused. We want to know how public moneys were used in the fishing co-ops and at Wabowden. We believe that abuses have occurred. And, Mr. Speaker, we want to be satisfied that political considerations have not encouraged them, or to allow them to be uncorrected.

We've indicated that we want the kind of review that we've suggested, and Mr. Speaker, I now want to indicate why that review of the government process is necessary. There has to be some understanding in this House of who exercises police power in this province. Police power to a large extent is controlled through the Attorney-General's Department. The RCMP cannot investigate any abuses with respect to the issue of the fishing co-ops, or even the matter with respect to the Wabowden affair, unless the Attorney-General through his director will give approval to them to proceed. Mr. Speaker, the RCMP cannot proceed unless the government approves, so that in effect what we have is the exercise of police power by that Cabinet with respect to matters which affect its political life.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for that to be opened up and for a new approach to be considered, because, Mr. Speaker, the RCMP will not go into the fishing co-ops unless the Attorney-General refers that matter to them. The RCMP will not go into the matter of R & M unless the matter is referred to by the Attorney-General. There have been requests other than members here, and our problem, Mr. Speaker, at this time is that in trying to deal with this matter, which is a political issue, and which has implications for the government, we now know that it was really going to be a cabinet decision as to whether they are going to be able to proceed or not. If the actions or suggestions by some, or the allegations of the affidavit are frivolous, the RCMP would know that very quickly, and the RCMP would be able to give a statement to the Attorney-General within a matter of 24 or 48 hours and the matter could be cleared. If it's not frivolous and it should be in their hands, then it should have been in their hands before, not now.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Auditor is limited, he is not an Auditor General, and I want to make that very clear. I'm satisfied now as a result of my meetings in Ottawa with the Auditor General's office and an understanding of how the committee system works in Ottawa and how the Auditor General functions in Ottawa, that our Provincial Auditor is not an Auditor General, nor does he answer to the committee of Public Accounts in Manitoba as the Auditor General must answer to the committee in the House of Commons.

MR. CHERNIACK: What is the difference?

MR. SPIVAK: The difference being that the committee can request and can ask the Auditor to go in and examine specific things that they are concerned about and get a direct report to that committee. Mr. Speaker, then if the difference in power is not there, it's a difference - if there's no difference. --(Interjection)--Oh, there's no difference. Then the only difference is that the government has not allowed the Provincial Auditor to act as an Auditor General (Applause) and, Mr. Speaker, if that was the situation, and I don't believe it is, if that was the situation because I believe the Act would still have to be changed to provide the same powers to the Auditor General, but even, Mr. Speaker, if I'm wrong, and that's the situation, again it is the Cabinet that is preventing the Auditor from being able to do the things that were required.

## BILL 34

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)

The motion that we moved with respect to the fishing co-ops in the Public Accounts Committee was that the Auditor go in and check the records of the co-ops to indicate that the records were in some order so that in effect we could at least accept the statements of the Minister. We weren't even allowed to do that. The Minister simply blocked it. The chairman of the Public Accounts Committee had me overruled because the government exercised its majority, and that is why, Mr. Speaker, in the debate that is ensuing with respect to this matter and will continue; it is not just the issue alone of the justice for the people involved, whether they be the fishermen, whether they be the creditors or the co-ops or the companies; whether it be the people who were entitled to - the pensioners or the Winter Warmth Program, but rather as well it is the whole question of how a government accounts to this Legislature, and how a government investigates itself, and how we are to have the ability to be able to get a meaningful review of what has taken place.

Mr. Speaker, we support the programs, what they call the Pensioners Program; we know the intent and we support the Winter Warmth Program, and we support the objectives of the fishing co-ops and the Communities Economic Development Fund. But, Mr. Speaker, we must say now that there has to be a very firm discussion as to how it is operated with, I think, very serious misgivings of the manner in which it is operated to this point. To give people who really have limited experience the ability to have access and to be able to handle public money in the way that has happened, I think is a reflection on the government because I think that advice could have been given, but the ability or the handling of that money could have been managed much better by those who would have been better and more experienced. We are concerned about mismanagement and negligence . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . that could hinder the achievement of these objectives.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the words "vote buying" in the north. We are not accusing northerners or any other Manitobans of having sold their votes, but, Mr. Speaker, we are saying that the government and some of its members . . .

A MEMBER: Pretty good peddling.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . were foolish enough to attempt to try and buy them. Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, there is no way that this will be answered other than by a separate judicial enquiry. And, Mr. Speaker, if the government has nothing to hide, if the government is so sure of its position, if the government is so confident of its situation, let them have the judicial enquiry, Mr. Speaker, because that enquiry I believe will indicate that for some they foolishly believe that this can happen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about what has taken place yesterday with respect to the government and the unprecedented use and abuse of the power that it has. Mr. Speaker, we have been frustrated over the last five years by the way in which the government has used the rules, both in committee and in this House, to prevent us from what we considered was a legitimate and proper way in which we were trying to develop the political issues of the day or to attempt to get information or carry on our functions. We also recognize that in the heat of the battle we say things to each other that we may regret afterwards, and that many times we go to the limit with respect to the use or abuse of the powers we have within this House. In some occasions leave has not been given by one member, where in fact it may have been frivolous on his part not to have granted it. But having said that, we recognize the rules by which we handle ourselves.

But with the New Democratic Party we entered into a new era, and that era was that the rules can be changed as they deem fit whenever they so decide. Mr. Speaker, I've said in this House that if the government wanted to it has the power not to call an election; it has the power to create itself into a position of being self-perpetuating, and legally it could do that. And the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources when that debate took place said there would be a revolution if that ever happened. Well that may be his answer, but the fact is that power is within them. We have established, Mr. Speaker, that there is absolutely no precedent in the House of Commons for a warrant to be given by the Governor-General-in-Council dealing with financial matters during the period of time that the House was in session. What the Minister did with respect to this Special Warrant that was issued yesterday has broken a long-standing tradition, and that one has to apply to a test of reasonableness to the government in determining

## BILL 34

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . the degree of frustration that would warrant them to change the rules of the game as they saw fit, and if this was one isolated act over the last five years, then it could be dealt with as one isolated act, but I suggest to you that it is more than one isolated act and it relates to the whole New Democratic philosophy of how or in what way they use their power. This, Mr. Speaker, this is a flagrant and violent and almost unforgivable use of power by a government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Boundaries Commission report was brought in, they pointed out the fact that under the Act--(Interjection)--under the Act, hearings had to be held. There were no hearings held, Mr. Speaker, because the government took the position we didn't have to have any hearings, but the government did not have the, you know, the decency - and that would be the only word to apply - the decency in law to at least bring an Act which would alter and amend that particular portion. A minor point, Mr. Speaker, but it simply meant that the government was above the law. The Act was there; they did not bring in a particular section amending it, saying that we're not going to hold the hearings. That would have meant, Mr. Speaker, that the matter would have had to be debated in the House, and they didn't want that matter debated in the House any more than they had to debate it on other issues.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister in charge of the matter of Housing and Renewal Corporation, when we dealt just recently with the problems of the bridge financing that took place where the Provincial Auditor refused to audit moneys that were transferred from Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation to the Northern Manpower Corps or to the Northern Remote Housing Program, where he refused to certify that, the Minister basically said, look, our objectives were right; you know, what we were trying to do was correct, and so don't--you know, the end result was all right, but there was, there was, you know, so there was bridge financing. Mr. Speaker, if in fact their moneys were allocated incorrectly and there was no authority, then the government would come into this House by way of a special Act and we would have to pass that Act, and they have a majority to pass it, but that would mean that it would be subject to scrutiny in this House, and that in turn, Mr. Speaker, would retroactively approve something that happened that could have happened inadvertently. But the NDP have taken the position that they don't have to account to anybody.

A MEMBER: Certainly not this House.

MR. SPIVAK: No. Nor do they have to apply the law, and what the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources did, knowing full well the implications of it, is he took a situation and applied something that should never have been done, because I say to you, Mr. Speaker, the test of reasonableness had to be applied. Why have we debated the question of Interim Supply? The Budget decision realistically was that of the government's as to when they brought it in. There was some discussion on this side of the possibility of delaying it because of the fact that there was a convention of one of the political parties in Ottawa. But nevertheless the Budget date more or less was set by them and that's their decision. The date on which Interim Supply was brought in was their decision. We have been asking a series of questions. We were frustrated completely by the handling of the committee of the Communities Economic Development by the Minister, who clearly said we have to abide by the rules then, when he said we had to quit at 12:30. We couldn't cross-examine or deal with the committee chairman for another hour. We couldn't even vote on whether we could or we couldn't do that, and he said we've got to apply the rules then.

So what have we done, Mr. Speaker? We have tried in the means that are available to us, which are legitimate to us, to try and deal with the government's spending programs and to be in a position to exert and persuade the government on the things that we are concerned about at the present time. There are many many issues yet to be discussed in this session, and we will be discussing. We are concerned about what's happened in the north; we are concerned about the way in which the government has handled itself, and so we exercised and used the rules that aren't in this House not to particularly embarrass the government in a sense because we said that they would go beyond the date on which normally Interim Supply would be passed, but to use the means that we had to debate on the issues that we thought were important. We wanted the government to know, and we wanted the people of Manitoba to know, that we're not satisfied with the handling of public moneys by the NDP government.

We are not satisfied with the way in which they answer the questions of the House and clearly attempt to mislead at different times; we are not satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that with

## BILL 34

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . respect to the Northern Development that notwithstanding how laudable the objectives have been, that they had handled themselves in a way in which there has to be a greater accounting than they have given us before; and we are not satisfied, Mr. Speaker, in the way at the Committee meeting on Public Accounts, the Minister of Finance frustrated our ability to be able to talk to and deal with the Provincial Auditor, particularly in the matter that we felt was important at that time. So what did we do, Mr. Speaker, we used the rules of this House and we debated the bill on Interim Supply, and when we got to a point, Mr. Speaker, where the government did not like it, what did they do? They broke one of the - you know, they broke one of the supreme traditions of parliamentary democracy, that the King who has control of the purse must answer to the House, and must not be in a position, Mr. Speaker, must not be in a position, Mr. Speaker, to exercise or deal with public expenditure without that approval. So what did they do, Mr. Speaker? Deal with you. Deal with you after the fact. Deal with you. You who have the power and you who use the power in a way that has never been used before, that I am aware of, in Canada, in Canada, Mr. Speaker, have used that power . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . and abused that power, is not concerned about the tradition, is not concerned about abiding by the rules, but is only concerned, Mr. Speaker, they're only concerned that their frustrations were so great that they did not want the debate to continue, and they were not - did not want the debate to continue, nor were they, Mr. Speaker, interested, interested, Mr. Speaker, in allowing us to use whatever means we could with respect to the rules and the debates that are allowed in this House to be able to exert some influence. Because, Mr. Speaker, when we come down to it, all an Opposition can do in our Legislature is try and persuade a government; a government that has a majority can basically do whatever it wants.

Now the power that the honourable members opposite use, which is section 42 (1), gives that power to the Executive Council but it has never been used, Mr. Speaker, for a good reason, and I don't want to have to go through the tradition. Now we have been frustrated; we have tried to abide by the rules; we have, you know, we've had our problems, and so has the government, but to have broken that tradition is a reflection on the government and really on its ability to govern, because surely a government that is prepared at this point to breach tradition, to put itself in this position is really at a point where it's tottering and whether it is capable of governing at all.

A MEMBER: Scared of closure, that's all.

MR. SPIVAK: We accept the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, for our actions. We think that the public is getting disgusted, or has become disgusted, with respect to the way government money has been handled and the way the government has handled itself in this session, and we think that it is within the parliamentary tradition and acceptable for us to deal with the means that are available to us, and to deal with the situation as we have.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we do not intend to hold up Interim Supply; we basically wanted the ability to be able to impress the government of our concern, and indicate that in this particular case we were prepared to go to certain limits. But the test of reasonableness has to be applied and, Mr. Speaker, the limits that we were prepared to go to were reasonable under the circumstances and the government at this point failed that test, and failed that test miserably. And while this may not be important to the vast majority of people who may not understand the complexities of the way the Legislative process operates, it is important, Mr. Speaker, in understanding an attitude on the part of government, in understanding how they breach tradition, and understanding how they view their power, and understanding how they account to this House, and understanding very much of what has happened in the past two months in this session. Because, Mr. Speaker, the fact that they have not been candid with respect to many answers in this House, the fact that they are not prepared to allow the independent investigation, the fact that they have frustrated this side at different times, both in this House and in the Committees, when we have been trying to carry out what we consider our legitimate rights, Mr. Speaker, is only indicative of a fear within the government, of a fear which realistically should not be justified, they have the majority now, but a fear of opening the process of government up so that the kind of review and the light would be let in on a governmental operation that is far more complex and more involved than it was five years ago.

And, Mr. Speaker, five years today it will be more involved and more complex than it is

## BILL 34

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . today, and what they now have done is set a precedent, they've set a precedent, Mr. Speaker, which essentially means that from hereon in whenever Supply comes, no government has to fear, you know, the opposition; no government has to be influenced by what the government opposition does; no one has to even listen to the Opposition - as a matter of fact, all of them instead of most of them, can go out to the coffee room when any of the Opposition members speaks, Mr. Speaker; and all of them, they don't have to listen to the various arguments they can--(Interjection)--that's right, and nothing has to be done, because they have that power and that ability to be able to operate.

Mr. Speaker, I said, and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was absent, if a government wanted to allow itself to stay in power beyond the five-year period they could so legislate and they--(Interjection)--Yes, they could, the same kind of government that took this power and said that we could while the House was in session basically do anything we want. Any government that says that they can do that, and any government that believes that they can - yes, Mr. Speaker, any government that can break the tradition and the rules is capable of doing that, and I am sorry to say that because I think, Mr. Speaker, we come down to rock bottom. At what point does a government have to take it like the Opposition has to take it and abide by the rules and tradition? And I think there was an obligation and I think a reflection on the character, not just of the individuals concerned but on the whole character of the New Democratic Party. Mr. Speaker, they are so frightened in the way they govern, they are so afraid of accounting, they are so afraid of criticism, they are so afraid, Mr. Speaker, of answering as they must answer for their actions, that they have used their power in this way: They are using the police power and not allowing the RCMP to investigate those matters.--(Interjection)--Oh yes. The RCMP will not investigate unless the Attorney-General refers it to them, and he won't refer it to them, Mr. Speaker. He won't, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that almost every member on our side has spoken in this debate. I think as well that they've indicated to the government we are not satisfied, nor can we be satisfied with what has happened in the session so far, or the use of public money by them. We believe the abuses of public money are serious. We believe as well that the government with respect to the whole gamut of expenditures have really not handled itself in such a way that they can justify our support. But having said that, Mr. Speaker, and we indicated in the Budget debate we recognize that governments have bills to pay, we recognize that the debate will continue with respect to Estimates, and we recognize as well that we will have further occasion with respect to Capital Supply and the Estimates to deal with other issues, and issues that are important to us and important to the people of Manitoba.

So having said that, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to allow Interim Supply to go through, and we are allowing it to go through with a caveat that the New Democratic Party Government has probably reached its lowest point in its legislative history in this Legislature in Manitoba by the action undertaken by the Minister of Finance and by the Cabinet in allowing the special award to go through; and further that it is a reflection, Mr. Speaker, that they really at this point, in the way in which they are discharging their obligations have, I think, proven without question that they have reached the point now where power has corrupted, and where power has corrupted, and where the question seriously has to be raised whether they have both the ability and they have the right to continue to govern.

QUESTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I'm all shook up.

BILL NO. 22

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, yes, I wonder if we can go to Bill 22 because there was some urgency of that, although I never thought that that was as urgent as Interim Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Third reading Bill 22. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. STEVE DEREWIANCHUK (Emerson): Moved by, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gimli, that Bill No. 22, an Act to Amend the Law Society Act, be now read a third time and passed.

Bill No. 22 was read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Carry on with - the Honourable Minister of Finance.

## BILL 22

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

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I didn't dare get up and speak following the honourable member's address. If the honourable member says that I seek foxholes . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I assume the Honourable Minister is speaking on a grievance.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. GREEN: The honourable member says that I seek foxholes and I did not think that I had the reputation at any time in my life of running away from things but you know sometimes you tend to think differently of yourself than other people think of you. The fact is that up until now I'd generally got the impression that other people do not regard me as a person who is easily frightened. So when the honourable member makes that type of statement I guess I have to reassess whether that in fact is the case. But nevertheless I want to tell him that I will admit to fright, that I did not want to get up and speak after he made what I considered to be a very constructive address. I had no objection with that type of discussion, and I'm prepared to carry it on, and I think that there were many constructive things said. But I didn't dare get up and answer it because I was worried that if I did that maybe somebody would get up, one speaker left on the other side to move a hoist as suggested could be done by the Member for Lakeside, have 20 more speeches, have that motion set aside, and something else of that nature happen.

And I will admit, Mr. Speaker, that although there are rules that either side can use to deal with ultimately the will of a majority being reflected in parliament, I do believe that parliament works best when, despite the fact that both sides know that certain rules can be used, that there is certain rapport between the members, certain understandings, certain appreciation of one side's position vis-a-vis the other side's position, and I think that possibly sometimes we both get into the position of thinking that the other side is unreasonable. Fortunately we are but a small tiny pinpoint in the spectrum of time, and that I think that as time goes on that common sense prevails and that this particular forum will not be damaged, such as has been mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, that we are too weak and too puny to damage the strength of the forum itself, and that it will assert itself and that it will prevail. Because, Mr. Speaker, I believe in the democratic process. I heard a lot of things said by the Leader of the Opposition today which I think pierced the very spirit of the democratic process and would sap it, I think that particularly the Member for Morris and the Member for Lakeside if they studied the speech very carefully would see that that kind of thing is being done. However, I accept the fact that a position was made, that the position was made in a reasonable way and that it is worthwhile to be able to undertake debate under those circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to make and I'm not going to make a big long answer, but I am going to make an answer with respect to two positions and this is why I am using my grievance time to do it.

I think the honourable member is saying that we are refusing answers, we are refusing to give information and that we somehow did badly vis-a-vis the Communities Economic Development Fund. I have to remind the honourable member that when the complaint was first made it was made in such a way as to get its maximum impact from an opposition point of view, and I do not fault that. When I'm in the opposition or in government I try to be as effective as I can. I indicated that I did not believe that despite the intention to be effective that it was an effective way of dealing with that particular complaint. Because when one heard the complaint at the face of it - and I said only at the face of it - the honourable member will remember that I said that I've just heard this, I do not know the name of the company, I will go back to the department and bring back answers relative to everything that has been said. But having said that let us look at what is being complained against. 1) essentially that there was power taken by the Communities Economic Development Fund over a company in which it was

## MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . almost the sole financier. And I suggested, Mr. Speaker, that that is a normal financial way of doing things. I have never denied that the Communities Economic Development Fund took effective supervisory control over that company. And I was surprised, Mr. Speaker, how issues change, because last week I read to my dismay that one of the columnists said that the issue now seems to be as to how much control the government took over this company, and I said at that time, Mr. Chairman, that was never an issue. That if anything, my problem would be that they took less control rather than more control, and the Leader of the Opposition said it today. He said we have to have more supervision with respect to these companies where money is given in northern Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, that has never been an issue. Of course, it is not the issue. I say that it was never an issue and the columnist who is having difficulty following this and says the issue now appears to be how much control was taken over this company, was all wrong, that was never an issue. I said from the beginning that the Communities Economic Development Fund had to take control. That they were the sole financier and that they appointed their boards of directors and one would expect them to do it. That's No. 1. That was the first issue.

The second issue appeared as it was coming forward that somehow the money was being used to buy votes in northern Manitoba. And let me now remind the honourable member that he didn't take the same position then as he takes now. He didn't take the position, it was I who took the position that the people in the north cannot be bought with that type of proposal. But, Mr. Speaker, that's not what he said, he said the Member for Thompson won by 200 votes. Is it reasonable to assume that he won the election on the basis of these activities? He now admits that that's an impossibility because the people in the north will not be bought, they will not be bought by that kind of thing, Mr. Speaker. If there is a citizen in northern Manitoba or anywhere else who sees that he is getting something free from the government, he's not that stupid, he doesn't think I am getting something free. What he says is that the government is running around giving free things and who is paying for it? I am. So don't think that you can ever get votes by means of distributing largesse, you cannot do it because the people are more--you say you can do it?--(Interjection)--Now we have a contradiction. I am not talking about, I am not talking, Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about what I consider . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there are two types of activities. The honourable member says that we should make sure there is no political influence. I've said in this House before, I say it today, that I am a politician from my head to my toes, twenty-four hours a day. I consider politics to be the most noble profession that a man can enter into. I consider politics as meaning serving the people in such a way as to give them the greatest maximize--to maximize the benefit that they can get through their elected representative; and I say that if I do that I will commend myself to the people of the Province of Manitoba.

I want to relate a little incident that occurred to me with regard to Churchill River diversion. I was on the telephone - this should be interesting to the two Liberals in the House because it was last year in the height of that controversy which I didn't hide in a foxhole for, never refused a single appearance no matter where it was - a Liberal "Stop, Look and Listen Program" invited me. I went everywhere I was asked and had to face sometimes 500 adverse people - that's being in a foxhole. I went on a Harvard show, I got about ten calls in which I tried to explain the program, and finally a friendly person phoned. They said,"Mr. Green, I'm glad that you went on this show and I'm glad that you are now telling us the truth, I'm glad that we are finally getting the facts, and we see that you are not interested in votes, you are interested in telling the truth!" And I said,"no, Madam, that is not right!" I said,"Madam, that is not right!" I said,"Madam, I am interested in getting votes, that's why I am telling the truth. It's the other people who want to throw votes away and that's why they are trying to mislead you!" Because, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the way to get votes, and the way in which I have always sought getting votes, is to try to honestly serve the people of the Province of Manitoba, and it was the honourable the Leader of the Opposition, let me remind him, who said that 200 votes were bought possibly by the Member for Thompson.

When that story was put out, I got the impression that what was being suggested was that we were putting money into this company and then the money was used to buy materials and give it away to people in various parts of northern Manitoba and was done during election day or during the period of the election. Well I indicated at that time that if these were government

## MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. GREEN) . . . . programs then they shouldn't stop during the election day. You know one cannot go to a person who says, I would like to take part in your pensioners program . . . Let's say this happened in Cross Lake. Would the honourable member really expect us to say, well, you know, it's an election time now, we do not give you the benefit of this program during an election time; we stop during an election time? Is that what the honourable member is suggesting? Well you know, I mean, one is entitled to try to get the commendation of the people on the basis of its programs. The Honourable Member for Morris would know that very well.

I considered the Acreage Program, not the best type of program and we've had arguments about this, I say that a sensible parity price-support program would have been better, a two-price system would have been better, but the Acreage Program was better than nothing because of the reduced farm population. Would the Honourable Member for Morris say that the Leader of the Conservative Party, Mr. Diefenbaker, shouldn't have sent out the Acreage payments cheques before the election? And do you remember the chagrin on the part of all of the Grits that the farmers were tripping over their cheques as they were going to the polls? But, Mr. Speaker, I have never said that a government should not seek the support of the people. What I was concerned with was the suggestion that somehow this money was being given to the people in order to get their support, and the Leader of the Opposition paid me a compliment which he has since withdrawn. He said that he had respect for my honesty and integrity in that I probably knew nothing about this program. Well he was right. I have to discount the first part of it because that's for other people to say, but I did not know the name of the company; I did not know the programs that were involved. All I knew was that charges were being made by a disaffected employee of the company whom the Fund appointed, hired to work for that company, and there is nothing unusual about that, and that is not an issue. Mr. Allison says that he worked for the Fund, the Fund says we hired him to work for the company. I would say that those affidavits, one saying one thing and one saying the other, are not in real conflict with one another. But, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition says that there's a great conflict here and that's oath against oath and both have sworn, therefore perjury is to be presumed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A point of privilege. I've already indicated to the honourable member, and I'll repeat again. I said that with respect to the affidavits there are obviously a number of facts that are at variance and if a person who swore it knew that what he was swearing was false that it could be considered that he was guilty of perjury, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)--No, to the Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, on the question of privilege. I have repeated this once in the House, I'll repeat it again if it's necessary. I'd like the Honourable Minister to withdraw what he said that I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: I will only say this, that the honourable member spoke in such a way as to cause - and I saw him on television and I read the newspapers the following day - he spoke in such a way as to indicate that he believed, as to indicate that he believed that the conflicts in the affidavit gave rise to perjury, and if the honourable member says--now, just a minute, I'll continue - if the honourable member says that there was nothing that he said which should have caused me to form that opinion then I will withdraw the opinion. Because that is the opinion which I formulated. And I withdraw any suggestion that the honourable member said it if he tells me that he didn't. But, Mr. Speaker, I do that only for myself. I do not do that with prejudice to any of the individuals involved who feel that they may have different cause of action and of course I cannot . . .

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

MR. SPIVAK: On the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Minister's entitled to whatever opinion he wants and is entitled to express that, I appreciate that, but I think the record should be clear because there is one other conversation between the Honourable Minister and myself that has to be related in understanding this issue of privilege for myself with respect to the question of perjury. I asked the Honourable Minister at one point that if one of the members swore, one of the people who swore an affidavit said that he did not know someone personally and there was undisputable fact that he did know him, what his answer would be

## MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . to that. I'm not sure whether he said that would be perjury or not.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact if he's not sure what my answer was, I'll tell him what my answer was. He gave it more correctly almost a week ago and he forgets. I said a man would have to be silly to swear under oath something which was non-consequential and which is a lie. That it was a non-consequential fact, that it would be silly for a person to swear something under oath with no motivation at all. I say that it would be silly to swear something under oath which was not. --(Interjection)--No. Then I said to him if it can be proved that Mr. Thompson did indeed know this other fellow then I would have to look into his explanation as to why he swore an affidavit to the fact that he didn't. That's what I said. And the reason that I said it, Mr. Speaker, is because I have taken a very very thorough interest in the Whittaker Chambers-Alger Hiss case and I discussed that with my honourable friend. I've read four books on it.

Alger Hiss who I believe was innocent. I believe that history will vindicate Hiss and condemn the person who imprisoned him, and I lay the blame squarely on the President of the United States. The existing president was asked whether he knew Whittaker Chambers; he said that he did not know Whittaker Chambers. He was then brought face to face with Whittaker Chambers and after some period of probing said, I know this man but he's not Whittaker Chambers - or I'm paraphrasing now, I'm not remembering the entire incident - he knew him under a different name. The committee walks out of the room, Mr. Nixon and his committee, and said, we now know that Hiss lied when he said he didn't know Whittaker Chambers. And that started it and it wound up with Alger Hiss spending time in jail. On what charge, Mr. Speaker? Chambers said that he was guilty of espionage. Do you know what charge he spent time in jail on? Anybody know? Perjury. They never ever convicted him of espionage; they never convicted him of being a Communist, but they convicted him of perjury, and the perjury had nothing to do with the statement that he didn't know Whittaker Chambers.

So the honourable member says, why do I raise this point? Because I say, you know, maybe I am not the only impressionable person in the world. I read an editorial comment that I had subjected people to perjury charges because somehow I had engineered a response to the program by letting people swear affidavits in response to affidavits which had been sworn against them. Now, Mr. Speaker, the first day I said that I cannot, I cannot conceive of the government having an investigation on the basis of a charge of a disaffected employee unless we at least find out from the Fund what is being done. I gave my honourable friend - I have letters in my office. On the basis of what he is now asking for an investigation I'd have to conduct an investigation every day because there are people in Firm "A", and if you want me to give them to you I'll give them to my honourable friend, the complaints that I get as to how they have been ill done by, by the Manitoba Development Corporation, making allegations against the corporation, making allegations against in some cases staff of the corporation, and I want to tell the honourable member in his case, making allegations against the directors of the corporation. You know there are people who have come to this Legislature I believe once a week every week while we are here - at least that's approximately the amount of time that I've seen them. They were the principals of Damascus Steel, Damascus Steel which was a corporation which received money when the honourable member was--well okay, was put into receivership, put into receivership when the honourable member was the Minister of Industry and Commerce. --(Interjection)--No, okay, I'm sorry, you're right. It was put in before the honourable member was Minister of Industry and Commerce; he did answer for it once in the House as a result of a speech of mine. I spoke on Damascus Steel and he got up and answered - happened to have occurred before his time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I answered because of my knowledge because I have acted for one party who was involved. Not acting on Damascus Steel but acting on other matters in which he was involved.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister answered me and now we are going to test my memory against his to see whether one of us should be guilty of perjury. He answered me as Minister of Industry and Commerce as a result of a speech that I made on Damascus Steel. Well we both agree then, neither of us is guilty of perjury.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Leader of the Opposition.

## MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. SPIVAK: To the best of my knowledge my answers indicated at the time that I had knowledge of that not as Minister of Industry and Commerce but because of my knowledge as a solicitor for someone who was involved.

MR. GREEN: That's not what the honourable member said. The honourable member said that my charges relative to Damascus Steel could not really be looked into because that wasn't the way the fund operated. That's what happened. Now let me continue, Mr. Chairman, let me continue. He said that we have had successes with small corporations vis-a-vis the Manitoba Development Corporation and I think he mentioned, it just may not have been a Development Corporation thing, but he mentioned that Versatile Manufacturing had started from nothing and became a big corporation and that this had happened in Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is trying to interrupt me and I'm really trying to be friendly so that we get the interruptions, but let us remember that that is what was charged in the first place, and there are numerous people walking around in Manitoba who say that they have been badly treated by the MDC or badly treated by the CEDF. And, Mr. Speaker, I cannot - I tell these people that you can do two things, you can go to the MDC and complain and try to get their board of directors change you, or you can get an independent inquiry. And here's what the honourable member is ignoring. If we have indeed done something to Mr. Kregeris which was wrong he could sue this Communities Economic Development Fund; there would be an independent inquiry; the government would be judged by a court and he would have his day in court. But he wasn't really the man who complained. What we understood and what was related by the Fund was that it was Mr. Allison who complained that Mr. Kregeris had dismissed, along with the Fund's consent, Mr. Allison. That really was the substance of the complaints and because the complaints were made against certain people, and I can tell the honourable friend that both Mr. McIvor and Mr. Thompson according to my information wanted to run around and make public statements. We said you need not make public statements, we will arrange for your answers to be given before the Communities Economic Development Fund, and they were given in the form of affidavits.

Now there was a great deal of suspicion raised at the meeting. Who prepared these affidavits? I want you to know, and I tell it to you, that I did not speak to Don McIvor before those affidavits were prepared; that I did not speak to Mr. Trithart, I do not to my knowledge know that I have ever seen that man. I said hello and perhaps, how are you, to Ben Thompson. --(Interjection)--I don't remember saying good-bye. But that is the extent of the relationship that I have had with those people before the swearing of the affidavits. Following the swearing of the affidavit I saw Mr. McIvor briefly. Again I said to him that what you are now involved in is the first onslaught as to whether people in northern Manitoba, small people, little people, are going to be able to get the kind of consideration that is given to other people in other parts of the province. That is the entire relationship between me and those people.

But, Mr. Speaker, what is the complaint? What is the possible complaint? What we said we would do is take those allegations, every one of them, and have them answered at Communities Economic Development Committee. Mr. Jones gave his account and he then gave the accounts of Mr. McIvor, Mr. Thompson and Mr. Trithart where they had been referred to in Mr. Allison's affidavit. Now what could be the possible objection to that type of procedure? Then the Leader of the Opposition came in and made a very lengthy speech, a three hour speech--and by the way I think his speech today was one which I can sit through and recognize as being legitimate, some legitimate criticism, some which I disagree with, some which I take to heart, but that speech, Mr. Speaker, was not such an address. That speech was not - a week ago Friday - things have changed in the last week and I believe to the better, I believe to the better. But what we said is that, and what I have instructed the Fund to do again is to list by number, if necessary, all of the allegations that you can glean from the Leader of the Opposition's speech, even if they number a hundred, and when the Fund meets on Thursday I want an answer to each of those allegations. And those people who are sitting here and pretending that we have said that we will not answer are making a case that doesn't exist. We say that the Fund will be there to answer every new point, and we are listing them; we are trying to glean them and list them, and have the Fund answer every new point.

Now where does that put me? You know I mean the honourable member said that I'm seeking a foxhole, I really don't understand that. His first statement was that he is aware that I didn't know anything about it. His second statement is that I'm hiding. Well, Mr. Speaker,

## MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . if I had come out and spoken for these people I am certain that the Leader of the Opposition would say, we want to know what those people themselves say, we don't want to hear from the Minister, and you know what, those same editorialists who said that the Minister engineered this, those same people would have said, Oh well, if Sid Green gave the answer why didn't he get those people to--we all know that Sid Green can make black sound like white and white sound like black. So that's what would have been said. They would have said that Mr. Green has come and used his forensic ability to defend what has been done by the people in the Fund. That's what it would have . . .

There's no way of answering every anticipated response, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, what we have to do is consider what is the right course of action, and the right course of action is that a man has sworn an affidavit, alleging certain things about the Communities Economic Development Fund and directors of the Fund. We have got the Communities Economic Development Fund and the directors of the Fund to respond. We then had another statement by the Leader of the Opposition which says that he is unsatisfied with those responses, that he indicates certain conflicts. They're not all conflict. One person says that I did not tell a person that there was a contract with B. F. Klassen. The Leader of the Opposition says, here is the contract, here is the oath that he did not tell him there was a contract, here is the contract. Let's take the Leader of the Opposition's position at its best; let us say that that document was a contract, and by the way I do not agree that it was a contract. But that doesn't matter. I will take, because the Leader of the Opposition has a rather weak position, I will take his position at its best. Let us assume--(Interjection)--well let us assume that that was a contract. Let us assume that - how does that make a statement that I never told somebody that there was a contract incorrect.--(Interjection)--Well, Mr. Speaker, but that's not what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said. He said, Don McIvor says I never told him there was a contract. Here is the contract. Now does that mean Don McIvor never told him there was a contract? Well the honourable member says that is not what he said. We will now both go back to Hansard. I remember specifically the statement, I could be wrong, I say the honourable member could be wrong, we will both look it up and we will not belavour the House with it. But what it comes down to now, and what I am prepared very easily to deal with, the honourable member says we have to reconsider just how much you do when you set up a Communities Economic Development Corporation, when you take people who have no real business experience and try to set them up in business. We had an understanding about that before.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition state his point of privilege?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I said that with respect to people who had no business experience being the Directors of the Board and being the people who handled the actual application of money.

MR. GREEN: . . . the people on the board as well, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Swan River made no objection, the Leader of the Liberal Party made no objection when we sat there and we said that there's no way in which we can develop such a fund and not give the people the opportunity to make the same type of blunders as we ourselves sometimes make.--(Interjection)--Because you were on the Task Force, the Northern Task Force - and you agreed with that. And I think that you agree with that today. I think that you agree with that today, that we sat there and we said that there's no way in which we can try to hold their hands while this Fund is operated, that they have to have a certain amount of control themselves. And, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that that is what we have done.

The Honourable, the Minister--I'm going to cut this part of it short, Mr. Speaker, because I know that my time is coming close. I want to tell the Leader of the Opposition that I am not finished on this issue, that I am not finished on this issue, that he has done something far more reprehensible than possibly he himself appreciates, and I will show you chapter and verse that that is so. I was talking about Damascus Steel when I got interrupted - I guess I got sidetracked. In Damascus Steel there was a claim by 30 Manitobans who had put up a small amount of money each and were the shareholders of this company and a disaffected manager who said that the Fund had gypped them out of their company, and look what the Fund did with that company. It foreclosed it, it got \$35,000, it paid the creditors, and it loaned new money beyond the amount of the foreclosure to a new owner against people who had set up a company. I want the honourable member to ponder until I speak next, what would he have said if someone, one of these little guys, had said, we want to investigate the deceased Morris Neaman,

## MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . who died yesterday, on the basis that he did us out of our company. Well, Mr. Speaker, what was his investigation? What was the third party independent inquiry that was set up to investigate that kind of charge. I know that they were stopped at every turn, and the government--(Interjection)--Pardon me? --(Interjection)--Sure they told him to his face. What investigation did the Leader of the Opposition set up to investigate that man's activities. vis-a-vis Damascus Steel? No investigation. Those people had been complaining for three years. We tried subsequently when we came into office to see whether--(Interjection)--Well if you will permit me to go beyond my time.--(Interjection)--Well then I can't.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has nine minutes.

MR. GREEN: Then I can't, because I've given several questions and I've used up a couple of my--(Interjection)--Well, I'm going to deal with it. I'm going to deal with it; I'm not going to finish today. I am merely going to ask him--(Interjection)--I've got friends on all sides. I'm going to ask the honourable member to ponder, to ponder that because I'm going to deal with this again, and I'm going to deal with it to show the damage that could have been done if we on this side were not stronger.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says that we have flouted parliament, or broken all traditions with regard to Interim Supply. Now I believe that I am as much a friend of this Chamber and of the proceedings of this Chamber as is the Leader of the Opposition. I believe that I am as much a friend of this Chamber and of the procedures of this Chamber as the Member for Lakeside. The honourable member says that the government has never issued Special Warrants during a Legislative Session. Of course there is a law that permits exactly that to occur. The fact that it has never occurred is as much a reflection on the Opposition as it is a reflection on the government. Because, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition has never done with Interim Supply--(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, the Opposition, the Leader of the--or the Member for Lakeside talks about a proceeding in 1968, federally, when the government in power existed by virtue of a minority, and existed at the sufferance of that minority. In this case, Mr. Speaker, on the day that the warrant was issued, parliament was meeting, and you cannot flout parliament when it is meeting considering a motion that can bring down the government on the very day on which it is meeting. The Opposition is the one that prevented that motion from coming to the House. We were sitting here considering Interim Supply; the government passed the warrant in accordance with legislation for two weeks, for two weeks because, Mr. Speaker, I still think it is a very very unusual procedure, a procedure which I would not like to see followed, and which I am prepared to discuss.--(Interjection)--Well you think it will be, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: The fact is that we have done it for two weeks and whether we have--you know the Honourable Member for Lakeside says that we are prepared to stand up and say we did it. Yes. We were prepared to come into the House that afternoon, say to all of the MLAs, and I want you to know that the Member for Thompson, the Member for Minnedosa, the Member for Ste. Rose, that these people believe in parliament too. And if what we did was so reprehensible as denying the King his money - parliament was here, Mr. Speaker. Parliament was here. Who prevented parliament from saying whether the government was flouting parliament or not flouting parliament? The people who said we will not let this come to a vote.

A MEMBER: You're acting like Henry VIII.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the people, the people who said we will not let this come to a vote. Parliament was here, and we were prepared to face parliament. But, Mr. Speaker, I am still suggesting to you . . .

Now the Honourable Member for Lakeside said we could have invoked closure. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that what he thinks I could have done as House Leader and what I believe that I could have done, are two different things. I am not now going to explain that difference because the Member for Morris will appreciate that the way in which you employ legislative action is something that whereby you yourself have to have some control over what steps you can take and what steps you cannot take. And I am telling the Honourable Member for Lakeside that the procedure he thinks we could have followed, we did not consider it available to us. And perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that's what the Honourable Member for Lakeside is really complaining about. That they felt that they were prepared to stand on the line in front of the people of Manitoba and say we are resisting Interim Supply, and we are prepared to accept the

## MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . political consequences. And they felt that we should have been prepared to do the same thing with regard to the political consequences of moving the kind of motion that he thinks we could move. And his annoyance, and I can understand it, is that we did not take a step which was willing to test our political conviction as to our course against the political conviction of the Opposition. And knowing, Mr. Speaker, or believing that we could do something that he thinks would have solved the problem, he feels that the Opposition really did not stop us because the government could have taken this motion and we will proceed depending on the fact that they will take this action.

Now I tell the honourable member that the action that I believe he is thinking of was not in our opinion appropriate in the circumstances. So we looked at what are the other things we can do, and one of the things that we could do is to pass a warrant for two weeks supply on the basis, Mr. Speaker, of legislation that this House adopted, knowing full well that if we were doing something that was contrary to the wishes of parliament, or a slap in the face in parliament, that we were going to have to be in parliament in the afternoon and that parliament was then considering a motion which if parliament felt it was flouted could bring down the government. Now, Mr. Speaker, obviously what the honourable member is saying is not that we were slapping parliament in the fact but they were not prepared to let parliament act because the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is right that ultimately, ultimately, and if you take each step to its nth conclusion, ultimately the majority should be able to conduct the proceedings of the House.

But, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't work in exactly that way, the Leader of the Opposition knows it, that--(Interjection)--Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that I tell the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and I cannot go further, that what he thinks may have been an appropriate procedure was not considered by us to be an appropriate procedure. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that other procedures would be taken but it looks like, it looks like parliament is going to survive this supposed crisis, and, Mr. Speaker, the warrant is for two weeks. Mr. Speaker, the warrant is for two weeks. Parliament met the same day as the warrant was issued and parliament could have punished the government if--(Interjection)--Well you people wouldn't let parliament act. We were, Mr. Speaker, we were here the same afternoon--excuse me, excuse me, that's not correct; I think we did it on Wednesday, we were here on Thursday, we were here on Thursday.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thursday morning.

MR. GREEN: Thursday morning? The same afternoon parliament was here and parliament had the power--(Interjection)--Well, Mr. Speaker, then it is not--(Interjection)--I'll just finish my . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, and then I tell the honourable members that I am not finished with this subject, that I am going to deal with it in the opportunities that will be available for debate. But the real issue is that the minority did not wish to let a majority of parliament express their view vis-a-vis the government, not that parliament--the parliament was not flouted by the government, it was attempted to be flouted by a minority of members in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside wish to go on the same, on a grievance too? Very well.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, if I may use the occasion.

MR. GREEN: The Administrator is here.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall we delay that for a moment? Thank you.

. . . . continued on next page

ROYAL ASSENT

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: His Honour the Administrator (Hon. A. S. Dewar).

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly at its present session passed a Bill which in the name of the Assembly I present to Your Honour, and to which Bill I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

MR. CLERK: Bill No. 22 - An Act to amend The Law Society Act.

In Her Majesty's name, His Honour The Administrator doth assent to this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of this Bill:

(No. 34)- An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st day of March, 1975.

MR. CLERK: "The Honourable the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this bill in Her Majesty's Name."

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am challenged to rise to use my opportunity on the matter of personal grievance to follow the Honourable the House Leader and deal with the particular matter that has I think most legitimately caused members on this side, as I believe it will cause increasing number of Manitobans a tremendous amount of concern. In fact, Mr. Speaker, one can't be clairvoyant and predict the future but I rather suspect that two, three years hence long after this session has become history, this session will probably be best remembered, this session of this Legislature will probably be best remembered because of the particular actions that we are now discussing, the actions taken by the Minister of Finance in this rather extraordinary manner that he chose.

Mr. Speaker, I tend to want to believe the Honourable House Leader's genuine appreciation for the parliamentary democratic system by which we govern ourselves. All the more grieved I am then, Sir, that he should be so insensitive to what is so obvious a flagrant and a very tragic abuse of the system, and I think we should really separate and clarify a few terms for the purpose of a brief discussion on the matter. We use, we bandy terms like rules and traditions and parliamentary procedure around with the danger of confusing and not being clear in our definition. It's true that we have our sitting, standing rules committee and we change a little rules of the procedures from time to time, we refer to certain things as being traditional in this House. But, Mr. Speaker, then there are some things that sometimes get called rules or traditions or practice that are in fact very fundamental and very important to the very heart of parliamentary democracy.

I refer to one specific incidence for instance which I know the Minister is aware. A year ago in the, it may have been two years ago, when the Budget was handed down and we got very close, we broke what on the surface appeared to be a very minor rule. That is that anybody in the public galleries desist from participating, from showing by means of applause or hissing or booing any participation in what goes on in this Chamber. I think you will recall Sir, you were in the Chair, that what happened, what transpired was that the First Minister in introducing the Budget - it was a grand a glorious Budget from his point of view - had the galleries filled with the supporters of the New Democratic Party and that there was a great deal of clapping going on at the appropriate places. Well it then became of course a matter of privilege for my leader to ask for the same privilege when his turn came to make his major address, and we had the galleries filled with supporters of the Progressive Conservative Party and there was a great deal of commotion up there whenever they thought my leader made a particular point of note. And of course understandably the Leader of the third party, the Leader of the Liberal party insisted that his gallery crowd should be allowed to do the same. Well, Mr. Speaker, what we were of course getting very close to was rule by mob, rule by gallery. It's some of the French republics that were ruled and brought down that way. So what we considered to be a very small and maybe just a traditional rule in fact becomes a very important part of the heart of democracy.

## MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

We could not function, Sir, in this Chamber if we based our actions solely on applause meters that generated from the public gallery. We could not function, Sir, if we had to cower and hide our heads from abuse that might be heaped upon us from time to time from the public gallery. That, Sir, brought down a big nation, a grand republic I might say. the Republic of France. I don't know which republic, they've had unfortunately so many. They've had unfortunately so many. But nonetheless I only point out that we want to be careful about our choice of words.

A MEMBER: . . . breaking another rule right here in behind you Harry.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I have never presented myself as an expert on parliamentary rules and parliamentary traditions in this House. I am hopefully learning. I intend to learn a great deal more. But, Sir, I have suggested and I have suggested that the course of action taken by this government, this Minister, you know is so, has so deviated and has so hurt a very fundamental, a very important part of that parliamentary democracy that we speak of that it, you know to me it is a sincere tragedy that people like the House Leader would rely on the resilient nature of our parliamentary democracy that it can withstand this kind of a failing. That in itself, Sir, is a pretty big admission for the Honourable House Leader to make. He relies on the resilience of our system that it can recover. Well recover from what, Mr. Speaker? Recover, Mr. Speaker, from what I suggest he well knows, he well knows is a grievous injury to it.

Mr. Speaker, I tried to point out in a few remarks yesterday that this course of action could have been avoided and that the options open to him were not limited to one particular course of action that may or may not have been acceptable politically to the members of the government. Closure was not the only way that this matter could have been dealt with. In my judgment it could have been dealt with, as it has been dealt with when faced in other legislatures, and perhaps the Minister of Health and Social Development should take note, that this is not a precedent setting action by the part of an opposition to use this route. It happened particularly of course of note in the Federal House in the pipeline debate when the opposition delayed Interim Supply for a reason they felt important to them. And they used, and I think we were supported by the New Democratic or then the CCF party at that time in that kind of a situation. Mr. Speaker, I am again not the kind of parliamentary expert that I can at the top of my hat pick up the dates, but I know for a fact that old age pensions' civil servants', family allowances' cheques did not go out because interim supply was held up and the government was incapacitated from doing so. But the government felt strongly enough, felt strongly enough about the use and abuse of certain powers when in fact a Legislative House was sitting. I would suggest that that was the proper course, Mr. Speaker, that was a course that I think would have not made it possible for us to look at these honourable gentlemen with so much more concern today and yesterday than we did even a few days ago.

Mr. Speaker, what is a tragedy to me is that they would choose to use this particular method of approaching a problem; Mr. Speaker, that they would choose to use and have so little concern in handling this situation. The question really begs an answer now. To what avail, to what avail any considerations, time limits, any efforts for considering of supply to this government at any time if any one of the Ministers opposite can at any time receive the necessary funds with or without our approval in this Legislature. If this Minister of Finance can at any time with or without the approval of this Legislature secure the necessary funds then really let us at least be favoured you know, to this extent that we can no longer be accused of in any way holding up this government's capacity from doing certain things.

It's obvious, Sir, that they are prepared to use that power in that way. To me the other answer, the other route was acceptable. Much more acceptable. The route of truly letting the political responsibility fall on those upon whose shoulders it should fall in the judgment of the public. If in fact because of the democracy and the rules that we have an opposition can frustrate and can prevent or incapacitate a government from paying its bills, then who's going to accept the responsibility. The opposition, those who have caused this to happen. On the other hand, if the issue of the day is such that the opposition is prepared to accept that responsibility then isn't the mere frustration of that a denial of the democratic process.

Mr. Speaker, this government chose a very thin veneer, a very thin veneer when it comes to allowing the democratic process to work to its full and natural limits. They have made the

## MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . suggestion that the opposition route taken in this instance by us is unprecedented. Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that there are enough examples, not all that frequent, but enough examples I'm sure if you examined provincial houses and the federal house where the opposition took precisely the course that we have taken in this matter. There have been also examples, without having had the time to do the necessary research, where the very situation which the Minister of Finance suggests in his news release of yesterday, he was not prepared to let happen, he was not prepared to be frustrated, not for one moment, by an opposition using its parliamentary rights; he rather would abuse his parliamentary rights to avoid that frustration.

The Honourable Minister the House Leader says that of course this was all okay because the very day that this action was taken by Cabinet they were facing the House assembled, they were facing the Legislative Assembly. Well, Mr. Speaker, what then was the problem with facing this same House and using their parliamentary majority in bringing about the same effect in acceptable parliamentary ways. You see, Mr. Speaker, there is just a - in the minds of the honourable members opposite just a simple little play on words, a question of semantics, of whether or not they go ahead and take a certain government action by Cabinet and then blame the minority Opposition party for having forced them to doing that, but they would not accept their majority responsibility in doing precisely the same thing here in this Chamber.

A MEMBER: You wanted closure.

MR. ENNS: Not necessarily closure. I suggested that was not the only route open to you. Not at all. You need not have done anything. --(Interjection)--That's right. That's right. But that is how parliament, that's how democracy works my friend. The way you are working that's how totalitarianism works. That's how you get to a totalitarian state. Then let me, then let me lecture the. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order.

MR. ENNS: . . . Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development, it is not germane it is not all that important to having a responsible government to having a responsible opposition. It is responsible government that maintains a responsible government and maintains the democracy in a state. --(Interjection)-- Certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Will the honourable member agree that it is also unprecedented that there is a specific legislative enactment enabling the government to issue a warrant during the time that the Legislature is in session and that enactment was agreed to by this Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: There is an enabling - there is under the Financial Administration Act, Section 42 (1) a vehicle by which government can under Special Warrant meet contingency expenditures unforeseen by governments at the time that they come to this Chamber. That --(Interjection)--No, I know that is not what it says but that is, and I will tell the House Minister, that is how one hundred and some years of use of that kind of power has been agreed to and accepted to by Legislatures not here but throughout the country. And certainly in the Mother of Parliaments in this country in Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I again ask the honourable member, since the amendment was brought in by this House, at its first sitting I believe, would he agree that it was specifically drafted for the purpose of enabling the government to issue a warrant while the Legislature was sitting?--(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, I will verify that to the honourable member if he wishes verification.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside. Ten minutes.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, House Leader, you know, only indicates a heightened degree of concern indeed touching on hysteria to some extent in dealing with this matter. Because he is aware, Sir, he is aware of the kind of contempt that his Minister of Finance has shown this Legislature, when with a stroke of the pen a morning meeting of Cabinet, they can do what we're trying to do in 90 hours during the discussion of Estimates. After all if it is not germane at all to them going through what has been accepted in a parliamentary way of gaining their supply motions and getting their supply bills through the House, then I suppose it's just a matter of courtesy that keeps them in their chairs for us to ask some questions to during their estimates. The relationship between

## MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . passing a supply bill and the government having the money to carry out the business is no longer relevant. They can meet at 10 o'clock on Wednesday mornings and solve that in five minutes with an Lieutenant Order-in-Council. Mr. Speaker, that's what we're talking about. Now, you know, fine, they can do that, they can do that. We appreciate, we've now experienced that they can do that. We've experienced that they can do that. Mr. Speaker, that's precisely my only point that I'm trying to make today. That they would take this action, that they would take this action, Mr. Speaker. The Minister speaks of a minority thwarting a majority. Well, Mr. Speaker, what we have had imposed upon us, quite unnecessarily so, you know a dictatorship by a majority. The minority was prepared, and was prepared to face its consequences of whatever actions their actions may lead them to.

And, Mr. Speaker, let's be very candid about those consequences. Let's understand that no opposition party could have, you know, withstood to any great length of time the kind of condemnation the general public aided and abetted by an angry government could have heaped upon an opposition party that was keeping the pay cheques away from its civil servants, that were keeping the moneys away from its programs and its agencies, that were preventing the ongoing business of the province. Any opposition that would take that course would surely destroy itself.

But, Mr. Speaker, this government has so little faith in using the acceptable parliamentary tools at hand that it chose, Sir, in my judgment one that could only be considered highly irregular, one that borders on the kind of actions that leads to totalitarianism, the kind of action that I hope we will never see in this Chamber again.

Mr. Speaker, my leader has indicated the power of government. --(Interjection)--You see, Mr. Speaker, just in this little interchange their responsibility, their concept of government, their concept of government is dependent entirely on what we think. . . --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ENNS: . . . they don't bring into this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, they don't bring into this Chamber any concept, any responsible concept of their own. Their Ministers aren't prepared to accept the consequences of accepting the oath to office. They have not bothered to look into their hearts and examine their position vis-a-vis their feeling towards maintenance, their responsibility for maintaining a responsible parliamentary democracy. The Minister, and he is the Minister, says that if we want Fascism we'll get Fascism. If we want communism we'll get communism. If we want a dictatorship we'll get dictatorship. That's what the Minister of Agriculture just said to my Leader. That the form of government that we want depends on us. And that's my point, Mr. Speaker, that's where they are irresponsible. That's where their action is irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, it's with the increasing number of occasions where this has happened in the last year or so particularly, beginning perhaps with the Minister of Agriculture, that this should cause Manitobans a growing, an ever-increasing growing concern. I suggest Mr. Speaker that this session will be remembered in my judgment, you know, maybe for many things, although sessions have a way of blurring into one another as they pass on into history, but I can assure you that the Minister of Finance's high-handed action in this particular instance will long be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, I only want to indicate in closing the remarks made, and one should not take them so lightly, that my Leader made with respect to what governments can or cannot do. How tragic are the pages of history filled with governments, democratic governments, that have voted themselves into dictatorships, into totalitarianism, into others. How many pieces of enabling legislation have democratically elected governments accepted on the basis because it was expedient to do so. It avoided a frustration.

A MEMBER: 1933 in Germany.

MR. ENNS: Well my friend from Morris says 1933 in Germany. Certainly it was. Certainly it was. Not all under a parliamentary - in fact a social democratic parliamentary government which passed enabling legislation giving Mr. Adolf Hitler all the powers that he eventually, we thought he used. Well certainly it was. It's called The Enabling Act. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has found a way, an enabling act, to circumvent the due course of debate in this Chamber, he has found a way to circumvent any frustration that a minority opposition may give him from time to time. He has found, Mr. Speaker, a way to circumvent an important aspect of our parliamentary democracy. And for that he should not

## MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . be forgiven, and for that he shall be remembered, he will long be remembered in the annals of political history in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if we should go through the formality of going into Committee and out of Committee, 4:30 is arriving. Is there a way in which we can ignore that, by unanimous consent can we. . .

MR. SPEAKER: By consent we can go into the Private Members' Hour.

MR. GREEN: By consent, yes, if by unanimous consent, we can go to Private Member's Hour and then, Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I hope, we can go home. But before we do, I'd like to indicate that next week we are meeting in Public Accounts, Tuesday, Communities Economic Development on Thursday; we'll go to the bills that are now on the Order Paper as far as we can get them, and also the Supply motion when we take the bill to whatever stage it can go, unless there are questions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): I'm just wondering if the Minister will tell the House what the order of business will be on Monday. Do we go into Capital Supply in the House when the House meets or what else?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: My indication is, Mr. Speaker, that we would move with bills, I don't expect we'll be able to move very far, but we'll take the bills as far as we can get them and then move into the Capital Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Since there's consensus on adjournment, the House is now. . . The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the House Leader when he intends to call Law Amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't even given thought to Law Amendments. There are not that many bills that have passed third reading and it seems to me that there have been urgent questions raised relative to administrative matters such as the Development Corporation, the Communities Economic Development Fund, Leaf Rapids is going to appear before Committee, Autopac is going to appear before Committee. I rather think that those are the priorities at the moment.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I raise the issue to the House Leader because there are bills that have passed this House and been referred to Committee, that have been referred to Committee over six weeks and are still sitting there waiting for Law Amendments to be called, and the House Leader has not called Law Amendments and the people of Manitoba are waiting. .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question is legitimate, the debate is not. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I consider those remarks almost unbelievable, almost unbelievable. I have not, Mr. Speaker, I haven't heard a single member of this House until now, nor a single member of the public, say that we should be dealing with bills. All of the urgents that I have had from members of this House is that we deal with the committees considering administrative matters. We will get--(Interjection)--Well if I am now hearing it now, Mr. Speaker, I will now consider calling Law Amendments Committee instead of one of the administrative committees. Yes I will do that.

MR. SPEAKER: There being agreement, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.