

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 22 June, 1982

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

## PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the third report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

**MR. ACTING CLERK, G. Mackintosh:** Your Committee met on Thursday, June 17 and Tuesday, June 22, 1982 and heard representations with respect to the Bills before the Committee as follows:

Bill (No. 15) - An Act to amend The Marital Property Act.

Ms Georgia Cordes - Y.W.C.A.

Ms Jill Oliver - Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties

Mr. A.L. Clearwater - Private Citizen

Mrs. Lauranne Dowbiggin - NDP Status of Women

Mrs. Beth Kroll - Congress of Canadian Women, Winnipeg Chapter

Ms Jennifer Cooper - Manitoba Association of Women and the Law

Ms Bernice Sisler - Private Citizen

Mr. Murray Smith - Private Citizen

Mr. Sam Malamud - Family Law Subsection, Manitoba Branch of the Canadian Bar Association

Mr. K.G. Houston - Private Citizen

Bill (No. 22) - Loi sur la Fondation manitobaine des loteries. The Manitoba Lotteries Foundation Act.

Mr. George Fraser - Private Citizen

Mr. Sidney Green - Bingo Enterprises Ltd.

Mr. Walter Kucharczyk - Private Citizen

Bill (No. 26) - An Act to amend the Human Rights Act.

Ms Tanis Cohen - Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties

Your Committee has considered:

Bill (No. 28) - An Act to amend Various Acts relating to Courts of the Province.

Bill (No. 42) - An Act to amend The Education Administration Act. Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'administration scolaire.

Bill (No. 47) - An Act to amend The Fisheries Act.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered:

Bill (No. 15) - An Act to amend The Marital

Property Act.

Bill (No. 22) - Loi sur la Fondation manitobaine des loteries. The Manitoba Lotteries Foundation Act.

Bill (No. 26) - An Act to amend The Human Rights Act.

Bill (No. 37) - Loi sur le Conseil de la recherche médicale du Manitoba. The Manitoba Health Research Council Act.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Riel that the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

**MR. ACTING CLERK:** Your Committee met on Monday, June 14, Tuesday, June 15 and Monday, June 21, 1982 and appointed Mr. Fox as Chairman.

Your Committee agreed that a quorum for all future meetings of the Committee should consist of six (6) members.

The Committee heard representations with respect to the Bills as follows:

Bill (No. 2) - The Residential Rent Regulation Act. Loi sur le controle du loyer des locaux d'habitation.

Mr. Jack T. McJannet, Q.C. - Manitoba Homebuilders Association

Mr. David Newman - Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties

Mr. Murray Sigmar - President, Winnipeg Real Estate Board

Mr. Lewis Rosenberg - Private Citizen

Mr. Doug Martindale - Winnipeg Housing Concerns Group, Inc.

Mr. Leslie Rohringer - Private Citizen

Mr. Art Werier - Private Citizen

Mr. Arnie Thorsteinson - Private Citizen

Mr. Michael J. Nozick - President, Fairweather Properties Ltd.

Mr. Graeme Haig - Manitoba Landlords Association

Mr. Sid Silverman - Private Citizen

Mr. Walter Kucharczyk - Private Citizen

Mr. Ron Klassen - Manitoba Legal Aid

Mr. Sam Linhart - Lakeview Realty

Mrs. Danita Onyebuchi - Crystal Properties

Miss Lori Bell - St. Matthews' / Maryland Community Ministry

Mr. Martin Bergen - Marlborough Development Corporation Ltd. / Edison Rental Agency

Mr. J.P. Borowski - Private Citizen

Ms Karin L. Warkentin - Dart Holding

Mr. A. Sekundiak - Private Citizen

Mr. Ray Williams- Private Citizen  
Mr. Peter S. Thiessen- Thiessen Management Ltd.

Bill (No. 19) - An Act to amend The Landlord and Tenant Act.

Mr. Doug Martindale- Winnipeg Housing Concerns Group, Inc.

Miss Lorraine Whiffin- Private Citizen  
Miss Lori Bell- St. Matthews'/Maryland Community Ministry

Your Committee has considered:

Bill (No. 20) - An Act to amend the Condominium Act.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Riel, that the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, with the concurrence of the House, I would like to make a statement of a non-political nature.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a brief statement in honour of the happy occasion of the birth yesterday of a son to Their Royal Highnesses, the Prince and Princess of Wales.

Manitobans have a warm regard for the Royal Family and I'm sure the birth has been greeted with joy and interest in our province. I can inform the House that Manitoba's gift to the Royal Prince will be a special porcelain sculpture by Helen Grainger Young. Members will note the sculpture at the rear of the Chamber. It will be later taken to the rotunda for display. It is from the same series as that which was presented to his parents and will be on display in the Legislative Building until Canada's birthday on July 1st.

It's an occasion of joy and celebration, a happy family event, and I'm sure that all members of this Chamber will join with me in extending heartiest congratulations to Their Royal Highnesses on the birth of the new Prince and may his future be blessed.

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

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, this is one of those very happy occasions when all members of the Opposition are pleased to join with the First Minister and the Government and to associate ourselves with his comments of congratulation; to share in the joy that I know is virtually unrestricted in all parts of the British Commonwealth today, at the happy news of the birth

of the new Royal Prince.

First of all, of course, our best wishes go to His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales, to Her Royal Highness, the Princess of Wales, and to the new Prince, who of course will be ultimately the King of Canada in many, many decades to come.

I suppose, Sir, there are a number of thoughts that come to mind. One, of course, is that it reinstills in all of us and, indeed, in all people throughout the world, the marvel of God's gift of life when it comes to a Royal Family on such an occasion when so many people throughout the world can join in it, and when the miracle of birth can bring together again the hopes and the joys of so many people in so many different parts of the earth. It helps to reinstall in us that sense of unrestricted joy, as the First Minister has so properly said, in the beauty and the stability of family life.

So we do join in rejoicing in this great Royal birth, this great human occasion for all Canadians and for all members of the British Commonwealth. It leaves us as well, Sir, to remark upon the marvellous continuity of the British Crown and how, in these days of trouble and despair for some people, the continuity of the Crown remains in place. The certainty of the succession of the monarchy remains in place. This has so much to do I think in giving to our people, in this day and in these troubled times, that kind of hope that we so dearly need if we are to persevere and to carry on.

So we join with the First Minister in thanking God for the gift of life of the new Prince and, in particular, paying a tribute to the Royal Family; to Her Majesty, The Queen; to His Royal Highness, Prince Philip and remarking as we always do in these occasions: GOD SAVE THE QUEEN.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we reach Oral Question period, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 16 students of Grade 6 standing of the Sir John Franklin School under the direction of Mrs. Farr. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

There are 20 students of Grade 5 standing from the Nordale School under the direction of Mr. Elrick and Mrs. Diakiw. The school is in the constituency of St. Vital.

On the behalf of all of the members here this afternoon, I welcome you to the Chamber.

### PROCEDURAL STATEMENT

**MR. SPEAKER:** I have a short procedural statement to present to the House.

On Friday, June 18, the Honourable Member for Virden rose in his place to object to the words, 'playing games,' uttered by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and directed at the Opposition.

Since the issue was raised by a former Speaker of the House, I took the matter under advisement in order to consider the facts most carefully. A reference was made during the discussion to a former ruling and

my first objective was to compare the two matters for consistency.

Beauchesne's Citation 322, refers particularly to an individual member's personal knowledge respecting himself. When the Member for Virden invoked the Privilege of the House, he thereby referred to the totality of the Opposition members and was therefore outside the applicability of Citation 322.

I have searched Beauchesne's lists of unparliamentary words and phrases without finding any reference to, "playing games" or anything similar and I do not recall in the last 12 years that the phrase has been a matter of procedural dispute.

Although the phrase, "playing games" has implications in politics that it does not have in other contexts, members should recall that the far more pejorative phrase, "the muffled cadence of jackboots" has not been ruled unparliamentary in this House.

Although I cannot conclude that the term, "playing games" is unparliamentary, I would strongly urge the Minister of Agriculture to choose his words with the utmost of care and circumspection.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Sir, following upon the announcement of last week of the indefinite postponement of the proposed Alcan smelter for Manitoba and faced today as we are with the unprecedented statement that has come from Alberta that Alberta intends to postpone its participation in any proposed Western Inter-Tie, can the First Minister give any reassurance to the people of Manitoba that he and his government are now working as they have never worked before to salvage the last of the three major projects, namely, Manitoba's first potash mine? Can he offer that hope and reassurance having seen in the last week two of the major projects go down the drain and the future of Manitoba be impaired in the way that it is?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I would be hesitant to give any hope which might indeed be unfounded. I just happen to have an article from The Leader Post, published just a couple of days ago, "Potash Mines' Fate Remain in Doubt," referring to the fact that there is no guarantee that the Cory, the Allan, the Lanigan and the Rocanville Potash Mines will reopen two months after they're shut down this summer. So I think I would be most reckless indeed with information such as that flowing out of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Insofar as the very difficult situation their potash mines are in, to offer at this point in time with the international recession the way it is now as affecting the economies throughout every part of the world in fact, any reckless hope. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that given time and given an improvement in economic and financial circumstances, there will be indeed a turnaround in regard to the economy as same affects both large and small projects. But with information

such as this, obviously with the information that 1,200 potash miners have been laid off in the Province of Saskatchewan is not a good time to talk about potash in Manitoba either.

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

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, can the First Minister give this House and the people of Manitoba some reassurance that he and his government will work as hard as they can to re-establish the position that was left to them on the 30th of November, 1981? With respect to the potash negotiations, Sir, there had been a signed Memorandum of Agreement which the NDP, Mr. Speaker, allowed to expire on the 15th of December, 1981. Can he give the assurance to the House that, notwithstanding the economic conditions of which we are all aware, at least that point of achievement can be reattained by this government, so that we move at least forward from the position of having a Memorandum of Understanding and of Agreement for the establishment of Manitoba's first potash mine as and when it becomes economically feasible to do so?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, first, I think we should be conscious of the fact that there was no firm agreement in November or in October. My Minister is meeting with IMC on July 8th or 9th, in which there will be real attempts and efforts in order to ensure that the negotiations can carry on towards a successful completion. But again, Mr. Speaker, I would be less than frank, in view of the information that is forthcoming, if I created any undue expectations.

We will do our hardest. I am as much disappointed as anyone else in this Chamber about the economic circumstances that Canadians are confronting, particularly Manitobans. We will do all that is possible. My Minister will be meeting IMC in July, but obviously, with what is happening next door in the Province of Saskatchewan, it's going to be very difficult to hope. Certainly last fall, there were no layoffs of potash workers in Saskatchewan; there were no closures of mines, as indeed is taking place now in the Province of Saskatchewan. The economic circumstances have obviously deteriorated in the potash industry.

We hope to be able to put it together, in order at least to ensure that when the potash market does improve - I'm sure that the economic recession is one that is of temporary nature and there will be recovery - that we'll be able to see substantial progress being made again in the province toward potash and other developments; small, medium, and large.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, a further question to the First Minister. Given the abject failure of negotiations carried on by him and his colleagues in the last six months with respect to Alcan and now faced with the news today of the abject failure of this government to be able to conclude an agreement that was left in their hands with respect to the Western Inter-Tie, I want to assure the First Minister, first of all, Mr. Speaker, that he's not raising any expectations in Manitoba. He's dashing expectations in Manitoba, not raising them.

All I want to do, Mr. Speaker, is to ask him to give

this one sliver of hope to the thousands of people who were depending upon these jobs; to the businessmen in Manitoba who are looking for the work that could have come from any one of these three projects, that he will work much harder than he has done up to the present time to re-establish the goodwill that was in place on the Memorandum of Understanding so that we can have at least that accomplishment with respect to the first potash mine in Manitoba, a Memorandum of Understanding and agreement that as and when it becomes economic to mine potash again that it will be mined in Manitoba, not in Saskatchewan or elsewhere.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated earlier, we will do all that we humanly can to ensure a satisfactory agreement that Manitobans indeed would support from negotiations that will involve the Minister of Energy and Mines. That's all that I can assure, that every effort will be undertaken to attempt to complete a satisfactory agreement.

I would like to make one further reference in respect to the Leader of the Opposition's question in which he referred to, and I understand the Leader of the Opposition's trying to score, I guess, some political points, but he referred to abject failure pertaining to the negotiations involving the Alcan. I sat in a meeting with the President of Alcan, Mr. Morton, and I asked Mr. Morton if he had any disagreements in respect to the manner by which the Province of Manitoba, under the present New Democratic Party Government, had carried on its negotiations in particular reference to the efforts by the Minister responsible. Mr. Speaker, it might interest members across the way to know that Mr. Morton said that he found the Minister® had handled those negotiations in an intelligent and rational manner.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I think we are all prepared on this side of the House to acknowledge that the President of Alcan is a very kind man and a courteous man. Mr. Speaker, I've always been a great believer that actions speak louder than words and when Alcan took up its options in Quebec 48 hours after the First Minister had his meeting with the President of Alcan, that said a book's worth about the ability or inability of his Minister of Energy and Mines to do any legitimate negotiating on behalf of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, given the fact that out of the three projects that were left to this government to complete negotiations upon, two appear to be dead in the water, can the First Minister give this House and the people of Manitoba some undertaking that he will instruct his Minister of Energy and Mines to change his methods of negotiation and to get on with the business of pursuing the public interest in Manitoba? Or will he, Sir, if he is not able to accomplish that purpose, change the Minister and change the Deputy Minister, who has been as much responsible for these failures as anyone, and put people of competence and good will into this position so that the future of Manitoba will not suffer any further?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, in response to the question from the Leader of the Opposition and in particular reference to the comments by the President of Alcan, Mr. Morton, I do not believe that Mr. Morton

would mislead me. I believe that Mr. Morton is honest and frank and I disassociate myself from any inference otherwise that the Leader of the Opposition may have left in this Chamber. So when Mr. Morton said that my Minister was conducting the negotiations in a rational and intelligent manner, I believe Mr. Morton. I do not believe he was attempting to mislead me.

Insofar as the acquisition of land, Mr. Morton also explained that very carefully I believe, not only to ourselves, but to members of the media that the land was under option. It was adjacent to an existing structure that would require early renovation and change, a smelter, and that it was not a question of building a brand new smelter. Mr. Morton went on to point out to us that in other parts of the world, including Australia, there had been a halt insofar as future smelter construction. So let no one, for political reasons, Mr. Speaker, attempt to suggest that there is any other reason behind the Alcan situation but a deepening of the economic recession throughout the world, a weakening of the economy.

Let me say to the Leader of the Opposition, that as regrettable as it is to us all, the potash industry is also in a weak situation, world-wide. I hope that situation can be repaired. I hope when it is repaired that, indeed, there will be a government in the Province of Manitoba that will ensure that Manitobans receive a satisfactory agreement, so that Manitobans can realize maximum benefit from potash development when indeed there is a recovery in the world recession.

Mr. Speaker, to the third question, because the Leader of the Opposition had grouped his three questions into one area of comment in regard to the agreements being 'dead,' I believe was the reference used, dead as —(Interjection)— dead as what? Dead in the water. All that I can say to the Leader of the Opposition, the Alcan situation has been postponed and not canceled. It will certainly be picked up by the fact there is interest on the part of both the province and Alcan in the event of an economic recovery throughout the world. The Inter-Tie, there are discussions that are continuing on July 19 involving the Ministers, which will be carried over into the Western Premiers' Conference later in September or October. I do not know whether that transaction will go ahead early or not. I suspect, because of the economic circumstances unfortunately that Alberta has been plunged into, and I think in the last six to eight months Alberta probably more than any other part of Canada has received a tremendous economic blow, regrettable as it is; that Alberta's in an entirely different situation now than it was even a few months ago.

So, Mr. Speaker, the challenge before us is to deal with the economic situation. In fact, I will have an opportunity to discuss some of my thoughts in regard to that with the Governor of the Bank of Canada this afternoon, Mr. Bouey, when he attends at my office.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, now that the First Minister is beginning to acknowledge what we told him some time ago, that Manitoba is in competition for new smelting capacity for Alcan or for any other aluminum smelting company with other jurisdictions on the face of the earth; realizing as he must now that the addition of new capacity by Alcan, whether by way of expansion or whether by way of renewal of old

equipment, results in capacity being put in place, how can he stand in his place and say that the announcement of last Thursday with respect to land options being taken up in Quebec is not really the clincher of what any reasonable people in this province already well know, namely, that this government by its pigh-eadedness; its refusal, Mr. Speaker, to bargain in good faith with respect to ownership of a Hydro plant; its refusal, Sir, to even agree to the site that had been previously selected by Alcan and to proceed with the environmental studies which were already in place, that they have been one of the proximate causes of Manitoba not getting that new capacity which is going to be put in place when economic circumstances permit?

Having learned that lesson, will he not now transfer that lesson to potash and realize that he's got to get to the bargaining table in good faith and he's got to renew that Memorandum of Understanding? Will he give us the reassurance that he will fight to renew that Memorandum of Understanding so that we will again have some hope for a potash mine in Manitoba?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, there is no requirement to assure that we will deal in good faith. That is, indeed, taken for granted.

Mr. Speaker, I find it regrettable that the Leader of the Opposition continues to misrepresent and in fact to distort - and I fear for cheap political points and that's all I can say - to attempt to create something that does not exist, because I read very carefully the press interview of Mr. Morton.

Mr. Morton, the President of Alcan, was asked specifically, is there anything that the government could do to change your mind at this given time? The answer by Mr. Morton was very, very clear —(Interjection)— no, because we are confronted with the international recession. I don't know whether honourable members across the way appear to be still either, (a) living in the time frame of a year ago or whether indeed they are, and I hesitate to suggest this, but sometimes it appears, Mr. Speaker, that there is an inward sense of some glee that they feel they can score some cheap political points out of the present economic circumstances that were confronted.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table in this Chamber because it may be, in fairness to the Leader of the Opposition, that he has not had an opportunity to study the documents that Alcan left with us pertaining to price forecasts, pertaining to the world situation. I would like to table this in the House because I believe that the Leader of the Opposition and members across the way are unfortunately very misinformed, appear to be very misinformed. It may indeed be, Mr. Speaker, our fault that we have improperly explained to members across the way the message that Alcan provided.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that honourable members would be much better to join with all Manitobans in recognizing that we're in the grip of a serious recession along with the rest of the world and it requires us to pull shoulder to shoulder during these economic —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to, as I have pointed out in previous occasions, attempt to out shout members across the way.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, it is time indeed that, rather than us trying to score - and there may be times that we all do this - it is now urgent that we pull shoulder to shoulder as Canadians and as Manitobans in order to provide some constructive ideas as to how we can pull ourselves out of the economic difficulties that this land is confronted with.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, it was just as urgent a year ago when the announcement of Alcan coming to Manitoba was met by harangues from the then Opposition and the NDP with statements of nonsupport, that they would never sell a portion of the plant to Hydro, all of those things that registered, I daresay, with Alcan. That's when the shoulder to shoulderness was needed and my honourable friends displayed then how much concern they have about the public interest of Manitoba.

I merely say to the First Minister and ask the First Minister today, Mr. Speaker, to recover what he can from this mess that he and his government have created out of the three projects. Will he now change course and start negotiating in good faith with IMC and re-establish the position of the Memorandum of Understanding which was in place on the 30th of November, 1981, so that Manitobans can have some hope that one, now, of these projects will at least come about? I say that to him, Sir, without alleging on his part cheap shots or anything at all because I am quite content, Sir, to let history be the judge of who has misrepresented these projects to the people of Manitoba, the Opposition or this incompetent government.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I am going to respond, but I believe it will be the fourth time to the same question. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is most unwise for any government at any particular time to build irresponsible hope. I fear indeed that was the case, before agreements were firmed up, that the previous government created a hope which was not properly established and firmed up by way of firm contract. Mr. Speaker, if the previous government, had it proceeded in a businesslike manner, rather than in a manner which was brought about only because they were desperate in the days and weeks leading up to the last election, they would have created more reasonable expectation rather than to, in a state of hysteria as they did, create an expectation before that expectation was properly firmed up by way of agreement. That's where the mistakes lie, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. S. LYON:** Well then, Mr. Speaker, I'm constrained to ask the First Minister, who gets off into these odysseys of his own revisionist history, why it was that his mentor, the former Premier of Saskatchewan, said on October 23, 1981 about the Western Inter-Tie which we hear is scuttled today because of the ineptness of this government in its failure to carry on the negotiations with dispatch; why is it, Mr. Speaker, why, I ask the First Minister, was Premier Blakeney, as he then was, was heling when he said to the people of Saskatchewan, repeating comments he made at a news conference in Regina on Thursday, October 15; the Premier said "An interim agreement

could be possible in the next short number of weeks if the recommendations and proposals of the Ministers are found to be generally acceptable?"

Is the First Minister standing in his place today and saying that Allan Blakeney was lying when he made that statement to the people of Saskatchewan?

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** On a point of order, it is clear in Beaulieu and you previously ruled as far as I can recollect, that to ask a Minister of the Crown to comment on someone else's statements out of the House is improper and is not a question to be asked or answered during question period.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I do not recall ruling on that particular matter in the House. Does the Honourable Government House Leader wish to quote the reference?

**HON. R. PENNER:** Yes. In Beaulieu, Page 132, Citation 135-10, "A question ought not to refer to a statement made outside the House by a Minister." - that's even by another Minister, never mind a Minister of another agency.

Citation 359-10 applies. I'm urging upon the Speaker to make a ruling. You cannot, during question period, ask a Minister of the Crown to comment upon some statement made outside of the House by some other Minister.

**MR. SPEAKER:** May I confer with the Clerk for a moment?

It's my opinion in reading Citation 359-10 that it refers, in the House of Commons in Ottawa, to Federal Ministers. I cannot recall that questions of a similar nature have been ruled out in this Chamber. Unless I find some other Citation which covers it more fully, the matter should be considered in order and the Honourable First Minister may answer the question.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, what does cause one to ask a question, if the Leader of the Opposition was so certain and so convinced October-November that he had everything signed and sealed, I wonder why the Leader of the Opposition didn't postpone his calling of the election and call it in the spring or early summer of 1982, if he is so convinced that he had everything, indeed all the agreements signed and sealed.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the words that are most telling by way of the quotation that the Leader of the Opposition referred to by Premier Allan Blakeney is "could be possible." What does "could be possible" mean, Mr. Speaker? It means that there is a possibility that an agreement might be signed, given certain circumstances. Who is going to argue with that? Is the Leader of the Opposition going to argue with that? Is any member going to argue with a statement such as that? But, Mr. Speaker, what we do know, that there has been an economic recession that has caused a —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker. I would suggest that you maintain some order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable First Minister has the floor.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, what we have been confronted with is an international recession and it appears that members across the way are still not conscious of that; an international recession that caused the cancellation of the \$17-billion Alcan operation in the Province of Alberta but one month ago; an international recession that caused the cancellation of the Alaska Pipeline but one month ago; reports, indeed of large layoffs involving potash workers in the Province of Saskatchewan; 400 steelworkers laid off in Regina but last week; five mines, by report from the Regina Leader Post in Saskatchewan, whose outlook is in question as to when or if they will reopen in the Province of Saskatchewan. That's what we've been hit with and it seems that honourable members across the way are still living in some sort of cuckoo land where they don't recognize the economic circumstances that we are confronted with.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to tempt the honourable members from their efforts to make cheap political points. Let me give honourable members some good advice. Manitobans know full well the economic circumstances that Canadians and themselves are presently working on. They want their governments to work together in order to achieve economic success and they will not be fooled by political trickery. Indeed, any party that exercises political trickery in this day and age is doomed to failure.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, the First Minister can oil his way and slither as much as he wants in this cuckoo land that he and his colleagues have created in Manitoba, because I acknowledge that we're living in a socialist cuckoo land now, where they have lost two out of three agreements that were left on their platter to conclude. We're left in a situation where, even the chief mentor of the First Minister of this province, Premier Blakeney, said that the agreement could be concluded in a few weeks. Instead, Mr. Speaker, we're faced this morning with the headline "Alberta pulling out of Grid," as a result, Mr. Speaker, of the ineptitude of this government.

Now my question, Mr. Speaker, is this: if, regrettably, Alberta is now pulling out of the Grid, what hope do we have of starting up Limestone construction this year, which was a firm promise of the NDP when they were in Opposition whether they had a market or not, but which their Hydro people have told us as recently as a few weeks ago and we knew cannot be started unless the Western Inter-Tie and Alcan are in place in Manitoba. When do they intend to start up Limestone as a result of these two failures that are now chalked up to their negotiating skills?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the announcement was that the New Democratic Party would bring about orderly development of Limestone. We intend to do that, Mr. Speaker. There will be orderly development towards eventual resumption of Limestone.

Mr. Speaker, there is one good bit of news that I would like to announce to the House that I have just received a —(Interjection)— well, Mr. Speaker, the - I hate to become personal because New Democrats

aren't nearly as good at being personal as Conservatives appear to be, but the voters of Manitoba expressed a very clear indication and demand who should resign on November the 17th of last year.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to put on the record that the Leader of the Opposition referred to the members on this side as being reds and cuckoos. I think Manitobans should know — (Interjection) — kooks, okay, reds and kooks. I think Manitobans should know the flowery descriptive phrases that are used by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the good news, and I would like to come to the good news because, hopefully, it will bring about some hope, some change in mood. The Minister of Finance has announced today at 2:00 o'clock that a new Budget will be coming down next Monday. Now, God hope that finally there are some effective and constructive steps undertaken by the Federal Government in order to stimulate the economy of Canada. I think that we should look forward with some constructive desire that there be that long awaited leadership on the part of the Minister of Finance next Monday.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, while acknowledging that there may be some glimmer of hope in that news from Ottawa, I get back to some glimmer of hope in Manitoba and repeat the question that I just asked the First Minister which he conveniently overlooked. Faced with this announcement that Alberta is pulling out of the Grid because of the ineptitude of this government, when can we have any hope of the construction of Limestone being started, as was intended in 1982? The schedules were there; everything was ready to go, if the Grid had been allowed to proceed. This government failed on the Grid. When can we now expect Limestone?

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, if the Federal Government has screwed up its courage to have a new Budget, can the First Minister do the same here and get rid of the invidious payroll tax that he's put on the people of Manitoba?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, this government nor, do I believe, any government, forecast the impact of the international recession. I hesitate to be repetitious, Mr. Speaker, but I am being repetitious because of the nature of the repetitious questions that are being posed. So any planning, any scheduling, must take into consideration the impact of the international recession which I hope will not be for long.

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member for Fort Garry asked a question; I told him that I would try to get all the information. It was re the personal care homes. I wish to say that the difference was that the Order-in-Council not be rescinded from January 1st to the end of September, each person in the personal care homes would have had to pay \$135 more.

I think the other question was also with their deficit. We had estimated a revenue. It wasn't the same revenue as, of course, was estimated by the former

government, so we can't talk about a deficit. We can't tell what's going to happen at the end of the year but, as of this time, we're very close to what we have projected as revenue from the personal care homes.

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

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the information from the Minister, but is he saying that when the Estimates were developed and finalized in Treasury Board and Cabinet which would have been about December-January, that at that point in time there had been no decision made with respect to the rescinding of the Order-in-Council that affected the January 1st per-diem increase? You'll recall, Sir, that a January 1st increase was announced and then repealed. The projections for personal care program budgeting surely must have been in the government's confirmed spending plans by that time.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, it is true that there was an announcement made. The announcement was made following the Order-in-Council that had been enacted, never rescinded. At that time, it was made by the Manitoba Health Services Commission. The Cabinet, at its first meeting, decided to rescind that and announce the policy that the Order-in-Council would be rescinded and that there would be no automatic increase; that they would have to be reviewed by Cabinet. They related this to the actual cost of living; that is the difference that I mentioned. If you remember, there was no increase the first quarter. Then there was an increase of 60 cents, April 1st, and 30 cents was announced July 1st which made a difference of \$135 to each patient by the end of September.

There was a deficit for the other year, of course, because the former government had projected - that was easy to project at the time - but there was the 50 cents automatic increase every quarter and of course, without the increase of the last quarter of the fiscal year, we were in deficit of that. But the announcement was made and the anticipated revenue - and I say anticipated because it's not a regular increase. It is something that had been decided only when presented to Cabinet and depending on the inflation rates. So it would be very hard to say exactly what the amount is, but I'm saying that, at this time, there is not a very significant deficit, if any.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I accept the Minister's statement, but we'll have to wait and see, because I'm not satisfied that the \$124 million budgetary appropriation in the Estimates for the Personal Care Home Program was not set and fixed on the basis of the Order-in-Council providing for the quarterly increase that was in place at that time.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I checked again today on that and the information that I have is that it wasn't. This was done after the policy of the present government was announced. They have tried to anticipate what the revenue would be and it might be that there will be a deficit at the end of the year. At this time, we're running fairly close. This is what I'm saying, but my information is, that no, it wasn't anticipated re the

Order-in-Council that was enacted by my honourable friend.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The time for Oral Questions having expired.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

### MATTER OF URGENCY

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that, under Rule 27, the ordinary business of the House be set aside to discuss a matter of urgent public importance; namely, the failure of the Minister of Energy and Mines, acting on behalf of the NDP Government of Manitoba, to prosecute with dispatch and prudence and to bring to a successful conclusion the negotiations with respect to the Alcan smelter, the Western Power Inter-Tie with Alberta and Saskatchewan, and the agreement leading to the establishment of Manitoba's first potash mine; resulting in the direct loss of thousands of job opportunities for Manitobans, the stagnation of the Manitoba economy, and the loss of hope and confidence among the people of our province.

#### MOTION presented.

**MR. SPEAKER:** In accordance with our Rule 27 the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has five minutes to demonstrate the urgency of debate to the House.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I rise at a time in the history of our province which is as perilous, in economic terms, as any time that we have perhaps faced in this century. I rise at a time, Sir, when, within a period of 8 days, this province has seen dashed into a thousand pieces, the hopes and the expectations for full realization that we had of two major projects, and now possibly even a third from what we are hearing today, which could have meant the addition of a new dimension to the industrial and employment and economic future of our province.

I say to you, Sir, as I said last week when we were speaking only about Alcan at that time, now we are speaking about the loss of the Western Inter-Tie which, Sir, has always been pivotal to the future development of Hydro in Manitoba and the building of that full potential of the Nelson-Churchill River system. What we have seen today, by virtue of the announcement from Alberta, Mr. Speaker, is the inevitable delay of the Limestone project until perhaps 1988, if we can believe the worst scenario that Manitoba Hydro presented to the Committee some few weeks ago, based upon no Western Inter-Tie, no Alcan, and so on.

The urgency, Sir, arises from the fact that this government, when it came into office, was left with negotiations in an advanced stage with respect to Alcan, with whom there had been a Memorandum of Understanding signed. Alcan had taken up a site selection in Manitoba; had taken options on that land. The government was moving ahead, Mr. Speaker, to have environmental studies made on that site and the matter was well in hand with respect to proceeding to

an agreement with respect to Hydro use; with respect, Sir, to the creation of the potential for a smelter in Manitoba, with or without the economic downturn. We had reached a certain plateau of achievement which regrettably, Sir, has now been wiped away through six months of pigheadedness, intransigence, ineptitude, ideological dithering, by principally the Minister of Energy of Mines and his incompetent Deputy.

I, Sir, am not one who likes to stand in this House and call to account civil servants, but the Deputy Minister of Energy of Mines of this government is a man who was recruited out of the office of Ed Broadbent. He came into Manitoba as an ideologue, Mr. Speaker, and along with his Minister . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader, on a point of order.

**HON. R. PENNER:** First of all, aside from the fact that it is completely out of order on the particular motion, you have previously had occasion to rule in this House on imputations made against a civil servant who has not the possibility of defending himself or herself in this House. The Leader of the Opposition knows that it is wrong; knows that it is scandalous. It's the kind of dirt he may be used to revelling in, but it is not part of the business of this House. These people cannot defend themselves in the House and should not have to tolerate that kind of libelous statement that is being made.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I would remind all members that our Rule 27 has to do with explanation of the urgency of the debate; the urgency, not the nature of the debate itself.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**HON. S. LYON:** And that is why, Sir, I have said in this motion that the urgency resides now. Having seen the failure of two of these three major projects under the inept handling of this Minister and his Deputy, the urgency arises, Sir, that they must be taken from their jobs by the First Minister before we lose the third one. I think the third one is seriously in jeopardy and has been seriously in jeopardy from the minute this Minister and his Deputy started to work on the negotiations.

So the urgency, Sir, is in the public interest of Manitoba. The urgency, Sir, is that this government be brave enough to stand up to a debate in this House with respect to how it has mishandled its fundamental mandate to develop the economy of Manitoba and, in fact has, by its ineptitude; and has, Sir, by its commitment to its funny ideology, sacrificed on the altar of socialism, the future of Manitoba in an economic sense.

So, Mr. Speaker, the urgency of debate, Sir, is that two are down. We have lost two major projects with the thousands of jobs that could come from those projects. We have one left that is still salvageable, if this government will rid itself of the paraphernalia that has attached itself to the government in terms of staff and in terms of this inept Minister; a new Minister be appointed who can bring those negotiations back to the level of understanding that they were on the 30th of November, 1981.



The urgency, Sir, lies in the future of Manitoba, the future of hope for all Manitobans; that they can see an expanding economy based upon our natural resources; an expanding economy based upon negotiation in good faith; an expanding economy that was within the grasp of Manitobans only six short months ago. Now, two-thirds of it has been wiped away by this torrent of ineptitude, principally led by the Minister of Energy and Mines and those incompetents that he has hired into his staff.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader also has five minutes.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, as we might have expected, instead of addressing the key points that must be addressed in a motion of this kind, we have been treated, perhaps I should say mistreated, to five minutes of bombast, rhetoric, and sound and fury signifying nothing. We've had occasion recently to refer to the precise meaning or the precise points which have to be established in order to justify adjourning the setting aside the regular business of the House to debate a matter of urgent public importance. The term "urgent public importance" is a very specialized term and there are at least two criteria; these were addressed only a week or so ago and it has to deal with matters within the administrative competence of the government and there must be no other reasonable opportunity for debate.

Now, there is a third Rule of the House which must be addressed in your consideration of this matter, and that is our own Rule 27(5)(b), that such a motion cannot address more than one matter - it says specifically - "not more than one matter may be discussed on the same motion." Now, this motion raises three matters specifically: one of them, with respect to Alcan, you have previously ruled on in any event; secondly, with respect to the Inter-Tie; and thirdly, with respect to potash. They are set out seriatim (1), (2), (3); so that you have a rolled-up motion dealing with three specific matters and that is contrary specifically to Rule 27(5)(b).

If you should not find that the motion violates Rule 27(5)(b), then with respect to the question of urgency as defined in Beauchesne, just dealing with the Inter-Tie question which sparked this particular motion, it has been announced by the Minister in Alberta, the Utilities Minister - and I just quote a brief passage that the Alberta Minister said - "A report on the Slave River power potential should be in his hands in July. A close study of the Slave River Report will reveal just how interested Alberta will be in the future of the Power Grid discussion." I quote that to make this point, that it is now up to Alberta. Alberta has not made a decision, other than to consider what its position will be in July when it gets its study. Therefore, there is nothing that this government can do until the Province of Alberta gets the report on the Slave River power station and then decides which is most economically feasible for it.

Finally, Sir, on the question which addresses the specific question of urgency; namely, whether there will be another opportunity to discuss this matter, the members opposite know full well that perhaps even today we will be moving into Ways and Means to

consider, among other matters, the question of Main Supply. The members opposite know full well, those of them who are experienced, that it is on such a motion that a debate may be general. Therefore, there is today another opportunity to debate these very questions. So on all three matters which I have addressed to you, the motion I suggest to you, Sir, fails.

What it is, it's posturing; what it is, it's political cheapness of the worst kind; what it is, it's exploiting a situation for narrow political advantage.

### SPEAKER'S RULING

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I thank both members that have spoken on this matter for their advice and although I do not accept the first point made by the Honourable Attorney-General that the resolution deals with more than one matter, he is quite correct in noting that Beauchesne's 285 says that "there must be no other reasonable opportunity for debate." I believe that most members of this House are sufficiently competent that if they wish to discuss this matter they will find some other opportunity quite easily and quite quickly. Therefore, I must rule against the motion put forward by the Honourable Attorney-General.

Orders of the Day.

**HON. R. PENNER:** You said, Sir, that you must rule against the position put forward by the Honourable Attorney-General. I think you meant the Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Pardon me, I did indeed mean the Leader of the Opposition.

Orders of the Day.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise to correct the record of the House. There was a procedural statement read in this Chamber earlier today which made reference to some remarks of mine and I wish to correct the record to the point that on Friday last I did not formally raise a matter of privilege. I studiously avoided raising a matter of privilege by not bringing in a substantive motion and any action that was taken after that it was purely as a request to the Minister to withdraw his remarks. He chose not to and I did not pursue the matter any further. So I wish to thank you for your gratuitous statement today, but I wanted to correct the record that it was not necessary.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I thank the honourable member for his remarks. I would suggest if he wishes to refresh his memory he should consult Hansard itself.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would you please call the report stage on Bill No. 40.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The question before the House is the report stage on Bill No. 40 and the adjourned debate stands in the name of the Honourable Member for St.

Norbert. (Stand)

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you please call the adjourned debates on Bills No. 21 through to 60, except Bill No. 54.

### **BILL NO. 21 - COMMUNITY CHILD DAY CARE STANDARDS ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Community Services, Bill No. 21. The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My comments will be brief, hopefully. A couple of comments I'd like to make - I'll take the liberty of quoting some parts from the brief presented to the Manitoba Government concerning child care standards. It has come from the Central Region of the Manitoba Child Care Association.

First of all, I want to re-echo the sentiments of other speakers from this side who have indicated that we feel at this particular time that we are blinded somewhat by the lack of regulations or the lack of full understanding of what may come forward.

Firstly, the bill is therefore a disappointment because of the fact we have no idea of really what is coming forward in regulations, although certainly we do support in a general sense the attempt to standardize the quality of care throughout the province. That, Sir, seems harmless enough but it brings some real questions to mind and many of them have been listed by my colleagues previously but I think that, as it pertains specifically to a rural situation, no doubt there are some concerns that maybe should be re-emphasized and underlined once again.

I'm concerned about primarily any regulation as it may pertain to standards relating to, as I've seen indicated in one or two briefs, child development courses. One can conjure up in one's mind any number of things that may mean and, of course, as a parent of young children and realizing how vulnerable they are to many facets of our life, one becomes concerned as to what degree and really what is meant in this whole area of child development courses.

So those are some of the areas and in a rural sense, of course, I'm wondering about those existing day care centres that now seem to provide the service that is required and how they will be affected when the new regulations come into being.

I wonder also who will draft these regulations. I'm one who of course is always suspicious of so-called professionals, sociologists, medical health officers, school counsellors, professional educators and I'm wondering really who is going to work toward developing the regulations that we so desperately want to see; whether there will be sufficient room on this new bureaucracy or this new committee that will develop these standards; will there be sufficient room for ordinary parents like myself and other people in this House and, of course, what about the profit concern? I've heard the Member for Wolseley speak in a passionate and emotional plea to this whole question of day care and I could readily identify her disdain for any mention of profit associated with day care. I

understand her sincerity and of course her deep commitment to, probably, total exclusion of any attempt to profit from providing care.

Yet I have to ask myself if it isn't the right of individuals who may be prepared to pay beyond what standards may indicate, to some individuals who may be prepared to provide care beyond the standards envisaged, at a profit to them and I wonder in fact why that situation should not be allowed to occur. Yet there's not much more that I or anybody else on this side can say to that issue or many others because we haven't seen, again, those regulations.

I'm worried about - and I think our Member for Fort Garry said it best - about the attempt to make homogeneous this whole standard of care and if I could quote from Hansard, Monday, June 14th and he said very briefly right to the point and I quote, "Mr. Speaker, so our first warning to the Minister is to avoid any philosophical or ideological urge to make this whole system totally homogeneous and to produce standards that will be applied universally across-the-board, where day care is in operation in every pocket and corner of this province."

Sir, I say to you that has real meaning to somebody like myself who, although is removed from active day care consideration, still comes from that part of the province where I see a number of volunteer groups; I see individuals within a small hamlet, like one from which I come, who devote two or three days a week - not specifically in a day care setting as we see - but they devote full days of the week to bringing children together and who spend time and devote time to that end, just not to allow a single parent or to allow the mother in this case to go and do something else, but just to have children come together for the purpose of learning early in their life what it's like to be with other children.

In having seen this type of system and as I envisage it, trying to put it into a very strict, commercial day care operation that probably exists in the city, I realize we're comparing two different things. But still I've got this concern that you're going to bring forward standards that are going to impose themselves across that whole, large area of preschool children coming together for whatever means, so I genuinely have that concern in a rural day care or a rural preschool gathering sense.

I also have to ask the question as to how the concerns in a rural sense are going to be brought forward into this type of committee - I don't know if it's going to be a director that will be setting these standards - and I'm wondering if they will pay total cognizance to all the efforts put in by volunteer groups.

As the Member for Fort Garry indicates again from the very same Hansard, and he quotes, "The warning thus ensues from that experience, Mr. Speaker, that if there is too heavy a hand laid on the day care community by the government with respect to qualifications and training, many rural day care centres may be forced to close." Sir, in all honesty, that's my greatest concern and also the impact it will have on the volunteer efforts because I've seen volunteer systems work. As a matter of fact, in many rural areas it's the only solution; it's the only way that you have programs of a social nature, whether it's in recreation or any other end, as to the volunteer efforts of individuals who want

to come together and give of their time. I think it would be a tragedy to that whole attempt by people if, in fact, you harmed that in any way, notwithstanding what the Member for St. Boniface just whispered in my ear.

I'd like to close by finally giving comment on enforcement. I never really thought too much about this until I had an opportunity to read again this brief, of which I made mention earlier on. In their introductory remarks they make this comment and I quote: "We acknowledge the tremendous resource of concerned, skilled, volunteer community citizens and welcome their direction. We do not acknowledge the resource of only one person being given the power to enforce standards nor do we welcome them."

Mr. Speaker, they go on further within this brief to indicate that, in their view, enforcement should be the responsibility of the Board of Directors who are responsible for all aspects of a day care centre's operation and that enforcement, in fact, should be achieved through monthly board meetings; through direct communications with directors; through parent involvement and daily access to the centre.

I think really all they're trying to say, in a rural sense, is that in fact the quickest way to create something that you don't want is to take enforcement, to take supervision and take ultimate say on day care as we know in the rural areas; is to remove that from local authority and take it, in fact, to some individual, one person in Winnipeg or somebody far removed.

So I want to register that as my main concern and close by no doubt saying to you that the importance of understanding the relationship between democracy and bureaucracy cannot be underestimated in specific issues and I say that this Day Care bill, as has been presented to us, is certainly one of them.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Community Services will be closing debate.

The Honourable Minister.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I intend to be brief and to the point.

Firstly, I welcome the support expressed for this legislation in general and I want to take the opportunity to allay any expressions of fear that have been forthcoming from members opposite with regard to the matter of the heavy hand of the state, or with regard to other matters such as the allowance for differences from one part of this province to another. If anything, the key in this legislation is flexibility and it was designed with that in mind.

The Member for Fort Garry and others said they were disappointed because it did not contain a lot of detail; that it didn't contain detail regarding standards; regarding ratios; regarding other aspects of the administration of legislation, the administration of day care centres; that at the same time they said they worried about the lack of flexibility. Well, you can't have it both ways.

I suggest that criticism contradicts itself. In other words, if you want to have the variety; if you want the heterogeneity rather than homogeneity; if you want to have ability to be flexible, then you cannot put all these details into the bill because it is much more

difficult to change with the times. It is much more difficult to change your approach if it is fixed in legislation.

Hopefully, as time goes on with further experience to the Act, if necessary, we hope that very few changes will have to be made, but if they are necessary, Mr. Speaker, then we can make them. We can make them more readily; more rapidly than we could if they were carved in legislation.

I ask members opposite, what other legislation has such details carved out in the bill? The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that very few major education legislation; major health care legislation do not outline in detail, standards. Those are not appropriate for the bill. Those are appropriate for regulations and as it's appropriated in those areas, so it is appropriate for child day care trusts. So we have deliberately taken that approach.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I notice none of the members opposite, who complain about the lack of content, the lack of detail, have proposed anything. We have no suggestions coming forward as to what should be in. The Member for Fort Garry said well, the bill was empty; there is nothing to criticize and yet he could not, he had nothing to propose; there was just negative criticism. There was nothing positive that the Member for Fort Garry was prepared to offer.

So the bill does provide a framework for regulations. Those regulations will be based upon the experience we've had to date in bringing forward day care programs to this province. We will recognize differences from one part of the province to another; from the north to the south; from the city to the rural, that will be recognized. We will recognize the role of the volunteer boards, as a matter of fact, nonproprietary organizations today and co-operative organizations today, by law, must have boards of directors. This is what is happening now. These nonprofit centres; these nonproprietary day care centres and co-ops have boards made up of parents essentially, members of the community, therefore it goes without saying that such organizations will continue to have boards made up essentially of parents, of people in the community. They will have responsibilities to run and operate a day care centre. So we don't envisage any change in that respect.

So there is plenty of room for community involvement and it certainly will be encouraged. There will not be the heavy-handed estate; there will be coordination. We will do what we can to assist in the development of new day care centres and new day care facilities. We'll do whatever we can to help ensure, however, that standards that are desirable are brought into being and are maintained.

I said the key was flexibility. We have in Section 19, provided for appeal procedures and it's only common sense, but I think it's indicative of the flexible approach that we have taken, that where any day care centre has its licence suspended or revoked, that the licensee may appeal the suspension. I won't go into the details, it's outlined in Section 19 of the bill.

Flexibility is also seen, Mr. Speaker, in Section 27 which refers to the Qualifications Review Committee. We want to ensure that while we want good quality people, that we want to have an opportunity because there's so many people with different backgrounds

that we have an organization - a Qualifications Review Committee - that can as far as possible ascertain qualifications and so on and make decisions with regard to qualifications. We have provided for a rather broad spectrum of people to be on that committee.

Further, Mr. Speaker, we have provided to give another example of flexibility; that a Ministerial Certificate may be issued, as outlined in Section 29, where there are special circumstances and where a person doesn't meet certain qualifications prescribed in regulations. So, if anything, perhaps we could be accused of allowing too much flexibility but certainly we have provided a sound framework for the necessary regulations.

Another example of the very flexible and liberal approach we've taken is with regard to commercial operators. There's no prohibition against operating day care centres on a commercial basis and I know there was some discussion of this in the Estimates Review. Many members opposite raised this matter and I notice that this is not a matter of debate at this time because, again, flexibility is the word and there is no prohibition of the private sector being in this.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, however that it's our intention to do whatever we can to support and enhance a very strong, nonprofit co-operative day care system in the Province of Manitoba so that, basically, we will continue to have what we have and to expand on the nonprofit segment in the province. In other words, hopefully with our various programs or various subsidies and the expansion thereof, we will be able to strengthen the nonprofit segment of day care delivery in the Province of Manitoba.

We have had plenty of consultation with people in the community. My Legislative Assistant, the Member for Wolsley, has spent many hours, many days, many weeks talking to various people in the City of Winnipeg and in various other cities, towns and rural parts of Manitoba, northern parts of Manitoba. All in all she has consulted, and dialogued, and met with 18 different groups, 18 different organizations far-ranging from the Day Care Liaison Committee to the Wee World Child Care in Portage la Prairie, to the St. Matthews and Maryland Day Care Centre, to the Mount Carmel Clinic, to the Children's House, to the YMCA Day Care Centre, to the Eastman Day Care Group and so forth and so on; the Metis Federation in Brandon, the Thompson organization that runs a day care centre and so forth and those are only a few.

So we look forward, having obtained much information and indication from those groups, we proceeded with the legislation and we do indeed look forward to the comments of any groups that are interested in this legislation when it goes before the Committee of the Legislature within the next few days, hopefully. We will listen very carefully to what the people have to say and based on what they have to say we are prepared to make any amendments, if necessary, to the legislation - hopefully none will be required - but if some are required they certainly will be forthcoming. Secondly, based on what is stated, we will certainly be guided in the making and in the formulation of regulations which are very important in the organization of the program.

Again, we intend to have a large consultative process in effect over the summer months and early fall

and truly I would expect that these regulations will be formulated in such a way that they will be found acceptable by the vast majority of people concerned with day care delivery in the Province of Manitoba.

So, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I state again that flexibility has been the key. We intend to be very gradual, very steady in our approach. The degree to which we can implement standards of course, will in large measure, depend upon the funding. It will be dependent on the amount of money that we can find in our treasury to allow the day care centres to flourish, to develop, to expand and to allow standards to rise.

I assure the Members of the House that our intention is to have the best day care system to be found anywhere in North America and that it is our intention to support volunteer groups; it is our intention to get the co-operation of the day care community; it is our intention to work with them to provide adequate programs, programs for children that will cause Manitoba to be in the forefront of this type of social service for the people of this province.

So I look forward to the Committee stage for further comments from the community and hopefully see this through to final reading and to get on with the job of flushing out further details so that we can indeed have the best child day care system to be found anywhere in the world.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Thank you. I might just announce that, by agreement, this particular bill is being referred to the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders which is meeting on Thursday.

### **BILL NO. 23 - THE LEGAL AID SERVICES SOCIETY OF MANITOBA ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 23, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I intend to be brief. I don't wish to repeat some of the arguments which have already been put forward by my colleagues with respect to the dangers of the wording of this bill and the sorts of groups that might conceivably qualify for aid under the bill, as worded.

What I would just simply like to point out to the Minister and the government is that this sort of action opens the floodgates to requests from special interest groups. This offers never ending possibilities for expansion.

In this case the Minister proposes to offer legal services to groups interested in issues which would include consumer and environmental issues. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister would find that, in respect to groups interested in environmental issues, for instance, that legal services would be something which they would regard as fairly low in their order of priority in terms of being able to fight an issue. The Minister is going to open his government up to all

manner of requests to deal with these other types of technical advice which, if offered, will simply make the situation that much more difficult for government to be able to govern.

Certainly it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is the responsibility of government to make certain that they have taken into consideration the views of the public, the values of the public, that they have examined the merits of various proposals and that they make their decisions in full knowledge of the situation; but I would warn the Minister that to provide extensive services to groups that have a concern or have an interest in issues of public concern, you will find that there will be a never ending stream of demands and that if granted they can tie up the mechanism of government almost indefinitely because it's possible to find experts that can give you advice which is contrary to almost any position that the government proposes to take.

Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to belabour the issue at all but I do offer that word of warning to the Minister and to the government because it's an area they can find that will open up to be a much broader one than is presented in this bill.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Attorney-General will be closing debate.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health that the debate on this bill be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 27, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. (Stand)

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General Bill No. 30, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa. (Stand)

### **BILL NO. 31 - THE CHILD CUSTODY ENFORCEMENT ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General Bill No. 31 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Attorney-General just introduced this bill yesterday but it was in the works, Mr. Speaker, prior to the change in government and I would like to make a few comments on the bill, Mr. Speaker. With respect to any technicalities in the bill, I hope that the Attorney-General has, in one way or another, had an opportunity to refer the bill to the various groups like the Family Law Subsection and the Manitoba Bar Association, Mr. Speaker, whom I believe would be very interested in the contents of this bill, and who might be able to provide some positive and constructive comments, and perhaps might offer some improvements to the bill when it reaches the Committee stage. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that they are aware of this bill and will be made aware when this bill goes to Committee.

Mr. Speaker, this bill deals with one of the most

emotional heartrending situations that, I think, can possibly occur in the lives of citizens and does so more and more as we witness the increasing number of divorces and separations in our society and the number of single parent families and those who are, particularly those who would be on the Family Law Subsection of the Manitoba Bar who practise in this area of law on a daily basis, could tell the members of this House some real horror stories that occur almost every day in our society, Mr. Speaker, where one spouse or the other leaves the home with the children and takes the children to another jurisdiction; let alone the difficulties that occur in custody situations where both spouses remain in this jurisdiction in this province and they get involved in very difficult, very complex, very expensive custody proceedings in other provinces, Mr. Speaker.

The fact that this bill adopts as a principle, Mr. Speaker, in Section 4(1) giving to the court, where the children have a real and substantial connection with the province, give that court jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker, if it is adopted by every province in this land that would tend to eliminate some of the interprovincial disputes that have taken place and do, on a daily basis, take place.

It would be helpful indeed, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope, in any event, and I'm reasonably satisfied that the Attorney-General will continue to press on other provincial departments and other provincial Attorneys-General, the practice that we follow in Manitoba of making available Crown Counsel, Crown Attorneys to assist in enforcement of orders from other jurisdictions, enforcing them in this province. That can go some way, Mr. Speaker, to providing immediate legal assistance where the child's whereabouts come to the knowledge of the spouse from whom they have been abducted or taken away. That is a good practice, Mr. Speaker, and it is one which I pressed on other Attorneys-General and on other provinces and I hope that the present Attorney-General will continue to impress upon other provinces, as a practice that should be adopted in those other jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, I would be interested to know from the Attorney-General, perhaps when he sums up his position with respect to, I believe, some proposed amendments of the Criminal Code which at one stage were being considered as strengthening the provisions of the Criminal Code with respect to abduction and considering it as a criminal offence. I know there were some Attorneys-General who had concerns about that, Mr. Speaker, but I took the position that this was such a serious matter, until there was a better system of enforcement, it should be considered as a criminal offence.

Mr. Speaker, I would be interested in that Committee and perhaps reviewing with the Attorney-General his comment that other provinces do not intend to enact this new legislation. He did say that in response to a question that it wasn't because they were opposed to this legislation but I would be interested in reviewing with him the reasons that other provinces have indicated for not enacting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was in the works. We're supportive of this or any other steps that can be taken to improve the enforcement of interprovincial Custody

Orders as well as Maintenance Orders.  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, J. Storie:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Just very briefly in closing debate then on Bill No. 31, I thank the Member for St. Norbert for his supportive remarks and concerns. I believe that in many ways Manitoba has shown the way in family legislation and fortunately, although there are some substantial differences of approach and nevertheless there has been more consensus than difference in the way in which respective governments, both NDP and Conservative, have approached the question of marital property, family maintenance and child custody. I would be pleased to discuss with him in committee such concerns as he may have and I would hope to be in a position to provide him with the information he requests about the approach of other jurisdictions because I do believe that is important.

I just want to make one comment about the question of the inclusion in the Criminal Code of a child abduction provision based on this kind of situation that is interparental. In fact, there is a provision in the Criminal Code that deals with what we might call interparental abduction. The difficulty with it as an enforcement vehicle - and that's why this particular statute is being brought in - is that, first of all, it does require that one invokes the criminal process which, I think, it's readily understood is a very blunt instrument. It brings the whole force of the state in on an individual who must, beyond a reasonable doubt, be criminalized; and in order to do that, because it is one the major offences in the Criminal Code, the court before finding such a person guilty, has to establish a guilty state of mind, has to prove that there was an intention; and has to do more than that, has to prove what is called guilty knowledge with respect to the existence of a court order favouring the other spouse. That's why that particular provision of the Criminal Code is used so rarely.

This is, in effect, a civil statute which provides a broader remedial power that is not essentially punitive in nature but is remedial. That, after all, is what we are aiming at; that is, to restore the child to the parent who has lawful custody; to prevent, insofar as we can prevent, this regrettable, often tragic child-grabbing under those circumstances. Therefore, one should look on it, not as in any way different from, but rather supplementary to the existing but essentially inoperative statute in the Criminal Code.

So, again, I thank the Member for St. Norbert for his general support for the principles of the bill and look forward to a constructive discussion with him in committee.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

### **BILL 33 - THE ASSESSMENT OF PROPERTY FOR TAXATION ACT**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 33, An Act to amend an Act respecting the Assessment of Property for Taxation in the Municipalities in

1981-82, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I've read the opening statement on this bill of the Honourable Minister, perused the bill and the report in some depth, to try and ascertain why the bill is before us and why the government of the day has seen fit to set aside this long awaited piece of legislation to deal with the assessment practices in our province. I think I'm satisfied, Mr. Speaker, and I think most of the people in this province are satisfied that enough meetings have been held already for this House and the Minister to proceed with the recommendations of the committee, especially some of the legislative requirements which are long overdue.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Minister and the government of the day have a problem with this report because of the name of the author being Weir. I'm sure that it's going to take them a long time to try and digest the subject matter of the committee, especially when he was the chairman. I went through this "Clear Choice For All Manitobans" with a fine-toothed comb to see if, in fact, the New Democratic Party have addressed themselves to this subject matter during the campaign. I fail to see even mention of the subject. That's strange, Mr. Speaker, because this has been a longstanding problem in this province, the assessment practices and one, I thought, that at least one would have put a line in that great document that we quote from on many occasions in this House.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, there is nothing in that document, at least that I have been able to unveil, to show that the party or the government are at all concerned about this subject matter. Of course, now my suspicions are sort of reinforced by the bill that we have before us, where we have the Minister asking for an extension of the freeze and no date, unfortunately. He hasn't given us any idea of when he's going to deal with it. I wonder if, in fact, they want to deal with it at all.

I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, as we stand here, what kind of message the Honourable Minister's getting from these meetings of the Union of Municipalities, the regional meetings that are being held in the province at the present time. I think he was at one this morning in Minnedosa and I believe he was at one yesterday. I'm sure when he closes the debate, he'll give us some of his wisdom of what the union is telling him. Some of the conversations I've had with union people who are attending these regional meetings tell me that they are urging the Minister - in fact, the resolution was on the Order Paper yesterday - to proceed immediately. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that's not going to be the way. He's going to delay this thing to some unknown date.

I wonder too, Mr. Speaker, why the Minister or why the government are backing away from the recommendations of the committee, especially the legislative requirements, because in the report it's quite easy to see that the committee recommended three types of assessment legislation should take place almost immediately if we're to implement the recommendations of the committee. But the Minister hasn't seen fit to do that; to follow out that guideline and at the end of

the first recommendation, Mr. Speaker; in the report it's quite clear. He says, in the committee's report, such a delay would be unacceptable to the public; acceptance, it says, of the committee's recommendations, but not the second alternative for the implementation which would involve the extension of Bill 100, at least until December 31st, 1987.

Mr. Speaker, it says here the committee says, in their opinion, such a delay would be unacceptable to the public. I think I side in with the committee report on this very important matter, that such a delay as we're experiencing with this bill is unacceptable. I think that's what the Union of Municipalities and the reeves and councillors are telling the Honourable Minister, that to delay this to 1987 or whatever date he has in mind is not acceptable. I'm sure he'll give us the benefit of his wisdom.

There certainly may be parts of it, the legislation, more discussions with the Department of Education and the school trustees across the province to ensure that we can come up with a fair way to share the provincial and municipal and school tax levies on the province, that there may be more debate required for that. But, Mr. Speaker, I say as I stand here today, I'm like a lot of reeves and councillors in the province, disappointed that the Minister has seen fit to bring a bill before us that he's not prepared to deal with. We're going to have more reviews. I spoke on reviews last night in a short address to the House. That's one of the favorite tactics of this government, to throw another review into circulation. I think we're reviewing almost everything that's of any significance for this government. I don't know whether they don't have the time or whether they don't have the courage or because maybe this is not in their guidelines that they're not prepared to deal with at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Honourable Minister that this matter has been studied in this province for many, many years. This study I think is one that's the best I've seen in my time. I think it's reasonable; it's acceptable; the public's waiting for it; the Union of Municipalities are waiting for it. I gather from the regional meetings that are being held in this province at the present time, one resolution has already been directed to the Honourable Minister - if it hasn't already, it will be directed to him - urging him to proceed at the earliest possible opportunity and not delay this long overdue legislation by putting a bill such as this before the House.

So I hope, when the Minister closes debate, he'll give us a little more positive indication of where this government is going, to take the recommendations of this committee, not another review. There may be parts, as I spoke earlier, that need more discussion but the first three recommendations, I think, of the committee, the public's waiting for them, the union is waiting for them, I'm waiting for them and I hope the Minister will consider. In fact, he's talking about a date; give us the date that you intend to extend it. I didn't think an extension was needed but maybe the Minister can prove to me that he needs more time. I don't hear that out in the country at all. I think they're ready for it and they're waiting for the legislation and he's the one who will have to carry it through this House.

I look forward to the Minister's comments when he

gets around to closing debate.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs will be closing debate.

**HON. A. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's a pleasure to rise and close debate on Bill 33, a bill to extend the freeze that was implemented by the previous administration.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am somewhat baffled and concerned by the comments that I'm hearing from members of the Opposition. For instance, I'll start with and refer to comments made by the Member for Roblin who was the last member of the Opposition to speak, in which he says he doesn't think an extension is needed. Mr. Deputy Speaker, when he makes that statement he indicates that he doesn't accept the report, he doesn't accept the recommendation, because it is clear that the Assessment Review Committee has indicated in their preliminary report, their interim report, that they recommended a freeze be extended. So now, the Member for Roblin is taking issue with the committee. He says they are wrong; he says they are wrong for suggesting that there should be an extension of the freeze and we have had other people as well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, who have suggested that; do not extend the freeze; go ahead and put it in place.

I want to say there are more. I am receiving more requests from municipalities. The Member for Roblin says that municipalities want to see it proceed immediately. Yes, they do and I do. I would like to see it proceed as expeditiously as is prudently possible. Yes, there are a few municipalities who said, yes, go ahead with it. We have received a number of letters; one said we have some concerns about the recommendations but we recommend that you go ahead with it. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wrote back to these particular municipalities and said, would you please indicate the recommendations that give you some concern. This is what I'm trying to find out. What are the issues or the recommendations, the sections that you have concerns about?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we received another correspondence from a larger urban centre, a rural centre, and they indicated they have made some preliminary studies of the recommendations and they said, please do not proceed until you meet with us again; we wish to discuss the contents of these recommendations. So I say to you, to the Members of the Opposition, that it is not all that simple. As a matter of fact, the position that I have taken in asking my staff, first of all, to make an in-depth study of the recommendations so that they themselves will be able to analyse the implications and they would then be able to brief the Cabinet, the Ministers and the Members of the Legislative Assembly and we hold hearings. I have asked my staff as well to do a number of projects, a number of assessments, particularly on school divisions, and that is now under way. That is taking place at the present time. We intend to do a number of them, Mr. Deputy Speaker, perhaps half a dozen or so, in different areas of the province in order that we can have an accurate idea of what the implications are for the people of Manitoba. In that respect, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have received nothing but positive com-

ments, nothing but positive comments on the way that we are proceeding to look at this report.

In fact, if I may quote from Page 3366 where the Member for Swan River who is the critic for the Opposition on Municipal Affairs, in which he says, and I quote, "I do not see anything wrong with the Minister's suggestion that an all-party Legislative Committee be established." Well, Mr. Speaker, this flies in the face of the suggestions from the Member for Roblin; it flies in the face of the comments from the Member for St. Norbert. The critic for the official Opposition, of which there's only one, indicates that he finds no fault with the way I am proceeding. He suggests that we should not delay and he suggests that I am dilly-dallying. I don't know where I have dilly-dallied on it. We have proceeded expeditiously. The staff, at the moment, are studying the report and its 164, I believe, recommendations. The Assessment Branch is now doing assessments at the present time, I think even today they are doing so. I fail to see where the problem is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Norbert, in his comments, first of all - and he's correct - he says the recommendations and assessments are not widely understood. Agreed. He indicated that it was a very complex issue. Agreed. He also indicated that the government he realized - and that is I'm trying to paraphrase or quote him as accurately as I possibly can - he said he realizes that the government does not have to accept any of the recommendations if it does not want to do so and that is correct. But then he goes on to say that the - and as other members have said - goes on to say that there should be a date in the extension in Bill 33. On the one hand, the member says that the government doesn't have to accept any of the recommendations; then he says there has to be a freeze. These two statements are contradictory to one another.

I want to advise the honourable members opposite that I have received requests from some of the local governments that have said, we have sat down and studied this as best we can and we want to ask you not to do anything until you meet with us again. That is what we intend to do, Mr. Speaker. We are proceeding in that manner.

As far as the freeze is concerned, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Pembina when he spoke indicated that the review took much longer than - I believe it was him, I'll apologize if I'm incorrect - longer than they had anticipated and that because of that - again that is a contradictory statement. On the one hand he has stated that when they asked for a review that they did not expect it would take that long to do the review. Therefore, an extension is necessary.

I suggest to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Bill 100 should have been so worded that we would not have had to have Bill 33 before this House. This bill should not be here if members opposite had been doing their work.

So now, Mr. Speaker, I am following the recommendations of the Assessment Review Committee. They have given us two alternatives: one is to extend the freeze for one year; the other alternative is to extend it to 1987. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to have to come back here next year to bring another bill to extend it for another year - (Interjection) - I'm not interested in bringing legislation just for the fun of

bringing legislation in this House, Mr. Speaker. We now have the flexibility with this bill to remove the freeze in one year, two years, three years along with the recommendations of the Assessment Review Committee so I fail to see where the problem is, Mr. Speaker. I have indicated that I will be setting up a Legislative Committee composed of members opposite along with members of the government side. They are part of the deal, Mr. Speaker. They will be on the road with us and report back to the next sitting of the Legislature, that will be next spring, I presume. I fail to see what is wrong with the way we are proceeding. We are getting positive response on the way we are proceeding. We are doing something, Mr. Speaker, not just for a year or two; we are trying to come up with assessment legislation that will be with us for a number of years, perhaps 10, 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, we want to know what the implications are and the way I'm proceeding we will know and so will members know. They will be briefed and when we go out on these committee hearings, they will know what the implications are and they will be able to dialogue intelligently and constructively with members out there, the Municipal Council and other interested groups.

I recommend that they accept this bill as it is. We are sincere with this bill. We are going to proceed as expeditiously as is prudently possible.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before we continue, I'd like to direct the members' attention to the gallery on my left where we have 40 members of the Moose Lake Fishermen's Association in attendance.

On behalf of all the members of the Assembly, I welcome you here today.

These individuals are obviously represented by the MLA for The Pas.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Community Services Bill No. 51, An Act to amend the Child Welfare Act. The bill stands in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. (Stand)

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General Bill No. 53, An Act to amend The Builders' Liens Act, Loi modifiant la Loi sur le privilège du constructeur, stands in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert. (Stand)

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General Bill No. 60, The Statute Law Amendment Act, stands in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert. (Stand)

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

It is the intention to continue the debate which was adjourned last night in Committee on Supplementary Estimates.



**MOTION presented.**

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

**MATTER OF GRIEVANCE**

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak today on a grievance as we go into the Motion of Supply and to use this occasion which is given to each member once in the Session, to express on behalf of the people of Manitoba the real grievance that they must feel about the lost opportunities, the lost expectations and hopes that are today more clear than ever before, directly attributable to this government opposite.

So from time to time, Mr. Speaker, when some of us get up to express a grievance we centre on an issue that is of particular concern to our constituency or to a select group in Manitoba. I today centre on issues in the course of my comments that affect every citizen of Manitoba and affect them in a very prejudicial way. It is rarely that a government so shortly into its term of office, it is rarely that such a government can attract to itself an indictment against it for sins of omission and commission that they have committed in the first six months or so of their term which will have a profound effect, Mr. Speaker, upon the future of this province and as I've said before, a very deleterious effect, upon the lives of each and every citizen of this province.

Mr. Speaker, it was only a week ago that we had the most unfortunate and sad announcement from Alcan that they were suspending indefinitely any plans for the establishment of a smelter complex in the Province of Manitoba. I don't think that I need read to the House again all of the benefits that have been postponed as a result of that unfortunate decision by Alcan. Suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, that in earlier debates in this House we were admonishing this government to get on with bargaining in good faith so that they could maintain and re-achieve the momentum that had been left to them as, if I may say so, Mr. Speaker, a solemn trust that they had been left to maintain and to move ahead with, in terms of achieving the thousands of jobs directly, and indirectly, that would have been available to Manitobans as a result of this smelter project.

At the very least, Sir, - because none of us on this side of the House are blind to the forces of the economy of the Western World or of the economy of North America, we know that we're in a recession - but at least, Mr. Speaker, that this government with goodwill and with some faint element of prudence could have continued on from the Memorandum of Understanding that was in existence with Alcan, and could have assured that the Memorandum of Understanding was undergirded by further agreements with Manitoba Hydro with respect to Hydro sales, and could then have convinced Alcan that it was in their interests in the short-term and medium and long-term to take up the options of land that Alcan had negotiated in the Balmoral District after announcing practically a year ago that it intended to locate its plant there subject to environmental and subject, of course, to socio-economic and other studies which the government and Alcan had put under way.

It was a going concern until the Minister of Energy

and Mines and some of the new itinerants that they brought on to their staff got a hold of it. It was a going concern and nobody is trying to say, Mr. Speaker, that companies are not postponing construction decisions today, of course they are. But the difference between the postponement of the construction decision in Quebec, which was announced some 48 hours after the sad announcement in Manitoba, the contrast between that and what's happened in Manitoba, as I've said earlier, speaks a book.

In Manitoba, what were they faced with? First of all Alcan, when they started to negotiate with the Minister of Energy and Mines and his new team, his new Deputy Minister of Energy and Mines - that Ottawa Palladin that came around here fresh from Ed Broadbent's office with all of the impedimenta of doctrine and doctrinaire nonsense that office would cause to adhere to anyone's skin - what were they faced with? First of all, with the bald statement that had been made by the New Democratic Party during the election campaign that they would not sell to Alcan any portion of a Hydro Electric Generating Plant which was Alcan's precondition, Mr. Speaker, for coming to Manitoba, that was the precondition. How do I know that was a precondition? Because, Mr. Speaker, our government went out and sought energy intensive companies to come to Manitoba to realize the potential of that hydro-electric resource to create jobs in Manitoba based upon that resource. We knew that resource had to be put to work for the people of Manitoba. We knew that was the primary way to harness hydro-electric energy. Sure we're interested in a secondary and a tertiary way in export sales, primarily of course, Mr. Speaker, and first of course to Saskatchewan and Alberta, the Western Inter-Tie because that would make Limestone possible. Of course we were interested in that.

But what in terms of priority was the first goal, the first goal of any government based on common sense, the first goal of any government that understands what this province is all about? The first goal, Mr. Speaker, was to make that energy resource work for the people of Manitoba, produce jobs for the people of Manitoba, expand the economy of the Province of Manitoba, create tax dollars for the Government of Manitoba so that through that expanded economy and those tax dollars we would then, as a government and as a people, have the ability to spend more for education, for health care, for the infrastructure of our roads and transportation system, for the assistance that people from Moose Lake look for in the kind of future that they see ahead of them, which is all too bleak, and any government with compassion wants to see special assistance and aid given to people who need that kind of help.

That was all implicit in the development for Alcan. It was good for all of Manitoba until the Minister of Energy and Mines and his ideological colleagues got a hold of it. Well, the first thing they said, Mr. Speaker, was this, we're not prepared to sell any portion of a hydro-electric plant to Alcan, and secondly, Mr. Alcan, we're not fussy about the site that you've chosen, we want to take a look, and we want to review some of the sites, because in our great wisdom - and I can just hear the Minister of Energy and Mines who is so all-knowing and all-seeing - in his great wisdom Alcan

really had to be second-guessed about their site, because after all what did they know about it.

So, Mr. Speaker, instead of negotiation over the last few months, what we've been having in Manitoba is a kindergarten class for the Minister of Energy and Mines to educate him and Mr. Eliesen, his friend from Ottawa, into the basic economics of why an aluminum smelter plant should be established in Manitoba; where it should be established; that it has to use power; where the power would come from; why they want to have an interest in the power plant because it's a 35-year agreement and so on.

Mr. Speaker, all of that was gone through with the previous government and the Memorandum of Understanding was in place. Because my honourable friend across the way and some of his hired advisers, his hired guns, required this kind of fundamental education, the people of Manitoba today are faced with a situation where Alcan has picked up - picked up - and left the province without any Memorandum of Understanding, given up its options for a site in the Interlake, and I'm certain that this is the case, I hope it isn't the case, but I'm certain it is the case that this government will never again negotiate with Alcan, because Alcan has said, by its actions, never mind its words, Alcan has said by its actions what it thinks about the style of negotiation carried on by the Minister of Mines and Energy and his hired guns.

Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— yes, we remember as well that moving moment when the Minister of Energy and Mines in his great wisdom, aided and abetted by that great Deputy that he's brought in at \$58,000 - to hire some socialist at 58,000 bucks out of Ed Broadbent's office - to come in to negotiate one of the biggest deals that Manitoba has had on its platter and within its grasp, one of the linchpins for the future development of this province and of our hydro resource, to put that kind of person and people in charge of the negotiations is nothing short of negligence on the part of the First Minister coming as both of them, the Minister and that Deputy do, as I say, carting about that paraphernalia of ideology and inflexibility and all of the doctrinaire nonsense that comes with closed minds who are wedded to this kind of silly 19th Century doctrine.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Alcan project, the capacity that could be put in place in Manitoba, the \$800 million plant is suspended indefinitely. Forty-eight hours later Alcan announces that with respect to the replacement of a plant at Arvida, it is taking up options in the Province of Quebec; it has secured the approval of the Government of Quebec with respect to environmental matters and the location of a plant south of Arvida and that while it is not announcing the date of the plant's construction, that is the site that has been selected, everything is in place, ready to go.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there's the contrast. When new capacity is put into place in Canada by Alcan it's going to be put into place in Quebec because this government fumbled the ball. New capacity is new capacity. It's either for replacement of existing capacity or it's expansion capacity. My honourable friend can read from all of the nice news reports that he wants to read from and from all of the self-serving documents that he wants to pull out which say what a great fellow he is and what a great negotiator he is, according to the

First Minister - all of which is so much baffle-gab - he can read from all of this business that he wants, but the fact remains that when Alcan get into the business of putting new capacity in place in Canada, they're going to put it into place in Quebec before they put it into place in Manitoba. Period. Paragraph and thanks very much. Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker, to this incompetent government opposite and in particular to this Minister who has dropped the ball.

Did they not realize that we weren't kidding when we told them a year ago that we're in competition for this plant, with Quebec, with British Columbia where Alcan already have facilities in place, indeed with Australia and other places around the world? —(Interjection)— Somebody across the way says giveaway. Is that the runaway talking about giveaways? Well, Mr. Speaker, yes, a runaway talking about a giveaway. Mr. Speaker, we had a run through the giveaway syndrome the other night with the First Minister in his Estimates and the First Minister of this province who was running around the province talking about giveaways was not able to demonstrate in one instance, in any instance that he had cited whether it be Trout Lake, whether it be Tantalum Mines, whether it be the Alcan negotiation, the Potash negotiation, anything at all where there was any giveaway to substantiate his election rhetoric because there weren't any giveaways. —(Interjection)— The member across the way says, "What about CPR?" Why doesn't he go and talk about the Grand Trunk Pacific? He would know more about that. Mr. Speaker, we're not talking about the CPR. We're talking about an industry that this incompetent government in six months has managed to lose for Manitoba. We're talking about a kind of pigh-earedness that has ill served the public interest of this province. We're talking about Quebec having beaten Manitoba in six months in getting smelting capacity put in place when that company is next able to build it.

The Minister of Energy and Mines screwed up his courage and went out to Stonewall about two or three weeks ago and what did he tell them out there? He told them that negotiations were going well. Yes, negotiations were going well and that they didn't have to worry about anything at all. What did the First Minister say when he was talking about these projects in his Estimates, Mr. Speaker? Oh, the negotiations were going very well. I think I used the word "swimmingly" and he didn't deny that at all.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they drowned in mid-channel last week; these negotiations that the First Minister said were going so well, that the Minister of Energy and Mines assured the people of Stonewall who were genuinely concerned because they were to be the prime beneficiaries in the first instance of this new economic injection of life into our province. He told them things were going very well. The master was in charge of all the negotiations but all of a sudden Alcan pulled the plug and his ship sank in mid-channel and Manitobans are the ones left to pay the price for the kind of tinkering, for the kind of ill-considered baffle-gab that my honourable friends opposite are so good at, the kind of fussiness that they were engaged in with respect to Alcan's ads. Boy, Mr. Speaker, if they had the chance to ask Alcan again about the ads, would they do that again? Don't they wish today that Alcan was running an advertising campaign, talking about

establishing a plant in Manitoba? Would they be so supersensitive today, Mr. Speaker? I rather think not, if they're capable of learning anything. Or are they like the Bourbons as I suggest they perhaps are? - they learn nothing and they forget nothing.

I think that's what we have across the way, a bunch of frozen minds, Mr. Speaker, frozen in their own ideology, and the inability to be flexible in negotiations, the inability to see a vision for something that is good for the people of Manitoba. But no, when their funny ideas about ownership of part of a Hydro plant get in the way, those take precedence over the public interest in Manitoba. Well, that's not good enough, Mr. Speaker.

I listened with a great deal of disbelief today, Mr. Speaker, when I saw the Minister of Energy and Mines whisper into the First Minister's ear and then the First Minister got up with that sort of itinerant snake oil salesman look on his face and said, if the deals were so good, why did you call the election when you did? The Minister of Energy and Mines tried that, what I call campy joke, during the course of his Estimates and I never heard of such high camp in my life.

Mr. Speaker, you're indicating to me that there's still some time left. I want to talk about the Grid. The second announcement today, the Grid's been lost and the Grid was the linchpin for the starting of Limestone and this government now has no economic justification for starting Limestone. And what are they going to say about that? The Minister from Alberta is saying pretty clearly, Mr. Speaker, why the Grid is not going to go ahead or it's going to be postponed for at least two years. He's saying that this government didn't negotiate, didn't get up off the mat fast enough. No, they were too busy having meetings with Mr. Blakey and with some of their other doctrinaire friends; they were too busy doing things like that or not even meeting with the Ministers; too busy catering to some of their funny ideas. They were going to drive a new, hard bargain. Well, they drove some bargain all right, Mr. Speaker, they drove Alberta right out of the bargaining room. That's the kind of bargain that they have negotiated.

So when we come to the Grid, Mr. Speaker, we know that the concept of the Western Power Grid was something that started back in 1978, goes back to 1962 to the National Power Grid, the linkage that we could have had through B.C. up through the southern states into Manitoba and so on, that's not new even though some writers in the Free Press seem to think it is. That's not a new concept at all and we were doing something about it, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say that the negotiations that have been carried on by this Minister and by his Deputy have been unreasonable. They've flubbed on two deals already. They've driven one major developer, Alcan, out of this province. They've succeeded, in six short months, in driving Alberta out of an agreement which the three Ministers had agreed upon last October and which is now being considered, or thought to be considered, by the respective governments, an agreement that Premier Allan Blakeney last October said, could be settled in a matter of weeks. Now Alberta's gone from it because of the ineptitude, the inflexibility of the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines and his Deputy Minister.

Mr. Speaker, we're used to kooky ideas coming from across the way. We're used to the loony fringe of the NDP with their funny resolutions talking about expropriating Shell and Imperial Oil and so on and so forth. We're not used to, Mr. Speaker, that kind of looniness affecting the public interest in Manitoba and that's what happened in Alcan and in the Western Power Inter-Tie. That is what has happened.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time being 4:30, I'm interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The first item on the agenda for today is the point of order from the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe there's an agreement between the Government and the Opposition that Private Members' Hour will be dispensed with today.

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

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's my understanding as well, that we will proceed with the government business which is at hand at the calling of 4:30.

#### MATTER OF GRIEVANCE (Cont'd)

**MR. SPEAKER:** With the leave of the House, the motion before the House is the grievance by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**HON. S. LYON:** Perhaps, Sir, you could give me some indication of how much time I have to pursue my grievance.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Our rules do not indicate any limit on the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's time.

**HON. S. LYON:** I listened, Mr. Speaker, with some disbelief today when I heard the First Minister make the statement, not only the "camp" statement about the election, that is, that high humour that was whispered into his ear by the Minister of Energy and Mines, but I listened to the First Minister with disbelief when he said that our government had been raising false expectations among the people of Manitoba with respect to the Grid and Alcan and I suppose the potash mine as well. The First Minister, who is anything but glib, was betraying a kind of shallow cynicism in this respect that I find unfitting, really, from somebody who's given the responsibility of directing the affairs of the province and bringing negotiations of this sort to a successful conclusion. Raising false expectations? Mr. Speaker, was Alcan raising false expectations when they took out options on land in the Interlake and said, this is the site that we have selected, and they paid money out to farmers and to business people in that area and said, we choose to locate our plant here? Was that the raising of false expectations? I rather think not. The people in the

Interlake took it seriously. Some 3,500 of them signed a petition not too long ago and sent it to the Minister of Energy and Mines and said that they wanted that smelter to be located in the Interlake. No, I don't think that was a false expectation.

If the First Minister is right, then by implication, Mr. Speaker, he's saying that Alcan was somehow or other in this kind of cloud cuckoo land area of thinking that he's engaged in, that Alcan was somehow by implication, a party to some kind of a vague political conspiracy to raise the expectations of the people of Manitoba about the location of a smelter plant in Manitoba. What arrant nonsense, Mr. Speaker. Even coming from the First Minister, that's arrant nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, is he going to say that as well about the Grid? I believe I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that the current negotiations on the Grid were started at the Western Premiers' Conference, April of 1978. Premier Blakeney, Premier Bennett, Premier Lougheed of Alberta and myself attended that meeting and one of the larger announcements coming out of the communique from that meeting had to do with the agreement of the four western governments then to start a feasibility study with respect to a Western Power Grid. To the press who were there at the time and subsequently when Premier Lougheed came to Manitoba in April of 1978, the two of us made a joint announcement here in the Cabinet room saying that we had the authority now to move ahead with this study for the feasibility of the Western Power Grid.

Is the First Minister of Manitoba today trying to say somehow or other that this was just something that we'd conjured up in our imagination and that the Premier of Alberta was somehow or other and the Premier Blakeney of Saskatchewan was somehow or other a conspirator with the former government trying to raise the expectations of the people of Manitoba? Mr. Speaker, that's unbelievable. When you hear that kind of nonsense coming from the First Minister of the Province, when you understand that's the kind of mentality that motivates this government, then you can understand why they've lost two out of the three deals already.

Mr. Speaker, are they trying to say that the potash deal was a figment of somebody's imagination? Are they trying to say that International Chemicals Corporation, when they came to negotiate with Manitoba and agreed that they would do extra drilling on this area that had been delineated in the McAuley area of Manitoba, that was somehow a conspiracy this company was entering into with the former government of Manitoba just to give the electorate certain jollies? Mr. Speaker, that's what the First Minister was seeming to suggest this afternoon.

To repeat myself, when you've got that kind of mentality charged with the responsibility of bringing to a successful conclusion these deals that were worked on and negotiated by intelligent teams of negotiators and God knows we hadn't finished all of the negotiations with respect to potash, there was still ground to cover on that. But these were real negotiations, Mr. Speaker.

I daresay that in the last year, the former Minister, Mr. Craik, in charge of these negotiations, had more meetings with the Potash Development Company, with his counterparts in Western Canada with respect

to the Western Inter-Tie and with the Alcan people, more meetings than the present Minister of Mines and Energy could have had if he'd multiplied his meetings by a factor of 50. We're going to be asking the Minister of Energy and Mines and the First Minister - indeed, I've already asked the question: how many face-to-face meetings have they had with the principals of Alcan? How many face-to-face meetings with the principals of the potash company, IMC? How many face-to-face meetings have they had with the Premiers of Alberta and Saskatchewan with respect to the Power Grid, the linchpin of development in Manitoba? And notwithstanding the kind of cosmetics that we have become accustomed to expect from the statements of the Minister of Energy and Mines, the facts of the case which are I'm sure capable of being checked by the other parties - and we'll check them, don't worry - will betray the fact that this government, Mr. Speaker, has not been negotiating in good faith and has been negotiating in a very lackadaisical way with respect to both Alcan and the potash and the Western Grid concept.

Mr. Speaker, I asked the questions in Orders of the Day today: when is Limestone going to start? Six months ago, we knew it was going to start in 1982 because the three Ministers in Western Canada had recommended to their respective governments that there was an agreement in place that those governments, after legal, environmental and other studies, should sign after further negotiations. Based upon that, Mr. Speaker, there was an exchange of letters between the then Minister in charge of Hydro and a response from the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro saying very clearly that Limestone could get under way this year if the Western Grid negotiations could be brought to a successful conclusion and, indeed, work was already under way with respect to the demothballing of the townsite for the preparation for the construction of Limestone.

Mr. Speaker, that's all part of the sad history of Manitoba now. The announcement today is, if I may say so, Sir, even more devastating than the announcement of last week, because more turned on the announcement of the success of the Western Inter-Tie negotiations; more turned on it, because Limestone, over \$2 billion of construction in Manitoba depended on it.

Mr. Speaker, I've been looking at some of the material that the Minister must be aware of because he sat in the Committee when it was passed about; some of the material that Manitoba Hydro passed about showing what the Capital expenditures were going to be for that once-great utility based upon what we called the worst scenario that they could conceive and that table, Mr. Speaker, which I don't have immediately at hand, but that table shows that there will be no substantial construction based on the ordinary domestic load growth possibly until 1988, long after this discredited government has been kicked out of office, albeit. But not until 1988 will we see any construction start on Limestone because the Manitoba Hydro, even with the present political patronage board which they have put in place in substitution for some of the good people who were there, even with the patronage board, they are subject to the advice that they're receiving from the President and General Manager. He gave

that advice openly in the Committee and the Minister acknowledged it there and that advice is that without the Western Inter-Tie, Limestone can't start until 1988 at the earliest for coming on stream in 1992.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of bequest that this government in six months has given to the people of Manitoba. That's how they repaid the mandate that they received on the 17th of November and that's why I rise on a grievance today on behalf of all of the people of Manitoba to condemn, Mr. Speaker, the incompetence of this government, to condemn in particular the incompetence of the Minister in charge of the negotiations, and to condemn the itinerant Deputy Minister of Energy and Mines that he brought in, whose lack of competence in this field is all too well demonstrated by what has occurred in two of the three major projects thus far.

That is why I asked seriously during the Question Period and I ask the First Minister again that he consider immediately putting another Minister in charge of the last remaining negotiation, the one on potash, and getting rid of the present Energy and Mines Minister and his Deputy, Mr. Eliesen, and getting them as far away from these negotiations, which they have fouled up in six months in a way that was virtually beyond belief six months ago; that the people of Manitoba would be faced with this kind of a double catastrophe in terms of its economic future, all largely attributable to the mishandling and the wrong-headed ideas brought to the negotiating table by this Minister, by some of his colleagues and certainly by the kookier fringe of his party which we are finding day by day is overrepresented in this House. If my honourable friend thinks that I'm being unkind to him, let him say so and I'll just start reading back to him again for the third or the fourth time some of the kooky resolutions that this party deals with in a serious way when they have their annual conflabs or cell meetings or whatever you want to call them, when they talk about expropriating all of the oil companies in Manitoba. —(Interjection)— What is that piping plover voice I hear, Mr. Speaker, coming from the marshes to the left? It sounds like a bittern in distress, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I do not make these charges against the Minister of Energy and Mines lightly. I do not include in those charges his Deputy Minister lightly, Mr. Speaker, because the evidence is clear from the statement that appeared in today's Press from the Minister in Alberta that he just doesn't regard the bona fides of this government as being brought to the negotiating table; they didn't get on with the negotiations fast enough. The First Minister got up in his place today betraying, I'm afraid, a degree of ignorance about this particular project, the Western Inter-Tie that I find frightening. He said Alberta's looking at Slave River. Mr. Speaker, last October, Alberta wasn't looking at Slave River. Who drove them to look at Slave River? It wasn't just the economy that drove them to Slave River, it was the incompetence of the negotiations carried on by the Minister of Energy and Mines and his satrap that he brought in from Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to lay on the Table of the House a document that has come into my possession from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, a letter that was written to Mark Eliesen, Chairman, Steering Committee, Western Electric Power Grid, Energy and

Mines, Winnipeg, written by the Chairman of Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Robert H. Moncur, the President of it, on the 6th of April, 1982, when the NDP Government of Premier Blakeney was still in office. I want to lay this on the Table because it offers some corroboration for what I have been saying with respect to the incompetence and the fixed attitudes and the sheer wrong-headedness that this government has been bringing to the negotiating table with respect to the Western Inter-Tie. Mr. Speaker, this letter, which I presume is a copy of an original, reads as follows:

"Dear Mark: Thank you for your letter of April 2nd in which you outline your current position on the issues of concern raised by Manitoba regarding the draft Interim Agreement. I appreciate that as a relatively newcomer to these negotiations you would have concerns with some aspects of the draft Agreement and may feel Manitoba's best interests are not protected. However, I believe it is important and I must emphasize that we have only been able to reach this point in the negotiations as the result of compromise and a certain amount of give and take by each of the three parties involved."

Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to interject - this is a letter from the Chairman of Sask Power to the present Deputy Minister of Energy and Mines, this great important itinerant Deputy Minister that's been brought in that's doing such a good job according to the Minister on behalf of Manitoba.

"While the Regina meeting indicated a willingness by the parties to investigate Manitoba's concerns further, it should not have been interpreted that there was a willingness on the part of Saskatchewan to accept the changes proposed by Manitoba as a reflection of a three-party compromise. Because the present Manitoba position, as outlined in your letter, shows little if any change from your initial position, I believe it would be helpful if I were to outline our thoughts for consideration in advance of the Calgary meeting."

Then he goes on to say and I can read the whole thing. Obviously some members opposite are listening to this with a great deal of care, because they hadn't realized perhaps until this moment just how badly these negotiations were being handled even in the eyes of the Saskatchewan people while the NDP Government was still in office. The letter continues:

"It has always been Saskatchewan's position that the capital cost allowed for Limestone should be strictly controlled. However, because these costs would be reflected in the power pricing and borne by the buying province, it was considered necessary that there be a provision in the Agreement to ensure Manitoba's diligence in building and controlling costs of Limestone. The provision in the current draft we found acceptable; however, we are prepared to discuss the modifications you have proposed while noting that they provide somewhat less certainty in the buying province regarding the final capital costs.

"On the matter of Limestone output, what you are proposing is that the buying provinces accept 360 gWh less than previously agreed to with no reduction in cost. We understand the arguments you put forth; however, these were the same points covered in earlier negotiations and because Limestone will produce 7,280 gWh on average when completed, we believe

this is the appropriate energy associated with the Limestone purchase."

These negotiations, Mr. Speaker, had been going on for three years. We now have Mr. Eliesen coming along with all of the collected knowledge of six or seven years in Ed Broadbent's office and offering to complete these negotiations on behalf of the Province of Manitoba. This is the letter he's getting in response, this is only one of them, Mr. Speaker, there are others.

I continue: "In your proposed revisions to the draft Interim Agreement, the pricing arrangements are such that the buying provinces accept all the risks, pay a higher cost for power in the initial years and depending on price level increases, may at some time in the future receive economic benefits from the power purchase. Manitobans who are guaranteed all their costs and accept no risks, suggest that when these benefits do occur, they should be split 50-50. We find this to be unacceptable and believe that because the buying provinces are accepting all risks, we should be guaranteed a period of firm power pricing arrangements. Because of Manitoba's express concern that benefits be shared as soon as they occur, it may be useful to reconsider the C [2B] B/2 pricing arrangements as discussed in the Grid Report. This does provide a mechanism to share costs and benefits in an equitable manner over the term of the Agreement. While Manitoba would not recover total costs in the initial years, they would share equitably in the benefits when they may occur.

"An additional point which I have intended to raise and which I believe must be included in any agreement is a clause which would deal with the possibility and consequence of any federal action upon any agreements we may reach. The following is suggested as possible wording:

"If through any action of the Federal Government, any provision of this Agreement became inoperable or caused undue economic hardship on any of the parties hereto, the parties will take action necessary to mitigate the circumstances and share losses fairly. If such action by the Federal Government is precipitated by a party to this Agreement, the party so doing will compensate the aggrieved parties.

"In summary, your suggested changes involve the buying provinces paying more, getting less energy and accepting virtually all of the risk. I simply cannot accept that such an arrangement would be equitable from Saskatchewan's point of view. Yours truly, Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Robert H. Moncur, President. c.c.: R.G. Steele."

I table that letter, Mr. Speaker, because it gives some indication from the Province of Saskatchewan, the bedmates ideologically of these people opposite when Premier Blakeney was still in power, that these negotiations were not being carried on in a fair manner with respect to Manitoba's great interest in this matter by the present Minister of Energy and Mines and particularly by his Deputy named in that letter.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we got the announcement today that Alberta is pulling out of the negotiations or suspending its interest for two years, we had at least some inkling that both parties, Alberta and Saskatchewan, were visibly dissatisfied with the method of negotiations with the fact that they were in effect back

to Square One. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, they were concerned as well - even the NDP Government of Saskatchewan - with the almost ravenous desire of this Minister to try to indicate, to anybody whose ear he could catch, that the previous government had been doing such a bad job and they were trying to clean up the act. He was so busy trying to score political points on the previous government that he has destroyed the Western Inter-Tie agreement that was in place six months ago.

When I heard the First Minister talking today in his best itinerant snake oil-salesman manner, sitting on the end of his buckboard as he does occasionally, talking about cheap political shots, Mr. Speaker, I was reminded of my knowledge of that communication I have just put on the Table. I was reminded of every attempt that this Minister of Energy and Mines has made on his feet in this House throughout this Session and believe me, he was considerably more jaunty here a few weeks ago than he is now. He's rather cowed now, Mr. Speaker, and so he should be; but every chance he's been on his feet to try to pin some indictment on the former government and saying you overlooked this in Alcan, you weren't doing good negotiating on potash, you were wrong on the Inter-Tie. Mind you, we can't tell you where you were wrong because these matters are all under negotiation. —(Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Speaker, Hydro management couldn't say anything was wrong on the Alcan arrangement or the Western Inter-Tie arrangement either because there wasn't anything fundamentally wrong with those negotiations. No, Mr. Speaker, and while my honourable friend opposite and some of his colleagues have been preoccupied with making cheap political shots at the former government, two of the three negotiations that they had a sacred trust to carry on to a successful conclusion have sunk out of sight and with that the economic future of the people of Manitoba has been impaired in a way that can only be described as tragic because of the incompetence, because of the political gutter work that this particular Minister was attempting to carry on for his own cheap, partisan, socialist, political purposes.

In six months, Mr. Speaker, to see two out of the three, and then for the First Minister to try to stand in his place today and say, ha, ha, it's all due to the economy. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, I hear that bitter in distress again. Well, Mr. Speaker, all I can say to the honourable member - am I to be allowed to speak or are we to listen to these piping voices, Mr. Speaker?

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

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, all I can say when I listen to the First Minister talk about the economic conditions that were causing Alberta to withdraw from the Western Inter-Tie, I say that's just so much rot.

I read today the letter from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation President. Did he talk about the economic conditions of the time making the agreement impossible? No, not a word. He talked about the intransigence, the pigheadedness and the lack of knowledge of Manitoba's chief negotiator. That's

what he talked about in the first paragraph, your lack of familiarity with what's going on and at the end his summary saying, what you're suggesting is just not possible in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan. You suppose we hadn't gone through that stage of negotiations much earlier, Mr. Speaker? Of course we had. You know, it's difficult to teach socialists anything because they tend to be rather wooden-headed as a class, but I know that's a generalization which has sometimes surprising exceptions.

Mr. Speaker, does the Minister not know that if you're going to make a deal, then both parties to that deal have to see some satisfaction in the deal? In the case of three parties, then three parties have to see some satisfaction, see some gain or benefit that they will obtain as a result of entering into this Agreement.

The announcement that we have today, Mr. Speaker, from the Alberta Minister and it's a sad announcement, it's one in which contrary to the inane mouthings of the First Minister about our taking any glee in it, would we take any glee in the loss of something that we had created? Would we take some glee in the fact that a building we had built burned down? That's what happened today, Mr. Speaker, and it happened last week, something that we had worked hard to create, something that was a linchpin for the future economic development of this province, something that offered some hope and some opportunity to our young people, dashed because this Minister, aided and abetted and supported by his First Minister and with that kind of help that I have described before, that imported help from Ottawa, has allowed the Western Inter-Tie, the single biggest prospect that this province has had perhaps even in this Century, to go down the drain.

The words of the Alberta Minister, Mr. Speaker, are words that should be etched on the forehead of the Minister of Energy and Mines - I don't mean that literally - but they should remain there for him to recall for the rest of his life because his incompetence in six short months has brought us to this sad state of affairs in this province. —(Interjection)— Somebody over there said stick to the issue. I'll stick to the issue in a way —(Interjection)— Was that the runaway from the backbench talking about the giveaway or who was it? No. It was the example of voters' landslide from Thompson that we see about. I say to the Honourable Member for Thompson, Mr. Speaker, and I hate to trivialize my comments by making any reference to him at all, let him go to the people in Thompson and explain how his government has dropped the ball on the Western Inter-Tie, which would have meant so much to that community in Northern Manitoba if the Inter-Tie had not been put back by the Province of Alberta in accordance with the announcement we have today.

Mr. Speaker, we have one left; that's the potash mine. We know that these people opposite who temporarily form the government of this province and, believe me, they won't be in office very long. I said across the House today, Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister, who keeps accusing us of worrying about the last election, we don't worry about the last election; we're worrying about the next one. If the First Minister wants to have an election tomorrow, we're game; we're ready. I think the people of Manitoba have seen enough in six months; I wouldn't have believed it, but I

think they have seen enough in six months, Mr. Speaker, to know that this is an incompetent government that had better be gotten out of office before it does further harm to the people of Manitoba.

They have one left; they've got potash. We had reached a Memorandum of Understanding with the IMC. Under that Memorandum of Understanding, there was to be built in Western Manitoba, with Manitoba Mineral Corporation as a part-owner, something that even the honourable members opposite wouldn't disdain, a potash plant of some \$600 million, the biggest single development ever to be contemplated for Western Manitoba in its history, the biggest since Confederation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, from what we have been able to ascertain from questions that we've asked the Minister of Energy and Mines, he has not been very successful. He has not been at all very successful in arranging meetings with the principals of this company to get on the negotiation, because I don't really think he wants to complete that negotiation. What did they spend the first few weeks of their office doing? Well, the First Minister of Manitoba went out and had a chummy meeting with the First Minister of Saskatchewan, then a fellow socialist. They talked, according to the press release, about the future of potash; they talked about arrangements for the development of potash. I asked him in the House shortly after that, when the opportunity first presented itself, using that press release of December or January as a base, did they talk about a joint venture between Sask Potash and Manitoba Mineral Corporation with respect to development of potash resources in Manitoba? Admittedly, he was a bit vague about that, but he didn't deny it.

Can't you imagine that they had in mind some loony scheme that they were going to set up a Potash Corporation of Manitoba, 100 percent government owned or in joint venture with the Government of Saskatchewan? Can't you just see that kind of looniness appealing to honourable members opposite, sinking hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money into that kind of an investment, when one of the largest distributors of potash in the world, with the knowledge of not only how to mine it but with the knowledge of how to sell it, which is equally important, was standing ready up to the 15th of December to make a deal with the Province of Manitoba?

What did these people across the way do, Mr. Speaker? I'll tell you what they did. They allowed that Memorandum of Understanding to expire. The Minister of Energy and Mines, in one of his glibber comments when he was asked about this in the House earlier on in the Session, said, "Oh, yes, that has been allowed to expire and we have told them that we're talking to other people. They have been asked to come back with a proposal."

These are the people, Mr. Speaker, and I don't have to make any brief for them at all, except that they were the first ones to come along to Manitoba and say we are prepared to consider putting into place a potash mine in Manitoba. That seemed to us, from an elementary standpoint and all other standpoints, to be a pretty darn good thing for Manitoba. It was a pretty darn good thing for Western Manitoba.

So, I want to say to the First Minister in particular, because he's the one with ultimate responsibility, that

he and his team have come to bat twice and they've struck out; first, on Alcan; second, on the Western Inter-Tie. They can now redeem themselves if they will get down to business on the potash agreement, it's the only one remaining. That is why today, Sir, I asked the question of the First Minister in his place in the House, "What reassurance could he offer the people of Manitoba that those potash negotiations were proceeding with any greater hope or expectation of success than the other two which have both ended up by being dead in the water, in polite terms, postponed?"

Mr. Speaker, what did the First Minister respond? He responded with the usual vaporizations about the condition of the world economy. I have never seen a politician in my life, Mr. Speaker, who prior to the 17th of November was so unaware of the conditions of the world economy that he had to blame everything on the previous Provincial Government and who, after the 30th of November, all of a sudden became seized of this great knowledge that the world economy wasn't in very great shape, and everything then had to be blamed on the world economy. You know, if they laid off people at Manfor, that had to be blamed on the world economy; when the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting announced their long layoff for the summer, the Minister of Energy and Mines and some of his colleagues said, well, that's the world economy. Six months before, it was the fault of the Conservative Government, but now it's the fault of the world economy. When the Swift Plant closed some two years ago, it was the fault of the Provincial Government, but with the Race Track teetering on the edge of bankruptcy today, oh, that's part of the economy's problems, that hasn't got anything to do with the Provincial Government.

We all know the old story, Mr. Speaker, about the chicken thief and the farmer going out with his lantern at night and a shotgun and rapping at the door to see if he could scare the varmint out of the chicken coop. The varmint turned out to be a chicken thief and the chicken thief said, nobody here, Sir, but us chickens. Well, that's what they are saying across the way. There is nobody here but us chickens, we're not responsible for anything. We are in there wringing the necks of the chickens, but we're not responsible. We are in there and we are the Government of Manitoba, but don't come and ask us any questions about layoffs in Flin Flon, layoffs in Thompson, layoffs in Manfor. We are awfully good at flying up and holding hands, but we're not responsible, that's the problem of the economy of the Western World. As the First Minister says, that's some of the economic madness being practised by President Reagan.

Did you ever hear of President Reagan prior to the 17th of November being responsible for anything in Manitoba? I don't recall it. I don't recall President Carter being responsible for anything in Manitoba prior to November 17th. All of a sudden, we seem to be sort of chattelized to the American Union to the south of us by the utterances of the Ministers opposite, because everything that happens in Manitoba now is the fault of President Reagan and Reaganomics and high interest rates and monetary conditions and so on.

As I stand talking this afternoon, the First Minister of the Province is meeting with the Governor of the Bank

of Canada. Well, a fat lot of good advice the Governor of the Bank of Canada is going to be getting from this First Minister, because he's the one who went to the last Federal-Provincial Conference and talked about Reaganomics and all of this other chatter that we hear now, and then talked about a 75-cent dollar solving all the problems. Mr. Speaker, I confess I am not up to date as to what level the dollar reached today, but I know that the trading opened this morning at 77.26 cents or something to that effect and that yesterday the Canadian dollar on its own, in comparison with the American dollar, traded it for a period at 76 and the high digits of 76.8, I think it was, and I don't know what it closed at today. So the First Minister is going to get his 75-cent dollar all right and a fat lot of good that's going to do to interest rates in Canada because the price that is being put on the Canadian dollar, the continuing declining price, is as a result primarily of a Federal Government in this country that has been carrying out the same kind of wrong-headed policies that Messrs. Broadbent, Pawley and so on would have them carry out.

I pointed out yesterday in the House, Mr. Speaker, that it was this First Minister when he was the Leader of the Opposition who was a great supporter of the National Energy Program. This First Minister who said it didn't go far enough to Canadianize industry. This First Minister, Mr. Speaker, who stood in his place and said, "Fear is a great thing. The only thing wrong with fear of The Foreign Investment Review Act is that it doesn't go far enough." Is that the advice he's offering to Mr. Bouey down the hall? Is he giving him those gems of wisdom down the hall? Because if he is, I can guarantee you that even "slugging" Allan MacEachen is going to turn around on his haunches next week and Mr. Speaker, unless every economic prognosticator in this country has holes in his head, you're going to see some fundamental changes in the National Energy Program which is endorsed by every socialist this side of Nova Scotia. You're going to see a fundamental change in that and you're going to see some watering down of FIRA, that great brainchild of all of the left-wing rhetoricians in Canada. You're going to see some change in that because, Mr. Speaker, they're finally coming to an understanding that if \$8 billion worth of capital flows out of Canada and nothing to speak of is coming in, there's got to be something wrong in the mix.

I said in New York about three years ago, speaking to the Canadian Society down there, that FIRA represented a kind of prissy nationalism that we could well do without in Manitoba because we wanted their investment capital. When I said that down there, in the next Session I was chastised in the House here by the then Leader of the Opposition saying FIRA, my heavens, a branch plant economy and all of these slogans that socialists can conjure up out of their grab bag. They try to live, Mr. Speaker, and they try to govern by slogans. You can't do it. You've got to lead a government by way of common sense, pragmatism, put your ideology to one side, because if you don't you end up with disasters such as we've seen from Alcan last week, the Inter-Tie this week.

Weil, Mr. Speaker, they've got a chance to redeem themselves on potash; they've got a chance to reverse themselves from the kind of lackadaisical ho-



humishness that they've been practicing in the last six months. I honestly suggest to the First Minister, who while not here is perhaps within hearing of my voice, that the first thing he's got to do is change the negotiating team because they've demonstrated already their incompetence. They are not able to handle these deals. They've got to put new Ministers and responsible professional career civil servants and outside advisers, get them back in place so that people, who are not blinded by the kind of ideological rose-coloured view that the Eliesens of this world have, will not be prejudicing the future of Manitoba. That's all I'm saying. If my honourable friend opposite wants to say that's a personal attack, I say no, it isn't. I say, Mr. Speaker, based upon the communication that I tabled in the House, based upon the evidence, the pragmatic results we see, Alcan and the Inter-Tie, that the people connected with those negotiations aren't fit to negotiate potash and that's the only one we've got left, so we've got to save that for Western Manitobans.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I see the Minister of Finance in his place and I can't resist recalling for his benefit - remember those impassioned speeches that he used to make last year when the Minister of Mines and Energy of the Day, Mr. Craik, was announcing in the House the Potash IMC Agreement and then the present Minister of Finance got up and in a series of arithmetic contortions, that this House has seldom seen, was trying to demonstrate that the proposed royalty charge that Manitoba was going to charge for the potash, which we hadn't finally secured in terms of the final agreement but the one we were working toward, that this was going to be bad for the people of Manitoba. They weren't going to be getting enough money, said he, and he was making apple and orange comparisons between mines in Saskatchewan and a potential mine in Manitoba, which had no more valid basis of comparison than comparing an apple with an orange, and yet that's the kind of tommyrot that these people used to try to get away with when they were in Opposition. That's the kind of mentality that is now leading the negotiations with respect to potash in Manitoba. So I remind the Minister of Finance of the kind of demonstrated incompetence, the manifestations of that, that he used to give to us on regular occasions when he didn't know anything more about potash than the colour of it and the only thing he liked about potash was the colour because it was pink.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the issue facing the people of Manitoba, the reason that I have risen today on the only grievance that I have on the Motion to go into Supply, I repeat, is a grievance on behalf of all of the people of Manitoba. It's a grievance brought about to recapitulate what I have been saying brought about by the demonstrated incompetence of this government with respect to the failure and the postponement of the Alcan negotiations, with respect to the even more tragic announcement today that Alberta, at the very least, is postponing any further consideration of the Western Power Inter-Tie while it looks at its own domestic sources.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that dealing with the latter case first, even though all of the evidence isn't in, I think it's clear from what we have seen thus far that when the Minister of Mines and Energy, and pray God it won't be him, but his successor as the lead man in

the negotiations or lead woman goes to the meeting on July 19th, they will find that for all practical purposes regrettably the Western Inter-Tie is going to be postponed as well.

Mr. Speaker, that is a sad, sad, sad day for all Manitobans and that's the kind of anticipation that people of Manitoba can have as a result of what's happened in this province in the last six months. Far from taking any glee in that situation, Mr. Speaker, we rise on this occasion to point out just how fundamentally prejudicial these two announcements have been for the future of our province. I'm sure that with the kind of cosmetic cynicism that motivates my honourable friends opposite that they will in their moments of rationalization, if indeed they ever have these around the Cabinet or Caucus Table, they'll be saying to themselves, "Well, the people of Manitoba proved they weren't a very bright lot on November 17th. We have that demonstrated because we made a bunch of silly promises that they bought and we haven't been able to carry them out and never will be able to carry out the fundamental ones." This is the NDP speaking and it could be any one of the members opposite - "With that kind of demonstrated short memories and incompetence, why we'll get away with this too." - because I know what their motivation is. They'll say, "How will people ever feel, how will the people of Manitoba ever be able to measure the loss of jobs that they never had, how can you miss something you never had?" That's what they'll be saying. Mr. Speaker, and in the crass cynicism which motivates them in the political course that they follow, but I have rather more faith in the intelligence of the people of Manitoba than that. I think that the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, are going to be looking at these projects and looking at them very carefully and we're going to make sure that the people of Manitoba remember how in the first six months of its mandate this government has succeeded in doing the impossible, has succeeded in achieving the postponement of two of the largest, single economic development projects that this province ever had the possibility of obtaining.

I think that we have a fundamental responsibility to the people of Manitoba to keep reminding them day after day, week after week, not as they would have you believe, Sir, in any sense of laughing over the grave, not at all; but with a sense of reminding the people of Manitoba that the same people who committed the \$600 million waste on Manitoba Hydro back in the '70s are at it again. Only this time what they're doing, Mr. Speaker, is not wasting the taxpayers' money in that sense. What they're doing is depriving the taxpayers of a large and expanding economy and of a tax source that this province could have benefited from for generations to come, squandering our hopes and squandering our future; that's perhaps the greatest indictment.

As I said earlier in my comments, Mr. Speaker, to listen to the First Minister stand in the House today and say, "Well, if these negotiations were so good, why didn't you wait and call the election after they were completed?" Did you ever think, Sir, in your wildest dreams or imagination you would hear the responsible First Minister stand in his place and make that kind of silly suggestion, notably whispered into

his ear by the Minister of Energy and Mines? It's that kind of silliness, it's that kind of pettishness, it's that kind of addiction to partisan gain at any expense that motivates my honourable friends opposite and it's those qualities, Mr. Speaker, that have caused other people who heretofore up until the 30th of November were able to negotiate in good faith, including their friends in Saskatchewan, to have to write letters to them of the kind that I've just read into the record today indicating that their chief negotiator really doesn't know what he's talking about.

So all I can say, Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister opposite and to his colleagues, the future of this province in large measure is going to depend upon how well you can carry out the last of the three negotiations that were left on the table for you to complete successfully. Any normal government could have reached a certain stage of understanding and economic conditions being what they were, we would expect that some postponement would certainly be necessary. Nobody's going to be a fool or a Pollyanna and try to deny that at all, but why didn't they move those negotiations forward so that when Alcan did make the decision that they would have to postpone their capital expansion, they would have made a decision based on the selection of a site in Manitoba and they could have had the environmental approval of that site in Manitoba if this government had not been so pigheaded. —(Interjection)— No, they sacrificed that. They helped to sacrifice that project on the altar of their own pigheadedness, Mr. Speaker, and that's not good enough for the people of Manitoba.

Secondly, on the Western Inter-Tie, the same thing, the same kind of funny negotiating stance carried on by this Minister and by his imported Deputy Minister. Mr. Speaker, I hear the interjection from the Member for St. Boniface and I know from years sitting in the House with him that he interjects when you touch a sensitive nerve and he knows that he's sitting in the company of some of the most incompetent people that he could ever hope to join in a government and he's only now beginning to find that out. I'm not one, Mr. Speaker, who would demean the ability of the Minister of Health because he's demonstrated as a Minister in the '70s and again in the early months of this administration that he is at least one of the Ministers who has some semblance or idea of his responsibility to the public interest. It's a pity, Mr. Speaker, that he hasn't been able to pass on that fundamental idea of the trusteeship role that he's well acquainted with to the Minister of Energy and Mines so that he would be a better Minister than he is, and so that he wouldn't be just engaged in political gutterwork of trying to blame things on the previous administration rather than getting on with negotiations in good faith with Saskatchewan and Alberta and with Alcan.

Mr. Speaker, the grievance that I have attempted to voice today is a real grievance. It's a grievance that the people of Manitoba regrettably are going to suffer from for years and years to come unless this government quickly comes to its senses or in the longer or medium term is replaced by another government from this side of the House that will try to resurrect, that will try to reconstruct from the pieces of destruction that this government has created, some hope for the people of Manitoba. It will not be easy, Mr. Speaker, and

the longer we have to wait in terms of this government fulfilling its tenure of office, the more difficult it is going to be.

But I say, Sir, that we stand ready on behalf of the people of Manitoba to do that renegotiating, to do that restructuring, to do that rebuilding, to resume those negotiations in good faith with the Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, and to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba can again have some hope for the future and that our young people coming out of schools, as they are and there are thousands today, who are hoping that down the line after community college or whatever they might have an opportunity to work in an Alcan smelter or they might have an opportunity to be engaged in that \$2 billion worth of construction on Limestone which now isn't going to take place in Manitoba. And there are still some of them hoping that they will have the opportunity to be engaged in the potash industry in Western Manitoba. It is those hopes that these people have blunted as a result of the announcements in the last 10 days. It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that all people of goodwill, all people who are really concerned about the future of this province have a grievance today against this government.

Mr. Speaker, in the famous words of other Speakers, I believe it was in the Long Parliament, the best words that can be applied to this government would be: "For God's sake, go before you do more harm to our province."

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

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Rule 33, I have been designated by my Leader to use his unlimited time when I speak in this debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Virden on a point of order.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is almost unheard of for a government to grieve against its own programs. I know of no case, Mr. Speaker, where a government has designated a person to grieve against its own program. I would surmise, Sir, that if the member is standing up to speak, he is standing as an individual member of this Assembly who takes the benefit of Section 235 of the 4th Edition of Beauchesne, but I would be very surprised, Sir, if he was allowed to speak with unlimited time as the designated speaker of this government.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member have a point of order?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Excuse me.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health, to the same point of order?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Did you recognize the last speaker as having a point of order? If not, I'll sit down, but I'd like to speak to the point of order if he has such a thing?

**MR. SPEAKER:** I wasn't able to perceive a point of order involved, but I am aware that it is almost 5:30 and a grievance does not carry over until the next day.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert on the same point.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. Rule 33(2) reads that the Leader of the Government, the Leader of the Opposition and the leaders of recognized opposition parties may each, in advance, designate some member of his party to speak in any debate. Mr. Speaker, and I would urge you to consider whether or not a grievance is a debate.

I submit that it is not a debate, Mr. Speaker, and therefore the honourable Minister cannot speak on behalf of the Leader of his party for unlimited time. I submit that, by virtue of Rule 33(2), a grievance is not a debate and therefore it is not open to the Minister to speak for more than 40 minutes on behalf of his Leader.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines to the same point.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Yes, I have just listened to the Leader of the Conservative Party take unlimited time, table documents regarding the negotiations that Manitoba is conducting on the Western Power Grid, basically argue the position of Saskatchewan, mock the position of Manitoba, say that is the position of my Deputy when in fact I will document material tonight indicating that was the position of Manitoba Hydro - it was the material that we received from Manitoba Hydro - and that this person would use his grievance, unlimited time, and conduct the cheapest shoddiest politics to undermine discussion on the Agreement. I will take unlimited time just as he has to debate that, to take appropriate time to document this, table the documents that he in fact made public, knowing that he could in fact undermine the discussions. That's exactly what he did, Mr. Speaker, and I am prepared to use the time, bring this forward, indicate why we took those positions, indicate the risk that Manitoba was at, indicate the dollar amount . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Springfield to the same point.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, to the point of order. For the same reason that no one on this side rose when the question was asked with regard to the unlimited time which you suggested was available to the Leader of the Opposition, in accordance with our Rule 33 and the Citation in Beauchesne's 4th Edition, which is the only Citation we have which refers to grievance, the debate is on the motion that the Speaker shall leave the Chair. That is exactly what it is, a debate, and defining that as a debate brings it under our Rule 33.

Now, the fact that Cabinet Ministers have often participated in that debate in response to members of the Opposition grieving has been accepted practice in this House and members on both sides know that. They know that Cabinet Ministers have often replied and our Minister of Energy and Mines, in accordance

with 33(2)(a), has been "that member on his behalf, on behalf of his Leader, has given prior notice of the designation to the Speaker." This is what he has done at the beginning of his remarks. I believe he has met the requirements; I believe this is a debate in accordance with our Rules. I don't see how, having offered recognition of it being a debate to the Leader of the Opposition, we can now deny that same recognition to the Minister of Energy and Mines.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time being 5:30, I will take the matter under advisement and reply to it at 8:00 o'clock this evening.