



Fifth Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

30 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



MG-8048

VOL. XXIX No. 70 - 10:00 a.m., FRIDAY, 1 MAY, 1981

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty - First Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, A. R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANDERSON, Bob	Springfield	PC
BANMAN, Hon. Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BARROW, Tom	Flin Flon	NDP
BLAKE, David	Minnedosa	PC
BOSTROM, Harvey	Rupertsland	NDP
BOYCE, J. R. (Bud)	Winnipeg Centre	Prog.
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
CHERNIACK, Q.C., Saul	St. Johns	NDP
CORRIN, Brian	Wellington	NDP
COSENS, Hon. Keith A.	Gimli	PC
COWAN, Jay	Churchill	NDP
CRAIK, Hon. Donald W.	Riel	PC
DESJARDINS, Laurent L.	St. Boniface	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOMINO, Len	St. Matthews	PC
DOWNEY, Hon. Jim	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
EINARSON, Henry J.	Rock Lake	PC
ENNS, Hon. Harry J.	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FERGUSON, James R.	Gladstone	PC
FILMON, Hon. Gary	River Heights	PC
FOX, Peter	Kildonan	NDP
GALBRAITH, Jim	Dauphin	PC
GOURLAY, Hon. Doug	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Hon. Harry E.	Birtle-Russell	PC
GREEN, Q.C., Sidney	Inkster	Prog.
HANUSCHAK, Ben	Burrows	Prog.
HYDE, Lloyd G.	Portage la Prairie	PC
JENKINS, William	Logan	NDP
JOHNSTON, Hon. J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
JOHNSON, Hon. Warner H.	Morris	PC
KOVNATS, Abe	Radisson	PC
LYON, Hon. Sterling R.	Charleswood	PC
MacMASTER, Hon. Ken	Thompson	PC
MALINOWSKI, Donald	Point Douglas	NDP
McBRYDE, Ronald	The Pas	NDP
McGILL, Hon. Edward	Brandon West	PC
McGREGOR, Morris	Virden	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., Hon. Gerald W. J.	Osborne	PC
MILLER, Saul A.	Seven Oaks	NDP
MINAKER, Hon. George	St. James	PC
ORCHARD, Hon. Donald	Pembina	PC
PARASIUK, Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PAWLEY, Q.C., Howard	Selkirk	NDP
PRICE, Hon. Norma	Assiniboia	PC
RANSOM, Hon. Brian	Souris-Killarney	PC
SCHROEDER, Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SHERMAN, Hon. L. R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
STEEN, Warren	Crescentwood	PC
URUSKI, Billie	St. George	NDP
USKIW, Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, D. James	St. Vital	NDP
WESTBURY, June	Fort Rouge	Lib
WILSON, Robert G.	Wolseley	Ind

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 1 May, 1981

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. ABE KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, Report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this time I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the Speaker's gallery where we have 14 students of the Bismarck High School — Art Club under the direction of Mrs. Arlene Gerhart.

We also have 50 students of Grade 11 standing from the Teulon Collegiate. That school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Education.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this morning.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could just tell members that I have available and will have distributed the Annual Report of the Manitoba Hog Producers Marketing Board, ended December, 1980, will be distributed to the members of the House for their information.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Economic Development. Does the Minister of Economic Development have an answer to the question posed to him on Wednesday of this week pertaining to the transfer or closure of operations of Walter Woods?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, Walter Woods is owned by Russelsteel whose parent company is York Steel in Toronto. They were purchased several years ago and since that purchase they expanded their operation much more into the Alberta market, because it's a warehouse and they wanted a warehouse close to that market. They have, over the past two years, been gradually moving their operation to that warehouse because it's modern and has computer for the control of inventory, etc., and their building in Manitoba was purchased by Gateway Packers a short while ago. It was sold to Gateway Packers by the parent company. They will still have the sales representation in Manitoba but they will supply from Alberta.

The building, after being purchased by Gateway Packers, will be housing a company called Gateway Soap and Chemicals, which purchased the soap-manufacturing equipment from Swift's when the Swift's operation was down to two people. It will now be up to about 15 to 20 people manufacturing soap in that building. I might say that the Department of Economic Development, through Enterprise Manitoba, did a feasibility study with them for the company. We also worked with them in the Design Institute to have the packaging properly for their product.

Also in the building will be Can-Us Trucking Company, which is owned and operated by the same people. They had 10 people two years ago; they have 30 now. They expect to have 50 and will be operating out of that building where they are at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say the change of the company Walter Woods is one of economics, is what their manager here told me. I guess that economics is the same reason why Drummond McCall opened their new warehouse in the fall of 1980 in Manitoba. I'll have the pleasure of opening the new Gulf warehouse in June of 1981 in Winnipeg. PWA's new centre was announced. Westube has 30 new people in their new warehouse, which I had the privilege of opening in 1981 and . . . Steel Fabricators are here also —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a point of order.

MR. PETER FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Minister wishes to make an announcement he should do so under the proper order of business. We also have our rule in Beausnes's which indicates the answer should be terse and to the point. Unfortunately, the Honourable Minister doesn't know that particular rule, and I would hope that you would introduce him to it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I thank the Honourable Member for Kildonan on his point of order. Yes, the rules do state that questions should be short and the answers should be as brief as possible as well.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, leaving aside the two announcements that the Minister made that could very well have been made under Ministerial Announcements, can the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The question should be as short as possible as well.
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, not wishing to reflect but sometimes when we question Ministers across the way short answers don't bring any kind of response. To the Minister of Economic Development, back to the original subject matter, can the Minister advise the number of employees that were employed by Walter Woods prior to the announcement of their transfer of operations to the Province of Alberta?

MR. JOHNSTON: I will answer this, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Labour has this information. It was a phase out that's been going on for two years; two years ago they had 75 employees; six months ago 20 to 25 employees were employed; during the phase out only 25 employees were actually laid off, the remainder found new jobs. Closing date is June 30th because of the takeover of the new people who will be using that building to manufacture in Manitoba, who are Manitobans manufacturing in Manitoba and the operation, as I mentioned, would be shifting to Edmonton. I believe they are down to five employees at the present time and the member asked me the reasons for them leaving and I merely said, Mr. Speaker, that they're leaving for economic reasons; for the same reasons that the companies I mentioned, all five of them, not two, are coming to Manitoba for good economic reasons.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to Minister. In view of the Minister's answer that he was speaking to the Manager of Walter Woods, I wonder if the Minister can advise the Manager of Walter Woods that he has indeed been running a series of advertisements on television urging Manitobans and Manitoba companies to stay in Manitoba and whether he could ascertain whether or not Walter Woods had seen the results of his expensive advertising campaign that he's launched, that I gather is continuing beyond the intended expiry date?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, when he speaks of the advertising for Manitobans to stay in Manitoba I can only say that, as I mentioned, Walter Woods was purchased by Russellsteel and is owned by the parent company of York Steel in Toronto and they have decided to use the new modern warehouse in Edmonton. The people that are taking over the warehouse are Manitobans that are expanding in Manitoba and believe in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, and we have worked with them in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, regarding the advertising, I'd just like to answer the member about the advertising. Who said we shouldn't do some advertising and who said we couldn't do some public relations and he tells about what was done. These were the basis of the various ads in various magazines and I think was a very effective way to get the message across that Manitoba was a good place to live and a good place to work and do business.

MR. EVANS: Who said that?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Evans said that on June 25, 1971, Mr. Speaker. So, you know, I really appreciate the fact that the Leader of the Opposition doesn't like us to advertise that Manitoba is a good place to live and work but I do appreciate the fact that the Member for Brandon does.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Labour. I wonder if the Minister would confirm that his department's research officials concur with the Conference Board analyses and forecast of last November to the effect that Manitoba not only has the slowest actual and forecasted growth of working-age population in Canada but also will experience the lowest labour force growth of any province, the lowest employment growth of any province in Canada in 1981 and '82, and will experience rising unemployment rates in 1981. Will the Minister concede that the actual and projected growth figures available to him confirm this dismal scenario in this province, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I don't know where the facts came from, I don't know what the numbers are that the member is using. I just suggest that she is probably sitting too close to that doom and gloom group over there and she's become sort of infectious. If she would really like to get answers to that I'd be quite pleased to try and get them for her.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Health. Can the Minister of Health confirm that there has been a reduction in surgery permitted in Manitoba hospitals by virtue of a shortage of anesthetists as appears to be the suggestion being made in a Winnipeg Free Press story of today?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): No, I can't confirm that, Mr. Speaker. I can confirm that there is a shortage of anesthetists. I don't think that is a surprise to any member of this House or to any member of any House in any province in Canada. There is a national shortage of anesthetists; Manitoba certainly shares in that experience but I can't confirm the point that lies at the root of the honourable member's question.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, accepting the fact that the Minister can't confirm this report which has been given some prominence, could the Minister tell me whether the report is incorrect, that there is not a reduction of surgery in Manitoba hospitals by virtue of the shortage of anesthetists?

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't tell the honourable member that is incorrect today but I

certainly will obtain the information for him and provide it to him in the House as quickly as I can.

I can confirm that strenuous efforts are being made by my office and by my colleagues, the other Health Ministers across the country, to recruit and retain more specialists in anesthesiology than have been available in recent years. It may produce methods of approach in terms of holding residencies in internships open and directing medical schools in such a way as to meet that specialty shortage specifically. Some provinces have undertaken that kind of measure already and certainly we're considering all measures, including reduced lengths of courses, including virtual para-technicals in the anesthesiology field to address the problem. I can't refute at this juncture the question that the Member for Inkster puts but I will explore the subject and report further to him.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, to allay any suggestion of criticism here, I wasn't blaming anybody for what has occurred. I merely think it would be useful for the legislators of the Province of Manitoba to know whether the situation is as described. Can the Minister tell me — he's indicated that he would tell the House — that in view of the fact that the Minister in his last answer indicated the strenuous efforts that are being made, can we assume that those strenuous efforts were being made because of the condition that is described in the newspaper story?

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, the only thing I can confirm is that there is a limited number of anesthesiologists. As a consequence, they work long hours, extremely long schedules, and it's not desirable to operate in that kind of an atmosphere any longer than is absolutely necessary. So we are motivated by a desire to expand the number of anesthesiologists in the field and thus spread out the workload and that's what the efforts have been directed to. They have not been motivated by evidence of any reductions in surgery. I have no such evidence, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. Last year when the Minister, speaking for the government, announced the CRISP Program, he stated that this was to help the people that did really need it. Could the Minister tell us why, if that is the case, could he explain why the people who are at the very bottom of the ladder, who are way below the poverty line, cannot participate in this program and I'm talking about these people that are on welfare? Why don't they get any benefit from that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should direct his question to the Minister of Community Services, who is responsible for that program.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I can't force any Minister to answer any question, I know that. I asked

the Minister of Finance because it was the then Minister of Finance who made the announcement and the decision was made by him. Now if the Minister of Community Services is in a better position to answer the question then I am directing my question to the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would repeat his question. Unfortunately I did not hear it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, this is the third time I got up and this is only my first question. I was saying that the government brought in certain programs — one of them was CRISP — and announced that this was to help the people in these days of need that needed it the most. My question is, what is the reason or how can you explain that the people that need it the most are at the bottom of the ladder, are below the poverty line, that the people on welfare cannot take advantage of this program?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, the people on welfare can take advantage of the program, it's an option to them. They do not get any additional dollars because we believe that the program we have for welfare recipients in this province is adequate at this time to meet all of their needs.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, there's such a thing as honesty in answering questions. The case is that if the people are taking or are applying for the \$30.00 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. If the honourable member has a further question, he may ask it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is saying that they can profit by it; they certainly cannot. I'm asking the Minister how can they? What good will it do them if they apply and receive the \$30.00 and it is deducted from them?

Furthermore the Minister is saying that they have everything they need at this time. Why then, this is sponsored by the taxpayers, why is it felt that people who are better off than them should get the \$30.00 but those people be singled out and say you have everything you want at this time. I have examples if the Minister would want them later on to tell him how well they're living, these people.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows very well that there are some people on welfare that receive a very small amount just to assist them and those people with children who may fall into that category can apply for the CRISP Program and get off the welfare rolls, which I think everyone knows is the source of last resource is the welfare rolls.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, again the Minister is playing games. I am referring to the people of the last resort — the people that are not just getting a bit — the people that have nothing else but the welfare to live by and I'm asking him why they

cannot have this additional \$30.00 like the other people in need are getting?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows very well what the policy of the government of today was, is identical to the policy of his former government when he was the Minister responsible, that the people on welfare in Manitoba get many services that contribute not just to the rates. They get their medical paid for, any medical costs or drug costs, their dental costs, they get the actual rent paid, the actual utility costs paid. They have had an increase this year of 10 percent for normal requirements but, in addition to that, the actual cost increases of rent, the utilities and so forth. So in actual fact they've received an indexing of about 12-1/2 percent this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I have no other questions. On a point of privilege . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please. The honourable member state his point of privilege.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister referred to the past government and said we did the same thing; the policy hasn't changed. We did not have a CRISP program at that time so how can the policy be the same, Mr. Speaker? —(Interjection)— That's right, we didn't.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The honourable member knows full well the Rules of this House. The matter he raised was not a point of privilege and I have to rule him out of order.

The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines. I wonder if the Minister can advise the House today if he has any knowledge of the additional federal energy taxes that are being posed upon Manitobans at the gas pumps today.

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

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, the increases today are the levy for the Petrofina purchase and the impact at the gas pump, by rough calculation, which will amount to about 3.6 cents per gallon or a little under 1 cent per litre. The Levy will have an impact of about \$17.50 per year for the average consumer. The levy also though, it's a wellhead levy, so it applies to other petroleum products and applies to natural gas. So the increase in natural gas prices for the Petrofina purchase work out to about 15 cents per Mcf or per 1,000 cubic feet and that would amount on the average household to about \$25 per year.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can advise the House if this tax is going to be imposed upon farm fuels and gasohol in the province.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, it will apply to all petroleum products because it's a wellhead levy and

passes through to all petroleum products, but the formula of 67 percent relationship to natural gas also transfers over to natural gas as well, so the answer to the question is "yes".

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin with a final supplementary.

MR. MCKENZIE: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, will any portion of these federal tax dollars be allocated to the province for further exploration of oil in Manitoba.

MR. CRAIK: In this case, Mr. Speaker, the levy is for the purchase of the Petrofina gas stations in Eastern Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Hydro. Can the Minister advise whether or not it is his practice to approve all drafts of annual reports submitted to him from the Manitoba Hydro Board prior to printing?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if the member has a specific question I could deal with it. Drafts of annual reports for the various Crown corporations are from time to time submitted.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the Minister. Can the Minister advise whether or not he received and approved a draft of the Manitoba Hydro Board Annual Report terminating March 31, 1979, and did he, upon receipt of same, approve it?

MR. CRAIK: It's quite possible, Mr. Speaker, I do from time to time receive the Annual Reports. I would have to examine to see if that particular one was received, although on the other hand I don't suppose there would be any formal record in the event that it was or wasn't.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the Minister. In order to further assist the Minister's memory in this respect, can the Minister advise whether or not, upon receipt of a draft of the Manitoba Hydro Annual Report, terminating March 31, 1979, that he did cause some editing of that report due to the fact there was an acknowledgement within that report to Len Bateman?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, there was one report and perhaps it would have been the 1979 report prior to the Tritschler Commission winding up its hearings and after Mr. Bateman had been relieved of his responsibilities from Manitoba Hydro, in that period, when there was, in an early draft of the report, an intention to include remarks with regard to Mr. Bateman, a tribute or whatever the right terminology is, and it was discussed with me at the time. I advised the board that I thought it would be in the best discretion to not include it at that point until the commission inquiry was finished its study.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition with a further question.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, to further refresh the Minister's memory in this respect, I would like to

refer the Minister to minutes dated August 10, 1979, of the Manitoba Hydro Board in regard to mention . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Has the honourable member a further question?

MR. PAWLEY: A very brief question then to the Minister. At what stage did the Minister cause an editing of that report which he indicates he received? He indicates a draft report, I gather. At what stage was that report at at the time that the Minister caused the deletion, the deleting of the acknowledgement to Len Bateman from the report which was brought to him by the Manitoba Hydro Board?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I am almost tempted to ask the Leader of the Opposition what he may have had for breakfast last Thursday because the answer would have to be in the same context because I wouldn't really have any idea at this point in time. All I can recall is that there was some suggestion about two or three weeks ago, I believe, attributed to a former board member, that a letter had been interfered with or interceded on or whatever the right terminology again is, and which I found very strange. But it did remind me of the fact that there had at one time been an intention, prior to the Tritschler Inquiry Commission Report coming down, to include remarks in the Annual Report. That was discussed with me and my recommendation to him was that it not be included until after the report was in one way or another — that any remarks with regard to the activities of the Commission and the people before it probably should not be included. I cannot recall exactly when it was. I can't recall it probably more accurately than over a period of months.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to direct to the Minister of Energy and Mines, further to the questions posed by the Member for Roblin. I wonder if the Minister has any information to indicate to the people of this Chamber and the consuming public of Manitoba of petroleum products as to just how long the Federal Government is going to keep these increased prices in effect so far as the price increases are concerned when it comes to purchasing Petrofina?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the programmed increases, although I don't have the specific amounts and dates, they are approximately every six months that there will be a wellhead increase for one reason or another. As you may recall, when the Federal Budget was brought in, it was indicated at that time that in the so-called Canadianization program that there would be additional levies added to the program if purchases were made. The Petrofina purchase is of course the first one that has been included and added on to the other increases that are already scheduled. But at the present time there are scheduled increases through to about December of 1982 and any additional purchases would have to be scheduled on top of that.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, one further supplementary question to the Minister. I wonder if

he would care to indicate his position as to how he considers or regards the inflationary effect that this measure by the Federal Government is going to have on the people of this country?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, it is possible to determine what the inflationary impact is of the price increases. I will attempt to get that information for the Member for Rock Lake.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister in charge of Hydro. In view of his previous answer that he had advised the Hydro Board several years ago that it would be in their best discretion to do something, could he now advise them that it would be in their best discretion pursuant to what has been happening in this Chamber in the last several weeks to contact Mr. Steward Martin and advise him that he is no longer under any solicitor-client privilege situation and that he can talk to the public about what happened with respect to that Tritschler Inquiry?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, that one has been dealt with many times.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that at that time when he felt it was in the best discretion of Hydro the Minister advised them as to what to do, can he now do the same thing; or does the Minister believe that it is not in the best interests of Hydro and the people of Manitoba to know exactly what did happen?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think it's fairly usual that if a Minister is asked by one of the Crown corporations for opinion or for comments with regard to some matter it is not unusual to pass on those comments and I've indicated what they were in this case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere with a final supplementary.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, a final supplementary to the Minister. Can he advise as to whether he believes or does not believe that it would be in the best discretion of Hydro to release Mr. Martin from that solicitor-client privilege in view of the debate that has gone on here in the last several weeks?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is on the record.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister and ask him whether he is proceeding with his lawsuit in reference to the Montreal Gazette which this week has indicated it is not backing down from its story? I'd like to ask him whether the basis of his objection is the same position, the fact that they said that he had the same position as the Premier of Quebec or whether they said that it was the collusion between the Premier of Manitoba and the Premier of Quebec?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I've been engaged at the Western Premiers Conference this week and haven't had an opportunity to consult with the lawyers since I got back. I appreciate my honourable friend's solicitude and concern. I dare say that in due course if there's anything public to be said about it, it will be said. Right now it's in the hands of the lawyers.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to also ask the Minister in view of some remarks made by the CBC concerning their view that the Federal Conservative Leader was angry at the provincial Premiers in regard to their avoidance of dealing with the Charter of Rights and comparing yourself to Mr. Clark a commentator said, "Give him credit for having principles, meaning Mr. Clark," will the First Minister be initiating a legal action against Peter Benish and the CBC for suggesting that he doesn't have any principles?

MR. LYON: Not that I am aware of, Mr. Speaker. If one were to do that one would have the CBC in court 365 days of the year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Energy and Mines. I wonder if he can inform the House and the people of Manitoba whether the 20 percent surcharge on gasoline prices will apply automatically every time that the Federal Government raises its prices?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, it perhaps should be directed to the Minister of Finance in this case but no, it does not apply automatically; it does eventually apply if that the levy remains on.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it does remain on, maybe not necessarily automatically, would anyone on the Ministry bench undertake to research whether this will add to the inflationary pressures of Manitoba as the federal tax is supposed to?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the money that is derived through provincial taxes is used to provide services to the people of Manitoba. The levy that is being put on the gasoline and home heating fuel and farm fuel and natural gas and gasohol is going to purchase the shares of a company, which I understand, that money will be going out of the country and certainly is going to be inflationary. I heard it likened to purchasing Safeway in order to increase food production. We would have the similar sort of impact by purchasing Petrofina.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan with a final supplementary.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question was specific. Would someone undertake to research

whether it will cause inflation in Manitoba by having an increase in taxes?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, in the course of our operation of the government we are continually assessing factors such as that. The question really is something that is continually being covered by governments . . . Maybe the Member for St. Johns has a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines. I'm sure the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines knows that the Canadian Diamond Drilling Association of Canada are holding their annual convention in Manitoba this week. I was wondering whether the Honourable Minister could advise the House whether there's any significance in the Canadian Diamond Drilling Association of Canada holding their convention in Manitoba where they are doing some exploration work and will be involved in exploration work in the province.

MR. CRAIK: Well for whatever the reason, Mr. Speaker, we welcome them to Manitoba. The member has pointed out that there is other significance and that it that perhaps the significance is that Manitoba has the highest level of exploration activity this year, has had perhaps in its history, at least in the last two decades.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I think the Member for Churchill addressed a question to the Minister of Mines asking him to give some indication of some of the work that our government was doing on the Roper Committee Report, that was the committee of union people and industry people in the mining industry that were bringing forth some recommendations. I won't go into detail but I'll just bounce off half a dozen of the things we are involved in, which is actually what the Member for Churchill had asked.

There are regulations being worked on in the heat stress area and the member should be aware that we have a pamphlet out on that already, which is the pre-run of a regulation. Regulations are being worked on in the hearing conservation area. Regulations are being worked on for roll over protective structures. We are running presently fire protection training classes in Northern Manitoba that's been well received. The Workers Compensation Board procedures were thoroughly reviewed and the Member is aware of that. That was part of the Wright Report. We have a Safety and Health Committee Training Program which is in place and if the member wishes to ask where the meetings are taking place, I'd be quite prepared to answer that question for him.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister to whom the Manitoba Hydro reports. In view of the fact that the Minister said that words of appreciation should await the conclusion of the Tritschler Inquiry, would he not consider that a demand for a resignation or a firing should have awaited the termination of the Tritschler Inquiry?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the answer is obviously no.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad the Minister has so patently displayed his perspective. May I ask the Minister to determine whether it was not a draft report that Manitoba Hydro had done containing words of appreciation to Mr. Bateman, which he countermanded or advised would not be appropriate, but that the report had been completed and printed? I want to be advised whether the report had been completed and printed and had to be scrapped and a new report printed, taking out words of appreciation to a civil servant for 40 years' work for the people of the Province of Manitoba, and before the Tritschler Inquiry Commission had made any findings with respect to his appearance before committee.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I can take that part of the question as notice but I would have to indicate to the member that it's going to be very difficult to establish, if at all possible, when it may have been. There certainly wouldn't have been any information as to whether it was printed or not. My recollection is that it was in an early stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a final supplementary.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister consider it at the present time and after the Tritschler Commission has completed its inquiry, and accepting — which I do not accept — the worst interpretation of what the Tritschler Commission has found — and I immediately say I don't accept it — that it would be appropriate for the Manitoba Hydro to express its appreciation to a former public servant who gave 40 years of excellent service to the people of the Province of Manitoba; and would he now countermand his instructions to Manitoba Hydro and tell them that now that the report has been completed, you don't consider it inappropriate?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear, at the time referred to there was the Commission of Inquiry sitting. It was in 1979, the year in which they had gone through their hearings; their final report was not brought out until late 1979. My advice to them at that time was that they ought to avoid anything in their annual report that in any way reflected or referred to the Tritschler Inquiry Commission or those people involved in it.

The Tritschler Commission report being in, the board of course can do whatever it likes with regard to recognition or if they want on the other hand to take excerpts from the Tritschler Inquiry report to show them the amount of waste and mismanagement that went on during the time of the former government and put in a special clause in the report that points out that waste and mismanagement that would undoubtedly cause them to be somewhat more embarrassed across the way than they are already, then they're free to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please, order please. Time for Question Period having expired we will proceed with Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, would you call Second Reading of Bills No. 50 and 56 and then adjourned debates on second reading from Bill 12 through to Bill 52.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. If honourable members want to carry on . . . order please. If the Honourable Member for Inkster wants to carry on a private conversation I suggest he leaves the Chamber. Order please. Order please. Order please. If the Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport wants to carry on a private conversation he may leave this Chamber.

Second reading, Bill No. 50 — the Honourable Attorney-General.

SECOND READING GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL NO. 50 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT

MR. MERCIER presented Bill No. 50, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 50, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act, provides for the development of a Fine Option Program in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, where a fine is the appropriate penalty we should not incarcerate people except as a last resort. For those few people who are able to perform unpaid community work but fail or refuse to take advantage of a Fine Option Program, incarceration will have to be our last resort. However, for those people who are unable to pay a fine, they will have the option of performing unpaid community work and thereby satisfy the amount of the fine.

Fine Option Programs, Mr. Speaker, in some other provinces permit a convicted person to satisfy the fine imposed by performing unpaid community work on the basis of the provincial minimum wage where a person elects to perform unpaid community work to satisfy a fine. No warrant for arrest of the person shall be executed and the driver's licence of the person or the registration of his vehicle will not be suspended.

The program will also include provision for dealing with convicted persons who are unable to pay the fine and are also unable to perform unpaid community work. Mr. Speaker, in developing this program we will be reviewing, as we already have to a certain extent, Fine Option Programs in the other provinces and I'm hopeful that the program will come into effect early in 1982.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the intent of this proposal is a good one. I, for one, have grave doubts about some of the community work that had been ordered by various magistrates. It seemed to me on occasion, almost on a sort of a

personal whim of the magistrate and I'm not at all sure that there should not be some clear-cut procedures outlined and programs outlined that would provide what the option actually is.

Now the Minister, under this bill, provides that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may by regulation Establish a Program and I would want to know whether or not that has been done; whether there is a draft of that that will be discussed in committee. My impression is that there is not because the Minister implied and what I inferred from what he said that he has yet to look at what's being done in other provinces, that he hopes to develop a good program and to bring this in as soon as possible.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the Act provides, the bill provides, that it comes into force on a day fixed by proclamation. That then means that we really have nothing before us that we can really debate except to transfer to the Lieutenant-Governor of the kind of penalty which will be defined and I think that would have been better to come with something much more specific and say that's what we have in mind. Because although the principal is fine, the Minister might say, well I don't know whether this will pass so why should I put all my department to all the work of preparing it when indeed the bill might not pass the Legislature. It seems to me, however that he should have done more homework than he indicates was done and now I think that all it is is an indication of intent.

What I think is important is that the nature of the substitute program should be available to be debated in this House and I would hope that the Minister will at least at the time that this bill is reviewed in committee will at least bring in some specifics; specific recommendations, specific, if not recommendations, thoughts as to what could be done and not just leave it as "Community Work." To my mind it is not too helpful just to pass this bill without having the additional information. Nevertheless, as I said I think it's a good idea. I don't think that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council is likely to do some form of community program which would be a substitution for work that is normally done by government and should be done by government. I assume that it would be done in a proper way but I would like to make sure that it is very clearly established, that it is well publicized, so that persons who make the choice will be able to know all the ramifications and that we in the Legislature will have an opportunity to review what is being proposed and have some input into it. Of course we could wait for next year's Estimates but it's unfortunate if there is nothing more forthcoming in committee, I would urge the Minister to ensure that at the committee stage he comes with specifics rather than the generalities we've heard this morning.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R.(Bud) BOYCE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to commend the Minister for bringing this forward; it is a step in the right direction. A lot of work has gone into it and notwithstanding the suggestion of the Member for St. Johns that some specificity may be desirable. Nevertheless, I would opt for the bill as it is at the moment. Albeit we can discuss it at committee because it has to allow for some growth

within the system, some experience in handling it and as a former Minister of Corrections, Mr. Speaker, I found it strange that in the Portage Judicial District, albeit dealing with young people rather than The Summary Convictions Act which deals with adults, that I could not find . . . there may have been some youngsters sentenced to the Manitoba Homes for Boys, we used to call them, I'm sorry I can't remember the name that we changed it to, but the Portage Judicial District had a diversion program, the jargon they came up with is Diversion Program in that area for years. The youngsters never went to the Manitoba Home for Boys, you see, they collected them from all over the province but it being in that judicial district that the people had worked out with the various components of law enforcement and corrections and probations, programs which had served the community well; it's from that experience that I would hope that it would allow some leeway, because if we nail it down with too much specificity it limits what they can do in the various judicial districts. There has to be, in my view, some leeway allowed to it and I end by commending the government for bringing this bill forward at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General will be closing debate.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of both the Member for St. Johns and the Member for Winnipeg Centre, and I will attempt at Committee to get into some more detail, where possible; I think there could be a useful discussion of some of the other programs that are in existence in other provinces, and we will do that at the Committee stage, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL No. 56 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION ACT AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

MR. MERCIER presented Bill No. 56, an Act to amend The Education Administration Act and The Public Schools Act, for second reading.

MOTION Presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, the main purpose of this bill is to give effect to the new Education Support Program for the public schools of this province, which as honourable members are aware, provides substantially increased financial support in the general revenues of the province, provides for greater equalization province-wide; establishes a multi-year plan of support, and provides increased funding for a number of special programs, particularly those associated with services for the handicapped.

The bill consists first of minor amendments to The Education Administration Act, in order that the

terminology in that Act may conform to that used in Part IX of The Public Schools Act; and second and wherever applicable, the relevant sections of other parts of The Public Schools Act are similarly amended.

The major amendments, however, are proposed for Part IX of The Public Schools Act which provide the legislative framework for the Support Program and for budgeting and levying of taxes pursuant thereto. Honourable members will find that many of the technical procedures for budgeting by school boards and for striking levies for school purposes remain essentially the same, except that in the case of tax levies over and above the Support Program, the procedure is the same for the entire province, as the Greater Winnipeg equalization levy procedures have been eliminated.

Other provisions of this bill include the method of determining the total amount of the Support Program for the province for 1981 and subsequent years; provision for determining the amount of the components of the total program; the method of determining the eligible expenditures for each school division on which the support under the new program is based; a formula for working out any transitional subsidy which a division in Greater Winnipeg may be entitled over a three year period, where the mill rate on taxable assessment and parts of the applicable divisions has to be increased more than five mills over the previous year, in order to raise the amount of the eligible expenditures of the division. And lastly, there is provision for authority to make regulations respecting the types of support which are payable under the program.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this bill to honourable members' consideration and enactment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I can't help but rise to comment on the statement by the Minister about the substantial increased support from the province for the educational system. I do that because I think it should be clear that whereas we tried when we were in government and we have proposed all along, that there has to be a shift towards progressive taxation for the provision of services to people and education is one of them.

That the property tax, which has been carrying the great burden of taxation, has to be relieved and that it has to eventually end up as services to property being taxed for services to property, that there has to be a shift towards progressive taxation, that is taxation on the ability to pay.

This Minister's government has a record of reversing the trend, the international trend of providing for taxation for the services given to people on a progressive basis, and the lie of the name of the party is shown by the fact that they call themselves Progressive Conservative and all they do is to become more and more reactionary as their program is revealed; and when they first came out and reduced income taxation, that was their first step towards a complete series of regressive taxation on the part of government; and the pride that we hear from the Minister and his colleagues about the substantial increase of provincial contribution to education, is denied by the fact that if we want to,

we can look at the budget, the Budget Address and the revenue estimate, to see where that \$70 million come.

Let me suggest, and mind you this could be repeated in many of the estimates, but I deal particularly with education, because this government was the one under this Minister who is going to come along with a complete new White Paper, a new program of financing education through a change in taxation form. The present Minister of Energy, the former Minister of Finance, a former Minister of Education himself in the 60s, is the one who said, "as soon as we are able to do something with a foundation levy, we will eliminate, eliminate the tax rebate system." He was quite insistent on the criticism he had for the Property Tax Credit Program which the NDP brought in, and I do believe one of the reasons, one of the reasons for the change in ministry is the embarrassment of having a Finance Minister continue the program of the property tax credit, which is amongst the most progressive types of taxation and it would be difficult for the Minister who denied the program, who called it election material, to have to face the fact that the government didn't have the courage of its own convictions and is continuing a program, which the NDP instituted which is progressive.

Instead of that, we waited and waited to see what would come out and finally, I think it was last December, the Minister's new program came out. What it says is aside from a change in the levy made on the various property tax people, aside from the additional costs imposed in their system on the suburban areas of Winnipeg as compared with the inner core of Winnipeg, aside from that, if one looks to see where the money comes from, one discovers two interesting sources that could be traced. One, is \$24.8 million that has been taken by the province out of the Special Municipal Loan and General Emergency Fund, just lifted straight out of that fund and put into revenue and used to reduce the highest deficit in history. We find that was taken out and put in and we could well say, well there's part of where this money comes from, the \$70 million. Then the rest is borrowed money, money on which the people of Manitoba will be paying interest at excessive rates at a time when the interest rates today are announced to be the highest ever during the time that this government has been paying lip service to bringing matters under control, coming along with the great depths that they do and then taking credit for the fact that this is a great increase, a substantial increase, to the financing of education.

It's a phony claim, Mr. Speaker. It's a phony claim because, as I say, close to \$25 million has been taken out of the Special Loan Fund, the emergency fund, at a time when it was brought out with the Minister for Municipal Affairs that he is crying copious tears, and has been for some 17 months, that the Federal Government withdrew a program to aid municipalities, and saying, they took away our program, the program we have been working on and we have been trying so hard to get them to bring it back, at the same time that he has been complaining about the lack of programming from the Federal Government on matters which I believe are basically provincial in jurisdiction, he has permitted — I shouldn't say that, Mr. Speaker, he didn't permit it

because he didn't know it was happening. It happened without his knowledge that close to \$25 million was taken out of the one fund that could have been used to supplement the kind of a program which the Federal Government apparently has withdrawn and he didn't know about it, nor did he know that the Act itself is going to be repealed. I should fault him for lack of knowledge but then if he wasn't told, how should he know, except I suppose as the Minister, a member of the Treasury Board, he ought to have known.

But the Minister of Finance, who is so proud of this \$70 million, is announcing his pride at the same time as he knows that some \$25 million is taken out of a municipal fund, a loan fund to be used for municipal work and general emergency fund, then he knows that he is participating from his department in a deficit of \$220 million plus this \$25 million, close to a quarter of a billion dollars of deficit for this year, and that's where the money is coming from, in effect, at rates of interest, which as I say, have reached their highest yet.

To stand up and say this bill before us is carrying out the government's program, that part is true, but to the great increase in contribution to education, it's really a great increase for a burden for future generations for the people of Manitoba to bear in order for him to be able to say, look at the greater contribution we are making to education. What it is is borrowed money. I would guess the government now pays for money borrowed from the banks about 18 percent interest for short-term, immediate borrowing from the banks, if it does indeed borrow. If it is a lender, then the interest rate of course is less. Nevertheless it is very substantial. It is buying, it's mortgaging the future for the present program, and in the end it isn't that much that helped the school boards to any really great extent in their having to finance their programs. In other words, it is a stopgap measure; it is an inadequate measure; it is falsely stated with pride that it is an improvement in the system, and indeed it is more — if this stood alone, I would say that might be election talk, but in the context of the entire budget — of course, we can't contemplate the possibility of an election when all the government can talk about is future dreams, future hopes, future mega-projects, none of which are sufficient to be able to justify an election. The entire budget speech, which reflects a period of serious economic concern for the province, can certainly not be called an election budget, so I take back — I don't take back, I just comment that the Minister with his \$70 million is accomplishing very little and certainly at the expense of future generations, at the expense of the Special Municipal Loan and General Emergency Fund, and really without any great contribution from progressive taxation, which should be the objective of any government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 12. The Honourable Member for Inkster. (Stand)

Bill No. 34, An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Vital. (Stand)

Bill No. 35, An Act to amend The Planning Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

Bill No. 38, An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, could we stand the remaining bills, standing in my name? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of personal grievance.

Mr. Speaker, it has now been over a week since we were presented with the details of an agreement described by many as a letter of intent, and I suppose that is its proper description, between the Government of the Province of Manitoba and the Aluminum Company of Canada, commonly known as Alcan Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it's incumbent on members in the short time that is left to us in the course of this Session to put on record positions with respect to this particular proposal.

Mr. Speaker, from the outset, I wish to indicate that it is not my intention in the course of my submission to castigate the Government for what it has done. It is not my intention to speak negatively with respect to the proposed development. I wish the record to show that I, like I think many other Manitobans look forward to any initiatives that will enhance the provincial economy and assist it in its retreat from the current cyclical recession into which it is now withdrawn. So it is a matter of great concern to members I'm sure on both sides of the House that the government be given encouragement in all ways in order that it can attempt to grapple with the very serious and real economic problems that present today to the people of Manitoba. But, Mr. Speaker, it would be remissive of members certainly on this side of House to suggest that we were willing as it would have superficially appear to wholeheartedly embrace the proposal that has been entered into; the development proposal that has been entered into as between the Government of Manitoba and Alcan.

There are in our submission, Mr. Speaker, many unanswered questions and we feel that it is

necessary that serious and sober reflection be made with respect to matters which deserve the exercise of critical judgement. Because, Mr. Speaker, critical judgement should not be equated with negativism. You know, whenever members on this side rise, or not whenever, but very often when members of this side rise and talk about problems which pertain today in the Manitoba economy they're accused of purveying gloom and doom. We're told that these members are being too negative or persisting in seeing the dark side of every issue and are trying to dissuade the good people of Manitoba from carrying on their affairs and having some optimism in the future of their problems.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish to put on record a categorical denial with respect to any such allegations because, Mr. Speaker, it's simply not true. We in the Opposition have a responsibility to the people. It is a responsibility which can only be discharged if from time to time we are indeed willing to do a little extra work, spend a little extra time in order to explore all the various facets, all the various permutations and possibilities of government policy initiative.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have before us now a document, it's entitled "Letter of Intent". As I said before it is duly executed and has been signed by officials of the government and of Alcan. It talks about the creation of a joint venture with respect to a substantial matter, a matter which involves quite literally hundreds of millions if not really ultimately, I suppose, billions of dollars. It is in my opinion probably and I will give it this credit, it is probably in terms of it's scope in magnitude one of the biggest development proposals in the history of not only this province but probably most other provinces and states in North America. So it's worthy of consideration and I intend in the time allotted to me in this matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to deal with that in some substance and detail.

What has prompted me to rise today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, were the answers that were presented to Opposition questioning in the Legislature yesterday. The Minister responsible for Energy was posed certain questions by the Member for St. Johns and myself. There were seven questions dealing with a variety of subject matters, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They involved matters relative to finance and just general business conduct, and what alarmed me and what alerted me was the seeming inability of the responsible Minister to provide responses.

I documented the question and answer sequence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I can tell you that I was alarmed. To give you an example, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister was asked why the government had seen fit to give Alcan what amounted to an option to water and ultimately hydro rights without charging a fee. And the Minister said that there was a 35-year rental fee on water and he didn't bother to say that there was an indefinite renewal period after that. He didn't bother to go into the detail of the Letter of Intent and generally skirted and evaded the query as to why there was no option.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can tell you that I have practicing law for a decade in this province and in the course of that ten years, I've done several business arrangements, and I think I'm speaking modestly. I have done several business arrangements

relative to people who wanted option rights and I can tell you that I have never, Mr. Deputy Speaker, ever seen this sort of open-ended option extended to a commercial party without any remuneration or consideration extended back to the giver, to the grantor of the rights.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this in my opinion is absolutely, unmistakably unbelievable. This flies in the face of normal business practice; it flies in the face of normal business prudence; it simply doesn't reflect the sort of management that we look to government to provide. Now there will be those, Mr. Deputy Speaker, who argue that the government didn't give Alcan an option of any sort, and I would be one who might be willing to agree, because frankly, having reviewed the provisions of this Letter of Intent, I don't think that the government has anything. But that's not what the government says. The government in its press releases is holding out to the people of Manitoba and to members of this Legislature what is described as a major step forward in the government's program to broaden the industrial base of our province and I'm reading from government's own Information Services releases, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the government can't have it both ways. The government wants to put this forward, this preponderant project as if it were a fait accompli and on the other hand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they're going to say, I suppose, "Well, why should we have taken an option fee; we didn't really do anything." Well, if they didn't do anything, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they sure did do with a lot of oomph, and it's questionable why there should be such a build-up and it was, I thought, not dissimilar, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to that which preceded the 1966 election and the CFI announcement.

Do we all remember the then Premier Roblin of this province just prior to the 1966 election? I think it was just two to three or four months before and it was all documented in the CFI report, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Do we remember how he went on television and held press conferences and they appeared with Messrs. Kasser and Reiser and we were told that these Swiss business magnates; these business scions from Europe were about to embark on what was to be the most important and substantial business development in the history of our province. And do we remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how that was played and all the publicity that was given to that? And it was all positive, it was all blue skies, Mr. Deputy Speaker —(Interjection)— and some member says, "It sure was," and it sure was, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and there was nothing in that package that was good for the people of Manitoba. What had been committed, had been committed in desperation by a government who was looking at a lagging popularity in the opinion polls desperately trying to find a way to propel itself into office for what I believe would be a third or fourth term.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what are we looking at today? We're looking at a situation again, when an election is in the offing, when letters of intent are being entered into and great publicity is being given when we're told that the future of Manitoba has been secured by a mega project. One would wonder if this isn't megalomania. I would suggest that there's perhaps more of the megalomaniac than the mega project involved in this Letter of Intent.

So Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have a radical departure from the normal Progressive Conservative approach to industrial development or the one they usually talk about when there aren't elections in the offing. Suddenly the government doesn't want to talk about the growth of small business; the government wants to talk about mega projects — one big windfall that secures the future of Manitoba overnight.

I wish, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in our own private lives we could enjoy that sort of opportunity. I suppose those of us who win lotteries; those fortunate few that win lotteries, have that sort of windfall experience. But most of us experience slow growth through generations, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But here we have a so-called Conservative Government investing all its efforts in megalomaniac mega projects. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say that it's time to start analyzing all the various aspects of this particular proposal. Prior to doing that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would ask that you indicate what my time limit is so we can set our watches together so I know where we're at.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Abe Kovnats: To the Honourable Member, your time ends at 11:53.

MR. CORRIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. First I want to talk about the question of ownership. This is something that conveniently members opposite would prefer I know to avoid but I think it's one that we have to talk about. We're talking about the future power supplies, the vital future energy supplies of Manitobans. We're talking about a resource which is, in my opinion, I think probably the opinion of most members here and of the public, the most vitally important resource that is available to Manitoba and Manitoba's future — hydro-electric power.

It was seen fit many years ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by wise legislators to make the ownership of hydro-electric resources a matter of public domain. It was seen fit to dedicate those resources to the public in perpetuity and right of the people of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we are reaching the time when we probably are looking at the ultimate end of our hydro-electric resources and I remind members, I remind them that in the 1960s, Hydro was predicting that these resources would be exhausted in the 1980s. And I remember it well. They said that by about 1985 to 1990 we would have — and they were using the models that were developed on then growth patterns of the economy — they said that there would be no future hydro resources available to Manitobans for development. Saturation has not, now they've moved it back, and saturation is apprehended probably now for towards the end of this century, perhaps the time between the year 2000 and 2010 or 2015. But those water resources, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will be exhausted; they are not infinite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we know that there are only two or three stations left to be developed on the Nelson River. We know that perhaps there will be one or two left to be developed along the Churchill Diversion and possibly one on the Seal River. But, Mr. Speaker, we have now passed the halfway mark with respect to the development of our hydro

resources and we are now in the downhill time leading to the diminution and the ultimate exhaustion of that particular resource.

Mr. Speaker, we have to be very cautious, we have to be very careful how we deal with that and I say that we have to husband that resource. We need a comprehensive hydro energy policy for the next 20 year. And I'm not sure that the government in advancing this sort of project, without adequate contemplation, I'm encouraging them to consider exactly what they're doing, before they enter into any final agreement. I'm not discouraging the agreement, I'm just encouraging them to think many times before they jump. I'm saying that they should give consideration to the fact that the turning over of half a power station, because that's really what we're talking about, the turning over of equity and trust in half a power station along the Nelson River, will be dedicating in perpetuity between a fifth and an eighth of our future hydro resources in this province.

Now when you look at it that way, Mr. Speaker, you have to consider soberly what portends for the future. I think I can say categorically that all the Churchill stations that are proposed to be developed will not amount to the the power output of one Nelson River generating station; and don't forget, Mr. Speaker, that the Churchill Diversion stations, when they're put in place are going to be much more expensive, because of transportation costs and presumably, obviously, because of inflation costs as well.

Mr. Speaker, we have to be very cautious. So I say that if Alcan is to be given a station, then we have to be sure that the public of Manitoba is not going to be called upon to indirectly subsidize the Alcan multinational company for generations to come. And we all know, Mr. Speaker, that that has been done before; we know the rather tragic history of the Canadian National Railway, the CPR; we know that the interests of Canadians have time and time again been sold out by governments seeking windfall development in their own times.

Mr. Speaker, I raise a note of caution. I say that the people of Manitoba's interests and future should be put before that of the Alcan company. Jobs, yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll never discourage the creation of one job; but, Mr. Speaker, if it means that my grandchildren or your grandchildren are going to be paying premiums for their hydro-electric energy, and in the year 2020 we may be using nuclear fuel or coal to provide ourselves with any necessary additional power resources, Mr. Speaker, there won't be hydro much after that, we'll have to start resorting to other forms of fuel. Mr. Speaker, I am saying that we have to be very, very cautious.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to raise another note of caution. You know I'm not sure that members opposite know a great deal about aluminum smelting plants, I can say that I'm not an expert, but I've consulted with some people who I think are; they tell me that our Hydro power stations are not designed to facilitate the needs of a major aluminum smelting plant. They tell me that such a mill requires fantastic demands of electricity. I am advised, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for instance, that our stations are only designed —(Interjection)— I know, Mr. Speaker, this government doesn't like to hear the advice of experts and if I want to relate the experts advice I will be chided.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to spend but a moment, but I can say that a government desperate for re-election should not be entrusted with the stewardship of this matter. It would be better to have a government that is more concerned about the people and less concerned about being re-elected to deal with the Alcan executives from Montreal, much better. And that ultimately, Mr. Speaker, is what we will put to the people of Manitoba in the next election; that they would better trust themselves to the New Democratic Party than a government that's desperate for re-election.

But going on, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the — if I can try and get over the Member for Minnedosa who's screaming at the top of his lungs, Mr. Speaker. It's unbecoming for such a senior member. He's bellowing like a stuck pig, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I can say that the hydro-electric generating stations that we have been building can't provide the power for an Alcan smelter. They can do it in the wintertime, Mr. Speaker, but when they are building up reserves, when they are building up the backflow behind the dams in the summertime, for the peak consuming period during the winter, it is absolutely, virtually assured, and I'm told that it's highly probable, that this particular smelter will have to have assured supplies of power from another generating station, and the question I pose, Mr. Speaker, and the one I encourage the Minister of Energy to look into very closely is what sort of leverage, what sort of demands are going to be made by Alcan in this regard.

The Letter of Intent talks very generally about that. It simply says that the government is to commit certain resources to the company. They covered that, Mr. Speaker, they know that they have to have it and they've got the commitment, but they don't say, Mr. Speaker, what they're going to do. Are they going to demand, for instance, Mr. Speaker, that the output from another plant be dedicated to them? Is that going to be one of the bargaining demands when they get down to the crunch, Mr. Speaker? Is a government that's going to be desperate for re-election going to simply give in and again force other Manitobans to subsidize that particular smelting plant and that particular multinational corporation? Because, Mr. Speaker, I say that they can have their smelter and I encourage it, but if it means that it's going to be done at publicly subsidized costs, I say that we have to think twice. And that is a real concern, because an aluminum smelter runs at a 90 percent load factor 50 weeks out of every 52 in the year. They shut down, I'm told, around the world for two weeks to clean their stacks and to clean their electrodes and that's it. They run full bore.

Apparently if you close down a plant, the startup costs are so exceptional that it makes it uneconomic. It costs a fortune to close down an aluminum smelter.

Mr. Speaker, I want to know whether this government is aware of that problem and I want to know if they are aware of that problem, Mr. Speaker, I want to know what they're going to do. I want to know what position they're going to take and I want to know before the election. I don't want to come after the election, as we did in 1966 and find out that they sold out the family farm, come back and find

out that some businessman from down the way has just walked away with Manitoba's future.

The Member for Portage says why don't you leave that for somebody who knows what he's talking about. Well if the member responsible for energy had a better memory, I might, but he has such a poor memory that you really can't view him as being a responsible politician, can you?

Mr. Speaker, we have so many concerns. We have so many concerns. For instance, we want to know, is the government going to insist that the company locate in Manitoba for corporate tax purposes. You know I was talking to somebody who used to work for Inco, in the financial branch of Inco, and he told me that Inco's big trick used to be to sell their product to a U.S. subsidiary and write off the distribution costs and they used to pay fewer taxes to the Province of Manitoba as a result of that action.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know about the Inco agreements and we know that there has been sharp division with respect to the terms and conditions of those agreements and there are many Manitobans, particularly those who live around the mining towns, who feel that too much was sold out to those multinational interests.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that we don't want that to happen again. I hope we don't anyway. So we want to get an assurance that there won't be any such hanky-panky, we're not going to have the aluminum products sold off to the U.S. subsidiary or the subsidiary off in British Columbia or Quebec, in order to evade Manitoba corporate and capital tax. Well it wouldn't apply to capital, but corporate tax. And I want you to know that as usual Manitoba lost its case in the Appeal Court, in the Supreme Court, when they challenged the Inco matter, Mr. Speaker. Sorry, portend I suppose for what's now before the courts.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very concerned, I'm concerned that Inco could be shifting . . .

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

MR. MERCIER: . . . if the member would accept a question?

MR. CORRIN: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for . . .

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

MR. SPEAKER: Point of Order? The honourable member on a point of order.

MR. MERCIER: The Member for Wellington appeared to assume some relationship between an Inco tax case and a constitutional case now before the court, Mr. Speaker; I don't think there's any relationship whatsoever.

MR. CORRIN: It's not a point of order, but I agree that there is no relationship. Mr. Speaker, I agree that there is no relationship.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about this, because you know we have a report in Ottawa today that says that the big oil companies of this country have

managed to secrete from the federal and provincial coffers billions of dollars in tax revenues, billions of dollars over the past 10, 15 years. Mr. Speaker, we have to worry about that, we have to concern ourselves, because the history as proven with CFI, Mr. Speaker, as proven by other cases in other provinces, the history of government trying to deal with multinationals is a sorry one indeed. So we have to guarantee that Manitobans will benefit from the tax flow from those sorts of developments.

I'm concerned for instance, Mr. Speaker, that the capital cost allowances that the company would be able to write down on the construction of the dam and the generating station, may in fact reduce the provincial revenues in such a way that again the people of Manitoba will end up subsidizing the Alcan development. And that's an exceptional sort of situation, Mr. Speaker, where we allow them to participate on an equity basis with Hydro in the construction of a dam and generating station and then we pay for that as a result of having to pay for more expensive power down the road and they get the benefit by being able to provide themselves with tax free profit from the output of their smelter.

Mr. Speaker, I'm also concerned, because in this letter of intent, it talks about the government providing a transmission line. Well, who's going to pay for the construction of that? Who's going to pay for the maintenance of that? Is that going to be several more million dollars tacked on? You know the last time a major transmission line was built, I think that it was the Federal Government through, what's the Crown corporation? — the Federal Government participated in order to facilitate a power supply to the nuclear station in the vicinity of the Whiteshell. Atomic Energy Canada, that was the supportive federal agency.

Mr. Speaker, that's not going to happen again. In this Letter of Intent the government has committed itself to paying millions of dollars, an unknown sum, in order to advance a second line that will provide this particular plant with the electrical energy that it requires. They're willing to participate in the development of the station and as I said, they're going to get the capital write down and allowance on that, but they're not willing to build the transmission line. And, Mr. Speaker, there's a question, because if we build this second line for them, isn't that going to prematurely advance the need for another line in order to provide supplies of energy to other members of the Manitoba consuming public? Has the government thought about that? Has the government considered that? That's another hidden cost, Mr. Speaker.

So when you start adding it up, Mr. Speaker, when you start looking at all the different facets of this arrangement, you're talking about tens of millions, compounded one on another, of hidden public investment and subsidy. Goodness knows, Mr. Speaker, that we could be talking about hundreds of millions of dollars. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that CFI could look like a drop in the bucket compared to Alcan if the government is not very careful. They can lose more simply on the hidden subsidy factory in the construction of the dam and the loss of taxes in the construction of the transmission lines than the former government lost in the CFI fiasco.

Mr. Speaker, there is also the question of the precedent. I don't want to get into that in any great

detail but I want to say that generally, although I must say that philosophically, I am opposed to private participation in Crown corporations. To me, it brings up all sorts of problems. First of all, it sets a bad precedent. Does this mean that in the future somebody can take an equity interest in the Manitoba Telephone System or MPIC? Even worse, Mr. Speaker, it begs the whole question of the rights of a minority shareholder to have insider status in a Crown corporation. Now, we have never done that before in this province, Mr. Speaker, and I dare say nobody has in this country. But, Mr. Speaker, I know enough about the corporate law of this province to know that insiders have now have many more rights and privileges with respect to representation on the boards of the corporations in which they own shares and have interest. There has been an indication that there will be, in the Letter of Intent, that there will be amendments made to the legislation. Presumably one item of legislation would be The Hydro-electric Act.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether or not the government is going to give insider status to Alcan of Canada on the Board of Hydro. Does that mean that they are going to be privy, and their board of directors in Montreal are going to be privy to all our most intimate negotiations and the details of our public enterprise? Does it mean that they could exploit this to their own advantage? Does it mean that they could exercise their minority rights in such a way to acquire confidential information, even if they weren't on the Board, because there have been cases where minority shareholders have gone to the courts and demanded access to inside information and received it, by virtue of investment.

So really, one wonders, who is going to be in charge of Hydro in the future? Who is going to be calling the shots? Is it going to be at arm's length with the private sector?

Mr. Speaker, also I want to talk about the whole question of plant maintenance. There is talk about dedicating 40 percent of the power from a plant, from the Nelson River plant to this particular development. Well, there is the whole question of who is going to maintain the generating station and dam. It was left open; the Letter of Intent is totally open. There's absolutely no stricture; there is no parameter put on the subject of plant maintenance and upkeep. Mr. Speaker, we're not talking about the upkeep of a small business office or Portage Avenue; we're talking about a billion dollar generating station. The upkeep, presumably, is going to be enormous. It's wide open. It's on the table for negotiation. As I said before, I wouldn't mind if I was sure that the government was going to be hard-nosed, but I'm not sure that's going to be case. In their desperate bid for re-election, I'm willing to bet that they're going to sign anything that's put in front of their little noses, as long as they don't have to put it to the people of Manitoba before the election day.

Mr. Speaker, this Letter of Intent, it's literally an agreement to agree. That's probably the best way to describe it and I learned in first year law that an agreement to agree was a nullity; it was essentially nothing; it was not recognized by the courts. It had very little legal effect. It has no legal effect, the Member for Inkster says, and I agree. That's what I think we have been presented with, an agreement to

agree, but an agreement to agree on such broad terms that nothing is defined, nothing is specified, not even the feasibility study. It leaves it purely within the discretion of the company whether they spend nil dollars or \$5 million. So where does that leave the people of Manitoba?

I also want to talk, Mr. Speaker, about the whole question of the environment. The Letter of Intent says that Alcan, not the Government of Manitoba, but Alcan is to undertake environmental studies and participate if it wishes in public hearings. Mr. Speaker, it's my distinct impression that the government in this document has passively ceded to Alcan the right of environmental impact review. I think that the government's right, the government's jurisdiction may well have been ceded. That may be about the only thing that Alcan could argue in a court of law, that the government has no right in the future to bring into play its legislation and its requirements with respect to environmental protection and control standards.

There's the whole question also of why the Letter of Intent didn't tell Alcan that the government would also be doing that. Why does the government put an onus on Alcan and not tell Alcan that it will also bear that same burden? I would like to see both parties have covenanted to undertake environmental studies because you know, Mr. Speaker, there are tremendous problems associated with aluminum smelters. They don't want to talk about the cows in places around the world that were pasturing near aluminum smelters that developed such skeletal deformity that they had to be destroyed. They don't want to talk about fluorosis. They don't want to talk about those problems, Mr. Speaker, but there's a study in British Columbia right now between the union, the government, and Alcan, and they are looking into environmental concerns and workplace health problems that have resulted, they think, from the operation of that particular smelter, and they are very serious problems. Aluminum plants produce fluoride and they produce it in fantastic quantity and, Mr. Speaker, unless there is very expensive, and I don't know whether it's economic — it hasn't been installed in Kitimat — unless very expensive environmental protection equipment is put in place, it is almost impossible to control the pollution from this sort of plant. I can tell you that I am told that the only way you can control it, even if you've got all the equipment, is to have access to vast quantities of water. You have got to have access to an outflow of vast quantities of water for both cooling and for discharge of treated contaminants, because it can't be put anywhere else; it can't be buried in the ground.

The whole question is, Mr. Speaker, you know, are we going to end up paying for that? On April 24th there was a government announcement and we talked about the recommendation that hazardous waste products be brought within the public jurisdiction and that government recommended that governments invest \$70 million in a regional system to deal with hazardous waste products. Well, damn it, Mr. Speaker, another subsidy, another potential subsidy. Is it really a bargain, Mr. Speaker, and if it is, who is going to pay for it? Are the people of Manitoba going to be asked to put in another \$5 million, \$10 million or \$15 million in order to deal

with all the waste? Is that going to be another tax write-down? And who is going to pay the taxes? That's another question, but I've dealt with that before.

Mr. Speaker, in the last two minutes I have, I wish to indicate that I want this government to negotiate. I want this government to be businesslike; I want them to look at all these various aspects that I have raised. They may have given an option to this company, and goodness knows what will happen if another competing company that needs hydro-electric comes in and gives us a better offer. I guess we can't pick it up or else we'll be accused of not dealing with Alcan in good faith — we signed a Letter of Intent. So they'll say, "You can't trust the Province of Manitoba. On the one hand, they allowed us to commit ourselves to a maximum of \$5 million in a feasibility study; on the other hand, they are willing to throw away the commitment and go and deal with someone else."

So what is this; what are we looking at? Should we give serious consideration — well, I say we should — to all the various aspects of this particular proposal.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker. I am concerned what it is going to cost Manitobans to buy back their surplus power from the station that's going to be owned by this company. I'm concerned whether it's going to be at the same rates, if we need it, as the other rates that are provided to Manitobans. That's on the table, Mr. Speaker; it's not assured in this Letter of Intent. Alcan is not required to protect the public interest. They have left that wide open.

So there are a million questions, Mr. Speaker, and I would submit that they all demand scrutiny.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that members opposite, rather than just providing Information Services releases, will see fit to provide more information to the House as these negotiations go on. I hope they'll provide feasibility studies, Mr. Speaker, so that deplorable answers as were provided to the Member for St. Johns yesterday, are not repeated. Yesterday the member, as I said before, asked some questions and he wanted to know about studies that had been done with respect to tax benefits from the project and he was told that such studies couldn't be done because no finite calculations could be made until the final terms of the agreement were known. Mr. Speaker, that is going . . .

MR. SPEAKER, Harry E. Graham: Order please. The honourable member's time has expired. Are you read for the question?

The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, in my eight sessions of the Legislature, I have always tried to keep my grievance speech because they said sometimes there might be something important that you might want to use it for so don't use it unless it's very important. Mr. Speaker, I would indicate to the Chamber, this is the first time I rise to use my grievance provision.

Mr. Speaker, in retrospect, I would suggest to any new members in this particular Chamber, if you get a chance on an issue that you feel is important to yourself, use your grievance, otherwise you will find yourself in the position that I am in, in using my first one now in eight years.

Mr. Speaker, I think what we heard today was, maybe aptly put, would be the Member for Wellington's Mayday speech. Mr. Speaker, I think that we listened to a bunch of ranting and raving from the member, the type of drivel that this Chamber doesn't have to listen to. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that what he has put forward here is the New Democratic Party's development package and I think, in this particular instance, NDP stands for No Development Party, Mr. Speaker. They will be opposed to the development of this project; they will be opposed, I suggest, to the development of any potash because — I'll go into it a little later. They do not want to see, Mr. Speaker — I believe they do not want to see Limestone go ahead. They don't want to see the Power Grid go ahead, Mr. Speaker, for one simple reason, and that is that they have based their whole re-election on one thing and that's the economy. They are getting up in this House day after day, talking doom and gloom and saying how bad things are in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, and that is the direction they are going.

How do you tackle something, let's say, for instance, a thing like Alcan if you are going to try to discredit it and create doubt in people's minds? Well, the first tactic, Mr. Speaker, is to employ the first part of the member's speech. You could have written a book on how he would react to this. He would say first of all that it's a sell-out; it's a sell-out. That seed he has sown already, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest to you that's the type of tactics they are going to be using, without really sitting down and looking at all the alternatives and looking at what has happened in the past with regard to other countries, the experiences that they have had with regard to developments of large producers such as Alcan and large energy users. We are not in the era anymore, Mr. Speaker, I believe, when we can sit down and give water rights in perpetuity to a particular individual. The people of Manitoba just wouldn't go for that. The other thing that has to be realized that in areas where agreements were made which were totally unacceptable to the Legislature maybe five or six years later, those agreements were changed, so I believe that the company officials realize that it has to be a deal that is acceptable to the public as well as to themselves. I think that is what the Minister of Mines is in the process right now of negotiating. We had to lay something on the table so that the members opposite would have something to look at, so that Alcan could move in and do their final study with regard to site development, with regard to holding the environment hearings.

First of all of course, Mr. Speaker, in the NDP official position, number one is to discredit the negotiations between Hydro, the government, and Alcan, that's number one. You accomplish that, you sow the seed of doubt in seed at this time, because I think that's what the members are doing, being pretty seedy about this thing.

The next step of course is if all else fails, if that doesn't work out, then of course you attack the environmental aspects of it. Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is anybody that questions the fact that we want to have as many safeguards in place as possible so that Alcan will not pollute the Manitoba environment wherever they do decide to locate, but one has to realize, Mr. Speaker, it would also be very good . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Wellington, he has had his 40 minutes, it is time that he allows someone else in this Chamber to speak.

MR. CORRIN: On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to your attention, you were right in drawing this to my attention, but I wish to draw to your attention that the heckling that I received during the term of my 40 minutes was far worse than the few remarks I was making just a moment ago, and you did not intercede nor did the Deputy Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. This Chair can recognize only one member at a time. At this time I recognize the Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, if we would like to adopt the type of approach that the Member for Wellington has taken on this particular issue we would not build anything in this province; we would leave it in an absolute natural state. We would go back to organic farming and produce a third of the crops that we have right now. We wouldn't use fertilizers or pesticides. You can use that type of scare tactics but where would we be at? We would all be still living in sod huts on the prairies.

Now we all realize that there are certain risks taken in any developments that we undertake, but I suggest to the members opposite that the people in Manitoba want to see some economic development, and what better way of doing it than attracting a company such as Alcan to base an industry which we do not have within the province right now. We have a strong agricultural component sector. We have a strong manufacturing segment. We have a number of other things that are of a big advantage to the Province of Manitoba and as a result, because we are so diverse, we do not feel the ups and downs which Saskatchewan has felt, let's say in the last 20 years. They used to rise and fall with the development or the lack of development in the agricultural field. All we have to do is look back ten years ago when grain prices dropped, the whole economy dropped in Saskatchewan. Manitoba was hit, but not nearly as bad because our economy is much more diverse.

So what better way of trying to stabilize that base that we have and build on that base by going even one step further, by trying to attract Alcan and get them to provide 800 jobs in the province plus the construction that goes with it; to go ahead and go after a potash mine, Mr. Speaker; to go ahead and try and develop more of our Hydro electrical sources, and this is precisely what we are trying to do. But the Member for Wellington has today, and I thank him for it because we are going to be in an election within the next year I suspect, and I thank him for putting the New Democratic Party or the No Development Party's position forward, because they are going to use scare tactics on Alcan, which they have started, and they are going to use scare tactics on potash, and they are going to make all kinds of statements with regards to Hydro development. And we see exactly what's happening here, because they are scared to see any development and they have a

vested interest, Mr. Speaker, in their own political careers in this province, in their desperate attempt for re-election, they are going to try and discredit this government's every move, which is fair ball.

But I suggest to the Member for Wellington — and I have been in the retail business a long time — when you walk into a retail store and you go up to a clerk or the manager and say how is business, and it's not quite as good as you'd like to see it, and the guy says, oh, terrible, oh, I am just having a terrible time with it, and I'm just not selling anything, and it's just not quite as good as last year. Do you know what you feel like doing? You feel like turning around and walking out, but if the guy says, not bad, we're working at it and we're trying our best, you have a totally different attitude.

I used to have a friend who sold cars who was a real positive thinker and when somebody asked him . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Wellington who has displayed his tremendous talents in the legal profession last night doesn't have to cast dispersions on my profession. I want to tell you that you are no credit to your society either, I can tell you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that if he addresses his remarks to the Chair we might have better cooperation in this Chamber.

MR. BANMAN: I accept your admonishment, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I wanted to say before, this particular gentleman when he was asked how things were, he said terrific, but they are going to get better. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that is the type of attitude that the members opposite should adopt because the people in Manitoba are people who through the years have displayed that they are competent, they are hard-working, and they will through any adversity, whether drought or other things, will come through with flying colours, and I know they will do that.

But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in light of what has happened in Ontario, in Quebec, in the last couple of elections where opposition parties took the same tact that the no development party across the way are taking right now, that it really backfired on them, and they should get away from the hang-up that they have with regards to this particular project and a few others, until we are in the position, Mr. Speaker, of being able to lay something concrete in the way of a bill or other things before the members across the way, when more information will be made available, I'm sure. But one has to realize that they are not doing anybody a favour and least of all the people of Manitoba when they get up and start using the type of scare tactics that the Member for Wellington used today. It is not going to help the negotiations as far as the government is concerned, and it's not going to stand or sit very well with the people of the Province of Manitoba.

The people in my area want assurances with regards to environment. They want assurances with regards to a good for Hydro, but, Mr. Speaker, they also want to see development, and they are very anxious to see this particular project because I think one of the natural locations for this site is out in Eastern Manitoba. So I would again say thank you to the Member for Wellington for putting his party's

position forward. They really don't want to see Alcan. They really don't want to see any potash, and they don't really want to see, Mr. Speaker, the Power Grid go, because if all of these projects come on within the next year or two we are going to see a lot of economic development in this province. You are going to see a lot of activity and that really doesn't help their re-election platform because they are very concerned only with one thing and that is to become government. I say to you today, Mr. Speaker, what we need from them is a little less crass politics and a little more statesmanship and a little more concern about the people of Manitoba, the people who are looking for a better life and a better quality of life in this particular province.

If we want to go back to the days when we didn't use any sprays or any chemicals or any fertilizers, we'll go back to growing 15 bushels of wheat an acre instead of 60. We can do that, but it really affects the quality of life that we are talking about. Now sure there are some risks in using different chemicals when they come out from time to time, but I don't think the people of Manitoba, if we can predict . . . put as many safeguards in place as possible. I really believe with regards to the environment that they really want to see this thing go ahead, and the Member for Wellington, I believe, has done us a real service in this province, to show exactly what the New Democratic Party's position on these developments are.

The bottom line finally is, I believe, that if they can't own it, nobody should own it, no development is better than corporate development, and I cannot go along with that. As I said before, let's have a little bit more of a positive attitude from the members opposite because the people of Manitoba are anxious to see some development come into the province and I believe this is one project that will be of benefit to all the people of Manitoba over the next number of years, and the scare tactics of Hydro sell-out, resource sell-out, environmental concerns, are all ones which I know they will employ very tactfully, but I suggest to you that the people of Manitoba will not buy them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

QUESTION put, MOTION carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Virden in the Chair for the Department of Northern Affairs, and the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Attorney-General.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY — NORTHERN AFFAIRS

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Arnold Brown (Rhineland): Committee come to order. We're on Resolution No. 114, 3.(d) — pass — the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to explore a concept with the Minister in the few minutes that we have available to us and that is relating, I suppose, to some of the discussion we've already had with respect to his department and that is the way in which his department relates to the

Community Councils in the carrying out of projects at the community level.

Now, I have the feeling, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister's preoccupation with the problems associated with communities doing things on their own and in so doing perhaps having some problems and making some mistakes in the learning process, has resulted in the department becoming very small "c" conservative in their approach to Northern communities. I say that because it appears that the department does not look favourably on contracting out or allowing Community Councils to take on the overall responsibility for the delivery of particular projects at the community level. One only needs to look at some specific examples to get some idea of what is happening there.

I get the feeling, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Northern Affairs is now dooming itself to follow in the footsteps of the Department of Indian Affairs that over the years has created, because of the paternalistic and bureaucratic way in which they've worked with Indian bands, they've created a situation whereby the Indian bands are very dependent on the department for almost all things that are done at the community level. The Department of Indian Affairs is only just now, after all these years, starting to move in the direction of allowing the Indian bands to take on responsibilities themselves in terms of carrying on projects at the community level. Where they have been able to allow the bands to do this, in the case of the Indian reserves, and where they have set up the contractual arrangement between the department and the band in an effective way, with the necessary guidelines written in to give the band the opportunity to know exactly what is required of them, they have been quite successful, I would say, Mr. Chairman, in being able to carry out projects and I dare say that it is probably much less expensive than having the department carry out each and every project in each and every reserve in the case of Indian Affairs.

Now in the case of Northern Affairs, Mr. Chairman, I think that the department's preoccupation with centralized control has its disadvantages and I think that the Minister should be looking at ways and developing ways in which the department can allow a community to take on the responsibility for doing a particular project with having only, as I said, the guidelines written into a contractual agreement between the department and the community in question so that there is a clear definition of the project, what has to be done at each stage, and that progress payments can be made to the local authority in their looking after the project. As long as the project, whatever it may be, is being carried out according to the specifications, I would think that's all the department would really be concerned about and as long as they are not asking for more funding than the department has budgeted for the particular project, then there should not be a concern there. I think that this could be an effective learning process for the community and it's something that they have to be able to go through if they are going to ever take over their own affairs because eventually, Mr. Chairman, as in any municipality, the local officials are going to have to be able to be responsible for overseeing and supervising local public works and they are not going to be able to depend forever on

outside officials from the department coming in and being the bosses, so to speak, on site.

I think that seems to be the only route that this department is following at this time, is having the Northern Affairs "boss" come into the community and run the whole show and the community council and the local people are merely the workers in the project. They are not given the opportunity to be the supervisors or to carry out the function that would normally be the function of a municipality, where a municipality in southern Manitoba, wherever it may be, would have a particular road to build or a gravel stockpile to put together or a sewer and water project to put in place, Mr. Chairman, the local municipality doesn't come to the Department of Municipal Affairs and say send us a boss out here so we can run this project because we don't know how to do it ourselves. The local municipality looks after it themselves and they are responsible to ensure that the project is done according to specifications. In the case of projects where there may be a significant technical aspect to it where the community may not have the necessary resources to supervise the technical aspect of it, well then, Mr. Chairman, I think that the Department could supply that engineering expertise. But often the people that are sent into the communities to be the bosses for these projects are not engineers. They are not particularly skilled in any technical aspect. They are simply sent there, from what I know, to be the supervisor or the boss for the project. I think whereas in some communities that may still be necessary, I think that in a vast majority of the communities it would not be necessary and that a much more effective job could be done and at a much more economical rate, as far as the department is concerned because, Mr. Chairman, it should not be necessary for the department to have supervisory personnel available for each and every community that has a project underway. The community should be able to take on that responsibility.

So, you know, I would think, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Northern Affairs in Manitoba should be at least as progressive as the Department of Indian Affairs, that has not had a good history of being a progressive department. It would appear to me that the present —(Interjection)— Yes, the Federal department — the existing Department of Northern Affairs in Manitoba seems to be falling into that rut of where Indian Affairs was 10 or 15 years ago, of being very paternalistic, centralized control, very bureaucratic in the way in which they relate to the client communities that they deal with and I think that's a real retrogressive step.

I would ask the Minister whether he has considered amending the guidelines to the department and the way in which they relate to the local government, the way in which they would relate to projects that are under way in communities, because I know from personal experience, Mr. Chairman, that it is the attitude of many of the senior officials in the Department of Northern Affairs that they must have their project boss on the job in the community or else they don't feel that the job can be carried out properly and, Mr. Chairman, that is not correct and it's not necessary in every case.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): The Honourable Minister.

HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River): Mr. Chairman, we certainly want the communities to become dependent on themselves but at the same time we don't want them to get hurt in the process. Also, at the same time, we have to be responsible for the taxpayers of Manitoba, who eventually pay these bills and in many of the communities, we do enter into contracts where they carry out the work entirely by themselves. But for heaven sakes, we don't want to get into anymore Wabowden arenas, and Norway House arenas, where there was no supervision. The local people went at it themselves with inadequate supervision and this is the type of situations that are created where communities are given the responsibilities to undertake jobs that are beyond their capabilities. I think that the Norway House arena is certainly a good example of what can happen in a community where there is inadequate supervision. We do have Northern Affairs supervisory personnel where it's felt that the local communities do not have the necessary expertise to carry out construction functions, whether it be community buildings or whether it be water and sewer programs or the like. But we do have a number of examples where the communities have undertaken projects entirely by themselves. We don't have a complete list but some of the examples are Cormorant did the water and sewer program; South Indian will be doing the similar thing this year; the community of Thicket put in their own dock facilities and in some communities, they have looked after their own road projects. This isn't a complete list. There are many other projects that are being handled entirely by the local communities. But I think we have to be very careful that we don't push these communities into undertaking projects before they are ready to do so, before they have the necessary local people that can undertake and properly supervise these projects that need and want to be done in the various communities.

Certainly we don't want to be involved in communities where the expertise is there locally and I think that the member's statement is unfair, that we are forcing the Northern Affairs personnel on these communities. We do it where we feel there's a necessity to do it. Where the expertise is there, we enter into contracts with the local communities to perform that work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to continue along this line, I'm just wondering what the criteria are to determine whether you're going to bring an outsider in, when do you and when don't you. I'm just thinking, for instance, of a southern community — you're referring to arenas. There was a southern community several years ago that also built an arena which happened to collapse while there was a court proceeding going on in it, in Powerview. It's a community not much different from Crystal City or Pilot Mound or Glenboro or any other community in southern Manitoba and I'm just wondering if you're going to say, because of something happening in one northern community, we're going to have daddy in here for everything. I'm not expecting that you're going to do that in the south, however, I think that it is very important that you tell us what the criteria are and on what basis do you send these outsiders in.

I happen to know several of the people who've gone up there from the south and I agree with the member who just finished speaking on this side that there is no specific expertise, engineering expertise or anything like that necessarily, that some of these people possess. They have probably common sense, they can probably supervise jobs, but surely there must be specific guidelines that the Minister would follow, or the department would follow, in coming into these communities and saying, this community can handle its sewer and water program, the next one can't; this community can handle a specific type of program, the next one can't. How do you determine which one can and which one can't?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, with reference to southern communities, of course have incorporated municipalities and they are sort of on their own as far as performing and making sure that the necessary expertise is available to undertake the projects that they may be undertaking. But in the situation with northern communities, it has to be taken into consideration the kinds and types of equipment that is available in the communities, the types and the various kinds of expertise that might be available in the various communities, and certainly these factors all have to be taken into account.

I should point out, too, that the member asked the question, when are southerners brought in. Where there is a contract tendered and the prices that come in from the local communities are deemed to be unreasonable and there are tenders received from southern parts of the province that are considerably under the tenders from the local communities, then we have to look at this very closely. Certainly we do give preferential treatment to the local communities and encourage them to participate if they have the expertise or to tender, but those are some of the things that are taken into account when projects are awarded locally or awarded to outsiders.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour of 12:30 having arrived, I move committee rise for Private Members' Hour.
Committee rise.

SUPPLY — ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Warren Steen (Crescentwood): Committee come to order, please. It's my belief that we are on Page 16 of the Estimates, Attorney-General's Department, Item 3, Boards and Commissions, 3.(a) — pass — the Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Going on with these Estimates, I would like to first deal with a recent ruling, which I believe may be, and if it isn't we'll soon find out, should be before the Manitoba Law Reform Commission. As I said, I think it probably is before the Law Reform Commission, but I certainly feel that it should be immediately sent there if it hasn't, and that is the question of my profession and the ruling that was made with respect to the Law Society's Reimbursement Fund.

There was a ruling brought down by the Court of Appeal, approximately, I think it was about a month-

and-a-half ago and it was, I have to say, I daresay, favourable to the members of my profession and I take exception to this. I feel that it was a bad ruling — not a bad ruling within the law, I'm sure that the Court of Appeal made a proper judgment on the basis of the law as it now exists — but it was a ruling which, well, it was a ruling which determined that a law of this province, or the lack of law in this province, gave lawyers certain privileges that I do not think should be accorded that profession.

The Court of Appeal determined, as I understand the decision, that there was no requirement or legal obligation for the Law Society of Manitoba to maintain a reimbursement fund for clients who had been affected by the negligence of a lawyer. I think the case involved — just to deal with specifics, because it's always easier to deal with the specific facts — this particular case involved a . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Attorney-General on a point of order.

MR. MERCIER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I want to bring to the attention to the Member for Wellington that I can't confirm it for sure but I believe this case has been appealed to the Supreme Court.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington, if that's the case . . .

MR. CORRIN: Well, it won't make any difference because what I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, and what I will say when I get to the conclusion of my remarks, is that the law has to be changed, so that the law that is before, if it were to be before the Supreme Court, is not relevant. What is relevant is whether the government will create new law that will not require claimants in the future to go to the Supreme Court. That is what is important.

I want the law to be black and white, so that lawyers are required to maintain a reimbursement claims fund and I want there to be no discretions within the professional society.

I was going to relate the particular case as I recollected it. In this case a certain lawyer, who had ultimately been disbarred, I think he had misappropriated and converted trust funds to his own use, had taken money in a professional capacity, which he had then invested, I suppose, much the same way as a broker or investment counsellor might, investments which I believe were controlled by him. I believe they were invested in a mortgage on property which he ultimately owned.

Now the majority, because this wasn't the opinion of the entire Court of Appeal of this province, but the majority held that the Law Society was not duty-bound to indemnify the lady in question for her losses. They said that they found no clear intention in the law of Manitoba to provide that such claims would have to be paid in whole or in part by the Law Society of Manitoba.

So essentially what they said was this was a discretionary matter to be left to the benchers of the Law Society to determine, or their designates to determine. As I understand it, the Law Society had rejected the claim and the court said, the majority of the court said that they could not interfere. There was dissenting opinion on the court but the majority

said they could not overrule, as it were, the Law Society position.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, to find out whether the Attorney-General feels that there should be an obligation on the Law Society to establish a reimbursement fund and I would like to know whether the Attorney-General believes that such a fund should be managed and administered by the Law Society itself because I, again, Mr. Chairman, respect the rights of professions to be self-governing, but self-policing, I'm not sure. I think there is probably a fine difference between the two terms and, Mr. Chairman, I'm not trying to suggest that I have the absolute answer. It's not the sort of thing that one can give definite responses to, but I would like to know that there is a requirement that there be a fund established and that there be a mechanism the government requires so that people who want to make claims can go before an objective body, an uninvolved body, not necessarily the body who is representative and elected by the contributors to the fund, because I think that there is an essential conflict of interest when you have that sort of situation in order that consumers of legal services can be afforded protection should lawyers like this, this particular disbarred lawyer, misappropriate their funds in this particular sort of way. I know that there are nuances here which defy easy discussion because I think that we're talking about a very specific type of misappropriation or conversion and a very specific type of application for reimbursement.

In any event, I feel, as I said, that the matter can be dealt with. I don't think that if it is being tested in the Supreme Court that it will have any effect on that case to have a policy statement as to the future enunciated or pronounced by the Minister responsible today. I think it's something that should be discussed. I think, like many things, it's worthy of discussion by members so that we have different points of view and perspectives, because it is important. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I agree that this is important and I agree that the discussion is valuable. I would ask the honourable member to reflect on his words. He said, "I want this to be black and white. I don't want a person to be confused as to whether they are entitled to it or not. I want them to have the right to get it without going to the Supreme Court." That was one expression. The next expression is that "There are nuances, there are difficulties and I do not have an absolute answer." Well, if the honourable member does not have an absolute answer, then it is not black and white and even when I have seen laws that I have thought were black and white, I have found out that what I thought was black was white and what I thought was white was black and I think that Swift said it best, Mr. Chairman.

In talking about lawyers, he said that there is a society amongst them, bred from their infancy, to prove that black is white and white is black, according as they are paid, and that's going to be the case, Mr. Chairman, forever because as much as we think that something is black and white, we suddenly find that there are different viewpoints as to what is black and what is white, according as they

are paid. The best judges in the land break up five-four on an issue which someone says they should know what the answer is and they break five-four and they say exactly the opposite thing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want it to be understood what we are talking about, because I am not again certain that in the particular case it is not right that there be reimbursement to this particular client, but I want it to be certain that we are talking about a reimbursement fund. There is no question that the lawyer involved is responsible criminally. There is no question except to qualify that I said that black is white and white is black and that I therefore have to talk in relative terms.

There is relatively no question that that lawyer is involved civilly, that he cannot escape responsibility; however, a civil action sometimes is of no value because a civil action could be a judgment which is not recoverable, which people have had happen to them from time to time in various areas.

We, the legal profession, and we are not perfect, but we have something that very few other professions have. We say that when one of us does something wrong in terms of dealing with moneys of a client that we hold in trust, we are so concerned that we want the public to trust us and give us that money, that we have said to people even if that lawyer doesn't do the right thing and misappropriates your money, we are going to gather a fund which we will pay for and that money will be repaid to you.

Now, Mr. Chairman, very few people do that. Let's now understand that if you go to a furniture store and leave money in trust and don't get your furniture, the furniture stores don't get together and say that client will get it. If you go to a doctor and not have money and that doctor does something which causes you permanent injury, the doctors don't put up a fund that says that you will be compensated for that injury. If you go to an accountant and that accountant costs you money because he does something wrong, the accountants don't put up a fund that says that if you lose money by virtue of having dealt with that accountant, all of the accountants are going to chip in to see to it that you are reimbursed.

But we lawyers, and I would say that's not because we are trusted but because we are distrusted, have got to establish our credibility. —(Interjection)— Well, the member says with good reason and, you know, I think that lawyers do have a bad image and I think that it's mostly because they are engaged in a profession where you can't really win.

I have seldom had a satisfied client who lost the case, Mr. Chairman, but half the cases are lost and I can tell you that the amount of money that is misappropriated by lawyers, in terms of having money, somebody else's money, is infinitesimal compared to the amount of money that lawyers have held. But they are in a vulnerable position, Mr. Chairman, because they have this money and I would suggest to you if that amount of money was deposited by the public with people who are not lawyers and held in trust, that there would be more misappropriation than there is now. That the lawyers, on the whole, deal decently with their trust fund.

But we have established, and it is right that we do so and I do not argue about it, that we will reimburse

a person whose money has been taken by a lawyer when it has been left in trust with him, and numerous people have been so reimbursed and the lawyers have gone to jail and been punished for their misappropriation as well and there is still a civil responsibility which is never avoided. I suppose that the Law Society could sue that lawyer, if he had anything, to get that money back to reimburse the reimbursement fund. They would have an indemnification of that claim.

Now, we have another problem, Mr. Chairman. I am a practising lawyer. Every year I have to send a certain amount of money to this reimbursement fund and I do not complain about it. It is in my interest to do so because the next client that comes to my office, he can rely to some extent, and I hope to a great extent, on my integrity but he can also rely on the fact that all of the other lawyers say that if this man takes your money, we're going to put up the money and reimburse you. I pay that and I'm satisfied to pay it.

Now, some lawyers are doing not law business. They are not taking money in trust for the purpose of buying the house or receiving the payment for a house or getting mortgage money. A person comes in to see a lawyer and he says to that lawyer, you're a smart man. I would like you to take my money and invest it and get me money for it. Mr. Chairman, — (Interjection)— Well, in my view that is not law business, and although I am perfectly satisfied to say that I will . . . my fellow lawyers for moneys which they have had in the course of doing their law business, must I have added to that Reimbursement Fund, and don't forget it affects every lawyer who does not practise this way and I don't practise that way and there are many lawyers who don't practise that way, who will say, I am not an investment counsellor; go somewhere else; go to a trust company; go to an investment counsellor. Don't ask me to do that. Why should all of those people — and I don't practise that type of law — be asked every year to pay money to reimburse a client who went to a lawyer to make money as an investment and trusted this man to do it and he didn't do it?

Now, I don't know, Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General is not even going to, probably, respond a great deal to this, because he's going say, I'm going to wait until the Supreme Court of Canada makes a decision. But, Mr. Chairman, it is not black and white. It is not black and white. If I am required to do so, I will do so. I sympathize with the person who has lost their money. The people lost their money in other areas. They loose their money with trust companies. They lost their money with the Winnipeg Mortgage Exchange and they weren't reimbursed by people who were innocent. In that particular case, are not the bulk of the lawyers innocent? Why are we going to say that these innocent people should pay for that particular crime? I really think it is a problem. I think that the public should be made aware. I think that maybe there should be a rule in the Law Society. Maybe there should be a rule that the person who gives money to a lawyer that is not covered by the Reimbursement Fund, that their lawyer has to give them in writing a letter to the effect that in this respect they are not covered by the lawyer.

Mr. Chairman, you know, what if he is a crook like Sims then he will go to jail and Mr. Sims went to jail.

At what stage do we say the innocent lawyers are responsible? We've agreed, the innocent lawyers have agreed, we are responsible regardless of the fact that we will never do it in our lives; the money is received by a lawyer in trust for the purpose of accomplishing a particular purpose and it's misappropriated and it's in the course of practising law that that money is reimbursed by all the lawyers, even those who have never done it. But if a person loans money to a lawyer and he doesn't pay it back, it would be obvious that the innocent lawyers should not be involved. So, that is the case where, I think, my honourable friend would agree that we're not going to deal with bad loans that lawyers have had made to them.

Then, there's the next area. Let us say that a lawyer goes into a business with somebody as a partner and they go into the investment business and both put up the money and the lawyer badly handles it. My honourable friend may say, well, we others who have not gone into the investment business should not be required to reimburse that person. Now, we come closer to my friend's case. A person, knowing a lawyer, feeling that he is a good investment counsellor goes in and says, I'd like you to invest my money, and the lawyer takes the money and goes to the race track. That's the question. Yes, it is terrible, and that lawyer has to go to jail and that lawyer should be sued but do all of the other innocent lawyers then have to chip in to pay that woman? That's the question.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we license them but we don't license him . . . We license him to practise law and the question is whether he is at that moment practising law or . . . Mr. Chairman, he doesn't need a license to do that. He doesn't need the license. A woman could go to anybody who is not a lawyer, so he'll get a mortgage brokers' license. But, Mr. Chairman, I'm not even going as far as to say that in the particular case, maybe, there should be. I'm saying that it is not simple and I know that the lawyers have a greater responsibility than the stationery engineers; that if a stationery engineer at Canada Packers does something wrong and there's an explosion, all of the other stationery engineers in the Province of Manitoba don't have to pay for the negligence of that particular stationery engineer. No, that's not an obligation on stationery engineers. And, it's an obligation on very few other people but it is an obligation on lawyers. And, how far that obligation is to go, I say is not black and white.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, the hour is 12:30. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, report of committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RES. NO. 9 — MARKETING ASSURANCE PLAN

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 9, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Springfield — the honourable member has 19 minutes.

MR. ROBERT ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, this resolution was introduced in this House and first debated on March 2nd, and was again debated on March 23rd. Since March 23rd, one other interesting aspect has come to light in that the Market Assurance Plan has been shelved by the Canadian Wheat Board Advisory Committee. And, I have in front of me their press release of March 31st, 1981, indicating essentially that there was no wide-spread support for the proposal from the farm community and from farm organizations and grain farmers in particular.

I would congratulate the Member for Gladstone on presenting his resolution and being just a little critical of the MAP Program and perhaps its work that has been done by people such as the Member for Gladstone that perhaps caused the Wheat Board Advisory Committee to have second thoughts from proceeding further with what I feel is a very ill-defined program. And, even if it were defined as well as possible, I think the principle of the whole thing is not correct.

The Member for St. George presented an amendment to the resolution of the Member for Gladstone not changing any particular intent of the resolution so much as making a positive sounding for the effect of making that resolution a positive sounding resolution related to the Market Assurance Plan. I cannot support the amendment by the Member for St. George because as I indicated earlier the plan is wrong; the principle is wrong; putting aside all question of the definition of the plan, it's entirely the wrong principle, Mr. Speaker, and I'll go through some of that in the time that has been allotted to me and put my thoughts on the record.

That Market Assurance Plan, Mr. Speaker, was unveiled by the Wheat Board Advisory Committee through the past winter in the month of January and was discussed at public meetings of farmers throughout the west by the elected members of the Canadian Wheat Board Advisory Committee.

The purposes or stated objectives of the Market Assurance Plan are laudable enough. I don't have any problem with that. The plan, Mr. Speaker, has been devised to encourage farmers to increase their productions to levels to meet the Canadian domestic requirements and grain export targets of some 30 million tons by 1985, and some 36 million tons by 1990. Scientists and farmers who attended the Prairie Production Symposium in October of 1980, agreed that type, that magnitude of a production increase can be achieved provided farmers are provided with adequate research and extension support and receive assurances on market prices and market volumes.

The stated objectives of the Market Assurance Plan, Mr. Speaker, are firstly, to provide a strong incentive to farmers to increase production both by increasing seeded acres, namely reducing summer-fallow and higher yields. Anyone who is a practical farmer knows full well that when markets and prices are low the intent of most farmers, at any rate, is to

cutback on the high cost inputs such as fertilizers, chemicals, and so on, that are necessary for optimum yields. As well, when prices are low and markets are poor farmers tend to keep more land in summer-fallow. Naturally, an assurance of markets will encourage farmers to increase their production.

The second objective or the stated objective of the Market Assurance Plan is to reinforce the ability of the Canadian Wheat Board to meet market demand effectively and efficiently, presumably by the means of making sure that there's a steady high level of production as well as a steady high level of grain in store on farms and within the grain system that the Wheat Board can call on as they achieve markets and make sales.

The third stated objective of the Market Assurance Plan is to eliminate so called distressed feed grain prices in Western Canada thus helping to provide equity in the domestic livestock industry as well as assuring supplies for the important and growing market for Western grains.

It's my understanding as the Market Assurance Plan has been set out that it would work something like this. After each harvest and by February 1st of that crop year, a farmer would commit the amount of grain that he would like to sell to the Canadian Wheat Board, presumably non-Board sales would not be effected. Any grain contracted for and not taken by the Canadian Wheat Board, by July 31, of that crop year, would be purchased and stored on the farm. The farmer would be paid a storage payment equal to that paid to an elevator company for the Market Assurance Plan grain from August 1, until the date of delivery, and grain from the Canadian Wheat Board-owned stocks would be called forward as needed. However, I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that each year's new production would get first call under the quota system.

The Market Assurance Plan, as it was set out, left far too many questions unanswered; there was no indication as to what it would do to the quota system. There was no understanding, to my way of thinking, as to what effect it would have on prices, and I do wonder what effect it would ultimately have on production.

There was also some concern, from my point of view, as to who would pay for the storage, namely the storage that farmers would be providing on the farm. If it comes out of Wheat Board funds, what we are talking about is simply farmers paying the storage, I believe, not to the greater good of farmers, Mr. Speaker, because if non-contracting farmers are penalized because storage costs come out of the pool account, the plan would seem to work to the disadvantage of non-participants.

I am also wondering if MAP works as well as it was indicated to be working or was projected to work for wheat, barley and oats, would that discourage the production of our special crops? We all know what has happened in western Canada in the last couple of decades with rapeseed or canola, likewise the outstanding growth in such crops as sunflowers. These special crops have had a profound effect on a farmers' cash income and has diversified their production, much to the advantage of western agriculture generally.

What about, Mr. Speaker, any consideration for flax, rye and rapeseed, as to whether a plan such as

that could work, or cover those other very important crops? And what about, Mr. Speaker, transportation problems and freight rates?

Mr. Speaker, the key to western grain production revolves around transportation. The major impediment to increased production, in my view, over the past decade has been the transportation system. If the transportation problems are not resolved by some means or other, farmers will not be encouraged to strive to the 1985 and 1990 goals outlined by the Western Grain Symposium.

My feeling about the Market Assurance Plan proposal is that it is a disincentive for the Wheat Board to market grain. That plan takes the pressure off the selling agencies to market western grain aggressively and to sell the total production every year. If the purpose of the MAP proposal, or Market Assurance Plan proposal, was to encourage a major increase in grain production on the Prairies, it had to be doomed to failure. There are only two things, Mr. Speaker, that will encourage farmers to grow more grain. One is high prices and the other is empty grain bins. I suggest to you that the Market Assurance Plan assured neither.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to see that the Wheat Board Advisory Committee has shelved that Market Assurance Plan. I felt from day one that the plan was ill-considered. It provided no long-term benefits to farmers. All it really did was extend the grain-handling system one notch further or one step further from the country elevators, one step further out to the farmers' granaries. Once that pipeline, or that portion of the pipeline was filled, we would be back to where we started with no further incentive to make the situation or the system any better. All it does it buy a little storage space. That's not a solution, Mr. Speaker. It may be a band-aid but it's certainly no solution.

As I said, I am very pleased that the Wheat Board Advisory Committee has shelved the program. I would like to congratulate the Member for Gladstone for bringing this resolution forward and I'll be pleased to support him in that regard.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a few comments on this resolution dealing with the Market Assurance Plan that the Advisory Board of the Canadian Wheat Board were given the responsibility of taking out to the country across western Canada and present to the farmers in such a way that they had hoped to do a selling job in regard to establishing probably a new type of policy insofar as the marketing of our grains is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I guess we are dealing with the amendment on this resolution and before I go any further, Mr. Speaker, I would too like to convey my congratulations to the Member for Gladstone on composing and bringing forth a resolution which seems to be most fitting because of the situation that has developed as a result of the hearings that the Advisory Committee to the Canadian Wheat Board have held across the three western provinces of Canada.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, of the results of those various meetings and the Advisory Board to the

Canadian Wheat Board are aware, too, of the feelings and the reactions that the farmers have towards this Market Assurance Plan that has been proposed by the — supposedly proposed, I should say, by the Advisory Board to the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment and the resolution by the Member for St. George, I believe it is, where he states that the resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone be amended by deleting the words "the Federal Government through the Canadian Wheat Board are promoting" after the Whereas in the first paragraph and substituting therefor the words, "The Canadian Wheat Board Producer Advisory Committee has proposed."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. George is suggesting a minor change here, that it should be directly the responsibility of the Advisory Board to the Canadian Wheat Board. It goes on to say, "in the second paragraph, all the words after 'proposal' in the first line thereof be deleted and the following words substituted: If implemented, would result in voluntary participation in the Marketing Assurance Plan."

From what I am given to understand, Mr. Speaker, and I have tried to follow this thing, while I did not have the opportunity to attend the meetings that were held in my particular part of the area, I know many farmers, and many of my constituent farmers, attended such a meeting. I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, because what I am given to understand is that there were a lot of questions that were asked by farmers that were not available in the way of answers from any of the members of the Advisory Board to the Canadian Wheat Board.

However, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to speak in a total negative tone on this matter because I think it was an exercise, a democratic exercise, where the Advisory Board went out to the farming communities in the three provinces and sort of got an indication as to how the farmers felt about this whole MAP program. I can't help but feel, Mr. Speaker, because this is an important subject matter, because of the ways things have been going with the Federal Government insofar as the whole aspect of marketing our grains in this country, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is almost like putting the cart before the horse, when they talk about trying to create an assurance plan to the farmers on providing them with some income towards grain that they are not able to sell.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I should go on too on this amendment, and I want to quote, Mr. Speaker, from the Member for St. George, "That all the words in the third and fourth paragraphs be deleted after the first Whereas and the following substituted: It should be the responsibility of the Canadian Wheat Board Advisory Committee to provide all Wheat Board permit holders with full documentation of this proposal, on how it works, what commodities it covers, what guarantees of payment to producers, what it costs and who pays the cost of this Market Assurance Plan.

"In the last paragraph, all the words after 'House' in the first line thereof be deleted and the following substituted: Request the Canadian Wheat Board Advisory Committee and the Government of Canada not to implement the said plan until such consultations have taken place."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I find that rather strange that the members opposite are bringing in this portion of their amendment. It's almost very similar to what the Member for Gladstone was talking about in his comments with regard to the concerns we have for the Assurance Plan.

But the first part of their amendment, Mr. Speaker, we have some difference of agreement here because I don't have any definite assurances of this particular situation, Mr. Speaker, but the Federal Government, or the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, gave the opportunity of the Advisory Board to go out and find out how the farmers felt about this matter. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I ask you, and I'm not sure, did the Canadian Government, did the Federal Government make some indication that this MAP program would be placed, or put into effect, by August 1, 1981, before the Advisory Board had ever gone out to meet with the farmers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta? That, Mr. Speaker, is a point of contention with me that I become very concerned about and I am wondering, like the Federal Government has done in so many cases with the problems that they are faced with pertaining to agriculture, I am suspicious of the fact that they were just passing the buck in asking the Advisory Board to do something that they should have accepted responsibility for themselves, namely the Minister who is responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, also the Minister who is responsible for transportation of grains out of Canada and finding its way to countries of the world who are going to purchase same.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Federal Government — my colleague from Springfield was making some comment this afternoon insofar as the MAP program was concerned, if this thing was to be put into place, I'm wondering if the Federal Government would really put its shoulder to the wheel and see to it that every effort was made to move grains to the various ports in Canada, make sure that the grain is at the ports at the time that the ships come in for loading. Would the railways take the same responsibility in upgrading those railroads and maintaining them to make sure that the grain cars are able to get over the tracks?

These are all questions, Mr. Speaker, that I think have a significant importance insofar as this MAP program is concerned. I can't help but feel, Mr. Speaker, because we did have a government, while it was for a very short period of time, that did more to solve some of the problems of marketing and moving grain in Canada in seven months than the present Liberal Government has done in 20 years, Mr. Speaker. I say that, Mr. Speaker, that if I had the opportunity, we could back that comment up with facts, that the then Minister under the Joe Clark government brought a number of railroads into the position where they are going to be maintained to the year 2,000, and I can go on and on, Mr. Speaker, so I wondered, Mr. Speaker, whether the Federal Government didn't suggest to the Advisory Board of the Canadian Wheat Board, you go out and see if you can't sell the farmers on accepting this plan that we have because there is a possibility that grain may be piling up in western Canada, God willing, if we get the rains and there is a real bumper crop again; a similar situation, Mr. Speaker, that happened in

1969, and you recall so well, Mr. Speaker, when the present Prime Minister came to Winnipeg and people were asking him what was he going to do with these mountains of grains that were piled up, and he says why should I bother taking care of that problem, or selling your grain, in words to that effect, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the same Prime Minister is at the helm today and farmers of western Canada, Mr. Speaker, have not forgotten the comment that the Prime Minister of today said in January, in Winnipeg, in 1969, Mr. Speaker, — why should I sell your wheat is the comment he made to them. And this, Mr. Speaker, is one of the reasons why I become very suspicious of the real serious intent to try to help the farmers and assist them when they talk about providing an assurance plan to farm stored grain that is not being sold.

Mr. Speaker, there are many questions that haven't been answered on this whole exercise. When farmers came to these meetings, number one of the things is that they wanted to know who was going to pay for all this. Is the Federal Government, because the Canadian Wheat Board, Mr. Speaker, is an agency to the Federal Government. It is not an agency to the farmers. It is an agency to the Federal Government and the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board must take full responsibility for the operation of the Canadian Wheat Board.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the present Minister who is responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board would take the same kind of attitude if it was given his opportunity to put this MAP Program into operation, that he would be no different than when he was in Brandon last fall and spoke to about 300 farmers — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I am deviating just a slight bit, but to sort of illustrate my point, Mr. Speaker, when about 300 cattlemen asked him how he was going to operate and promote the Herd Maintenance Program, he had no answers for them, Mr. Speaker, no answers at all. He just told the farmers, fill in your applications and we will deal with them. So, Mr. Speaker, even to this present day many of those farmers have not received the compensation that the Federal Government said they were going to provide and assist them because of the drought last year.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, we could be faced with a very same situation today, that as long as the present Minister is responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, that if this MAP Program was actually to go into effect, we are very concerned as to who is going to pay for it. Is it going to be farmer participation? Is it going to be Federal Government participation, or what is the situation?

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, is this just a scheme that is going to let the Canadian Wheat Board — and I don't blame the Canadian Wheat Board as such because they are answerable to the Federal Government — I should really say, Mr. Speaker, is it going to allow the Federal Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, allow him to become somewhat irresponsible for not accepting his responsibility and seeing to it that our grains are going to be marketed to the best of their ability to countries that want to purchase our crops?

Mr. Speaker, again I want to commend the Member for Gladstone for bringing forth this

resolution. I think, Mr. Speaker, it was timely. We indicated that there was no communication between the Federal Government and the Provincial Governments, to me, Mr. Speaker, I think that was very important. I hear a lot of chatter from the Member for St. Boniface from the seat of his pants. I would sure like to hear the Member for St. Boniface get up and make some comments about the agricultural industry in this province and perhaps he is such a close friend of the Prime Minister of this country, maybe he would like to rise and make some comments in defence of what this Prime Minister is trying to do. It's something like, Mr. Speaker, the only promise that he made to western Canada was double tracking from Winnipeg to Vancouver. That was all we got from the Prime Minister in the last Federal election, Mr. Speaker. Yes, that's all we got, something similar to what the Member for St. Boniface is prepared to give.

Mr. Speaker, someone mentions what about Churchill? We have just had a meeting with four Premiers of Western Canada in the northern part of Manitoba and you know when we hear of so much controversy going on because of the political situation that eastern Canada likes to create in regard to this whole situation, we are very concerned when they talk about providing assurances to farmers for storing grain that is not being sold. I think, Mr. Speaker, if there was more effort placed in trying to get more grain out to the Port of Churchill, get more grain say to the west coast, more grain to the Lakehead and through the St. Lawrence Seaway, Mr. Speaker, if they also spent more effort and more time in upgrading our railroads, not just double tracking because one double track from Winnipeg to Vancouver doesn't mean a thing to the outlying areas of all provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I think these are matters that are far more important, and you know, if the Advisory Board was to take on that task, which are much more closely related and farmers understand far better, than to try to devise what they call a MAP Program such as they have brought about. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I attended the Canada Grain Council meeting here a few weeks ago, and one of the members of the Advisory Board did make some comments at that meeting, and he did indicate that they had failed in their selling job of trying to convince the farmers of western Canada that what they had to offer was the right thing and the best thing for the farmers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, I think that my colleague from Gladstone and this side of the House are fully in tune with what the farmers are thinking throughout the western provinces of Canada in this regard, and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I want to support the Member for Gladstone on his efforts. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, let it not be said that I refuse an invitation when it's offered to me to participate in a debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I recognize the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I will admit that this is not a subject that I know that much about, and usually when I don't know too much about a certain subject I don't do like some of the members, like the one that just spoke, I keep my mouth shut. But I was invited to participate in this and I want to make a point quite clear. I won't be out of order, Mr. Speaker, but I will not even discuss the resolution that we have in front of us.

I want to give the member an example of how a politician can show disrespect for each other, how a politician can also help misleading statements or something that is completely wrong, and I want to say to him that although he wasn't there, I was at that meeting years ago where the present First Minister supposedly said, I am not interested in selling your grain. Everybody knows and the press knows and the people know that what he did was he made a joke, it wasn't in the way it was said at all; there were an awful lot of farmers there, and it is not proper, not fair, and not honest to go on and build a speech, like the last member, to build a speech around something like this that is absolutely false. I was there. It is the same thing when his colleague made a statement, in committee, that somebody said it was a racial slur, and it wasn't, and we said so.

It's about time that we try not to misrepresent everything that is said and if it catches on with certain people that we flog it to death, and if we dare say something in here, we are doom and gloom. — (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, when somebody wants to brag and say we are the best breeders, well you give them their dues. All we have done is given you your dues. If he is referring to what I said, I said all the breeders and one breeder. That is what I said, and I pointed at the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. We can only have one speaker at a time. The honourable members will have their turn. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the only point, it's not the resolution itself, but it is false, it is a cheap trick and it shows that the member hasn't got very much when he comes in and builds a speech around a statement that was made years ago and he takes it out of context and he takes it out of the meaning. I was there, I don't have to refer back to anybody else, and you weren't, and it was explained many times, but it is always brought back, I am not going to sell your wheat, I am not interested. That is asinine and ridiculous.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake on a point of order.

MR. EINARSON: The Member for St. Boniface is saying because I had indicated a comment that the Prime Minister made when he was in Winnipeg in January in 1969 when the question was asked of him what he was going to do about the pile up of grains in Canada, and his answer that he gave, as I indicated, and the member is not correct when he says that I am wrong. I dispute that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. A dispute as to allegations of fact does not constitute a point of order. The honourable member had no point of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: See what I mean, Mr. Speaker, when you don't know what you are talking about you should sit down. Mr. Speaker, I was there at that time and that's exactly what I am talking about, that you are using something that wasn't said in the way that you interpret it and you misquoted. — (Interjection)— That's not important. I was there, and I will tell you what party, I was a member of the Liberal party at the time. Are you happy? You made big points? You're happy? I'm glad that I salvaged something from this session for you because that's the most important thing you did all session.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I hope the honourable member will stick to the resolution.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, you've admonished these people, you've told them many times that you recognize me. I was greatly invited to participate in this debate by the last member who took his 20 minutes, whatever, and I am trying to do so and I want to make sure that I respond to all the accusations or the jokes or whatever is done.

Mr. Speaker, that is the thing that I wanted to show, that I think the member certainly, if his speech had anything in it — and I am not going to profess to know it all; maybe he had some good points. I am not an expert at that — but he is certainly wrong when he builds it around a statement like this. It would be the same thing for me knowingly sitting near the member, his neighbour from Minnedosa and saying yes it was a racial slur because he belongs to a different political party and I want to make points on that. It is cheap; it is not worthy of a member of this House, and it does very little for the speech that you just made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. WESTBURY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to make a long speech or a speech at all on this, Mr. Speaker, but in view of the fact that it may not be called as other than a voice vote, I just wanted to register the fact that I will be voting for the amendment because I think it is a more realistic recitation of the historical facts, among other things, than the original resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have an opportunity to speak on this resolution today which was so thoughtfully brought into the House by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, and amended by the Honourable Member for St. George. I wonder what the tactics are across the House today. It's the first time I ever saw the Member for St. Boniface speaking on the Wheat Board and we haven't had Private Members' Hour for several weeks and all of sudden, today, the Members Opposite want to speak on this resolution. And as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the matter has been shelved by the Advisory Board of the Canadian Wheat Board. As I understand it, it has been set aside.

However, Mr. Speaker, the strategy of the members opposite, it certainly shocks me and alarms me to think that we're digging our heels in here

today and debating this very important matter which has . . . and I want to speak on it, I want to speak on it very much but I just wonder if that's their election strategy, Mr. Speaker, or is this some backroom thing they cooked up last night or this morning to deal with this resolution on MAP which has been apparently set aside or set on the shelf until they go back and deal with the farmers in the west again. I would think, likely, Mr. Speaker, that due to the fact that the Honourable Member for Gladstone has saw fit to bring this resolution into this House is maybe one of the reasons why the matter has been shelved, I suspect. I would also like to express my appreciation, Mr. Speaker, to several other members in the House who have taken the time to speak on this resolution during Debate and no doubt their contributions are very likely very important too in having the matter shelved.

I've studied this resolution, Mr. Speaker, at great lengths, to just try and finger what the mind was of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose who likely drafted this resolution. I find it very difficult to get the thought out of it because basically the amendment which has been offered by the members opposite is almost identical to the resolution that the Member for Gladstone. Maybe the Member for Gladstone's resolution needed the cleaning up of a couple of words in his resolution which the Honourable Member for St. George has very ably done. But the nitty-gritty, the meat of the resolution itself that was presented by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, I don't see is changed at all by the amendment as proposed by the members opposite. So maybe that's the reason, Mr. Speaker, why they want us to debate that matter today and get it on the record that they are finally agreeing with us on a one thing. I was elated at that because it's very very seldom we get the members opposite to agree with us over here as the debates are generally fairly heated and it's unusual but this amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for St. George very neatly ties in with the words of wisdom of the Member for Gladstone.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I've had some conversations with constituents of mine on this proposed MAP Program that was laid out by the Advisory Board of the Canadian Wheat Board and like their resolution spells out, Mr. Speaker, it . . . —(Interjection)— Am I not allowed to put my remarks in the record? I would very much like to Mr. Speaker, because I represent one of the most productive farming areas in the Province of Manitoba, and not only in agriculture, in many other fields. We've got the CSP Foods Development out there. And, Mr. Speaker, we have the first effluent irrigation project in Roblin; a lot of things happening out there. I didn't want to shock the Member for Ste. Rose by making those two announcements at the same time and I see it really rocked him back.

Mr. Speaker, the concerns of farmers that have been expressed to me regarding the proposed MAP Program are similar to those that were raised by several members in the course of this debate. And I at the same time as many farmers wonder what they are trying to do in Eastern Canada with regard to our marketing system. Who was the author of this so-called MAP Program. Was it the Advisory Board themselves? Was it the Chairman of the Board? Was

it the Alberta delegation or who in fact, and I've never been able yet to put my finger on who was the author, or was it the Minister, or was it the Honourable Hazen Argue from the Senate, who is now sticking his finger into the pie and as we've seen for many years in Western Canada, tried to guide us through some of the benefits of his wisdom? And that answer, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I have not been able to gather. Even the Members for Alberta and I did have chance to speak to one of them on the telephone. He said that he didn't know where it came from. So I wonder, was it in fact the Advisory Board that were the ones that created this proposal for the farmers? But until we get those kind of things out in the open, I'm glad that the resolution was brought in by the Member for Gladstone and amended by the Honourable Member from St. George, because matters in the west and the east today, the tensions are growing almost daily, and here is another example of the animosity that has come about in our country through all these terrible things that's happening in Canada today. And the members of the Advisory Committee have come out almost flatly and said, we don't want no part of it. Now, can you imagine why that would arrive at a table and come out in a consensus amongst the farmers of this Province or Saskatchewan and Alberta when Alberta was so opposed to that proposal? That just doesn't make sense; it doesn't make sense. It's not fair to the farmers of this Province. It's not fair to the farmers of Saskatchewan and Alberta for them to bring that kind of a Resolution out and say, we want to know what you think of it. I think they should have at least agreed at the Board level before they brought the proposal out to the farm community, and then, Mr. Speaker, the other concerns that I got as very very few people in Roblin constituency had an opportunity to learn anything about the program at all. I believe a couple did go to Dauphin; it's my understanding there was a meeting. But is this the way that we have to treat our number one industry in this province today with those kinds of tactics of coming out with a proposal that they're not prepared to divulge all the details of, all the facts, where it came from, who was the author of it and all the other questions that are continually being raised.

So I do again, as I say, Mr. Speaker, congratulate the Member for Gladstone and the Member for St. George and members of this House that have taken the time to speak on this very important matter, like many other members that have spoken on the subject matter and I was questioned on this at great lengths as to what about the alternative crops. Are we not concerned about these farmers today that are growing alternate crops? Is the Wheat Board not concerned? Is the Advisory Committee not concerned about these? If they're going to get into the business of giving some assurance plan, surely they should have addressed themselves to that facet because of the fact that's our number one industry in this province and we deserve those kinds of answers, Mr. Speaker.

The other question that was raised to me and the Honourable Member for Springfield and his comments, Mr. Speaker, what about the flax and the rye and the rapeseed? Are they not concerned about those grains, or are they to be set aside? And, Mr.

Speaker, those are questions that deserve very fair and honest answers and we didn't get them and we haven't got them to this day, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker.

And of course, Mr. Speaker, the one that came the most often was what about the quota system? What type of a quota system are they going to implement with this MAP Program? —(Interjection)— Open, he says, certainly. Open for what? Open to fill up your own grainery? Certainly, it'll be open to fill up your own bins. And, Mr. Speaker, until the Federal Government of our great country does a lot more about transportation and grain handling facilities and ports, there never will be an open quota in this country ever again. The Member for Ste. Rose knows that, that we'll never have an open quota in our country again until they address themselves to those problems. The rail transportation in Western Canada today is a disaster and he knows that and I know that and we all know that. We're harping here about Crow rates, day after day. That's not the major problem. The problem is the rail transportation system and the port facilities.

I'm glad that the four Premiers that met in Thompson the other day, Mr. Speaker, addressed themselves to the subject of the Port of Churchill and are demanding that at least 3 percent of the grains are delivered through the Port of Churchill. Now why doesn't the Advisory Committee that are cooking up the MAP Plan give us some assurance in this province that they're going to use the Port? There's nothing, Mr. Speaker, nothing at all; not a word, Mr. Speaker, not a word. And that is an important matter. What about the other port facilities? I understand that the Great Lakes Port facilities now need a huge upgrading if we're ever going to dream about an open quota in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. Is that going to happen? I haven't heard it.

What about the \$14 billion to \$20 billion that's needed to upgrade the rail system. Are there any dollars in any of these proposals from the MAP people that they're going to address themselves, or the two Ministers that are involved? And, Mr. Speaker, I was not able to tell the people in my constituency that there was any of these matters addressed at all. So I certainly am pleased to have a chance to express these concerns and to put them in the record. And as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, likely due to the resolution and the way it's been addressed and the way the Honourable Minister of Agriculture in our province has handled this matter, it is set aside for the time being. But I suppose if Roy Atkinson is still chairing the Board, he'll be back because Roy's not known to quit. I recall the time when he went down to the Wheat Board office with that red pitchfork and nailed that proclamation on the door. In fact, we were marching with him that time. We went down, I believe it was high noon and some of the members of this House, and Roy was leading the parade and he had that pitchfork and we rammed that proclamation on the door of the Wheat Board, and now he is the Chairman of the Advisory Board. Can you believe that one, Mr. Speaker? Can you believe the hate that man had at that time for the Wheat Board and now he is chairing the Advisory Committee? —(Interjection)— He is the Chairman of the Advisory Board. (Interjection)— No, no, I don't

know how you'd call it when you use a pitchfork to nail a proclamation on the door of the Wheat Board. Is that hatred or is that saying we like you or . . . Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Rose doesn't believe that. There are members in this House that marched with him that day.

Mr. Speaker, I would even go further in my remarks on this resolution today and to the amendment that's proposed by the Honourable Member for St. George. I think that the Minister of Agriculture and a committee of all parties of this House, call this Advisory Committee at an early date into our province and sit down and discuss this matter so that we can give some answers to the people of this province as to where we're going to go if we proceed with the MAP Program. There's not enough answers. There's not enough information and it just doesn't satisfy the majority of the people that I represent.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't like to delay the vote on this important matter but I had a lot of remarks that I wanted to put into the record and I suspect that there are several others that would like to put their comments into the record. So, Mr. Speaker, I'll not delay. I will take my place and thank you for the opportunity to speak on this very important matter today. And I thank the two members, the Member for Gladstone and the Member for St. George, for their emotion and their amendment to the motion. I think it's very timely; they've done a good job; it shelved the proposed MAP program and until we get more answers and a lot more information than we've had to know, I hope it stays on the shelf.

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

MR. LLOYD G. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to get up in this House on the spur of the moment . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I find it very difficult to hear the remarks of the honourable member.

The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. HYDE: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to be able to get up on the floor of this House in support of the resolution proposed by the Member for Gladstone.

To me, Mr. Speaker, the whole thing required a lot further, a lot more discussion and deeper discussion than what was proposed at the time that it was brought forward by the Advisory Committee of the Wheat Board. The questions that I feel needed to be further discussed were the fact that the storage and the quota system wasn't explained; the storage system and what effect it will have on our price system of our grains; what effect it will have on the production, as was brought out by the Member for Springfield, and who is going to pay for the storage.

Well, these people who don't produce grain just have not got the answer. You've got to come back to the grassroots of the producers of these commodities; you've got to hear their story of the whole thing to get the facts straight. The storage today is a very costly part of our production of grains and therefore it is a major concern to those of us who are in the production of grains and coarse grains. Mr. Speaker, that, in my mind, is one of the

first and major points, to make certain, before this ever comes out again that these points be totally discussed and brought forward.

I'm glad that the Wheat Board Advisory Board was able to wash it from their minds for the present time at least until they do get these facts together. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Downey, I'm glad that he was able to come forward and almost demand the fact that these answers be given.

My own area of Portage la Prairie, of course, is now very much involved in the production of vegetables, only special crops. We are in the position where we're fortunate that we can produce them and naturally takes away from the glut of our commodities produced by the more productive coarse grain areas of our prairie provinces.

Mr. Speaker, Portage, in the past has been a very highly productive area and as I say, they've gone to the production of vegetables and special crops, but I think my big concern today is that more emphasis must be paid to the transportation of all commodities to the point of export. To me, if we were to take and were forced to store grain on our farms after a heavy year of production, there is very little left for the bankers to even be smiling about when we have to tie up all our money in the storage of grains. The exporting of grains, I want to stress this, that we certainly must encourage our Federal Government to take and give every effort possible to the building of our facilities on the export points such as Prince Rupert, etc. Mr. Speaker, unless they have this transportation system to a point where it is going to be an advantage to the entire agricultural industry — it's got to be dealt with. Mr. Speaker, I want to add those few words just in support of the Member for Gladstone on this resolution and that it will be dealt with.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, the Honourable Member for Rhineland has already spoken.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have some detailed notes here that I would like my full time to go into so if the House was so disposed to call it 1:30, I would take my full time when the bill comes up again, but if not, I will . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The matter is standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

The hour is 1:30, the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until two o'clock Monday.